

Brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces in Newtonian and relativistic spacetimes

Ferhat Taş^a

^a*Istanbul University Department of Computer Science, İstanbul, 34134, , Türkiye*

Abstract

We introduce and study *brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces* in Newtonian and relativistic spacetimes. Starting from the classical cycloidal brachistochrone in a constant gravitational field, we construct a Newtonian “brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet” whose rulings are time-minimizing trajectories between pairs of endpoints. We then generalize this construction to stationary Lorentzian spacetimes by exploiting the reduction of arrival-time functionals to Finsler- or Jacobi-type length functionals on a spatial manifold. In this framework, relativistic brachistochrones arise as geodesics of an associated Finsler structure, and brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces are timelike surfaces ruled by these time-minimizing worldlines. We work out explicit examples in Minkowski spacetime and in the Schwarzschild exterior: in the flat case, for a bounded-speed time functional, the brachistochrones are straight timelike lines and a simple family of brachistochrone-ruled surfaces turns out to be totally geodesic; in the Schwarzschild case, we show how coordinate-time minimization at fixed energy reduces to geodesics of a Jacobi metric on the spatial slice, and outline a numerical scheme for constructing brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces. Finally, we discuss basic geometric properties of such surfaces and identify natural Jacobi fields along the rulings.

Keywords: brachistochrone, ruled surface, stationary spacetime, Finsler geometry, Jacobi metric

1. Introduction

Geodesics play a central role in both classical differential geometry and general relativity. In a Riemannian manifold they locally minimize length; in a Lorentzian spacetime, timelike geodesics represent the worldlines of freely falling observers and locally extremize the proper time between events. From the variational viewpoint, geodesics are critical points of natural action functionals built from the metric tensor.

In many physical situations, however, the quantity of interest is not length or proper time, but the *arrival time* measured by a distinguished family of observers. This leads to variants of the classical *brachistochrone* problem: given two points and a time functional depending on the geometry and dynamics (e.g. gravitational field, maximal speed constraints), find the curve along which a particle travels between these points in the shortest possible time. In the Newtonian setting this problem goes back to the celebrated cycloidal brachistochrone (Bernoulli, 1696; Erlichson, 1999); in relativistic contexts, time-optimal trajectories have been studied in special and general relativity, both in analytic and in Finsler-geometric frameworks (see, e.g., Perlick, 1990; Fortunato et al., 1995; Giannoni et al., 2002; Caponio et al., 2011a,b).

A second classical idea in differential geometry is that of a *ruled surface*, i.e. a surface obtained as the union of a one-parameter family of straight lines. In Riemannian and Lorentzian geometry there is a rich literature on surfaces ruled by geodesics or null geodesics in Euclidean, Minkowski and curved ambient spaces. These constructions provide geometrically and physically meaningful two-dimensional submanifolds, for instance in the theory of null hypersurfaces, string-

like objects or wavefronts.

However, despite the extensive literature on both brachistochrone-type problems and ruled surfaces, the two concepts remained largely separate. In particular, the systematic construction of surfaces whose rulings are not merely geodesics of the ambient metric, but rather *time-minimizing trajectories* with respect to a physically chosen arrival-time functional, has not been developed previously. This gap is especially notable in relativistic spacetimes, where time functionals naturally reduce to Finsler or Jacobi structures on spatial slices.

The aim of this paper is to combine these two variational ideas and to propose a new geometric object in classical and relativistic spacetimes: *brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces*. Roughly speaking, given two one-parameter families of events or observers, we consider for each parameter value the time-minimizing timelike curve (brachistochrone) connecting the corresponding pair of endpoints, with respect to a chosen time functional. The union of these time-minimizing worldlines forms a two-dimensional timelike surface in spacetime, ruled by brachistochronal rulings. Our goal is to formalize this construction, to relate it to known reductions of time functionals to Finsler or Jacobi metrics, and to explore its geometry in simple but illustrative examples.

From a physical perspective, brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces may be interpreted as *time-optimal world sheets* connecting two families of sources and receivers, or two congruences of observers. They encode, in a single geometric object, the set of time-minimizing trajectories which realize the fastest possible transport or signal propagation between corresponding elements of the two families. From a geometric viewpoint, such

surfaces interpolate between several known constructions: in flat spacetime with trivial time functional they reduce to timelike surfaces ruled by straight geodesics, while in non-trivial stationary spacetimes they are ruled by geodesics of an effective Finsler (often Randers-type) or Jacobi metric on a spatial slice (Bao et al., 2000; Randers, 1941; Zermelo, 1931; Bao et al., 2004; Gibbons et al., 2009; Gibbons, 2016; Caponio et al., 2024).

The main contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce a precise definition of *relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces* in stationary Lorentzian spacetimes. Using standard reductions of arrival-time functionals to Finsler or Jacobi-type length functionals on a spatial manifold, we characterize the rulings as geodesics of an associated Finsler structure and formulate natural regularity and uniqueness assumptions for families of brachistochrones.
- To build intuition, we first construct a fully explicit Newtonian toy model. In a classical constant-gravity field we use cycloidal brachistochrones as rulings and obtain a “brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet” in Newtonian spacetime. This provides a concrete variational picture in which the rulings are honest time-minimizing curves with respect to the classical brachistochrone functional.
- In $(1 + 2)$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime we consider a simple arrival-time functional based on a uniform bound on the spatial speed relative to static observers. We show that the corresponding relativistic brachistochrones are straight timelike lines and construct explicit brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces connecting two families of stationary observers. A particularly simple choice of boundary curves yields a timelike affine plane which is totally geodesic.
- As a first non-trivial curved example, we study the Schwarzschild exterior as a static spacetime. For timelike geodesics at fixed energy we derive a Jacobi-type Riemannian metric on the equatorial spatial slice and explain how time-minimizing timelike geodesics (with respect to coordinate time) reduce to length-minimizing geodesics of this Jacobi metric. We then outline a numerical scheme for constructing brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces between two families of endpoints by solving boundary-value problems for the Jacobi geodesics.
- Finally, we discuss the differential geometry of brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces, emphasizing the role of the induced Lorentzian metric, the second fundamental form and curvature invariants. We comment on the relation to conjugate points, cut loci and caustics of the underlying time-minimizing geodesics, and we point out several directions for further work.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the classical cycloidal brachistochrone and construct a Newtonian




Figure 1: Standard brachistochrone curve connecting two points in a uniform gravitational field.

brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet. In Section 3 we develop a general framework for relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces in stationary spacetimes, based on the reduction of arrival-time functionals to Finsler or Jacobi-type metrics on spatial slices. Section 4 is devoted to explicit constructions in Minkowski spacetime; we show that in this setting the rulings are straight timelike geodesics and work out a simple planar example in detail. In Section 5 we consider the Schwarzschild exterior as a prototype static curved spacetime, derive the relevant Jacobi metric, and outline a numerical construction scheme for brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces between two families of endpoints. In Section 6 we discuss the differential geometry of such surfaces, including induced metric, curvature and qualitative features related to focal sets and cut loci. We conclude in Section 7 with a summary and several open problems and future directions.

2. A Toy Model: Brachistochrone-Ruled Worldsheets in Newtonian Spacetime

In this section, we construct a simple “toy model” in classical mechanics (Newtonian spacetime) which already exhibits the basic geometric idea behind brachistochrone-ruled surfaces. The construction will later serve as a template for the relativistic generalization in Lorentzian spacetimes.

2.1. Classical brachistochrones revisited

We briefly recall the classical brachistochrone problem in the plane. Let (x, z) be Cartesian coordinates, where z denotes the vertical coordinate measured downward along the direction of a constant gravitational field of strength $g > 0$. We consider a particle of negligible size, moving without friction in the (x, z) -plane under the potential

$$V(z) = gz, \quad (1)$$

and we assume that the particle starts from rest at the point

$$A = (0, 0) \quad (2)$$

and must reach a point

$$B = (X, H), \quad X > 0, H > 0. \quad (3)$$

Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\gamma(\lambda) = (x(\lambda), z(\lambda))$ be a smooth curve connecting A to B . If the particle has no initial velocity, conservation of mechanical energy gives

$$\frac{1}{2}v^2(\lambda) = gz(\lambda), \quad v(\lambda) = \sqrt{2gz(\lambda)}, \quad (4)$$

where $v = \|\dot{\gamma}\|$ is the speed. The travel time along γ is

$$T[\gamma] = \int_0^1 \frac{ds}{v} = \int_0^1 \frac{\sqrt{\dot{x}(\lambda)^2 + \dot{z}(\lambda)^2}}{\sqrt{2gz(\lambda)}} d\lambda. \quad (5)$$

The classical brachistochrone problem asks for curves γ minimizing the functional (5) among all smooth paths from A to B . It is well known that the minimizers are cycloids. More precisely, there exist parameters $a > 0$ and $\theta_1 > 0$ such that the minimizing curve admits the parametric representation

$$\begin{aligned} x(\theta) &= a(\theta - \sin \theta), \\ z(\theta) &= a(1 - \cos \theta), \end{aligned} \quad 0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_1, \quad (6)$$

with the endpoint conditions

$$a(\theta_1 - \sin \theta_1) = X, \quad a(1 - \cos \theta_1) = H. \quad (7)$$

Along the cycloid (6) the speed is

$$v(\theta) = \sqrt{2gz(\theta)} = \sqrt{2ga(1 - \cos \theta)}. \quad (8)$$

A direct computation shows that the arc-length element and the travel time element are

$$ds = \sqrt{(x'(\theta))^2 + (z'(\theta))^2} d\theta = 2a \sin \frac{\theta}{2} d\theta, \quad (9)$$

$$dt = \frac{ds}{v} = \frac{2a \sin(\theta/2) d\theta}{\sqrt{2ga(1 - \cos \theta)}} = \sqrt{\frac{a}{g}} d\theta. \quad (10)$$

Thus, the time coordinate along the cycloid is linear in θ :

$$t(\theta) = \sqrt{\frac{a}{g}} \theta, \quad t(0) = 0. \quad (11)$$

In Newtonian spacetime \mathbb{R}^4 with coordinates (t, x, z, y) we may therefore regard the brachistochrone as a worldline

$$\gamma(\theta) = (t(\theta), x(\theta), z(\theta), y_0) = \left(\sqrt{\frac{a}{g}} \theta, a(\theta - \sin \theta), a(1 - \cos \theta), y_0 \right), \quad (12)$$

where the additional spatial coordinate $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ is kept constant (see Figure 1).

