

# The Extension of the Desargues Theorem, The Converse, Symmetry and Enumeration

Aiden A. Bruen

Adjunct Research Professor,  
School of Mathematics and Statistics,  
Carleton University,  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada,  
abruen@math.carleton.ca

Keywords: Arcs, Desargues theorem, Desargues configuration, simplex, coordinate system, 5-compressor, projective spaces, duality, polarity, finite field

2020 MSC: 51A30, 51E15

## 1 Introduction

The fundamental building blocks of projective geometry are the theorems of Pappus of Alexandria, living in the fourth century A.D., and the theorem of Desargues published in Paris by Girard Desargues a French architect, engineer and mathematician in 1629.

The celebrated Desargues perspective theorem in the plane, over any field or skew field, states that when two triangles are in perspective the meets of corresponding sides are collinear. The theorem and the converse can be proven by using coordinates or by invoking the principle of duality in projective geometry.

In Coxeter ([8]) the author writes:

Is it possible to develop a geometry having no circles, no distances, no angles, no intermediacy (or “betweenness”), and no parallelism? Surprisingly, the answer is Yes: what remains is projective geometry: a beautiful and intricate series of propositions, simpler than Euclid’s but not too simple to be interesting... The original motivation for this kind of geometry came from the fine arts. It was in 1425 that the

Italian architect Brunelleschi began to discuss the geometrical theory of perspective which was consolidated into a treatise by Alberti a few years later.

Vanishing points in drawing become mathematical points at infinity, all lying on a line at infinity. For an elaboration of this we refer to “Art and Geometry” by William Ivins, a former curator of the Metropolitan Museum of Art [12].

Crannell and Douglas [9] and Lord [13] also provide interesting and related background.

A brief overview of the connection of the Desargues theorem with axiomatics is as follows. We start with a point  $V$  and line  $l$  which may or may not be on  $V$  in a projective plane and study a possible “central collineation”  $T$  that fixes  $V$ , all lines through  $V$  and all points on  $l$ .

Let  $A$  be a point unequal  $V$  and not on  $l$ . Then  $T(A)$  has to be a point  $D$  on the line  $VA$ . Let  $B$  be chosen with  $B$  not on  $l$  or  $VA$ .  $T(B)$  is a point  $E$  on  $VB$ . Using the corresponding pair  $\{A, D\}$  we see that  $E$  must be the intersection of  $BV$  and  $DZ$  where  $AB$  meets  $l$  in  $Z$ . Similarly, let  $C$  to be a point on  $VC$  where the lines  $VA, VB, VC$  are distinct. To find  $T(C) = F$  we can use the pair  $\{A, D\}$ . Then  $F$  is the point of intersection of  $VC$  and  $DW$ , where  $AC$  meets  $l$  in  $W$ . We can also use the pair  $\{B, E\}$ . Then  $F$  must be the point where  $CV$  and  $EU$  meet where  $BC$  meets  $l$  in  $U$ . Both constructions must give the same answer for  $F$ . Thus, for the central collineation to exist, the Desargues theorem must hold for the triangles  $ABC, DEF$ , in perspective from  $V$ , since the intersections of the corresponding sides must all lie on the line  $l$ .

Conversely, if for all triangles  $ABC, DEF$  in perspective from  $V$ , the intersections of corresponding lines lie on a line then there exists a such a central collineation  $T$ , fixing  $V$ , all lines on  $V$  and a line  $l$  pointwise, where  $l$  contains the intersections of corresponding lines. This suggests an indirect, and involved, proof of the extended Desargues theorem in any dimension.

However, the emphasis here is on synthetic reasoning and the resulting configurations. From [18, p. 141]: “The proof of Desargues’ theorem of projective geometry comes as close as a proof can to the Zen ideal. It can be summarized in two words: ‘I see’.” The topic of geometrical configurations has undergone a resurgence in recent years: see for example Conway and Ryba [7], Luotoniemi [14] and Gévay [10].

In this paper, inter alia, we show that the analogue of the Desargues theorem holds in all dimensions over infinite and finite fields of sufficiently large order. The result is that if two simplexes with no common points or faces are in perspective from a point then the intersections of corresponding  $t$ -spaces are  $t - 1$  spaces, all lying in a hyperplane  $H$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ . The simple, synthetic proof of this result, and the converse, in Section 3, valid in all dimensions, only assumes that pairs of corresponding edges meet

in a point. The second proof is based on arcs as in [3]. In the planar case, although several authors use a 5-point in 3 dimensions the proofs can still be quite complicated. The elegant proof in [7] uses a different approach - see Section 12.

Regarding previous work we mention that in 1916 [19, p. 43-44] the authors offer a proof for  $n = 3$ . The accompanying diagram for this 3-dimensional case includes 15 points and many lines. There are many interesting recent papers, too numerous to cite, in the general area. The paper by Gévay includes several references. The papers by Luotenemi on models of important configurations such as the Desargues configuration and the double six are informative and very helpful for visualization.

A potential problem with synthetic proofs in geometry is unanticipated coincidences of points or collinearities of lines. Concerning the classical Hessenberg theorem, showing that Pappus implies Desargues, we have the following in Pedoe - see Introduction ([17]), "It should interest those who may be disposed to believe that all outstanding problems in classical projective geometry have been solved to note that Pickert in his *Projective Ebenen* (Berlin 1955) lists eight defective versions of the classical Hessenberg theorem. Two of these defective proofs are by Hessenberg himself".

In [19], for the case  $n = 3$ , although they do not state it, the authors assume that the two simplexes do not share a face. If the simplexes have a face in common the above result is false for the case  $t = n - 1$ . Merely assuming perspectivity from a point is not enough.

In [19, p. 54, problem 26], the writers enunciate the extension of Desargues theorem in  $n$  dimensions. No proof is offered. They cite research by A. Cayley "Sur quelque théorème de la géométrie de position", *Crelle's Journal*, vol. 31, (1846): *Collected papers*, Volume 1, p. 317, and also a paper by G. Veronese, "Behandlung der projectivischen Verhältnisse der Räume von verschiedenen Dimensionen durch das Princip des Projicirens und Schneidens", *Math Annalen*, vol. 34, 1889 together with a paper by W. B. Carver [5]. In this paper the author states that Cayley's paper describes sections by the plane or 3-dimensional space of the complete  $n$ -point in higher dimensions and that the Veronese paper is concerned with "the configurations thus obtained in  $r$  dimensions". In a footnote Carver refers to the Desargues theorem in the plane as an "incidental occurrence of these configurations". On line 7 the author writes: "both Cayley and Veronese state that these same configurations can also be obtained as projections of higher-dimensional figures".

It appears that no proof of the extended Desargues Theorem has ever been written down. Apart from the sketch of the proof above, using homogeneous coordinates, we offer two further, different proofs of the extended theorem, valid for all  $n$ .

