

625.

ON THE CONDITION FOR THE EXISTENCE OF A SURFACE
CUTTING AT RIGHT ANGLES A GIVEN SET OF LINES.

[From the *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, vol. VIII. (1876—1877),
pp. 53—57. Read December 14, 1876.]

IN a congruency or doubly infinite system of right lines, the direction-cosines α , β , γ of the line through any given point (x, y, z) , are expressible as functions of x, y, z ; and it was shown by Sir W. R. Hamilton in a very elegant manner that, in order to the existence of a surface (or, what is the same thing, a set of parallel surfaces) cutting the lines at right angles, $\alpha dx + \beta dy + \gamma dz$ must be an exact differential: when this is so, writing $V = \int (\alpha dx + \beta dy + \gamma dz)$, we have $V = c$, the equation of the system of parallel surfaces each cutting the given lines at right angles.

The proof is as follows:—If the surface exists, its differential equation is $\alpha dx + \beta dy + \gamma dz = 0$, and this equation must therefore be integrable by a factor. Now the functions α, β, γ are such that $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \gamma^2 = 1$, and they besides satisfy a system of partial differential equations which Hamilton deduces from the geometrical notion of a congruency; viz. passing from the point (x, y, z) to the consecutive point on the line, that is, to the point whose coordinates are $x + \rho\alpha, y + \rho\beta, z + \rho\gamma$ (ρ infinitesimal), the line belonging to this point is the original line; and consequently α, β, γ , considered as functions of x, y, z , must remain unaltered when these variables are changed into $x + \rho\alpha, y + \rho\beta, z + \rho\gamma$, respectively. We thus obtain the equations

$$\alpha \frac{d\alpha}{dx} + \beta \frac{d\alpha}{dy} + \gamma \frac{d\alpha}{dz} = 0,$$

$$\alpha \frac{d\beta}{dx} + \beta \frac{d\beta}{dy} + \gamma \frac{d\beta}{dz} = 0,$$

$$\alpha \frac{d\gamma}{dx} + \beta \frac{d\gamma}{dy} + \gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dz} = 0.$$

Combining herewith the equations obtained by differentiation of $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \gamma^2 = 1$, viz.

$$\alpha \frac{d\alpha}{dx} + \beta \frac{d\beta}{dx} + \gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dx} = 0,$$

$$\alpha \frac{d\alpha}{dy} + \beta \frac{d\beta}{dy} + \gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dy} = 0,$$

$$\alpha \frac{d\alpha}{dz} + \beta \frac{d\beta}{dz} + \gamma \frac{d\gamma}{dz} = 0,$$

and subtracting the corresponding equations, we obtain three equations which may be written

$$\alpha : \beta : \gamma = \frac{d\beta}{dz} - \frac{d\gamma}{dy} : \frac{d\gamma}{dx} - \frac{d\alpha}{dz} : \frac{d\alpha}{dy} - \frac{d\beta}{dx},$$

or, what is the same thing,

$$\frac{d\beta}{dz} - \frac{d\gamma}{dy}, \frac{d\gamma}{dx} - \frac{d\alpha}{dz}, \frac{d\alpha}{dy} - \frac{d\beta}{dx} = k\alpha, k\beta, k\gamma,$$

and, multiplying by α, β, γ , and adding,

$$k = \alpha \left(\frac{d\beta}{dz} - \frac{d\gamma}{dy} \right) + \beta \left(\frac{d\gamma}{dx} - \frac{d\alpha}{dz} \right) + \gamma \left(\frac{d\alpha}{dy} - \frac{d\beta}{dx} \right).$$

We thus see that, if the function on the right-hand vanish, then $k=0$, and consequently also

$$\frac{d\beta}{dz} - \frac{d\gamma}{dy}, \frac{d\gamma}{dx} - \frac{d\alpha}{dz}, \frac{d\alpha}{dy} - \frac{d\beta}{dx} \text{ each} = 0;$$

viz. if the equation $\alpha dx + \beta dy + \gamma dz = 0$ be integrable, then $\alpha dx + \beta dy + \gamma dz$ is an exact differential; which is the theorem in question.

But it is interesting to obtain the first mentioned set of differential equations from the analytical equations of a congruency, viz. these are $x = mz + p$, $y = nz + q$, where m, n, p, q are functions of two arbitrary parameters, or, what is the same thing, p, q are given functions of m, n ; and therefore, from the three equations, m, n are given functions of x, y, z . And it is also interesting to express in terms of these quantities m, n , considered as functions of x, y, z , the condition for the existence of the set of surfaces.