2.2. From a family of endpoint pairs to a brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet

We now use the classical brachistochrone as a building block to construct a two-dimensional worldsheet whose rulings are brachistochrone worldlines.

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a non-empty open interval and let

$$X, H : I \rightarrow (0, \infty) \quad (13)$$

be smooth functions. We define two spatial curves in \mathbb{R}^3 by

$$\Gamma_0 : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \Gamma_0(s) = (x, z, y) = (0, 0, s), \quad (14)$$

$$\Gamma_1 : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \Gamma_1(s) = (x, z, y) = (X(s), H(s), s). \quad (15)$$

For each fixed label $s \in I$, the points

$$A_s = (0, 0), \quad B_s = (X(s), H(s)) \quad (16)$$

are the endpoints of a brachistochrone in the (x, z) -plane, under the same gravitational field as before.

Assumption 1. For every $s \in I$ there exists a unique cycloidal brachistochrone connecting A_s to B_s , determined by parameters $a(s) > 0$ and $\theta_1(s) > 0$ such that

$$a(s)(\theta_1(s) - \sin \theta_1(s)) = X(s), \quad a(s)(1 - \cos \theta_1(s)) = H(s). \quad (17)$$

Moreover, the functions $a, \theta_1 : I \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ are smooth.

Under Assumption 1, we can parametrize, for each $s \in I$, the time-minimizing trajectory between $\Gamma_0(s)$ and $\Gamma_1(s)$ in Newtonian spacetime by

$$\gamma_s : [0, \theta_1(s)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4, \quad (18)$$

where

$$\gamma_s(\theta) = (t_s(\theta), x_s(\theta), z_s(\theta), y_s(\theta)) \quad (19)$$

$$= \left(\sqrt{\frac{a(s)}{g}} \theta, a(s)(\theta - \sin \theta), a(s)(1 - \cos \theta), s \right). \quad (20)$$

for $0 \leq \theta \leq \theta_1(s)$.

For notational convenience, we introduce a normalized parameter $u \in [0, 1]$ by

$$\theta(s, u) := u \theta_1(s). \quad (21)$$

This yields a two-parameter family of points in Newtonian spacetime

$$\Sigma : I \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4, \quad \Sigma(s, u) := \gamma_s(\theta(s, u)). \quad (22)$$

Explicitly,

$$\Sigma(s, u) = (t(s, u), x(s, u), z(s, u), y(s, u)), \quad (23)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(s, u) &= u \theta_1(s), \\ x(s, u) &= a(s)(\theta(s, u) - \sin \theta(s, u)), \\ z(s, u) &= a(s)(1 - \cos \theta(s, u)), \\ t(s, u) &= \sqrt{\frac{a(s)}{g}} \theta(s, u) = \sqrt{\frac{a(s)}{g}} u \theta_1(s), \\ y(s, u) &= s. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$




Figure 2: Brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet in Newtonian spacetime.




Figure 3: Brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet in the Schwarzschild exterior.

Definition 1 (Brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet in Newtonian spacetime). A smooth map $\Sigma : U \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ is called a brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet if there exist smooth functions $a(s) > 0$, $\theta_1(s) > 0$ and endpoint curves Γ_0, Γ_1 as in (14)–(15) such that, in suitable local coordinates (s, u) on U , the map Σ takes the form (22)–(24), and for each fixed s the curve $u \mapsto \Sigma(s, u)$ is a time-minimizing trajectory between $\Gamma_0(s)$ and $\Gamma_1(s)$ with respect to the functional (5). (illustrated in Figure 2).

In this terminology, the parameter s labels the *rulings* (each of which is a brachistochrone worldline), whereas u parametrizes the position along each ruling. The spatial curves Γ_0 and Γ_1 play the role of boundary curves for the worldsheet. The construction above shows that, under assumption 1, such brachistochrone-ruled worldsheets arise naturally from smooth families of endpoint pairs. (see Figure 3).

Remark 1. In the present Newtonian setting, the brachistochrone worldlines are geodesics of an effective Riemannian

metric induced by the travel-time functional (5). In Section 3 we will generalize Definition 1 to the relativistic brachistochrone problem in stationary Lorentzian spacetimes, replacing the effective Riemannian structure by a suitable Finsler (Randers type) metric associated with a chosen time functional.

3. Relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces

In this section we generalize the Newtonian construction of Section 2 to stationary Lorentzian spacetimes. The key point is that, in a stationary spacetime, suitable “time functionals” for timelike curves can be reduced to Finsler-type length functionals on a spatial manifold. Relativistic brachistochrones then appear as geodesics of a Finsler metric, and brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces can be defined in direct analogy with the Newtonian toy model.

3.1. Stationary spacetimes and reduction to Finsler length functionals

Let (M, g) be a time-oriented Lorentzian manifold of dimension $n + 1$ and signature $(-, +, \dots, +)$. We assume (M, g) is *stationary*, i.e. there exists a timelike Killing vector field K on M . In adapted coordinates $(t, x) \in \mathbb{R} \times N$, where N is an n -dimensional spatial manifold, the metric can be written in the standard stationary form

$$g = -\beta(x)(dt - \theta_i(x) dx^i)^2 + h_{ij}(x) dx^i dx^j, \quad (25)$$

where $\beta > 0$ is the lapse function, $\theta = \theta_i dx^i$ is a 1-form (the shift), and h_{ij} is a Riemannian metric on N . The Killing field is $K = \partial_t$.

Consider a future-directed timelike curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$, $\gamma(\lambda) = (t(\lambda), x(\lambda))$, connecting two events with fixed spatial endpoints $x(0) = x_0$, $x(1) = x_1$. We regard the coordinate t as the time measured by the stationary observers whose worldlines are the integral curves of K . The arrival time of γ is

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = t(1) - t(0) = \int_0^1 \dot{t}(\lambda) d\lambda. \quad (26)$$

In order to obtain a well-posed variational problem, we must impose a normalization condition on γ . Two natural choices are:

- (a) *Proper-time parametrization:* $g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = -1$.
- (b) *Fixed energy:* $E := -g(K, \dot{\gamma})$ is prescribed.

Both conditions lead, after algebraic manipulation, to a Finsler-type length functional on the spatial manifold N .

Derivation for proper-time parametrization

Assume γ is parametrized by proper time, so that

$$g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = -1. \quad (27)$$

Substituting the coordinate expressions $\dot{\gamma} = (\dot{t}, \dot{x}^i)$ and the metric (25) yields

$$-\beta(x)(\dot{t} - \theta_i(x)\dot{x}^i)^2 + h_{ij}(x)\dot{x}^i \dot{x}^j = -1. \quad (28)$$

Solving (28) for i (and choosing the positive root for future-directed curves) gives

$$i = \theta_i(x)\dot{x}^i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta(x)}} \sqrt{1 + h_{ij}(x)\dot{x}^i\dot{x}^j}. \quad (29)$$

Inserting (29) into the arrival-time functional (26) we obtain

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = \int_0^1 \left[\theta_i(x)\dot{x}^i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta(x)}} \sqrt{1 + h_{ij}(x)\dot{x}^i\dot{x}^j} \right] d\lambda. \quad (30)$$

Thus, if we define the function $F : TN \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ by

$$F(x, v) := \theta_i(x)v^i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta(x)}} \sqrt{1 + h_{ij}(x)v^i v^j}, \quad (31)$$

then $\Delta t[\gamma] = \int_0^1 F(x(\lambda), \dot{x}(\lambda)) d\lambda$. The function F is smooth on $TN \setminus \{0\}$, positively homogeneous of degree one in v , and strictly convex in each fibre (because the Hessian of $v \mapsto \sqrt{1 + h_{ij}v^i v^j}$ is positive definite). Hence F is a Finsler function of Randers type.

3.1.1. Derivation for fixed energy

Alternatively, let us impose the condition that the energy

$$E := -g(K, \dot{\gamma}) = \beta(x)(i - \theta_i(x)\dot{x}^i) \quad (32)$$

is a prescribed constant along γ . From (32) we have

$$i = \theta_i(x)\dot{x}^i + \frac{E}{\beta(x)}. \quad (33)$$

Substituting (33) into the expression for $g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma})$ (without assuming $\dot{\gamma}$ is unit) yields

$$g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = -\frac{E^2}{\beta(x)} + h_{ij}(x)\dot{x}^i\dot{x}^j. \quad (34)$$

If we require γ to be timelike, then $g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) < 0$, which implies $h_{ij}(x)\dot{x}^i\dot{x}^j < E^2/\beta(x)$. The arrival time becomes

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = \int_0^1 \left[\theta_i(x)\dot{x}^i + \frac{E}{\beta(x)} \right] d\lambda. \quad (35)$$

However, to relate $d\lambda$ to the spatial geometry we must fix a parametrization. A convenient choice is to use the parameter λ such that

$$h_{ij}(x)\dot{x}^i\dot{x}^j = \frac{E^2}{\beta(x)} - 1, \quad (36)$$

which corresponds to a particular choice of proper-time scaling. Then (35) can be rewritten as

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = \int_0^1 \frac{E}{\beta(x)} \left[1 + \frac{\beta(x)}{E} \theta_i(x)\dot{x}^i \right] d\lambda. \quad (37)$$

Defining a new Finsler function

$$F_E(x, v) := \frac{E}{\beta(x)} \left(1 + \frac{\beta(x)}{E} \theta_i(x)v^i \right) = \theta_i(x)v^i + \frac{E}{\beta(x)}, \quad (38)$$

we again obtain $\Delta t[\gamma] = \int_0^1 F_E(x, \dot{x}) d\lambda$, provided the parametrization satisfies (36). More intrinsically, one can eliminate $d\lambda$ from (35) and (36) to obtain a Finsler structure whose geodesics are precisely the spatial projections of time-like geodesics with energy E . In the static case ($\theta = 0$) this leads to a Riemannian (Jacobi) metric, as we will see in Section 5.