In the 1964 paper by S. R. Mandan [15] entitled "Desargues Theorem in  $n$ -space" the author describes a result concerning two simplexes of size

$n + 2$  in  $n + 1$ -space which, between them, span a  $2n$ -space or a  $2n + 1$  space. For  $n = 1$  the Desargues theorem in the plane follows from one of the cases. However, the extended Desargues theorem deals with two simplexes in an  $n$ -space which therefore span just that  $n$ -space. Thus, the result in [4] does not apply to the result here.

In Rota [18, p. 145] referring to the first of the 6 volumes of H. F. Baker's *Principles of Geometry* he writes: "After an argument that runs well over one hundred pages, Baker shows that beneath the statement of Desargues' theorem, another far more interesting geometric structure lies concealed. This structure is nowadays called the Desargues configuration". The new results here on the configuration also form a central part of this paper. We present the detailed structure of the intersections of corresponding edges of the two simplexes in perspective. Those points all lie in a hyperplane  $H$ . The consequence of the assumption that the simplexes do not share a face plays a crucial part in our simple proof of the extended Desargues theorem in Section 3. For  $n = 3$  that configuration in the plane  $H$  consists of the 4 points and 6 lines of a complete quadrilateral. We begin with two simplexes, with no point or face in common, and the vertex of perspective, 9 points in all. We then complete the configuration by adjoining the set of six intersection points in  $H$  which are disjoint from the simplexes and the vertex for a total of fifteen points. Mirabile dictu, each and every one of these 15 points then serves as the vertex of two simplexes in perspective with no point or face in common, such that the intersections of their corresponding edges are in the 15-point set and form a complete quadrilateral lying in a plane. The analogous result holds in all dimensions and this is just the beginning of the fun. There is much more to be had!

As in [3] over finite fields we can also, in principle, enumerate the total number of configurations of simplexes in perspective in  $n$  dimensions since arcs can be enumerated. The use of arcs clarifies the classical idea of "points in general position". Because of the method used in labelling points we know that points in the configuration are distinct. There is no concern about unexpected possible coincidences of points or collinearities of triples such as those detailed in Pedoe in the proof of the Hessenberg theorem.

The inherent combinatorial reciprocity in the configurations can frequently be realized as a geometrical polarity, at least when the characteristic is not 2. Working over general fields, and not just the real or complex numbers, adds fresh insights and opens up new problems. For example the question of the number of self-conjugate points also arises. In the plane there are at most 4 such points: this is achieved only in characteristic 3 [3], [1], [2]. The issues above will be discussed in a future paper.

## 2 Preliminaries: Definitions and Notation.

a. *Dimension.* In this paper the dimension of a projective space is the projective dimension which is one less than the rank of the underlying vector space. For example a projective plane has dimension 2 while the underlying vector space has rank 3. The space generated by subspaces  $A, B$  - their union or join - or by a set of points  $S$  is denoted by  $\langle A, B \rangle$  or  $\langle S \rangle$  respectively. The rank formula for vector subspaces states the following:  $rank(E + F) = rank(E) + rank(F) - rank(E \cap F)$ . For projective subspaces, with  $Dim$  denoting dimension, we have a similar dimension formula as follows:  $Dim\langle E, F \rangle = DimE + DimF - Dim(E \cap F)$ , where,  $\cap$  denotes the intersection of spaces  $E, F$ .

[A word of caution: if the intersection is the zero vector its vector rank is zero. To make the formula work in the projective case, the dimension of the empty intersection is one less than zero, i.e., -1! . A test case is afforded by set of 2 skew lines in 3 dimensions].

b. *Simplex.* In  $\Sigma_n$ , the projective space of dimension  $n$ , a simplex is a set  $X$  of  $n + 1$  points which generate the space. This implies that each  $t$ -subset of  $X$  generates a  $(t - 1)$ -space. Dually, we can also describe a simplex as a set of  $n + 1$  hyperplanes or faces, that is, subspaces of dimension  $n - 1$  generated by subsets of  $X$  of size  $n$ .

In the plane a simplex is a set of 3 non-collinear points. The faces are the 3 lines joining pairs of points. The 3 points or 3 lines are different descriptions of what is really the same object ie a triangle with its points and lines. A simplex is a self-dual concept. The line joining a pair of points of the simplex is called an edge. Each subset of  $t$  points of  $X$  generates a subspace of dimension  $t - 1$  for  $t$  lying between 2 and  $n$ . Dually, the intersection of  $m$  faces is a subspace of dimension  $n - 1 - [m - 1]$ , i.e., of dimension  $n - m$ ,  $m = 1, 2, \dots$

In dimension 3 a simplex is a set  $X$  of 4 points,  $X = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , not all lying in a plane. The four faces are the 4 triangles generated by the sets  $\{1, 2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 4\}, \{1, 3, 4\}, \{2, 3, 4\}$ . The simplex can be visualized by drawing a figure where the point 4 is above the plane generated by 1, 2, 3. It represents a tetrahedron and, as mentioned, is self-dual - [16]. A reciprocity can be set up by mapping each point to a face. For example we can map 1 to the opposite face  $\langle 234 \rangle$ , 2 to  $\langle 134 \rangle$  3 to  $\langle 124 \rangle$  and 4 to  $\langle 123 \rangle$ . Then  $\langle 1, 2 \rangle$  maps to the intersection of  $\langle 234 \rangle$  with  $\langle 1, 3, 4 \rangle$ , i.e., to  $\langle 34 \rangle$ , and so on.

## 3 The Desargues theorem in $n$ dimensions.

We start with two simplexes

$$A = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n, A_{n+1}\} \text{ and } B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{n+1}\}$$

in  $\Sigma_n$ , an  $n$ -space.  $A, B$  are perspective from the vertex  $V$  if there are  $n + 1$  lines on  $V$  with each line containing the points  $A_i, B_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n, n + 1$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $A, B$  denote two simplexes in  $\Sigma_n$  which do not share a point or face. Assume there is a correspondence between the points  $A_i, B_i$  such that the edge joining  $A_i$  to  $A_j$  intersects the edge joining  $B_i$  to  $B_j$  in a point,  $1 \leq i, j \leq n + 1$ . Then  $A, B$  are in perspective from a vertex  $V$ .*

*Proof.* A priori, a pair of corresponding edges might be the same line or they might be skew. This is ruled out by the hypothesis. The result holds for  $n = 2$  by the planar Desargues theorem. We assume that  $n \geq 3$ . By assumption, the edges  $A_1A_2$  and  $B_1B_2$  are distinct and meet in a point. Thus the lines  $A_1B_1$  and  $A_2B_2$  meet in a point  $V$ . Let  $A_3, B_3$  be any remaining pair of corresponding points. We claim that triangles  $A_1A_2A_3$  and  $B_1B_2B_3$  are not coplanar. For suppose they lie in plane  $\pi$ . Let  $C_4$  be the point of intersection of lines  $A_3A_4$  and  $B_3B_4$ . If  $C_4$  is in  $\pi$  then  $A_4$  is in  $\pi$  [as is  $B_4$ ]. This contradicts the simplex property. Thus the sets of points  $\{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\}$  and  $\{B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4\}$  both lie in the same 3-dimensional space generated by  $A_1, A_2, A_3, C_4$ .