We have

$$\alpha, \beta, \gamma = \frac{m}{R}, \frac{n}{R}, \frac{1}{R}, \text{ where } R = \sqrt{1 + m^2 + n^2};$$

and thence without difficulty

$$\left(\alpha \frac{d}{dx} + \beta \frac{d}{dy} + \gamma \frac{d}{dz} \right) \alpha = \frac{1}{R^4} \left[(1 + n^2) \left(m \frac{dm}{dx} + n \frac{dm}{dy} + \frac{dm}{dz} \right) - mn \left(m \frac{dn}{dx} + n \frac{dn}{dy} + \frac{dn}{dz} \right) \right],$$

$$\left(\alpha \frac{d}{dx} + \beta \frac{d}{dy} + \gamma \frac{d}{dz} \right) \beta = \frac{1}{R^4} \left[-mn \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{ } \\ \text{ } \end{array} \right) + (1 + m^2) \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{ } \\ \text{ } \end{array} \right) \right],$$

$$\left(\alpha \frac{d}{dx} + \beta \frac{d}{dy} + \gamma \frac{d}{dz} \right) \gamma = \frac{1}{R^4} \left[- \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{ } \\ \text{ } \end{array} \right) - \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{ } \\ \text{ } \end{array} \right) \right],$$

so that the required equations in α, β, γ will be satisfied if only

$$m \frac{dm}{dx} + n \frac{dm}{dy} + \frac{dm}{dz} = 0,$$

$$m \frac{dn}{dx} + n \frac{dn}{dy} + \frac{dn}{dz} = 0,$$

and it is to be shown that these equations hold good.

Writing for shortness $dp = A dm + B dn$, $dq = C dm + D dn$, the equations of the line give

$$\begin{array}{l|l} 1 = z \frac{dm}{dx} + A \frac{dm}{dx} + B \frac{dn}{dx}, & 0 = z \frac{dn}{dx} + C \frac{dm}{dx} + D \frac{dn}{dx}, \\ 0 = z \frac{dm}{dy} + A \frac{dm}{dy} + B \frac{dn}{dy}, & 1 = z \frac{dn}{dy} + C \frac{dm}{dy} + D \frac{dn}{dy}, \\ -m = z \frac{dm}{dz} + A \frac{dm}{dz} + B \frac{dn}{dz}, & -n = z \frac{dn}{dz} + C \frac{dm}{dz} + D \frac{dn}{dz}; \end{array}$$

or, writing

$$\lambda, \mu, \nu = \frac{dm}{dy} \frac{dn}{dz} - \frac{dm}{dz} \frac{dn}{dy}, \quad \frac{dm}{dz} \frac{dn}{dx} - \frac{dm}{dx} \frac{dn}{dz}, \quad \frac{dm}{dx} \frac{dn}{dy} - \frac{dm}{dy} \frac{dn}{dx},$$

so that identically

$$\lambda \frac{dm}{dx} + \mu \frac{dm}{dy} + \nu \frac{dm}{dz} = 0,$$

$$\lambda \frac{dn}{dx} + \mu \frac{dn}{dy} + \nu \frac{dn}{dz} = 0,$$

then in each set, multiplying by λ, μ, ν and adding, so as to eliminate A, B, C, D , we find

$$\lambda - m\nu = 0, \quad \mu - n\nu = 0.$$

Substituting these values of λ, μ in the last preceding equations, ν divides out, and we have the two equations in question.

The foregoing equations give further

$$A, B, C, D = -z + \frac{1}{\nu} \frac{dn}{dy}, \quad -\frac{1}{\nu} \frac{dm}{dy}, \quad -\frac{1}{\nu} \frac{dn}{dx}, \quad -z + \frac{1}{\nu} \frac{dm}{dx}.$$

Taking for α, β, γ the before-mentioned values, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\alpha}{dy} - \frac{d\beta}{dx} &= \frac{1}{R} \left(\frac{dm}{dy} - \frac{dn}{dx} \right) - \frac{m}{R^2} \left(m \frac{dm}{dy} + n \frac{dn}{dy} \right) - \frac{n}{R^2} \left(m \frac{dm}{dx} + n \frac{dn}{dx} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{R^2} \left\{ (1 + n^2) \frac{dm}{dy} - (1 + m^2) \frac{dn}{dx} + mn \left(\frac{dm}{dx} - \frac{dn}{dy} \right) \right\}; \end{aligned}$$

and similarly, but using the equations

$$m \frac{dm}{dx} + n \frac{dm}{dy} + \frac{dm}{dz} = 0, \quad m \frac{dn}{dx} + n \frac{dn}{dy} + \frac{dn}{dz} = 0,$$

to eliminate the coefficients $\frac{dm}{dz}$, $\frac{dn}{dz}$ which in the first instance present themselves, we find

$$\frac{d\beta}{dz} - \frac{d\gamma}{dy} = \frac{m}{R^3} \left\{ (1+n^2) \frac{dm}{dy} - (1+m^2) \frac{dn}{dx} + mn \left(\frac{dm}{dx} - \frac{dn}{dy} \right) \right\},$$