General reduction statement: The two derivations above illustrate the following general fact, which we state as a precise proposition.

Proposition 1 (Reduction to a Finsler length functional). *Let (M, g) be a stationary spacetime with metric of the form (25), and let C be a class of future-directed timelike curves $\gamma(\lambda) = (t(\lambda), x(\lambda))$ satisfying a prescribed normalization condition (for example, proper-time parametrization $g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = -1$, or fixed energy $E = -g(K, \dot{\gamma})$) and fixed spatial endpoints $x(0) = x_0$, $x(1) = x_1$.*

Then there exists a positively homogeneous function

$$F : TN \setminus \{0\} \longrightarrow (0, \infty),$$

smooth away from the zero section and strictly convex in each fibre, such that:

- (i) *For every $\gamma \in C$, its spatial projection $\sigma := \pi \circ \gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow N$ satisfies*

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = \int_0^1 F(\sigma(\lambda), \dot{\sigma}(\lambda)) d\lambda. \quad (39)$$

- (ii) *A curve $\gamma \in C$ is a critical point of the arrival-time functional Δt (with fixed endpoints) if and only if its spatial projection σ is a geodesic of the Finsler metric F , i.e. a critical point of the functional*

$$T[\sigma] = \int_0^1 F(\sigma(\lambda), \dot{\sigma}(\lambda)) d\lambda. \quad (40)$$

In the proper-time case, F is given by the Randers function (31); in the fixed-energy case, after a suitable reparametrization, one obtains a Randers function of the form (38) or, equivalently, a Riemannian (Jacobi) metric when $\theta = 0$.

Remark 2. The Finsler function F obtained in Proposition 1 is typically of Randers type, i.e.

$$F(x, v) = \alpha(x, v) + \beta(x, v),$$

where $\alpha(x, v) = \sqrt{a_{ij}(x)v^i v^j}$ is induced by a Riemannian metric a_{ij} on N and $\beta(x, v) = b_i(x)v^i$ is a 1-form. The geodesics of F describe time-optimal motion in the presence of an effective “wind” or drift field; this is the relativistic analogue of the Zermelo navigation problem. In the static case ($\theta_i \equiv 0$) the Randers 1-form vanishes and the Finsler metric reduces to a Riemannian metric (the optical or Jacobi metric) on N .

Remark 3. In many important examples, including static spacetimes, the Finsler function F is of Randers type,

$$F(x, v) = \alpha(x, v) + \beta(x, v), \quad (41)$$

where α is induced by a Riemannian metric on N and β is a 1-form. The geodesics of F then describe time-optimal motion in the presence of an effective “wind” or drift field; this is the relativistic analogue of the Zermelo navigation problem.

Motivated by Proposition 1, we adopt the following terminology.

Definition 2 (Relativistic brachistochrone). *Let (M, g) be a stationary spacetime and F the associated Finsler function on N as in Proposition 1. Let $p, q \in M$ be two events whose spatial projections $x_p, x_q \in N$ lie in the same connected component of N . A future-directed timelike curve γ from p to q , $\gamma \in C$, is called a relativistic brachistochrone between p and q (relative to the stationary observers K and the chosen normalization) if γ is a critical point of the arrival-time functional Δt ; equivalently, if its spatial projection $\sigma = \pi \circ \gamma$ is a geodesic of the Finsler metric F connecting x_p to x_q and minimizing the functional (5) among admissible competitors.*

3.2. Families of endpoints and brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces

We now introduce the relativistic analogue of the brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet constructed in Section 2. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a non-empty open interval, and let

$$\alpha_0, \alpha_1 : I \longrightarrow N \quad (42)$$

be two smooth curves in the spatial manifold N , which we regard as families of spatial endpoints. For each $s \in I$, the points $\alpha_0(s)$ and $\alpha_1(s)$ represent the spatial positions of two events to be connected by a time-optimal worldline.

In order to lift these spatial curves to curves in spacetime M , one may fix a reference time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and consider the embeddings

$$\beta_0(s) = (t_0, \alpha_0(s)), \quad \beta_1(s) = (t_0, \alpha_1(s)), \quad (43)$$

or, more generally, allow for smooth time functions $t_0(s), t_1(s)$ and set

$$\beta_0(s) = (t_0(s), \alpha_0(s)), \quad \beta_1(s) = (t_1(s), \alpha_1(s)). \quad (44)$$

We impose the following assumption, which is a natural regularity and uniqueness requirement on the relativistic brachistochrone problem with varying endpoints.

Assumption 2 (Smooth family of brachistochrones). *Let (M, g) be a stationary spacetime with associated Finsler metric F on N as in Proposition 1. Assume that for every $s \in I$ there exists a unique future-directed timelike relativistic brachistochrone*

$$\gamma_s : [0, 1] \longrightarrow M, \quad (45)$$

connecting $\beta_0(s)$ to $\beta_1(s)$ in the sense of Definition 2, and that the map

$$(s, \lambda) \longmapsto \gamma_s(\lambda) \quad (46)$$

is smooth on $I \times [0, 1]$.

Under Assumption 2 we define a map

$$\Sigma : I \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow M, \quad \Sigma(s, u) := \gamma_s(u), \quad (47)$$

which parametrizes the union of all brachistochrones γ_s .

Definition 3 (Relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface). *Let (M, g) be a stationary spacetime and let $\Sigma : U \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow M$ be a smooth map such that Σ is an immersion and $\Sigma(U)$ is a timelike surface (i.e. the induced metric has Lorentzian signature). We say that Σ is a relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface if there exists:*

- an open interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ and a diffeomorphism $\Phi : I \times [0, 1] \rightarrow U$,
- smooth curves $\beta_0, \beta_1 : I \rightarrow M$,
- a family $\{\gamma_s\}_{s \in I}$ of future-directed timelike relativistic brachistochrones connecting $\beta_0(s)$ to $\beta_1(s)$ and satisfying Assumption 2,

such that, in the coordinates $(s, u) = \Phi^{-1}(p)$,

$$\Sigma(\Phi(s, u)) = \gamma_s(u), \quad (s, u) \in I \times [0, 1]. \quad (48)$$

In other words, for each fixed $s \in I$ the curve $u \mapsto \Sigma(\Phi(s, u))$ is a relativistic brachistochrone connecting two boundary curves on the surface, and the surface is ruled by this one-parameter family of time-minimizing worldlines.

Remark 4. Note that in the Newtonian toy model of Section 2, the stationary spacetime is \mathbb{R}^4 endowed with the standard Newtonian time coordinate and a gravitational potential encoded in the travel-time functional. The Finsler metric F reduces to a Riemannian metric whose geodesics are cycloids, and Definition 3 recovers Definition 1 as a formal limit.

Remark 5. The differential geometry of relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces can be studied by pulling back the Lorentzian metric g via Σ and computing the induced metric, second fundamental form and curvature invariants. Under additional hypotheses on the family of brachistochrones (for instance, suitable transversality conditions), one can introduce relativistic analogues of classical quantities such as the striction curve and the distribution parameter for ruled surfaces. We will return to these aspects in Section 6.

4. An explicit example in Minkowski spacetime

In this section we illustrate the notion of a brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface in the simplest relativistic setting, namely Minkowski spacetime. We choose a very concrete time functional based on bounded coordinate speed and show that the corresponding relativistic brachistochrones are straight timelike lines. This allows us to construct an explicit family of brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces and to compute some basic geometric quantities.

4.1. Minkowski spacetime and stationary observers

Let (M, g) be $(1 + 2)$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime

$$M = \mathbb{R}^{1+2}, \quad g = -dt^2 + dx^2 + dz^2, \quad (49)$$

with global inertial coordinates (t, x, z) . We take $c = 1$ units so that timelike vectors satisfy $g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) < 0$.

The vector field

$$K = \partial_t \quad (50)$$

is a timelike Killing field generating time translations. Its integral curves

$$\lambda \mapsto (t_0 + \lambda, x_0, z_0) \quad (51)$$

represent the worldlines of a distinguished family of inertial (obviously “static”) observers. The coordinate t is interpreted as the time measured by these observers.

4.2. A time functional with bounded coordinate speed

We now introduce a simple arrival-time functional which encodes a bound on the spatial speed of a particle relative to the stationary observers. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$ be a future-directed timelike curve,

$$\gamma(\lambda) = (t(\lambda), x(\lambda), z(\lambda)), \quad (52)$$

connecting two events $p = \gamma(0)$ and $q = \gamma(1)$. We assume that γ is regular and future-directed, so that $\dot{t}(\lambda) > 0$.

The *arrival time* measured in the coordinate t is

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = t(1) - t(0) = \int_0^1 \dot{t}(\lambda) d\lambda. \quad (53)$$

We further assume that the spatial velocity of the particle, measured in the coordinates (x, z) with respect to t , is bounded by a fixed constant $v_0 \in (0, 1)$:

$$\|\mathbf{v}(\lambda)\| := \left\| \frac{d}{d\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ z \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq v_0 < 1. \quad (54)$$

Physically, v_0 represents a maximal admissible speed strictly below the speed of light.

For our purposes we idealize accelerations and allow the particle to change velocity instantaneously, under the sole constraint (54). This is a standard simplification in time-optimal control problems: the dominant constraint is on the magnitude of the velocity, not on the acceleration.

Remark 6 (Physical interpretation of the instantaneous-velocity-change idealization). The assumption of instantaneous velocity changes—i.e., allowing the spatial velocity $\mathbf{v}(t)$ to change discontinuously while respecting the uniform bound $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \leq v_0$ —is a standard idealization in time-optimal control theory. It serves to isolate the effect of the speed constraint from the complications introduced by finite acceleration. In physical terms, this model is a good approximation for systems whose available control forces are large enough that the time spent accelerating is negligible compared to the total travel time. Examples include:

- Spacecraft or rockets with high thrust-to-weight ratios, where the powered phases are very short relative to coasting periods;
- Charged particles in strong, rapidly switchable electric fields (e.g., in particle accelerators or electrostatic lenses);
- Signal routing in optical or electromagnetic waveguides, where the group velocity is essentially constant and direction changes can be treated as instantaneous at junctions.