Iterating this we end up with two corresponding faces namely

$$\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n\} \text{ and } \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_n\}$$

lying in the same  $(n - 1)$ -space. Then  $A, B$  have a common face. But this contradicts the hypothesis. Thus the triangles are not coplanar and lie in two different planes.

Since the line  $A_iA_j$  intersects the line  $B_iB_j$ , for  $j = 1, 2, 3$  the triangles are perspective from the line of intersection of the two planes. Thus the triangles  $A_1A_2A_3$  and  $B_1B_2B_3$  are in perspective from a point [8, 2.31]. Therefore  $V$  lies on  $A_3B_3$ . But  $A_3, B_3$  are an arbitrary pair of corresponding points. Thus all lines  $A_iB_i$  pass through  $V$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n, n + 1$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *The point  $P = P_{ij} = A_iA_j \cap B_iB_j$  is distinct from the point  $P_{rs}$ , defined similarly with  $r, s$  replacing  $i, j$  unless  $\{i, j\} = \{r, s\}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $i = r$  and  $j$  is not equal to  $s$  then the points  $A_i, A_j, A_s$  are collinear contradicting the fact that they are part of a simplex. If  $\{i, j, r, s\}$  consists of 4 distinct numbers this means that the 4 points  $A_i, A_j, A_r, A_s$  all lie in the plane containing  $P$  and the 2 lines  $A_iA_j$  and  $A_rA_s$ . But this contradicts the fact that the 4 points form a simplex if  $n = 3$  or partial simplex for  $n = 4, 5, \dots$   $\square$

In what follows  $\alpha_k, \beta_k$  are corresponding faces of  $A, B$ .

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $A, B$  denote simplexes in the  $n$ -dimensional space  $\Sigma_n$  as in Theorem 3.1. Then*

- a. The intersections of corresponding  $t$ -spaces are  $(t - 1)$ -spaces, for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ .
- b. The spaces  $(\alpha_i \cap \alpha_j)$  with  $(\beta_i \cap \beta_j)$  generate an  $(n - 1)$  space, a hyperplane of  $\Sigma_n$ , where  $i, j$  are distinct.

*Proof of a.* The result holds, by hypothesis, for  $t = 1$ . Let  $t = 2$ . We have 2 triangles  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  and  $B_1, B_2, B_3$ . Each edge of the triangle from  $A$  meets the corresponding edge from  $B$  in a point. The line of intersection of the planes of the triangles is a line containing 3 distinct points  $P_{ij}$ ,  $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$ .

Let  $t = 3$ . We have two tetrahedra  $A, B$  with 4 pairs of corresponding faces. Each face contains a triangle. Each corresponding pair of faces intersect in a line. From Lemma 3.2 no two of the lines are the same. Thus, for  $t = 3$ , the dimension of the intersection is at least two. To establish the result we induct on  $t$ . Assume, by induction, that the intersection of two  $t$ -spaces has dimension  $t - 1$ . The intersection of two corresponding  $(t + 1)$ -spaces contains the union of the intersections of corresponding pairs of  $t$ -spaces. Each such pair intersect in a  $(t - 1)$ -space. Distinct pairs yield distinct intersections from Lemma 3.2. Thus the dimension of the intersection is at least  $t$ . From the dimension formula the corresponding union has dimension at most  $t + 1$ . From the argument in the proof of Theorem 3.1 the dimension of that union of the two subspaces is at least  $t + 1$ . We conclude that the dimension of the union is  $t + 1$ , and that of the intersection is  $t - 1$ , for all values of  $t$  between 1 and  $n - 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of b.*  $Dim\langle(\alpha_i \cap \alpha_j)\rangle$  and  $Dim\langle(\beta_i \cap \beta_j)\rangle$  are  $n - 2$  as each face is generated by  $n - 1$  points of  $A, B$ . From part a the dimension of their intersection is  $n - 3$ . From the dimension formula the dimension of their union is  $n - 1$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.4.** *Let  $A, B$  denote two simplexes in perspective from a vertex  $V$  in  $\Sigma_n$  which have no common points or faces. Then*

- a. The intersection points of corresponding edges form a set  $S$  of  $\binom{n+1}{2}$  distinct points in  $\Sigma_n$ . None of these points lie in  $A$  or  $B$  or are equal to  $V$ .
- b. The intersection of corresponding  $t$ -spaces of  $A, B$  is a  $(t - 1)$ -space in  $\Sigma_n$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ .
- c. The intersection of two corresponding faces of  $A, B$  is an  $(n - 2)$ -space which lies in a fixed hyperplane  $v$  of  $\Sigma_n$ .
- d. In particular the set  $S$  lies in  $v$ .

*Proof.* Since  $A, B$  have no common points the lines  $A_i B_i, A_j B_j$ , for distinct  $i, j$ , exist, are distinct and contain  $V$ . It follows that lines  $A_i A_j$  and  $B_i B_j$

intersect in a unique point which cannot be  $V$  and which does not lie in  $A$  or  $B$ . From Lemma 3.2,  $S$  contains  $\binom{n+1}{2}$  distinct points. This proves part a.

Since corresponding edges meet in a point, part b follows from Theorem 3.3 part a

The dual of Theorem 3.1 asserts that the intersection of pairs of corresponding faces of  $A, B$  lies in a fixed hyperplane  $v$  provided that Theorem 3.3, part b, holds. Since Theorem 3.3 applies, in particular, to simplexes  $A, B$  in perspective from a point this proves part c. Each point of  $S$  lies in the intersection of (several pairs of) corresponding faces of  $A, B$ . This proves part d.  $\square$

We have now shown a (strong) converse to Theorem 3.4, as follows.

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $A, B$  be simplexes which do not share a common point or face. Assume that there is a correspondence between points  $A_i, B_i$  such that lines  $A_iA_j, B_iB_j$  meet in a point. Then  $A, B$  are perspective from a point and  $a, b, c, d$  of Theorem 3.4, hold.*

## 4 Arcs and coordinate systems

In an  $n$ -dimensional projective space  $\Sigma_n$  a *coordinate system* is a set of  $n+2$  points such that any subset of size  $n+1$  is a simplex [11]. A simplex and a coordinate system are examples of arcs. An *arc* in  $\Sigma_n$  is a set of  $m$  points, with  $m$  at least  $n+1$ , with the property that every subset of size  $n+1$  forms a simplex. This implies that any subset of the arc of size  $t$  generates a subspace of dimension  $t-1$  when  $t$  is at most  $n+1$ . If the underlying field is finite, of order  $q$ , it is conjectured that, if  $n \leq q$ , the maximum size of an arc in  $\Sigma_n$  is  $q+1$  if  $q$  is odd or  $q+2$  if  $q$  even: see [4].

