Finding the Curve that Focuses Parallel Rays to a Single Point

P. Reany

June 27, 2022

Abstract

This paper uses Geometric Algebra to solve for the curve that focuses parallel rays to a single point. The curve will be shown to be a parabola and the point its focus. A basic knowledge of geometric algebra and firstyear calculus is assumed.

1 Introduction

Consider the limiting case of an infinitely shallow 2-D reflecting structure (curve) in \mathbb{R}^2 . It will reflect all light rays that hit it by the rule *the angle of reflection is equal to the angle of incidence*. We demand that this reflecting structure sends all reflecting rays to the point $\mathbf{Q} = (0, w)$ with w > 0. We also demand that this reflecting structure pass through the point (0, 0). Lastly, we'll assume that the equation of this curve is at most quadratic. The situation is depicted in the figure below.



Figure 1. Sure, our so-called unknown curve is a parabola, but we have to prove that and solve for its coefficients. The formula for \mathbf{u}' is given by $-\mathbf{T}(-\mathbf{u})\mathbf{T}$, where $\mathbf{u} = -\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2$ is a unit vector, and where \mathbf{T} is a tangent vector to the curve at the point \mathbf{P} . A priori, it's possible that there is no quadratic curve that suits the given requirements. Well, we'll see.

2 Solution

For starters, we're assuming the curve to be a polynomial, so it's differentiable everywhere. Therefore, it has a well-defined tangent line to every point \mathbf{P} on the curve. By the way, since the point \mathbf{P} is arbitrarily chosen, what we prove about the reflection at this point is true for every point on the curve. As for the curve, we're assuming it has the polynomial form:

$$f(x) = ax^2 + bx\,,\tag{1}$$

where the constant term is zero to satisfy the requirement that the curve goes through the origin. Anyway, the slope function f'(x) is given by

$$f'(x) = 2ax + b. (2)$$

The geometric algebra encoding for a reflection about a vector \mathbf{T} is given by

$$\mathbf{u}' = -\hat{\mathbf{T}}(-\mathbf{u})\hat{\mathbf{T}}.$$
(3)

By requirement in our problem, \mathbf{u}' must be a unit vector along the direction $\pm(\mathbf{Q} - \mathbf{P})$, and it won't matter which sign we choose. Also, by construction, $\mathbf{u} = -\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2$. The last constraint we need to satisfy is

$$[\hat{\mathbf{T}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2)\hat{\mathbf{T}}] \wedge (\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}) = 0.$$
⁽⁴⁾

Now, since the expression on the LHS is being set equal to zero, we don't have to worry about normalizing the tangent vector, hence, we can simplify (4) down to

$$[\mathbf{T}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2}\mathbf{T}]\wedge(\mathbf{P}-\mathbf{Q})=0.$$
(5)

So, now we need a tangent vector **T**.

$$\mathbf{T} = (\Delta x, \Delta y) = \Delta x(1, \frac{\Delta y}{\Delta x}) = \Delta x(1, f'(x)).$$
(6)

We'll drop the nonzero factor of Δx and, with y' = f'(x), write

$$\mathbf{T} = (1, y') = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 + y' \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \,. \tag{7}$$

We'll get the constraints we need on a and b in (1) by reducing Eq. (5) to a sum of terms that are each scalar multiples of the bivector $\sigma_{12} = \sigma_1 \wedge \sigma_2$.

So, now we calculate $\mathbf{T}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2}\mathbf{T}$.

$$\mathbf{T} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2} \mathbf{T} = (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{1} + y' \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2}) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{1} + y' \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2})$$

$$= (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{12} + y') (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{1} + y' \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2})$$

$$= -\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2} + 2y' \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{1} + (y')^{2} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2}$$

$$= 2y' \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{1} + [(y')^{2} - 1] \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{2}$$
(8)

What about $\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}$?

$$\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q} = (x, y) - (0, w) = x\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 + (y - w)\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2.$$
(9)

Now we're ready for (5):

$$[\mathbf{T} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{T}] \wedge (\mathbf{P} - \mathbf{Q}) = [2y' \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 + [(y')^2 - 1] \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2] \wedge [x \boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 + (y - w) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2]$$

= 2y'(y - w) \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{12} - [(y')^2 - 1] x \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{12}
= {2y'(y - w) - [(y')^2 - 1] x} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{12}
= 0. (10)

So, if this procedure is to work, the constraints we need on a and b will be evident when we expand

$$2y'(y-w) - [(y')^2 - 1]x = 0, \qquad (11)$$

and then compare coefficients to (1). Substituting in from (1) and (2), we get, after much simplification,

$$2abx^{2} + (-4aw + b^{2} + 1)x - 2bw = 0.$$
⁽¹²⁾

First, on comparing this to (1), we see that -2bw = 0, and since $w \neq 0$, then b = 0, leaving us with

$$(-4aw+1)x = 0. (13)$$

On setting this last coefficient to zero, we get

$$w = \frac{1}{4a}, \qquad (14)$$

which is the expected result, although we need to solve for a in this case, to get for our quadratic polynomial

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{4w}x^2,$$
 (15)

which, in standard form, would be written as

$$4w(y+k) = (x+h)^2,$$
(16)

with h = k = 0, since the vertex is at point (0, 0).

3 Conclusion

Instead of using geometric algebra to help in proving this theorem, I could have used the Gibbs's inner product and cross product, and have accomplished the task. Either way, let's not forget the point of the theorem: There exists a quadratic solution to the existence problem of whether or not incoming parallel rays can be focused to the single point by reflecting them off a surface defined by a quadratic polynomial.