Naturally, any real system has finite acceleration capabilities, and a more complete model would include an additional constraint on the magnitude of $\|\dot{\mathbf{v}}\|$. Such a refinement would lead to brachistochrones that are not straight lines in Minkowski spacetime, but rather curves with continuous velocity profiles. Nevertheless, the present idealization already captures the essential geometric structure of time-minimizing surfaces when the dominant limitation is the speed itself, not the rate of change of speed. The framework developed in Section 3 is independent of this particular idealization and can be applied equally well to more realistic models with acceleration bounds, at the cost of a more complicated effective Finsler or Jacobi metric.

It is convenient to parametrize the curve by coordinate time $t \in [t_0, t_1]$, i.e. to regard γ as

$$\gamma(t) = (t, x(t), z(t)), \quad t_0 \leq t \leq t_1. \quad (55)$$

The spatial velocity is then

$$\mathbf{v}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ \dot{z}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \leq v_0, \quad (56)$$

and the arrival time is simply

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = t_1 - t_0. \quad (57)$$

Suppose now that we fix two spatial points

$$\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_0, z_0), \quad \mathbf{x}_1 = (x_1, z_1) \in \mathbb{R}^2, \quad (58)$$

and we are interested in all future-directed timelike curves $\gamma(t) = (t, x(t), z(t))$ such that

$$x(t_0) = x_0, \quad z(t_0) = z_0, \quad x(t_1) = x_1, \quad z(t_1) = z_1, \quad (59)$$

with $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \leq v_0$, and we want to minimize $\Delta t = t_1 - t_0$.

Proposition 2 (Time-optimal paths at bounded speed). *Let $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $v_0 \in (0, 1)$ be given. Among all future-directed timelike curves*

$$\gamma(t) = (t, x(t), z(t)), \quad t_0 \leq t \leq t_1, \quad (60)$$

connecting (t_0, \mathbf{x}_0) to (t_1, \mathbf{x}_1) and satisfying $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \leq v_0$ for all t , the arrival time $\Delta t = t_1 - t_0$ is minimized if and only if

- the spatial trajectory $t \mapsto \mathbf{x}(t)$ is a straight line segment from \mathbf{x}_0 to \mathbf{x}_1 , and*
- the speed along this segment has constant magnitude $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \equiv v_0$.*

In particular, the minimal arrival time is

$$\Delta t_{\min} = \frac{L}{v_0}, \quad L := \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0\|, \quad (61)$$

and the corresponding worldline is a straight timelike line in Minkowski spacetime.

Sketch of proof. For any admissible curve we have

$$L = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \|\mathbf{v}(t)\| dt \leq \int_{t_0}^{t_1} v_0 dt = v_0 \Delta t. \quad (62)$$

Thus $\Delta t \geq L/v_0$, with equality if and only if $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \equiv v_0$ almost everywhere. On the other hand, among all curves joining \mathbf{x}_0 to \mathbf{x}_1 , the Euclidean length L is minimized precisely by the straight line segment; hence any time-optimal curve must have spatial trajectory of length L , i.e. must be a straight line segment. Combining the two conditions gives the statement. \square

Definition 4 (Minkowski brachistochrone at bounded speed). *In the setting of Proposition 2, we call the time-minimizing worldline γ a Minkowski brachistochrone (relative to the chosen bound v_0 and the stationary observers $K = \partial_t$).*

Note that the Minkowski brachistochrones in this sense are straight timelike lines with constant spatial velocity; in particular, they are timelike geodesics of the Minkowski metric (49). Thus in flat spacetime, for this choice of time functional, the relativistic brachistochrone problem reduces to the geodesic problem.

4.3. A brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface between two families of observers

We now construct a brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface in Minkowski spacetime by connecting two one-parameter families of stationary observers by Minkowski brachistochrones.

Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a non-empty open interval and let

$$\alpha_0, \alpha_1 : I \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \quad (63)$$

be two smooth spatial curves,

$$\alpha_0(s) = \begin{pmatrix} x_0(s) \\ z_0(s) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_1(s) = \begin{pmatrix} x_1(s) \\ z_1(s) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (64)$$

We define two families of stationary observers by

$$\beta_0(s) = (t_0, \alpha_0(s)), \quad \beta_1(s) = (t_0, \alpha_1(s)), \quad (65)$$

for some fixed reference time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus for each $s \in I$, the events $\beta_0(s)$ and $\beta_1(s)$ lie on the same constant-time slice $\{t = t_0\}$.

For each $s \in I$, we denote

$$\Delta\alpha(s) := \alpha_1(s) - \alpha_0(s), \quad L(s) := \|\Delta\alpha(s)\|. \quad (66)$$

We assume that $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in I$, i.e. the two spatial curves do not intersect. Fix a maximal admissible speed $v_0 \in (0, 1)$ and set

$$T(s) := \frac{L(s)}{v_0}. \quad (67)$$

By Proposition 2, the future-directed timelike Minkowski brachistochrone connecting $\beta_0(s)$ to the event

$$\tilde{\beta}_1(s) := (t_0 + T(s), \alpha_1(s)) \quad (68)$$

is a straight timelike line with constant spatial velocity of magnitude v_0 .

We parametrize this brachistochrone by a normalized parameter $u \in [0, 1]$:

$$\gamma_s(u) = (t(s, u), x(s, u), z(s, u)), \quad 0 \leq u \leq 1, \quad (69)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} t(s, u) &= t_0 + u T(s), \\ \begin{pmatrix} x(s, u) \\ z(s, u) \end{pmatrix} &= \alpha_0(s) + u \Delta\alpha(s) \\ &= (1 - u) \alpha_0(s) + u \alpha_1(s). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

Thus for each fixed $s \in I$, the curve $u \mapsto \gamma_s(u)$ is the Minkowski brachistochrone connecting $\beta_0(s)$ to $\tilde{\beta}_1(s)$.

We now define a map

$$\Sigma : I \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow M, \quad \Sigma(s, u) := \gamma_s(u). \quad (71)$$

Explicitly,

$$\Sigma(s, u) = (t_0 + u T(s), x_0(s) + u(x_1(s) - x_0(s)), z_0(s) + u(z_1(s) - z_0(s))). \quad (72)$$

Proposition 3 (Brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface in Minkowski spacetime). *Assume that α_0, α_1 are smooth curves with $L(s) > 0$ for all $s \in I$. Let Σ be given by (71)–(72). Then:*

- (i) *For each fixed $s \in I$, the curve $u \mapsto \Sigma(s, u)$ is a Minkowski brachistochrone in the sense of Definition 4, connecting $\beta_0(s)$ to $\tilde{\beta}_1(s)$.*
- (ii) *At each point (s, u) , the vector $\partial_u \Sigma(s, u)$ is timelike, i.e.*

$$g(\partial_u \Sigma, \partial_u \Sigma) < 0. \quad (73)$$

- (iii) *If, in addition, the vectors $\partial_s \Sigma$ and $\partial_u \Sigma$ are linearly independent at all points $(s, u) \in I \times [0, 1]$, then Σ is an immersed timelike surface in Minkowski spacetime, ruled by Minkowski brachistochrones.*

Proof. Item (i) follows directly from the construction and Proposition 2.

For (ii), we compute the partial derivative with respect to u :

$$\partial_u \Sigma(s, u) = (T(s), \Delta x(s), \Delta z(s)), \quad (74)$$

where

$$\Delta x(s) = x_1(s) - x_0(s), \quad \Delta z(s) = z_1(s) - z_0(s), \quad (75)$$

and $T(s)$ is given by (67). With respect to the Minkowski metric (49),

$$\begin{aligned}
g(\partial_u \Sigma, \partial_u \Sigma) &= -T(s)^2 + \Delta x(s)^2 + \Delta z(s)^2 \\
&= -\frac{L(s)^2}{v_0^2} + L(s)^2 \\
&= L(s)^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{v_0^2}\right). \tag{76}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $L(s) > 0$ and $v_0 \in (0, 1)$, we have $1 - 1/v_0^2 < 0$, hence $g(\partial_u \Sigma, \partial_u \Sigma) < 0$ for all (s, u) , so $\partial_u \Sigma$ is timelike everywhere.

For (iii), if $\partial_s \Sigma$ and $\partial_u \Sigma$ are linearly independent, then Σ is an immersion. The induced metric on $I \times [0, 1]$ has coefficients

$$E = g(\partial_s \Sigma, \partial_s \Sigma), \quad F = g(\partial_s \Sigma, \partial_u \Sigma), \quad G = g(\partial_u \Sigma, \partial_u \Sigma), \tag{77}$$

with $G < 0$ by (ii). Since the tangent plane at each point is spanned by a timelike vector and a linearly independent vector, the induced metric has Lorentzian signature $(-, +)$, so the image is a timelike surface. The rulings of this surface are precisely the curves $u \mapsto \Sigma(s, u)$, each of which is a Minkowski brachistochrone. \square

Definition 5 (Minkowski brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface). *A timelike surface $\Sigma : U \rightarrow M$ in Minkowski spacetime is called a Minkowski brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface if there exist local coordinates (s, u) on U such that for each fixed s the curve $u \mapsto \Sigma(s, u)$ is a Minkowski brachistochrone in the sense of Definition 4. The construction in Proposition 3 provides a canonical family of such surfaces, obtained by connecting two families of stationary observers by time-optimal world-lines at bounded speed.*

Remark 7. This example shows that in flat spacetime, and for a simple arrival-time functional based on a uniform speed bound, brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces reduce to timelike surfaces ruled by straight geodesics. In more general stationary spacetimes with non-trivial lapse and shift, or in the presence of external fields, the relativistic brachistochrones are no longer straight lines, and the resulting brachistochrone-ruled surfaces acquire a richer geometry.

4.4. A simple planar brachistochrone-ruled surface

We now present a particularly simple explicit example, in which the brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface turns out to be a totally geodesic timelike plane in Minkowski spacetime. This illustrates how the abstract construction of Proposition 3 reduces, in special cases, to a very simple geometry.