**Theorem 4.1.** *For each  $n$  there exists a coordinate system  $\Gamma_{n+2}$  in  $\Sigma_n$  such that no point lies in a given hyperplane  $H$  of  $\Sigma_n$  so long as the underlying field  $F$  has order greater than 2.*

*Proof.* Using homogeneous coordinates  $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, x_{n+1})$  let  $K$  be the hyperplane with equation  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + \dots + x_n + x_{n+1} = 0$ . We choose the first  $n+1$  points  $P_i$  of the arc  $\Gamma_{n+2}$  to have 1 in position  $i$  and zeros elsewhere,  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n, n+1$ . These points form a simplex. Point number  $n+2$  is  $(1, 1, 1, \dots, 1, z)$ , where  $z$  is any non-zero number in  $F$ . This point is off  $K$  provided  $n+1+z$  is non-zero. This can always be done if  $F$  has order greater than 2. These  $n+2$  points form a coordinate system with no point in  $K$ . Finally we use a collineation of  $\Sigma_n$  mapping  $K$  to the given hyperplane  $H$ . This will map the set of  $n+2$  points above to a coordinate system having none of its points on  $H$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** *If  $F$  has order 2 then Theorem 3.1 is false. To see this let  $n = 3$ . Let  $W$  be a 5-arc in  $\Sigma_3 = PG(3, 2)$ . Suppose the result holds. Then*



as in [3] the section by  $PG(2,2)$  yields a configuration with 10 points. But  $PG(2,2)$  only has 7 points.

Henceforth we assume that  $F$  has order greater than 2.

## 5 The section of a coordinate system in $\Sigma_{n+1}$ by a hyperplane $H = \Sigma_n$ .

We start with  $\Sigma_n$  embedded as a hyperplane  $H$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_{n+3}$  denote a coordinate system in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  consisting of  $n+3$  points  $1, 2, \dots, n+2, n+3$  where none of these points lie in the hyperplane  $H$ . By joining pairs of points of  $\Gamma$  we generate  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  lines in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . The section of the line joining points  $i, j$  of the arc by  $H$  is the point denoted by the unordered pair  $(i, j)$ . All told this yields  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points in  $H$ , with  $i, j$  lying between 1 and  $n+3$ .

We claim that these points are distinct. From the arc property no 3 points of  $\Gamma$  are collinear. Further, suppose that the line joining 1 to 2 meets the line joining 3 to 4 say in the same point of  $H$ . Then the 4 points 1, 2, 3, 4 lie in a plane, which is forbidden by the arc property.

A triangle formed from 3 points of  $\Gamma$ , say  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  has as its section by  $H$  three collinear points  $(1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)$ . In general, points  $(i, j)$  and  $(k, l)$  lie on a line in  $H$  if and only if the points have a symbol in common, in which case they lie on a line with 3 points.

**Example 5.1.** *Suppose we section the figure formed from 4 of the 6 points in  $\Gamma$ , say the points in  $S = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , by  $H$ . These points form a tetrahedron with 4 points, 6 lines and 4 planes in  $\Sigma_3$ . The section of the figure has  $\binom{4}{2}$ , i.e., 6 points and 4 lines. These lines come from the 4 triangles formed by the 4 triples in  $S$ . Any pair of triples share a pair of points. Thus any 2 of these 4 lines in  $H$  meet in a point, and no 3 lines are concurrent. This figure lies in a plane in  $H$  and is a complete quadrilateral [8, p. 7], [13, p. 7] If we project the tetrahedron to  $H$  from a general point of  $\Sigma_3$  we end up with a planar figure having, dually, 6 lines and 4 points which is known as a complete quadrangle [8, p. 7], [13, p. 18].*

*If we project just the points in the set  $\{2, 3, 4\}$  from the point 1 to  $H$  we obtain a triangle with vertices  $(1, 2), (1, 3), (1, 4)$ . From these 3 points we generate 3 more, namely  $(2, 3), (2, 4), (3, 4)$ . Thus we end up with the same set of six points as the section of  $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$  by  $H$ .*

**Theorem 5.2.** *Let  $S$  denote a subset of size  $t+1$  of an arc  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . Then*

- $S$  generates a subspace of dimension  $t$  in the space  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ .*
- The section of  $\langle S \rangle$  by the hyperplane  $H = \Sigma_n$  generates a subspace  $M$  of dimension  $t-1$  in  $H$ .  $M$  is also generated by the projection of  $S$  to  $H$  from any point of  $S$ .*

In summary the section of (the space generated by) a set  $S$  of  $t + 1$  points of the  $(n + 3)$ -arc in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  by  $H$  is a space of dimension  $t - 1$  in  $H = \Sigma_n$ .

*Proof.* Part a follows from the definition of an arc.

For Part b, let  $S = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, t, t + 1\}$ . Denote by  $L$  the subspace generated by  $\{2, 3, \dots, t, t + 1\}$ .  $L$  has dimension  $t - 1$ . Projecting  $L$  from the point 1, which is not in  $L$ , we obtain a  $(t - 1)$ -dimensional space  $M$  generated by the  $t$  points  $(1, 2), (1, 3), \dots, (1, t), (1, t + 1)$  in  $\Sigma_n$ . Since  $(1, 2), (1, 3)$  are in  $M$  the point  $(2, 3)$  on the line joining them is also in  $M$ . Then the points  $(2, 1) [= (1, 2)], (2, 3), (2, 4), \dots, (2, t), (2, t + 1)$  are in  $M$ . Proceeding, we see that  $M$  contains all points  $(i, j)$  where  $i, j$  lie between 1 and  $t + 1$  so  $M$  is generated by the section of  $\langle S \rangle$ .

We generate the same space  $M$  by using any point in  $S$  instead of the point 1.

Alternative proof of b. As shown in Example 5.1 for the case  $n = 3$ ,  $M$  is generated by  $\{(1, 2), \dots, (1, t), (1, t + 1)\}$ , and has dimension  $x$  say. Since the point 1 is not in  $\Sigma_n$  it is not in  $M$ . Thus  $K = \langle 1, M \rangle$  has dimension  $x + 1$ . Since  $K$  contains points 1 and  $(1, j)$  it contains the line joining them and so the point  $j$  for  $j = 2, 3, \dots, t, t + 1$ .  $K$  also has the point 1. Thus  $K$  contains  $t + 1$  arc points and has dimension  $t$ . Therefore  $t = x + 1$ , so  $x = t - 1$ . Thus  $M$ , the section of the  $(t + 1)$ -set  $S$  of the arc by  $H$  generates a space of dimension  $t - 1$ .  $\square$

From the above the section of the space generated by a  $(t + 1)$ -set of the arc  $\Gamma$  by  $H$  is a  $(t - 1)$ -space. We also have the following result.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Given the arc  $\Gamma$  with  $n + 3$  points in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  the section by the hyperplane  $H = \Sigma_n$  has  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points,  $\binom{n+3}{3}$  lines,  $\binom{n+3}{4}$  planes,  $\dots$ , and  $\binom{n+3}{n+1}$  spaces of dimension  $n - 1$  i.e. hyperplanes in  $H = \Sigma_n$ .*

## 6 From arcs to simplexes in perspective.

We continue with the same notation.  $H = \Sigma_n$  is a hyperplane in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ .  $\Gamma = \Gamma_{n+3} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n + 3\}$  is an arc of  $n + 3$  points in the space  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ .

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $S = \{(1, 3), (1, 4), \dots, (1, n + 2), (1, n + 3)\}$ . Then the  $n + 1$  points of  $S$  generate a subspace of dimension  $n$  and form a simplex in  $H$ .*

*Proof.* This follows as in the proof of Theorem 5.2.  $\square$

Similarly we have:

**Theorem 6.2.** *Let  $T = \{(2, 3), (2, 4), \dots, (2, n + 2), (2, n + 3)\}$ . Then the points in  $T$  form a simplex in  $H$ .*

**Theorem 6.3.** *The sets  $S, T$ , augmented by the point  $(1, 2)$ , form a coordinate system yielding an arc of size  $n + 2$  in  $H$  in each case.*

*Proof.*  $S$  is a simplex. We show that any  $n$ -subset  $Z$  of  $S$ , when augmented by  $(1, 2)$  is a simplex. Let  $Z = \{(1, 3), (1, 4), \dots, (1, n + 2)\}$ . We must show that  $X = \{(1, 2), (1, 3), \dots, (1, n + 2)\}$  is a simplex.  $X$  is the projection of  $U = \{2, 3, 4, \dots, n + 2\}$  from the point 1 onto  $H$ . Since  $\langle U \rangle$  has dimension  $n$  we conclude that  $X$  is a set of  $n + 1$  points that generates a space of dimension  $n$  i.e.  $X$  is a simplex in  $H$ .

Similarly  $T$ , augmented by  $(1, 2)$ , forms a coordinate system.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.4.** *a. The sets  $S, T$  are simplexes which are in perspective from the vertex  $V = (1, 2)$ .*

*b.  $S, T$  have no points in common.*

*c.  $S$  and  $T$  have no faces in common.*

*Proof.* From Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2,  $S$  and  $T$  are simplexes. They are in perspective from the point  $V = (1, 2)$  because  $(1, 2)$  is collinear with points  $(1, i)$  and  $(2, i)$  for  $i$  between 3 and  $n + 3$ . The labels of their points show that  $S$  and  $T$  have no points in common.

For part c, suppose that  $S$  and  $T$  have a face  $\Lambda$  in common. The lines joining the  $n$  corresponding points  $A_i, B_i$  in  $\Lambda$  all contain the vertex  $V$ . Then  $\Lambda$ , augmented by  $V$ , is not a simplex in  $H$ , contradicting Theorem 6.3.  $\square$

## 7 From simplexes in perspective to arcs.

Our goal now is to show that two simplexes in perspective which have no common points or faces arise from an arc as developed in Section 6.

**Theorem 7.1.** *In  $\Sigma_n$  let*

$$A = \{A_3, A_4, \dots, A_{n+2}, A_{n+3}\}$$

*and*

$$B = \{B_3, B_4, \dots, B_{n+2}, B_{n+3}\}$$

*denote two simplexes in  $\Sigma_n$  which are in perspective from a point  $V$  and have no point in common. Assume also that the two simplexes have no face in common or, equivalently, that  $V$  does not lie on a face of  $A$  or of  $B$ . Then, as in Theorem 6.4,  $A, B$  arise from the section of the space generated from an arc of size  $n + 3$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  by  $H = \Sigma_n$ , an  $n$ -dimensional hyperplane of  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ .*

*Proof.* We choose a line  $l$  on  $V$  not lying in  $H$  and on it we choose two points labelled 1, 2 which are different from  $V$ . Define a set  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  as follows: Point  $i$  is the intersection of the lines  $1A_i$  and  $2B_i$ ,  $3 \leq i \leq n+3$ . This is well-defined as, for each  $i$ , those two lines lie in a plane containing two distinct lines on  $V$  i.e. the lines joining  $V$  to the point 1 and the point  $A_i$ . We claim that  $\Gamma_{n+3} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, \dots, n+2, n+3\}$  is an arc of size  $(n+1)+2$  yielding a coordinate system in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  such that none of its points lie in  $\Sigma_n$ .

We must show that every  $(n+2)$ -subset of  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  generates the space  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . Such a subset must contain either 1, or 2, or both.

Case 1. We show that the  $n+2$ -set  $S = \{1, 3, 4, \dots, n+2, n+3\}$  generates  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  as follows. The  $n+1$  points  $\{A_3, A_4, \dots, A_{n+3}\}$  generate a face of  $A$ , which is an  $n$ -space in  $\Sigma_n$  as  $A$  is a simplex. The face is a projection of the space  $U = \langle \{3, 4, \dots, n+2, n+3\} \rangle$  from the external point 1. Thus  $U$  has dimension  $n$ . When we adjoin 1, the enlarged space, generated by  $\{1, 3, 4, \dots, n+2, n+3\}$ , has dimension  $n+1$ . [Alternatively the above face of  $A$  is an  $n$ -space. Since the point 1 is not in  $\Sigma_n$  adjoining it to this face generates an  $n+1$ -space, namely the space generated by  $\{1, 3, 4, \dots, n+2, n+3\}$ ].

Case 2. The  $n+2$ -set  $\{2, 3, 4, \dots, n+2, n+3\}$  also generates  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . The proof is the same as for Case 1 upon interchanging points 1, 2.

Case 3. We show that the set  $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, n+2\}$  generates  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . The  $n$  points  $\{A_3, A_4, \dots, A_{n+2}\}$  form a face of  $A$  and generate a hyperplane  $K$  of dimension  $n-1$  in  $\Sigma_n$ . By hypothesis, the point  $V$  is not in  $K$ , so  $\langle K, V \rangle$  has dimension  $n$ . Adjoining the point 1 to  $\langle K, V \rangle$  yields an  $(n+1)$ -dimensional space  $W$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . The points 1, 2 and  $V$  are collinear. So  $W$  contains 1 and 2. Since the points 1,  $i$  and  $A_i$  are collinear,  $W$  also contains points  $3, 4, \dots, n+1, n+2$ . Since  $\langle 1, 2, 3, \dots, n+1, n+2 \rangle$  contains  $K, V$  and the point 1 it is an  $(n+1)$ -space contained in  $W$  so it must be  $W$ . In summary, the set  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  above is an  $(n+3)$ -arc in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . Moreover, no point of it lies in  $\Sigma_n$ . To see this, the points 1, 2 lie outside  $\Sigma_n$ . Suppose that a point  $i$  other than the points 1, 2 lies in  $\Sigma_n$ . Since  $A_i$  lies in  $\Sigma_n$  and the points 1,  $i, A_i$  are collinear, this implies that the point 1 is in  $\Sigma_n$ , which is a contradiction.

We examine the section of the arc  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  by the hyperplane  $H = \Sigma_n$ , assigning new labels to the two simplexes, and to  $V$ , as follows.  $V$  is on the line joining points 1 and 2 and is relabelled  $(1, 2)$ .  $A_i$  is on the line joining points 1 and  $i$  so it becomes  $(1, i)$ . Similarly  $B_i$  is now the point  $(2, i)$  for  $i = 3, 4, \dots, n+2$ .

