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# SPECLAL PROPERTIES OF CONICS 

Cynthia Liu and Soonkyu Park

## IntroductionA Point Inside and Out

For all three conics, there are special properties associated with a point located inside (or outside of) the curve and the distances from the point to the focus (or foci) and/or to the directrix(es) of the conic.

In the case of an ellipse, the sum of the distances from any point inside the ellipse to the foci is less than the length of the major axis. If the point is located outside, the distance is longer than the major axis.


To prove this, connect a point $X_{1}$ inside the ellipse to one of the foci, and extend this line until it intersects the ellipse at a point $Y$ (Figure 1).
Applying the triangle inequality to triangle $X_{1} F_{2} Y$, we get that $X_{1} F_{2}<X_{1} Y$ $+Y F_{2}$. Adding $F_{1} X_{1}$ to both sides gives us $F_{1} X_{1}+X_{1} F_{2}<F_{1} X_{1}+X_{1} Y+Y F_{2}=$ $F_{1} Y+F_{2} Y$. Likewise, for a point $X_{1}$ outside the ellipse, $F_{2} Y<X_{1} Y+X_{1} F_{2}$, and, therefore, $F_{1} X_{1}+X_{1} F_{2}=F_{1} Y+$ $Y X_{1}+X_{1} F_{2}>F_{1} Y+F_{2} Y$. Now, to show that $F_{1} Y+F_{2} Y$ is equivalent to $A B$, the major axis, we place the point $Y$ on the intersection between the major axis and the ellipse. Due to the symmetry within the ellipse, we know that $F_{1} A$ and $F_{1} B$ are equal. Therefore, $F_{1} Y+$ $F_{2} Y=F_{1} A+F_{2} A=F_{1} A+F_{1} F_{2}+F_{2} B$.

The opposite holds true for a point outside the ellipse.

In the case of a hyperbola, the absolute value of the difference of the distances from any point between the two branches to the foci is greater than that of the distances from any point on the hyperbola to the foci.

To prove this, let $X_{1}^{\prime}$ be a point between the two branches of the hyperbola, and $Y$ the intersection of $X_{1}^{\prime} F_{1}$ and the hyperbola (Figure 2). Then, $F_{1} X_{1}^{\prime}=$ $F_{1} Y+Y X_{1}^{\prime}$. By the triangle inequality, $F_{2} X_{1}^{\prime}<F_{2} Y+Y X_{1}^{\prime}$. Subtracting $F_{1} X^{\prime}$ from both sides, we have $F_{2} X^{\prime}-F_{1} X^{\prime}<$ $F_{2} Y+Y^{\prime} X^{\prime}-\left(F_{1} Y+Y X^{\prime}\right)=F_{2} Y-F_{1} Y$.

In a similar fashion, we can show the opposite is true for a point inside one of the branches of the hyperbola.

In the case of a parabola, the distance between a point inside the parabola and the focus is less than the distance between that point and the directrix.

To prove this, let $X_{0}$ be the point, $F$ the focus, and $Z$ the projection of $X_{0}$ onto the directrix (Figure 3). $X_{0} F<X_{0} Z+F Z$ by the triangle inequality. Since $F Z=$ $Z Y$ by the definition of the parabola, $X_{0} F<X_{0} Z+Z Y=X_{0} Y$.

For points outside the parabola, the opposite holds. Let $X$ ' be such point, $F$ the focus, and $Z$ the projection of $X^{\prime}$ onto the directrix. By the triangle inequality, $X^{\prime} F+X Z^{\prime}>F Z^{\prime}=Z^{\prime} Y^{\prime}=$ $Z^{\prime} X^{\prime}+X^{\prime} Y^{\prime}$. Subtracting $X^{\prime} Z^{\prime}$ from both sides yields $X^{\prime} F>X^{\prime} Y^{\prime}$.

## Optical Properties

Optical properties describe the relationship between a line tangent to a conic and the exterior angle formed by the tangent.

In the case of an ellipse, a line 1 that is tangent to the ellipse at point $P$ is the bisector of the external angle $\angle F_{1} P F_{2}$ (Figure 4).