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dx} - \frac{d\alpha}{dz} = \frac{n}{R^3} \left\{ \begin{array}{ccc} & & \\ & & \\ & & \end{array} \right\};$$

whence, multiplying by γ , α , β , and adding,

$$\alpha \left(\frac{d\beta}{dz} - \frac{d\gamma}{dy} \right) + \beta \left(\frac{d\gamma}{dx} - \frac{d\alpha}{dz} \right) + \gamma \left(\frac{d\alpha}{dy} - \frac{d\beta}{dx} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1+m^2+n^2} \left\{ (1+n^2) \frac{dm}{dy} - (1+m^2) \frac{dn}{dx} + mn \left(\frac{dm}{dx} - \frac{dn}{dy} \right) \right\};$$

or we have

$$(1+n^2) \frac{dm}{dy} - (1+m^2) \frac{dn}{dx} + mn \left(\frac{dm}{dx} - \frac{dn}{dy} \right) = 0$$

as the condition for the existence of the set of surfaces.

It is clear that the condition is satisfied when the lines are the normals of a given surface: seeking the surfaces which cut the lines at right angles, we obtain the parallel surfaces; and we are led to the theorem that any parallel surface is the locus of the extremity of a line of constant length measured off from each point of the surface along the normal—or, what is equivalent thereto, the parallel surface is the envelope of a sphere of constant radius having its centre on the surface. I will verify the theorem for the case of the ellipsoid. Taking X , Y , Z as the coordinates of a point on the ellipsoid $\frac{X^2}{a^2} + \frac{Y^2}{b^2} + \frac{Z^2}{c^2} = 1$, and x , y , z as current coordinates, the equations of the normal are

$$\frac{a^2}{X}(x-X) = \frac{b^2}{Y}(y-Y) = \frac{c^2}{Z}(z-Z), \quad (= \lambda \text{ suppose}).$$

We have therefore

$$X, Y, Z = \frac{a^2 x}{a^2 + \lambda}, \frac{b^2 y}{b^2 + \lambda}, \frac{c^2 z}{c^2 + \lambda},$$

and thence

$$\frac{a^2 x^2}{(a^2 + \lambda)^2} + \frac{b^2 y^2}{(b^2 + \lambda)^2} + \frac{c^2 z^2}{(c^2 + \lambda)^2} = 1,$$

an equation which determines λ as a function of x , y , z .

The direction-cosines α , β , γ of the normal are proportional to $\frac{X}{a^2}$, $\frac{Y}{b^2}$, $\frac{Z}{c^2}$, that

is, to $\frac{x}{a^2+\lambda}$, $\frac{y}{b^2+\lambda}$, $\frac{z}{c^2+\lambda}$, and the equation $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \gamma^2 = 1$ then determines their absolute magnitudes: the equation $\alpha dx + \beta dy + \gamma dz = dV$ thus is

$$\frac{\frac{x dx}{a^2+\lambda} + \frac{y dy}{b^2+\lambda} + \frac{z dz}{c^2+\lambda}}{\sqrt{\frac{x^2}{(a^2+\lambda)^2} + \frac{y^2}{(b^2+\lambda)^2} + \frac{z^2}{(c^2+\lambda)^2}}} = dV,$$

viz. the left-hand side, considering therein λ as a given function of V , is an exact differential. We verify this by finding the value of V , viz. writing down the two equations

$$\frac{x^2}{(a^2+\lambda)^2} + \frac{y^2}{(b^2+\lambda)^2} + \frac{z^2}{(c^2+\lambda)^2} - \frac{V^2}{\lambda^2} = 0,$$

$$\frac{x^2}{a^2+\lambda} + \frac{y^2}{b^2+\lambda} + \frac{z^2}{c^2+\lambda} - \frac{V^2}{\lambda} = 1,$$

these are equivalent in virtue of the equation that determines λ ; and it is to be shown that, regarding V as given by either of them, say by the second equation, we have for dV its foregoing value. In fact, differentiating the second equation, the term in $d\lambda$ disappears by virtue of the first equation, and the result is

$$\frac{x dx}{a^2+\lambda} + \frac{y dy}{b^2+\lambda} + \frac{z dz}{c^2+\lambda} - \frac{V dV}{\lambda} = 0,$$

in which substituting for $\frac{V}{\lambda}$ its value from the first equation, we have for dV the value in question. Regarding V as a given constant, the two equations give, by elimination of λ , an equation $\phi(x, y, z, V) = 0$, which is, in fact, the surface parallel to the ellipsoid and at a constant normal distance = V from it.