Because the points  $(1, i), (2, i)$  and  $(1, 2)$  are collinear we have that  $A_i$  and  $B_i$  are in perspective from the vertex  $(1, 2)$ . In summary the two simplexes  $A, B$  are contained in the section of the arc  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  which yields a set  $X$  of  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points in  $\Sigma_n$ .  $X$  contains two simplexes,  $A = \{(1, 3), (1, 4), \dots, (1, n+3)\}$ ,  $B = \{(2, 3), (2, 4), \dots, (2, n+3)\}$ . They are in perspective from  $(1, 2)$  and they do not share a point. The vertex of perspective which is the point  $(1, 2)$ , does not lie on any face of  $A$  or  $B$ . Thus

$A$  and  $B$  do not share a face. This proves Theorem 7.1.  $\square$

## 8 An extension of the Desargues theorem.

It is time to reap the benefit of the work in Sections 4-7. This section contains a second proof of the extended Desargues theorem in all dimensions.

**Definition 8.1.** *Let  $A, B$  be simplexes of  $\Sigma_n$  which have no common points or faces. They are defined to be in perspective from a hyperplane  $v$  if there is a correspondence between the points of  $A, B$  – and therefore the subspaces of  $A, B$  – such that the following holds: the intersection of corresponding  $t$ -spaces of  $A, B$  is a  $(t - 1)$ -space lying in a fixed hyperplane  $v$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, n - 1$ .*

**Theorem 8.2.** *Let  $A, B$  denote two simplexes in the space  $\Sigma_n$  with no common point or hyperplane. Then, if  $A, B$  are in perspective from a point they are in perspective from a hyperplane.*

*Proof.* From Theorem 7.1. we may assume that  $A, B$  are as follows:

$$A = \{(1, 3), (1, 4), \dots, (1, n + 3)\},$$

$$B = \{(2, 3), (2, 4), \dots, (2, n + 3)\}.$$

They are in perspective from the vertex  $(1, 2)$  since the line joining corresponding points  $(1, i)$  and  $(2, i)$  contains the vertex  $(1, 2)$ ,  $3 \leq i \leq n + 3$ . The edge of  $A$  joining  $(1, i)$  to  $(1, j)$  contains the point  $(i, j)$ . The edge of  $B$  joining  $(2, i)$  to  $(2, j)$  contains the point  $(i, j)$ . Moreover each point  $(i, j)$  arises as the intersection of two corresponding edges,  $3 \leq i, j \leq n + 3$ . Thus the set  $S$  of points  $(i, j)$ , which is the set of all intersections of corresponding edges of  $A$  with  $B$  is found as the section of the configuration generated by the  $(n + 1)$ -set  $U = \{3, 4, \dots, n + 3\}$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  by the hyperplane  $H = \Sigma_n$ .  $U$  is an  $(n + 1)$ -subset of the arc  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ .

From Theorem 5.2 part b,  $\text{Dim}(\langle S \rangle) = n - 1$  and  $S$  generates a hyperplane in  $H = \Sigma_n$ . The number of points in  $S$  is  $\binom{n+1}{2}$ .

More generally, let  $Q, R$  denote sets of  $t + 1$  corresponding pairs of points of  $A, B$ . For example let  $Q = \{(1, 3), (1, 4), \dots, (1, t + 3)\}$  and let  $R = \{(2, 3), (2, 4), \dots, (2, t + 3)\}$ . Then  $Q, R$  each generate a  $t$ -space. As above, in the case when  $t = n$ , the set of intersections of all pairs of corresponding edges consists of points  $(i, j)$  for  $i, j$  lying between 3 and  $t + 3$  with  $i$  unequal  $j$ . These points generate a space of dimension  $t - 1$  in  $H$ .  $\square$

The dual of Theorem 8.2, where we use the reciprocity that interchanges points and faces as mentioned in Section 2, provides a converse to it as follows.

**Theorem 8.3.** *Let  $A, B$  be two simplexes in a projective space  $\Sigma_n$  with no common point and no common hyperplane. Then if  $A, B$  are in perspective from a hyperplane they are in perspective from a point.*

## 9 The Configurations.

To recap, we are working in  $\Sigma_n$  which is contained as a hyperplane  $H$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . The arc  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ , when sectioned by  $H$ , yields a set  $W$  of  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points in  $H$ . As in Section 6,  $W$  contains two simplexes  $A, B$  accounting for  $2(n+1)$  points. The vertex of perspective is one point. Then, from Section 8, the intersections of pairs of corresponding edges yield  $\binom{n+1}{2}$  additional points in a hyperplane of  $H = \Sigma_n$ . This accounts for all points of the configuration! The proof follows from the following identity.

$$\binom{n+3}{2} = 2(n+1) + 1 + \binom{n+1}{2}. \quad (9.1)$$

From the manner of assigning pairs  $(i, j)$  to points in  $H$ , different pairs yield different points. Thus the points of the simplexes, the vertex and the edge-intersections are distinct sets of points.

**Theorem 9.1.** *Each of the  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points of the configuration is a vertex of perspectivity for a pair of simplexes having no points or faces in common.*

*Proof 1.* Choose any point  $(i, j)$  in  $H$ . It lies on the line joining points  $i$  and  $j$  of the arc. It will be the vertex. The section by  $H$  of the lines joining  $i, j$  to the other points of the existing arc yields two simplexes in perspective from the point  $(i, j)$ . The intersections of corresponding edges of the new pair of simplexes also lie in the original configuration.  $\square$

*Proof 2.* Any permutation  $T$  of  $\{1, 2, 3, \dots, n+3\}$  when applied to the points of the configuration yields two simplexes in perspective from a vertex, with the intersections of corresponding edges lying in a hyperplane. This is so because two points  $(x, y)$  and  $(z, w)$  are contained in a line i.e., share a symbol, if and only their images under  $T$  share a symbol.  $\square$

**9.2.** *The case  $n = 4$ . The underlying initial arc in  $\Sigma_5$  has  $5 + 2$ , i.e. 7, points named  $1, 2, 3, \dots, 7$ . The section of lines joining pairs of points of the arc by the hyperplane  $H = \Sigma_4$  yields a set of 21 distinct points. From Theorem 8.2 the section of the lines joining pairs of points of the 5-subset  $X = \{3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$  by  $H$  generates a  $\Sigma_3$  subspace of  $H$  denoted by  $v$ . The section of (the lines generated by)  $X$  contains 10 points  $(i, j)$  where  $i$  and  $j$  are different elements of  $X$ . These 10 points are the intersections of pairs of corresponding edges of the given simplexes  $A, B$  in  $H$  as in Theorem 8.2.*

We mention some facts on the structure of these ten points. Choose any of the ten points to be a vertex, say the point  $(3, 4)$ . Then we have two triangles namely  $\{(3, 5), (3, 6), (3, 7)\}$  and  $\{(4, 5), (4, 6), (4, 7)\}$  which are in perspective from  $(3, 4)$ . From the arc property the triangles lie in different planes. [If, for example,  $(4, 7)$  was in the plane containing  $(3, 5), (3, 6), (3, 7)$  then the arc points  $3, 4, 5, 6, 7$  would only generate a 3-space.] The intersection of the corresponding triangle edges lies on the line of intersection of the two planes. The intersection points are  $\{(4, 5), (4, 6), (4, 7)\}$ . The two planes of the triangles in perspective meet in a line in  $v$ . Each line in  $v$  is descended from a 3-subset in  $\Sigma_5$ . A 3-set such as  $\{3, 4, 5\}$  lies in two 4-subsets of  $\{3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ . Thus each line in  $v$  lies in just 2 planes of  $v$ . Each point such as  $(3, 4)$  lies on 3 lines formed from the triples  $\{345\}, \{346\}, \{347\}$  and on 3 planes formed from the 4-sets  $\{3456\}, \{3457\}, \{3467\}$ .