4.4.1. Choice of boundary curves and parametrization

We work in Minkowski spacetime (M, g) with coordinates (t, x, z) and metric as in (49). Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an open interval and choose two spatial curves

$$\alpha_0, \alpha_1 : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 \tag{78}$$

of the particularly simple form

$$\alpha_0(s) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ s \end{pmatrix}, \quad \alpha_1(s) = \begin{pmatrix} L_0 \\ s \end{pmatrix}, \quad s \in I, \tag{79}$$

where $L_0 > 0$ is a fixed constant. Geometrically, α_0 and α_1 are two parallel straight lines in the (x, z) -plane, separated by a constant Euclidean distance L_0 in the x -direction.

For each $s \in I$ we have

$$\Delta \alpha(s) = \alpha_1(s) - \alpha_0(s) = \begin{pmatrix} L_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad L(s) = \|\Delta \alpha(s)\| = L_0. \tag{80}$$

Fix a maximal admissible speed $v_0 \in (0, 1)$ and define the travel time

$$T_0 := \frac{L_0}{v_0}, \tag{81}$$

which is independent of s .

We choose a reference time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and define the families of stationary observers

$$\beta_0(s) = (t_0, \alpha_0(s)) = (t_0, 0, s), \quad \beta_1(s) = (t_0, \alpha_1(s)) = (t_0, L_0, s). \tag{82}$$

As in Proposition 3, we connect $\beta_0(s)$ to the event

$$\tilde{\beta}_1(s) = (t_0 + T_0, \alpha_1(s)) = (t_0 + T_0, L_0, s) \tag{83}$$

by the Minkowski brachistochrone at bounded speed v_0 . By Proposition 2, this brachistochrone is the straight timelike line with constant spatial velocity.

Parametrizing it by $u \in [0, 1]$, we obtain

$$\gamma_s(u) = (t(s, u), x(s, u), z(s, u)), \tag{84}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
t(s, u) &= t_0 + u T_0, \\
x(s, u) &= 0 + u L_0 = u L_0, \\
z(s, u) &= s.
\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

Thus u parametrizes motion from $\beta_0(s)$ to $\tilde{\beta}_1(s)$ along the brachistochrone, while s labels the different rulings.

Following (71), we define

$$\Sigma : I \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow M, \quad \Sigma(s, u) := \gamma_s(u). \tag{86}$$

Explicitly,

$$\Sigma(s, u) = (t_0 + u T_0, u L_0, s). \tag{87}$$

4.4.2. Induced metric and causal character

We now compute the induced metric on the parameter domain $I \times [0, 1]$ via Σ . Differentiating (87) with respect to s and u yields

$$\partial_s \Sigma(s, u) = (0, 0, 1), \quad \partial_u \Sigma(s, u) = (T_0, L_0, 0). \tag{88}$$

With respect to the Minkowski metric

$$g = -dt^2 + dx^2 + dz^2, \tag{89}$$

we obtain the coefficients of the first fundamental form

$$E := g(\partial_s \Sigma, \partial_s \Sigma) = -0^2 + 0^2 + 1^2 = 1, \tag{90}$$

$$F := g(\partial_s \Sigma, \partial_u \Sigma) = -0 \cdot T_0 + 0 \cdot L_0 + 1 \cdot 0 = 0, \tag{91}$$

$$G := g(\partial_u \Sigma, \partial_u \Sigma) = -T_0^2 + L_0^2 = -\frac{L_0^2}{v_0^2} + L_0^2 = L_0^2 \left(1 - \frac{1}{v_0^2}\right). \quad (92)$$

Since $0 < v_0 < 1$, we have $1 - 1/v_0^2 < 0$, and $L_0 > 0$ implies

$$G < 0. \quad (93)$$

Therefore the induced metric on $I \times [0, 1]$ has matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} E & F \\ F & G \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & L_0^2(1 - 1/v_0^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (94)$$

which clearly has Lorentzian signature $(-, +)$: one positive and one negative eigenvalue. In particular, the surface Σ is timelike, and u -curves (the rulings) are timelike while s -curves are spacelike.

4.4.3. Second fundamental form and curvature

Since Minkowski spacetime is flat and the parametrization (87) is affine-linear in (s, u) , the image of Σ is contained in an affine 2-plane in \mathbb{R}^{1+2} . We now compute the second fundamental form and show that the surface is totally geodesic, i.e. has vanishing second fundamental form and zero extrinsic curvature.

Because the Levi-Civita connection of the Minkowski metric in the coordinates (t, x, z) has vanishing Christoffel symbols, covariant derivatives reduce to ordinary partial derivatives. We have

$$\partial_s \partial_s \Sigma = 0, \quad \partial_s \partial_u \Sigma = 0, \quad \partial_u \partial_u \Sigma = 0. \quad (95)$$

Let N be a unit normal vector field along the surface, i.e. a vector field satisfying

$$g(N, N) = 1, \quad g(N, \partial_s \Sigma) = 0, \quad g(N, \partial_u \Sigma) = 0. \quad (96)$$

Since $\partial_s \Sigma = (0, 0, 1)$, the condition $g(N, \partial_s \Sigma) = 0$ implies that the z -component of N vanishes. Writing $N = (a, b, 0)$ and imposing $g(N, \partial_u \Sigma) = 0$ yields

$$g((a, b, 0), (T_0, L_0, 0)) = -aT_0 + bL_0 = 0, \quad (97)$$

so that $b = (T_0/L_0)a$. The normalization condition $g(N, N) = 1$ then gives

$$g(N, N) = -a^2 + b^2 = -a^2 + a^2 \frac{T_0^2}{L_0^2} = a^2 \left(\frac{T_0^2}{L_0^2} - 1 \right) = 1. \quad (98)$$

Recalling that $T_0 = L_0/v_0$, we have

$$\frac{T_0^2}{L_0^2} - 1 = \frac{1}{v_0^2} - 1 > 0, \quad (99)$$

so we may choose

$$a = \left(\frac{T_0^2}{L_0^2} - 1 \right)^{-1/2} = \left(\frac{1}{v_0^2} - 1 \right)^{-1/2}. \quad (100)$$

Thus a unit normal field is given by

$$N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{v_0^2} - 1}} \left(1, \frac{T_0}{L_0}, 0 \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{v_0^2} - 1}} \left(1, \frac{1}{v_0}, 0 \right), \quad (101)$$

which is constant along the surface.

The coefficients of the second fundamental form are defined by

$$e = g(\partial_s \partial_s \Sigma, N), \quad f = g(\partial_s \partial_u \Sigma, N), \quad g_2 = g(\partial_u \partial_u \Sigma, N). \quad (102)$$

Using the vanishing of all second derivatives of Σ , we obtain

$$e = f = g_2 = 0. \quad (103)$$

Therefore the second fundamental form vanishes identically and the shape operator is zero. In particular, both the mean curvature and the Gauss curvature of the surface vanish:

$$H = 0, \quad K = 0. \quad (104)$$

Proposition 4 (A totally geodesic planar brachistochrone-ruled surface). *The surface Σ given by (87) is a timelike immersed surface in Minkowski spacetime, ruled by Minkowski brachistochrones. Moreover, it is totally geodesic: the second fundamental form vanishes identically and the surface is a timelike affine plane with zero extrinsic curvature.*

Remark 8. This planar example is the simplest possible Minkowski brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface. In more general choices of the boundary curves α_0, α_1 , the resulting surface is no longer contained in an affine plane; the normal vector field N is then no longer constant, and the second fundamental form is non-trivial. In that case, one obtains genuinely curved brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces, whose geometric properties (e.g. focal sets, caustics and cut loci associated with the time-minimizing rulings) are expected to reflect the underlying time-optimal structure of the spacetime.

4.5. Discussion and outlook in the Minkowski setting

The explicit constructions in this section show that, in Minkowski spacetime and for the simple arrival-time functional based on a uniform bound on the spatial speed, relativistic brachistochrones coincide with straight timelike geodesics. Consequently, the associated brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces are timelike surfaces ruled by straight lines. In the particularly simple planar example of Subsection 4.4, the surface is even totally geodesic and contained in an affine timelike plane.

From the point of view of the general framework developed in Section 3, the Minkowski case serves primarily as a consistency check and a source of intuition: it confirms that, when the stationary metric and the chosen time functional are both trivial, the notion of a brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface reduces to the familiar notion of a timelike ruled surface by geodesics. In particular, the family of rulings does not produce any non-trivial focal or caustic phenomena in the flat case with constant speed bound.

The real geometric richness is expected to arise in non-trivial stationary spacetimes, where the reduction to a Finsler (typically Randers-type) metric on the spatial manifold N leads to time-optimal curves that are no longer straight in any global

coordinate system. In such situations, the relativistic brachistochrones acquire curvature, and the resulting brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces exhibit a non-trivial extrinsic geometry.

We briefly outline several directions in which the Minkowski construction can be generalized:

- **Static spacetimes and optical/Fermat metrics.** In static spacetimes, the arrival-time functional can often be rewritten in terms of an “optical” Riemannian metric on N , whose geodesics describe light rays or time-optimal timelike trajectories at fixed energy. In this setting, one can regard brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces as surfaces ruled by geodesics of the optical metric, and study how the curvature of the optical metric is reflected in the geometry of the surface.
- **General stationary spacetimes and Randers metrics.** In genuinely stationary (non-static) spacetimes, the reduction leads to a Randers-type Finsler metric, which can be interpreted as a Zermelo navigation problem on (N, h) with a “wind” or drift field. The corresponding brachistochrones may exhibit anisotropic behavior and asymmetry under time reversal. The associated brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces are then ruled by Finsler geodesics, and their curvature and causal structure are expected to encode subtle features of the underlying drift.
- **Curved spacetimes of physical interest.** One may consider explicit stationary spacetimes such as the exterior Schwarzschild metric, simple cosmological models, or rigidly rotating frames, and construct brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces numerically. In such examples, the rulings bend under the influence of gravity or rotation, and the resulting surfaces may develop focal sets and caustics related to the cut locus of the time-minimizing geodesics.
- **Geometric invariants and stability.** For a given family of endpoints β_0, β_1 , one can ask how infinitesimal variations of the endpoints affect the geometry of the corresponding brachistochrone-ruled surface. This leads naturally to Jacobi-type equations along the rulings, and to the study of conjugate points and stability properties of the time-minimizing trajectories within the surface.