To prove this, draw a line tangent to the ellipse and pick a point $X_{1}$ that lies on the line and is outside the ellipse. Straight away, we can tell that $X_{1} F_{1}+$ $X_{1} F_{2}>P F_{1}+P F_{2}$. Because the point of tangency provides the smallest sum of $F_{1} P$ and $F_{2} P$, we can deduce that $\angle X_{1} P F_{1}$ and $\angle Q P F_{2}$ must be congruent. This makes sense because if

we reflect $F_{2}$ over the line, $F_{1} F_{2}^{\prime}$ has the smallest length when the three points ( $F_{1}, P$, and $F_{2}^{\prime}$ ) are collinear. In order for that to happen, $\angle X_{1} P F_{1}$ and $\angle Q P F_{2}^{\prime}$ must be congruent since they are vertical angles. Therefore, because $\angle Q P F_{2}^{\prime}$ and $\angle Q P F_{2}$ are congruent
(property of a reflected point), $\angle X_{1} P F_{1}$ and $\angle Q P F_{2}$ are congruent.

In the case of a hyperbola, a line that is tangent to the hyperbola at point $P$ is the bisector of $\angle F_{1} P F_{2}$, where $F_{1}$ and $F_{2}$ are the foci of the hyperbola (Figure 5).


To prove this, we use proof by contradiction. Suppose the bisector of $\angle F_{1} P F_{2}$ intersects the hyperbola twice at $P$ and $Q$. Reflect $F_{1}^{\prime}$ with respect to 1 and call the second point $F_{1}^{\prime}$. Because 1 is the angle bisector of $\angle F_{1} P F_{2}, F_{1} Q=$ $Q F_{1}^{\prime}$ and $F_{1} P=P F_{1}^{\prime}$. Hence, $F_{2}, F_{1}^{\prime}$, and $P$ are collinear. By definition of a hyperbola (that is, the difference between the distances from the foci to
any point on the hyperbola is constant), $F_{2} P-P F_{1}=F_{2} Q-F_{1} Q$, and, thus, $F_{2} F_{1}^{\prime}=F_{2} P-P F_{1}=F_{2} Q-Q F_{1}^{\prime}$. But, by the triangle inequality, $F_{2} F_{1}^{\prime}>F_{2} Q-$ $Q F_{1}$. This is a contradiction, because line 1 should be an angle bisector. Therefore, the line intersects the hyperbola at only one point and must be a tangent.

In the case of a parabola, a line 1 that is tangent to a parabola at point $P$ is the angle bisector of $\angle F P P^{\prime}$, where $P^{\prime}$ is the projection of $P$ on the directrix (Figure 6).

To prove this, we once again use proof by contradiction. Suppose the bisector of $\angle F P P^{\prime}$ intersects the parabola at two points, $P$ and $Q$. Let $Q$ ' be the projection of $Q$ onto the directrix. By the definition of the parabola, $P P^{\prime}=P F$ and $Q Q^{\prime}=Q F$. Since edge $P Q$ is shared, $P P^{\prime}=P F$, and $\angle F P Q=\angle P^{\prime} P Q$, triangle $P P^{\prime} Q$ is congruent to triangle $P F Q$ (SAS congruence). Thus $Q P^{\prime}=Q F$ $=Q Q^{\prime}$. But this is impossible because, by the definition of a parabola, $Q^{\prime}$ is the only point where its distance from $Q$ is equal to the distance from $Q$ to $F$.
Therefore, the bisector has to go through only one point on the parabola; that is, it is tangent to the parabola at $P$.

## Isogonal Properties

The optical properties of conics can be used to produce proofs of the following results.

In the case of an ellipse, $\angle F_{1} P X_{1}$ and $\angle F_{2} P Y$ are equal, where $P$ is any point outside the ellipse and $X$ and $Y$ are the points of tangency from $P$ to the ellipse (Figure 7). This is called the isogonal property of an ellipse.

To prove this, we start by noting that $\angle F_{1}^{\prime} P X_{1}$ is congruent to $\angle F_{1} P X_{1}$, and that $\angle F_{2}^{\prime} P Y$ is congruent to $\angle F_{2}^{\prime} P Y$ (property of a reflected point), so $\angle F_{1} P X_{1}$ and $\angle F_{2} P Y$ are congruent if $\angle F_{1}^{\prime} P F_{2}$ and $\angle F_{1}^{2} P F_{2}^{\prime}$ are congruent. In other words, the above theorem is established if we can prove triangles $P F_{2} F_{1}^{\prime}$ and $P F_{1} F_{2}^{\prime}$ congruent. It is easy to see that segments $F_{1} P$ and $F_{1} P$ are congruent (property of a reflected point) and that $P F_{2}$ and $P F_{2}^{\prime}$ are congruent, but the third congruency is a little more complicated. According to the Optical Property, $\angle F_{2} X_{1} P$ is equivalent to $\angle F_{1} X_{1} Q$, and because $\angle F_{1} X_{1} Q$ and $\angle F_{1} X_{1} Q$ are congruent