The structure of the 10 points is symmetric in the sense that any point is the vertex of perspective of two triangles such that the intersection of pairs of corresponding edges lie on a line, the axis of perspectivity.

As mentioned above each of the 21 points serves as a vertex of perspective of two simplexes in  $\Sigma_4$ . The intersections of corresponding edges yield a set of 10 points as described above. So we have 21 such sets of ten points.

## 10 Self replication of configurations.

For want of better terminology we first define what is meant by a “semi-simplex”.

**10.1.** *In  $\Sigma_n$  a semi-simplex is defined to be a set of  $n$  points which generate an  $(n - 1)$ -space. A simplex is a set of  $n + 1$  points which generate the  $\Sigma_n$ . We examine the configuration of a pair of semi-simplexes in perspective and the intersections of corresponding edges.*

*$n = 1$ . Here a semi-simplex pair is a set of 2 points  $A, B$  on a line  $l$ . Let  $V$  be another point on  $l$ . Then  $A, B$  are in perspective from  $V$ . So the configuration is a line with 3 points  $A, B$  and  $V$ .*

*$n = 2$ . In the plane a semi-simplex is a pair of points  $A_1, B_1$  on a line  $L_1$ . Let  $A_2, B_2$  form another line  $L_2$  in the plane. Let  $V$  denote the intersection of  $A_1A_2$  with  $B_1B_2$ . We now have two semi-simplexes in perspective from  $V$ .*

*Next, the intersections of corresponding edges is the point  $C_3$  where lines  $A_1A_2$  and  $B_1B_2$  meet. In summary we have a complete quadrilateral with 6 points.*

*$n = 3$ . A semi-simplex is a triangle. A pair of semi-simplexes in perspective is simply a pair of triangles in perspective from a vertex. In our situation, because of the arc property, the triangles will not be coplanar. The general result is as follows.*

**Theorem 10.2.** *In  $\Sigma_n$ , let  $A, B$  denote two simplexes in perspective from a point  $V$  such that  $A, B$  share no points or hyperplanes. Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma_{n+3}$  denote the underlying arc in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$  giving rise to  $A, B$  as in Section 7. Let  $X_n$  denote the  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points  $(i, j)$  in  $\Sigma_n$  which are the section of lines joining points  $i, j$  of the arc  $\Gamma$ . Then*

- a.  $X_n$  consists of two simplexes  $A, B$  in perspective, the vertex of perspective, and a subset  $Y_n$  of  $X_n$  consisting of the intersections of pairs of corresponding edges of  $A, B$ .
- b. The points of  $Y_n$  form a semi-simplex pair  $C, D$  in perspective from a vertex in  $\Sigma_{n-1}$ . This pair, the vertex of perspective and the intersections of pairs of corresponding edges of  $C, D$  account for all the points in  $Y_n$ .
- c. The intersections of pairs of corresponding edges of  $C, D$  form a semi-simplex pair  $E, F$  in  $\Sigma_{n-2}$  which are in perspective from a vertex.

*Proof.* The general case is analogous to the configuration of 10 points in  $\Sigma_3$  for the case  $n = 4$  in 9.2.  $X_n$  consists of the  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points  $(i, j)$  for  $i, j$  between 1 and  $n + 3$ . As in Theorem 8.2 the intersections of pairs of corresponding edges is the subset  $Y_n$  of  $X_n$  consists of points  $(i, j)$  with  $i, j$  lying between 3 and  $n + 3$ .

$Y_n$  lies in  $K$ , with  $K$  a hyperplane of  $\Sigma_n$  of dimension  $n - 1$ , and contains  $\binom{n+1}{2}$  points. If we choose say, the point  $(3, 4)$  as vertex we have two mini-simplexes in perspective from it, namely  $\{(3, 5), (3, 6), \dots, (3, n + 3)\}$  and  $\{(4, 5), (4, 6), \dots, (4, n + 3)\}$ .

The set  $Y_n$ , lying, in  $\Sigma_{n-1}$ , contains 2 mini-simplexes in  $\Sigma_{n-1}$ , each having  $n - 1$  points, along with the point  $(3, 4)$  as a vertex of perspective and contains also  $\binom{n-1}{2}$  points of intersection of corresponding edges which lie in a  $\Sigma_{n-2}$ .

This accounts for all points in  $Y_n$  as follows from the following identity:

$$\binom{n+1}{2} = 2(n-1) + 1 + \binom{n-1}{2}. \quad (10.1)$$

This identity is simply Theorem 8.2 with  $n$  replaced by  $n - 2$ . Part c follows from an iteration of the above procedure.  $\square$

## 11 Some further extensions of Desargues theorem.

Using the above notation, we consider 3 semi-simplexes  $A, B, C$  in  $\Sigma_n$  such that each pair is in perspective from one of three vertices of perspective that lie on a line in  $X_n$ . Recall that  $X_n$  is the set of  $\binom{n+3}{2}$  points obtained from the arc  $\Gamma_{n+3}$  consisting of the points  $1, 2, \dots, n + 2, n + 3$ .



Without loss of generality the 3 vertices are  $(1, 2)$ ,  $(1, 3)$  and  $(2, 3)$ . Neither one of the pair of semi-simplexes in perspective from  $(1, 2)$  is allowed to contain  $(1, 3)$  or  $(2, 3)$ . The pair  $A, B$  of semi-simplexes, perspective from  $(1, 2)$  must look like  $\{(1, 4), (1, 5), \dots, (1, n+2), (1, n+3)\}$ ,  $\{(2, 4), (2, 5), \dots, (2, n+2), (2, n+3)\}$ . If the simplex  $C$  is in perspective with  $B$  from the point  $(2, 3)$  then  $C = \{(3, 4), (3, 5), \dots, (3, n+2), (3, n+3)\}$ . The pair  $A, C$  are then in perspective from the point  $(1, 3)$ .

We now have the following result which is shown for the case  $n = 3$  [13, p. 64].