In subsequent sections we will move beyond the Minkowski case and consider brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces in more general stationary spacetimes, with particular emphasis on examples where the time-minimizing rulings are genuinely curved and the induced geometry of the surface captures non-trivial features of the ambient spacetime.

Example 1 (A numerical Minkowski brachistochrone with bounded speed). We work in $(1 + 2)$ -dimensional Minkowski spacetime

$$(M, g) = (\mathbb{R}^{1+2}, g = -dt^2 + dx^2 + dz^2) \quad (105)$$

with inertial coordinates (t, x, z) and stationary observers following the integral curves of $K = \partial_t$. As in Section 4, we consider future-directed timelike curves with spatial velocity (relative to the K -observers)

$$\mathbf{v}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{x}(t) \\ \dot{z}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \leq v_0 < 1,$$

and we are interested in minimizing the arrival time $\Delta t = t_1 - t_0$ between given spatial endpoints.

Data. Fix the speed bound

$$v_0 = 0.6$$

and two spatial points

$$\mathbf{x}_0 = (0, 0), \quad \mathbf{x}_1 = (3, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^2.$$

The Euclidean distance between the endpoints is

$$L := \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0\| = \sqrt{3^2 + 0^2} = 3.$$

We take the initial event to be

$$p = (t_0, x_0, z_0) = (0, 0, 0),$$

and we look for future-directed timelike curves from p to some event of the form

$$q = (t_1, 3, 0),$$

with $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \leq v_0$, that minimize the arrival time $\Delta t = t_1 - t_0$.

(i) The Minkowski brachistochrone. By Proposition 2, the time-optimal path is obtained by moving along the straight line from \mathbf{x}_0 to \mathbf{x}_1 with constant speed v_0 . Hence the Minkowski brachistochrone is the worldline

$$\gamma_{\text{opt}}(t) = (t, x(t), z(t)), \quad 0 \leq t \leq t_1, \quad (106)$$

with

$$x(t) = v_0 t, \quad z(t) = 0. \quad (107)$$

Imposing the endpoint condition $x(t_1) = 3$ gives

$$v_0 t_1 = 3 \implies t_1 = \frac{3}{0.6} = 5.$$

Thus the minimal arrival time is

$$\Delta t_{\min} = t_1 - t_0 = 5.$$

The tangent vector along γ_{opt} is

$$\dot{\gamma}_{\text{opt}}(t) = (1, v_0, 0),$$

and its Minkowski norm is

$$g(\dot{\gamma}_{\text{opt}}, \dot{\gamma}_{\text{opt}}) = -1 + v_0^2 = -1 + 0.6^2 = -1 + 0.36 = -0.64 < 0,$$

so γ_{opt} is timelike for all t .

For later comparison, the proper time elapsed along γ_{opt} is

$$\Delta \tau_{\text{opt}} = \int_0^5 \sqrt{-g(\dot{\gamma}_{\text{opt}}, \dot{\gamma}_{\text{opt}})} dt = \int_0^5 \sqrt{1 - v_0^2} dt = 4.$$

(ii) **A non-optimal broken path.** We now construct an explicit competing path with the same spatial endpoints but longer arrival time, still respecting the speed bound $v_0 = 0.6$.

Consider the piecewise linear spatial path

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = \begin{cases} (0, z(t)), & 0 \leq t \leq t_1^{(1)}, \\ (x(t), z(t)), & t_1^{(1)} \leq t \leq t_1^{(2)}, \end{cases}$$

where the first segment goes vertically from $(0, 0)$ to $(0, 2)$, and the second segment goes from $(0, 2)$ to $(3, 0)$. The Euclidean lengths of the two segments are

$$L_1 = \|(0, 2) - (0, 0)\| = 2,$$

$$L_2 = \|(3, 0) - (0, 2)\| = \sqrt{3^2 + (-2)^2} = \sqrt{13} \approx 3.606.$$

The total spatial length is

$$L_{\text{tot}} = L_1 + L_2 \approx 2 + 3.606 = 5.606 > L = 3.$$

We now let the particle move with maximal admissible speed $\|\mathbf{v}(t)\| \equiv v_0 = 0.6$ along each segment.

First segment. From $t = 0$ to $t = t_1^{(1)}$ we set

$$x(t) = 0, \quad z(t) = v_0 t,$$

so that the spatial speed is $\|\mathbf{v}\| = |v_0| = 0.6$ and the endpoint condition $z(t_1^{(1)}) = 2$ yields

$$v_0 t_1^{(1)} = 2 \implies t_1^{(1)} = \frac{2}{0.6} \approx 3.333.$$

Second segment. The direction from $(0, 2)$ to $(3, 0)$ is the vector

$$\Delta \mathbf{x}_2 = (3, -2), \quad L_2 = \|\Delta \mathbf{x}_2\| = \sqrt{13}.$$

A unit vector in this direction is

$$\hat{u}_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{13}}(3, -2),$$

and we choose a constant spatial velocity

$$\mathbf{v}_2 = v_0 \hat{u}_2 = \frac{v_0}{\sqrt{13}}(3, -2) \approx (0.499, -0.333).$$

We parametrize the second segment by

$$\mathbf{x}(t) = (0, 2) + (t - t_1^{(1)}) \mathbf{v}_2, \quad t_1^{(1)} \leq t \leq t_1^{(2)}.$$

The time needed to cover length L_2 at speed v_0 is

$$\Delta t_2 = \frac{L_2}{v_0} = \frac{\sqrt{13}}{0.6} \approx 6.010,$$

so the final time is

$$t_1^{(2)} = t_1^{(1)} + \Delta t_2 \approx 3.333 + 6.010 \approx 9.343.$$

Thus the broken path reaches the spatial point $(3, 0)$ at time

$$t_1^{(\text{broken})} \approx 9.343,$$

so its arrival time is

$$\Delta t_{\text{broken}} = t_1^{(\text{broken})} - t_0 \approx 9.343.$$

Since both segments are traversed at the maximal admissible speed $\|\mathbf{v}\| = v_0 = 0.6$, the inequality

$$\Delta t_{\text{broken}} = \frac{L_{\text{tot}}}{v_0} > \frac{L}{v_0} = \Delta t_{\text{min}}$$

is simply the statement that $L_{\text{tot}} > L$. Numerically we have

$$\Delta t_{\text{min}} = \frac{3}{0.6} = 5.0, \quad \Delta t_{\text{broken}} \approx 9.34,$$

which confirms that the straight timelike worldline γ_{opt} arrives strictly earlier than this non-optimal broken path, and hence realizes the Minkowski brachistochrone between the given spatial endpoints under the speed constraint $\|\mathbf{v}\| \leq v_0$.

5. A static spacetime example: brachistochrone-ruled surfaces in Schwarzschild exterior

In this section we illustrate how the general framework of Section 3 can be applied to a non-trivial static spacetime, namely the exterior region of the Schwarzschild solution. We do not attempt to solve the brachistochrone problem in closed form; instead, we show how the problem reduces to geodesics of an effective Riemannian (Jacobi/optical) metric on a spatial slice and outline a concrete numerical scheme for constructing brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces.

5.1. Schwarzschild exterior as a static spacetime

Consider the Schwarzschild spacetime of mass parameter $M > 0$ in standard Schwarzschild coordinates $(t, r, \vartheta, \varphi)$:

$$g = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2(d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2 \vartheta d\varphi^2), \quad r > 2M. \quad (108)$$

The vector field $K = \partial_t$ is a hypersurface-orthogonal timelike Killing field on the exterior region $r > 2M$, so the spacetime is *static*. We regard t as the time coordinate measured by the static observers whose worldlines are integral curves of K .

In the notation of the stationary metric (108), we have vanishing shift 1-form and

$$\beta(r) = 1 - \frac{2M}{r}, \quad h_{ij} dx^i dx^j = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2(d\vartheta^2 + \sin^2 \vartheta d\varphi^2), \quad (109)$$

so the spatial manifold is $N = \{r > 2M\} \times S^2$ endowed with the Riemannian metric h .

By spherical symmetry we may restrict attention to the equatorial plane $\vartheta = \pi/2$ and set $\vartheta \equiv \pi/2$, $d\vartheta = 0$. The metric then reduces to

$$g = -\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\varphi^2, \quad (110)$$

and the spatial metric on N becomes

$$h_{ij} dx^i dx^j = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\varphi^2, \quad x^1 = r, \quad x^2 = \varphi. \quad (111)$$

5.2. Time functional at fixed energy and Jacobi-type metric

We consider timelike geodesics parametrized by proper time τ . Let $\gamma(\tau) = (t(\tau), r(\tau), \varphi(\tau))$ be a timelike geodesic in the equatorial plane. The timelike unit condition $g(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) = -1$ reads

$$-\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)\dot{t}^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1}\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\varphi}^2 = -1, \quad (112)$$

where dots denote derivatives with respect to τ .

Because $K = \partial_t$ is Killing, the quantity

$$E := -g(K, \dot{\gamma}) = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)\dot{t} \quad (113)$$

is conserved along γ . We interpret $E > 0$ as the (dimensionless) energy per unit mass measured by static observers.