**Theorem 11.1.** *Let  $A, B, C$  be three semi-simplexes in  $\Sigma_n$  such that each of the 3 pairs are in perspective from one of three collinear points. Then each pair of semi-simplexes is perspective from the same hyperplane in  $\Sigma_n$ .*

*Proof.* As in the proof of Theorem 8.2 the intersections of corresponding pairs of edges for each pair of simplexes lies in a hyperplane  $Z$  generated by the set  $\{(i, j)\}$  where  $i, j$  lie between 4 and  $n+3$ . Alternatively as in the proof of Theorem 5.2,  $Z = \{(4, 5), (4, 6), \dots, (4, n+2), (4, n+3)\}$ .  $\square$

## 12 A fourth proof of an extended Desargues Theorem.

**Theorem 12.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  be simplexes in  $\Sigma_n$  which are in perspective from a point and share no points or faces. Then the intersections of corresponding edges of  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  lie in a hyperplane of  $\Sigma_n$ .*

*Proof.* We use the method in [7] in the case  $n = 2$ . In detail, let  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  and  $B_1, B_2, B_3$  form triangles in the plane  $\pi$  which are in perspective from  $V$  and share no vertices or edges. Choose any point  $W$  of the 3-space containing  $\pi$  that is not in  $\pi$ . Let  $A_2^* \neq W, A_2$  be a point on the line  $WA_2$ . Then  $A_2^*$  is not in  $\pi$ . The plane  $\sigma$  formed from  $W, A_2, B_2$  also contains  $A_2^*$  and  $V$ .

We define  $B_2^*$  as the intersection of  $VA_2^*$  and  $WB_2$ . The triangles  $A_1, A_2^*, A_3$  and  $B_1, B_2^*, B_3$  are in perspective from  $V$  and do not lie in a plane. Thus, the intersections of corresponding lines of these two triangles lie in a line  $l^*$  which is the intersection of the planes of the two triangles.

$W$  projects the two triangles to the plane  $\pi$ . It projects lines  $A_1A_2^*, B_1B_2^*$  to lines  $A_1A_2, B_1B_2$ . The intersection of  $A_1A_2^*$  and  $B_1B_2^*$  is projected by  $W$  to the point of intersection in  $\pi$  of lines  $A_1A_2, B_1B_2$ . Similarly the intersection point of lines  $A_2^*A_3, B_2^*B_3$  is projected to the intersection point of lines  $A_2A_3$  and  $B_2B_3$ . Since  $A_1, A_3, B_1, B_3$  are in  $\pi$  the point  $A_1A_3 \cap B_1B_3$  is projected to itself. In summary,  $W$  projects  $l^*$  to the line  $l$  in  $\pi$  containing the 3 points of intersection of corresponding lines of the triangles  $A_1A_2A_3, B_1B_2B_3$ . This proves the planar theorem.

In  $\Sigma_n$  we have two simplexes  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  in perspective from a point  $V$  with  $\mathbf{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{n+3}\}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{n+3}\}$ .  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  share no points

or faces. As above, a point  $W$  not in  $\Sigma_n$  lifts  $A_2, B_2$  to points  $A_2^*, B_2^*$  in  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ , not in  $\Sigma_n$ . The lifted simplexes  $\mathbf{A}^* = \{A_1, A_2^*, A_3, \dots, A_{n+3}\}$  and  $\mathbf{B}^* = \{B_1, B_2^*, B_3, \dots, B_{n+3}\}$  lie in distinct hyperplanes  $H_1, H_2$  of  $\Sigma_{n+1}$ . The intersections of corresponding edges lie in  $L^* = H_1 \cap H_2$ . As above  $W$  projects  $L^*$  to a hyperplane  $L$  of  $\Sigma_n$  containing the intersection of corresponding edges of  $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}$  in  $\Sigma_n$ . This proves the theorem.  $\square$

### 13 Concluding Remarks.

**Acknowledgement:** The author acknowledges the support of the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada over the last fifty years. He is also grateful to the National Research Council of Italy for supporting his work over many of these fifty years.

He thanks Professor James McQuillan of Western Illinois University for his insights and assistance with this work.

### References

- [1] A. A. Bruen and J. M. McQuillan, “On Geometrical Configurations”, *European Journal of Mathematics*, **4**, 73-92 (2018).
- [2] A. A. Bruen and J. M. McQuillan, “Desargues configurations with four self-conjugate points”, *European Journal of Mathematics*, **4**, 837-844 (2018).
- [3] A. A. Bruen, T. C. Bruen, and J. M. McQuillan, “Desargues theorem, its configurations, and the solution to a long-standing enumeration problem”, *arXiv:2007.09175 [math.CO]*, July 17, 2020.
- [4] A. A. Bruen, J. A. Thas and A. Blokhuis, “On MDS codes, arcs in  $PG(n, q)$  with  $q$  even, and a solution of three fundamental problems of B. Segre”, *Invent. Math.*, **92**, 441-459 (1988).
- [5] W. B. Carver, “On the Cayley-Veronese class of configurations”, *Transactions of the AMS*, **6**, 534-545 (1905).
- [6] A. Cayley, “Sur quelque théorème de la géométrie de position”, *Crelle’s Journal*, vol 31, 1846: Collected works, Vol 1, p. 317, 1846.
- [7] J. Conway and A. Ryba, “The Pascal Mysticum Demystified”, *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, **34**, 4-8 (2012).
- [8] H. S. M. Coxeter, *Projective Geometry*, second edition. Springer-Verlag (1987).

- [9] A. Crannell and S. Douglas, “Drawing on Desargues”, *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, **34**, 7-14 (2012).
- [10] G. Gévay, “Pascal’s triangle of configurations”, In: Conder, M., Deza, A., Weiss, A. (eds) *Discrete Geometry And Symmetry*. GSC 2015. Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, vol 234. Springer, Cham., pp. 181-199 (2018).
- [11] J. W. P. Hirschfeld, *Projective Geometries over Finite Fields*, second edition. Oxford University Press (1998).
- [12] W. M. Ivins, *Art and Geometry, a Study in Space Intuitions*, Dover (1948).
- [13] E. Lord, *Symmetry and Pattern in Projective Geometry*. Springer-Verlag (2013).
- [14] T. Luotoniemi, “Stick models of projective configurations”, *Journal of Mathematics and the Arts*, **16**, 104-120 (2022).
- [15] S. R. Mandan, “Desargues theorem in n-space”, *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, **1**, 311-318 (1960).
- [16] E. A. Maxwell, *General Homogeneous Coordinates in Space of Three Dimensions*, Cambridge U. Pr. (1951).
- [17] D. Pedoe, *An Introduction To Projective Geometry*. Pergamon Press (1963).
- [18] G.- C. Rota, *Indiscrete Thoughts*. Birkhauser Verlag (2008).
- [19] O. Veblen and J. W. Young, *Projective Geometry*, Volume 1. Ginn and Co. (1910).
- [20] G. Veronese, “Behandlung der projectivischen Verhältnisse der Räume von verschiedenen Dimensionen durch das Princip des Projicirens und Schneidens”, *Math Annalen*, **19**, 161-234 (1881).