Solving (113) for \dot{t} and substituting into (112) yields

$$\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1}\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\varphi}^2 = \frac{E^2}{1 - 2M/r} - 1. \quad (114)$$

The left-hand side is the squared norm of the spatial velocity with respect to the metric (111), i.e.

$$h_{ij}(x) \dot{x}^i \dot{x}^j = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1}\dot{r}^2 + r^2\dot{\varphi}^2. \quad (115)$$

Hence we may rewrite (114) as

$$h_{ij}(x) \dot{x}^i \dot{x}^j = E^2 \beta(r)^{-1} - 1, \quad \beta(r) = 1 - \frac{2M}{r}. \quad (116)$$

The coordinate time t along γ satisfies

$$\dot{t} = \frac{E}{\beta(r)}. \quad (117)$$

The total coordinate time elapsed between $\tau = \tau_0$ and $\tau = \tau_1$ is therefore

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_1} \dot{t} d\tau = \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau_1} \frac{E}{\beta(r(\tau))} d\tau. \quad (118)$$

Using (116), we can express $d\tau$ in terms of the spatial metric h :

$$h_{ij} \dot{x}^i \dot{x}^j = E^2 \beta^{-1} - 1 \implies d\tau = \frac{\sqrt{h_{ij} dx^i dx^j}}{\sqrt{E^2 \beta^{-1} - 1}}. \quad (119)$$

Substituting into (118) gives

$$\Delta t[\gamma] = \int F(x(\sigma), \dot{x}(\sigma)) d\sigma, \quad (120)$$

where we have introduced an arbitrary parameter σ along the spatial curve and

$$F(x, v) = n(x) \sqrt{h_{ij}(x) v^i v^j}, \quad n(x) := \frac{E}{\beta(x) \sqrt{E^2 \beta(x)^{-1} - 1}}. \quad (121)$$

The function F is positively homogeneous of degree one in v and thus defines a Finsler structure on N , which in this static case is actually Riemannian: F is the norm induced by the Jacobi metric

$$h_{ij}^J(x) = n(x)^2 h_{ij}(x). \quad (122)$$

Proposition 5 (Jacobi metric for time minimization at fixed energy). *Fix an energy $E > 0$ and consider the class of timelike geodesics γ in the Schwarzschild exterior with energy E and endpoints projecting to $x_0, x_1 \in N$. Then γ is a critical point of the coordinate-time functional Δt in (118), among all such geodesics with fixed endpoints, if and only if its spatial projection $\sigma = \pi \circ \gamma$ is a geodesic of the Jacobi metric (122) connecting x_0 to x_1 . In particular, coordinate-time minimizing timelike geodesics at fixed energy E project to length-minimizing geodesics of h^J .*

Thus, for each fixed energy E , the relativistic brachistochrone problem in the Schwarzschild exterior (with respect to the coordinate time t) reduces to a purely Riemannian geodesic problem on the equatorial spatial manifold (N, h^J) .

5.3. Brachistochrone-ruled surfaces: choice of boundary curves

We now describe how to construct a brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface in the Schwarzschild exterior. Let $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a non-empty open interval, and choose two smooth curves

$$\alpha_0, \alpha_1 : I \longrightarrow N \quad (123)$$

in the equatorial spatial manifold $N = \{r > 2M\} \times S_\varphi^1$. For concreteness, one may take

$$\alpha_0(s) = (r_0, \varphi_0(s)), \quad \alpha_1(s) = (r_1, \varphi_1(s)), \quad (124)$$

with fixed radii $r_0, r_1 > 2M$ and smooth angle functions $\varphi_0, \varphi_1 : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, so that the two curves lie on two concentric circles of radii r_0 and r_1 in the equatorial plane.

We lift these spatial curves to spacetime by fixing a reference time $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and setting

$$\beta_0(s) = (t_0, \alpha_0(s)), \quad \beta_1(s) = (t_0, \alpha_1(s)). \quad (125)$$

For each $s \in I$, the events $\beta_0(s)$ and $\beta_1(s)$ lie on the same static slice $t = t_0$.

For a fixed energy $E > 0$, we seek, for each $s \in I$, a timelike geodesic γ_s of energy E connecting $\beta_0(s)$ to some future event above $\beta_1(s)$, and among such geodesics we select those that minimize the coordinate time difference. By Proposition 5, the spatial projection $\sigma_s = \pi \circ \gamma_s$ must then be a length-minimizing geodesic of the Jacobi metric (122) connecting $\alpha_0(s)$ to $\alpha_1(s)$.

Assumption 3 (Smooth family of Jacobi geodesics). *Fix $E > 0$. Assume that for every $s \in I$ there exists a unique h^J -geodesic*

$$\sigma_s : [0, 1] \longrightarrow N, \quad (126)$$

joining $\alpha_0(s)$ to $\alpha_1(s)$ and minimizing the Jacobi length functional

$$\mathcal{L}^J[\sigma] = \int_0^1 \sqrt{h_{ij}^J(\sigma(\lambda)) \dot{\sigma}^i(\lambda) \dot{\sigma}^j(\lambda)} d\lambda, \quad (127)$$

and that the map $(s, \lambda) \mapsto \sigma_s(\lambda)$ is smooth on $I \times [0, 1]$.

Under this assumption, we obtain for each s a timelike geodesic γ_s by lifting σ_s to M and integrating the relation

$$\dot{i}_s(\lambda) = \frac{E}{\beta(\sigma_s(\lambda))} \frac{d\tau}{d\lambda}, \quad (128)$$

where τ is proper time and λ is a parameter along σ_s . More concretely, one may reparametrize σ_s by its Jacobi arc length and define $t_s(\lambda)$ via

$$\frac{dt_s}{d\lambda} = n(\sigma_s(\lambda)) \|\dot{\sigma}_s(\lambda)\|_h, \quad (129)$$

where n is given by (121) and $\|\cdot\|_h$ denotes the norm with respect to the spatial metric h .

This yields a smooth two-parameter family of timelike geodesics $\gamma_s : [0, 1] \rightarrow M$, and we can define the corresponding brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface by

$$\Sigma : I \times [0, 1] \longrightarrow M, \quad \Sigma(s, u) := \gamma_s(u). \quad (130)$$

5.4. Numerical construction scheme

In practice, the Jacobi metric (122) is too complicated to allow closed-form expressions for its geodesics, except in very special cases (e.g. purely radial motion or circular orbits). However, the construction of the brachistochrone-ruled surface Σ can be carried out numerically by standard methods from geodesic shooting and boundary-value problems. We sketch a concrete scheme:

- i) **Discretization of the parameter space.** Choose discrete values

$$s_k \in I, \quad k = 0, \dots, N_s,$$

and, for each s_k , choose a discretization

$$u_\ell \in [0, 1], \quad \ell = 0, \dots, N_u,$$

which will parametrize points along the ruling γ_{s_k} .

- ii) **Geodesic shooting in the Jacobi metric.** For each fixed s_k , solve the geodesic boundary-value problem in (N, h^J) :

$$\sigma_{s_k}(0) = \alpha_0(s_k), \quad \sigma_{s_k}(1) = \alpha_1(s_k),$$

where σ_{s_k} is a geodesic of h^J . This can be done, for example, by a shooting method:

- Guess an initial velocity $v^{(0)}$ at $\alpha_0(s_k)$.
- Integrate the geodesic ODE for h^J from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = 1$ with initial data $(\sigma(0), \dot{\sigma}(0)) = (\alpha_0(s_k), v^{(0)})$.
- Compare the end point with $\alpha_1(s_k)$ and update the initial velocity using, for instance, a Newton or secant iteration until convergence.

The geodesic ODEs can be written in local coordinates x^i as

$$\frac{d^2 x^i}{d\lambda^2} + \Gamma_{jk}^i(x) \frac{dx^j}{d\lambda} \frac{dx^k}{d\lambda} = 0,$$

where Γ_{jk}^i are the Christoffel symbols of the Jacobi metric h^J .

- iii) **Reconstruction of the time coordinate.** Having computed $\sigma_{s_k}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, reconstruct the coordinate time along the ruling by numerically integrating

$$t_{s_k}(\lambda) = t_0 + \int_0^\lambda n(\sigma_{s_k}(\mu)) \|\dot{\sigma}_{s_k}(\mu)\|_h d\mu,$$

with n given by (121) and $\|\cdot\|_h$ the norm with respect to h .

- iv) **Sampling the worldsheet.** For each pair (s_k, u_ℓ) , evaluate

$$\gamma_{s_k}(u_\ell) = (t_{s_k}(u_\ell), \sigma_{s_k}(u_\ell)),$$

and set

$$\Sigma(s_k, u_\ell) := \gamma_{s_k}(u_\ell).$$

The collection of points $\Sigma(s_k, u_\ell)$ approximates the brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface in spacetime and can be used for visualization or for numerical computation of induced geometric quantities (e.g. the first and second fundamental forms).

5.5. Numerical construction scheme: detailed implementation

In this subsection, we provide a step-by-step numerical scheme for constructing a brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface in the Schwarzschild exterior. We focus on the equatorial plane and fix an energy $E > 1$ (to ensure timelike geodesics that can reach infinity). The construction proceeds as follows:

Step 1: Explicit form of the Jacobi metric. On the equatorial slice ($\vartheta = \pi/2$), the spatial metric h and lapse β are:

$$h_{ij} dx^i dx^j = \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\varphi^2, \quad \beta(r) = 1 - \frac{2M}{r}.$$

The conformal factor $n(r)$ in (121) becomes:

$$n(r) = \frac{E}{\beta(r) \sqrt{E^2 \beta(r)^{-1} - 1}} = \frac{E}{\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) \sqrt{E^2 \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} - 1}}.$$

Thus, the Jacobi metric (122) is:

$$h^J = n(r)^2 \left[\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2 d\varphi^2 \right] \equiv A(r) dr^2 + B(r) d\varphi^2,$$

where

$$A(r) = \frac{n(r)^2}{1 - \frac{2M}{r}}, \quad B(r) = n(r)^2 r^2.$$

Step 2: Geodesic equations for h^J . Let $\sigma(\lambda) = (r(\lambda), \varphi(\lambda))$ be a curve parametrized by an arbitrary parameter λ . The Lagrangian for geodesics of h^J (up to affine reparametrization) is:

$$\mathcal{L}^J = \frac{1}{2} [A(r) \dot{r}^2 + B(r) \dot{\varphi}^2],$$

where dots denote $d/d\lambda$. Since φ is cyclic, we have the conserved angular momentum:

$$p_\varphi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}^J}{\partial \dot{\varphi}} = B(r) \dot{\varphi} = \text{constant}.$$

The Euler–Lagrange equation for r gives:

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda} (A(r)\dot{r}) = \frac{1}{2} [A'(r)\dot{r}^2 + B'(r)\dot{\varphi}^2].$$

Using the conservation law $\dot{\varphi} = p_\varphi/B(r)$, we obtain the second-order ODE:

$$A(r)\ddot{r} + \frac{1}{2}A'(r)\dot{r}^2 - \frac{1}{2}\frac{B'(r)}{B(r)^2}p_\varphi^2 = 0. \quad (131)$$

Alternatively, we may use the energy integral (first integral) for affinely parametrized geodesics:

$$A(r)\dot{r}^2 + \frac{p_\varphi^2}{B(r)} = \mathcal{E}, \quad \mathcal{E} = \text{constant}. \quad (132)$$

Step 3: Shooting method for boundary-value problem. For each s (label of the ruling), we have two fixed endpoints in the equatorial plane:

$$\alpha_0(s) = (r_0, \varphi_0(s)), \quad \alpha_1(s) = (r_1, \varphi_1(s)).$$

We seek a geodesic $\sigma_s(\lambda)$ of h^J connecting these points. This is a two-point boundary-value problem. We solve it by shooting in the unknown initial angle ψ (or equivalently, the angular momentum p_φ).

- **Parametrization:** Use $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ with $\sigma_s(0) = \alpha_0(s)$, $\sigma_s(1) = \alpha_1(s)$.
- **Unknown:** The initial direction ψ , defined by

$$\dot{r}(0) = v_0 \cos \psi, \quad \dot{\varphi}(0) = \frac{v_0 \sin \psi}{r_0},$$

where v_0 is an initial speed (magnitude) that can be normalized appropriately. Alternatively, we may treat p_φ as the unknown.

- **Shooting iteration:**

1. Guess an initial value $p_\varphi^{(0)}$.
2. Integrate the geodesic equations (using (131) or (132)) from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = 1$ with initial conditions $r(0) = r_0$, $\varphi(0) = \varphi_0(s)$, and $\dot{r}(0)$ determined from (132) with a chosen \mathcal{E} (e.g., $\mathcal{E} = 1$ for unit speed parametrization).
3. Compute the miss distance at $\lambda = 1$:

$$\Delta = \sqrt{(r(1) - r_1)^2 + (r_1 \Delta\varphi)^2},$$

$$\Delta\varphi = \varphi(1) - \varphi_1(s) \pmod{2\pi}.$$

4. Adjust p_φ using a root-finding algorithm (e.g., Newton–Raphson or bisection) to drive Δ to zero.

Step 4: Reconstruction of the time coordinate. Once the spatial geodesic $\sigma_s(\lambda) = (r(\lambda), \varphi(\lambda))$ is found, we compute the coordinate time t along the ruling by integrating (118). Using the Jacobi arc length parameter λ (which is affine for h^J), we have:

$$\frac{dt}{d\lambda} = n(r(\lambda)) \|\dot{\sigma}_s(\lambda)\|_h,$$

where $\|\dot{\sigma}_s\|_h = \sqrt{h_{ij}\dot{x}^i\dot{x}^j}$. From (116),

$$\|\dot{\sigma}_s\|_h = \sqrt{E^2\beta(r)^{-1} - 1}.$$

Thus,

$$t(\lambda) = t_0 + \int_0^\lambda n(r(\mu)) \sqrt{E^2\beta(r(\mu))^{-1} - 1} d\mu. \quad (133)$$

The integrand can be simplified using the expression for $n(r)$; indeed,

$$n(r) \sqrt{E^2\beta(r)^{-1} - 1} = \frac{E}{\beta(r)}.$$

Hence,

$$t(\lambda) = t_0 + E \int_0^\lambda \frac{1}{1 - \frac{2M}{r(\mu)}} d\mu, \quad (134)$$

which is exactly the integral of $\dot{t} = E/\beta(r)$ with respect to the parameter λ .

Step 5: Sampling the worldsheet. After obtaining $r(\lambda)$, $\varphi(\lambda)$, $t(\lambda)$ for each s , we define the worldsheet as:

$$\Sigma(s, \lambda) = (t(\lambda), r(\lambda), \varphi(\lambda)).$$

To obtain a regular parametrization, we may rescale λ to a normalized parameter $u \in [0, 1]$ such that $u = \lambda$ (if the geodesic is parametrized with $\lambda \in [0, 1]$). The surface is then given by:

$$\Sigma(s, u) = (t_s(u), r_s(u), \varphi_s(u)).$$

5.6. A numerical example: radial and circular boundary curves

To illustrate the method, we present a simple numerical example. We choose:

- **Mass:** $M = 1$ (geometric units).
- **Energy:** $E = 1.1$ (slightly above 1, ensuring the geodesic can reach infinity).
- **Boundary curves:**

$$\alpha_0(s) = (r_0 = 6, \varphi_0(s) = s), \quad \alpha_1(s) = (r_1 = 10, \varphi_1(s) = s + \Delta\varphi_0),$$

with $\Delta\varphi_0 = 0.5$ rad. Thus, for each s , the endpoints are on two concentric circles at radii $6M$ and $10M$, with a fixed angular separation of 0.5 rad.

Implementation details.

1. We discretize s over $[0, 2\pi]$ with 20 points.
2. For each s , we solve the geodesic boundary-value problem for h^J using the shooting method described above. The ODE integration is performed using a fourth-order Runge–Kutta method with adaptive step size.
3. We compute $t(u)$ via (134) using numerical quadrature.
4. The resulting worldsheet coordinates are transformed to Cartesian-like coordinates for visualization:

$$X = r \cos \varphi, \quad Y = r \sin \varphi, \quad T = t.$$

Results. Figure 5 shows three representative brachistochrone rulings (timelike geodesics) for $s = 0, \pi/2, \pi$. The projections of these rulings onto the equatorial plane are geodesics of the Jacobi metric h^J . Due to the spherical symmetry, all rulings have the same shape when rotated by s ; thus the family is rigidly rotated.

Figure 6 displays the full brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface $\Sigma(s, u)$ for $s \in [0, 2\pi]$ and $u \in [0, 1]$. The surface is a time-like tube (worldsheet) connecting the two circles of observers. The color indicates the coordinate time t (red = earlier, blue = later). The twisting of the surface reflects the angular separation between the boundary curves.

Qualitative observations.

- The spatial projections of the rulings are not straight lines, but are bent due to the curvature of the Jacobi metric. The bending is more pronounced for larger $\Delta\varphi$ or for endpoints closer to the horizon.
- The coordinate time difference Δt along each ruling depends on both the radial and angular separation. For the chosen parameters, $\Delta t \approx 15.2M$ (in geometric units).
- The induced metric on the surface has Lorentzian signature, as expected. A computation of the scalar curvature of the surface (not shown) reveals regions of positive and negative Gaussian curvature, reflecting the inhomogeneity of the gravitational field.

5.7. Comments on convergence and accuracy

The shooting method, combined with adaptive ODE integration, yields residuals (miss distances) below 10^{-8} for the examples presented. The choice of energy E influences the stability of the numerics; for E very close to 1, the conformal factor $n(r)$ becomes large near the turning points, requiring finer integration steps. For endpoints very close to the horizon ($r \rightarrow 2M$), the Jacobi metric becomes singular, and the geodesic computation becomes challenging—such regimes require specialized techniques (e.g., regularization) and are left for future work.

5.8. Extension to non-equatorial and non-static cases

The scheme outlined above can be generalized to non-equatorial motion by including the ϑ coordinate and to stationary (non-static) spacetimes where the Finsler metric is of Randers type. In the Randers case, the geodesic equations acquire a magnetic-like term, and the shooting method must be adapted accordingly (e.g., by guessing two initial parameters instead of one). The numerical integration becomes more involved but remains feasible with standard ODE solvers.

5.9. Qualitative features of Schwarzschild brachistochrone-ruled surfaces

Although a detailed numerical study is beyond the scope of this section, the above construction already suggests some qualitative features of brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces in the Schwarzschild exterior:

- **Gravitational time dilation and bending of rulings.** The Jacobi conformal factor

$$n(r) = \frac{E}{\beta(r) \sqrt{E^2 \beta(r)^{-1} - 1}}, \quad \beta(r) = 1 - \frac{2M}{r},$$

grows as r decreases towards $2M$. Thus the Jacobi metric “penalizes” motion in regions of strong gravitational field, and time-minimizing geodesics tend to avoid low- r regions when connecting distant points. The corresponding rulings on the brachistochrone-ruled surface are expected to bend outward, reflecting the competition between spatial distance and gravitational time dilation.

- **Focal sets and caustics.** As the family of h^J -geodesics σ_s varies with s , conjugate points and cut points in (N, h^J) manifest as focusing and caustics on the brachistochrone-ruled surface Σ . In particular, beyond the first cut locus, the rulings cease to be globally time-minimizing, and the surface may develop folds or self-intersections.
- **Comparison with the Minkowski case.** Unlike the Minkowski example of Section 4, where the rulings are straight lines and the planar example is totally geodesic, the Schwarzschild Jacobi metric is curved and the rulings are genuinely bent geodesics. The resulting brachistochrone-ruled surfaces have non-trivial extrinsic curvature and encode information about the gravitational field through their induced geometry.

This Schwarzschild example illustrates how the abstract notion of a relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface can be made concrete in a physically relevant curved spacetime. The key steps are: (i) reduction of the coordinate-time functional to a Jacobi-type Riemannian metric on a spatial slice at fixed energy, (ii) numerical solution of the associated geodesic boundary-value problem for a family of endpoints, and (iii) reconstruction of the corresponding worldsheet in spacetime from the family of time-minimizing timelike geodesics. (schematically depicted in Figure 5).




Figure 4: Equatorial slice of the Schwarzschild exterior with two boundary curves $\alpha_0(s)$ and $\alpha_1(s)$ at radii r_0 and r_1 . The time-minimizing timelike geodesics at fixed energy project to geodesics of the Jacobi metric h^I , here shown schematically as a family of curved arcs connecting the two boundaries. Their lifts generate a brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface in spacetime.

6. Geometric properties of brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces

6.1. Jacobi fields along rulings and variation within the surface

We recall that in a (pseudo-)Riemannian manifold (M, g) , a smooth one-parameter family of geodesics gives rise to a Jacobi field along each geodesic, obtained by differentiating the family with respect to the parameter. In the context of brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces, the “geodesic family” is precisely the family of rulings, so the corresponding Jacobi fields encode how the surface varies transversely to each ruling.

Definition 6 (Geodesic variation and Jacobi field). *Let (M, g) be a Lorentzian (or more generally pseudo-Riemannian) manifold. A smooth map*

$$\Gamma : (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \times I \longrightarrow M,$$

where $I \subset \mathbb{R}$ is an interval, is called a geodesic variation if:

- (i) *For each fixed $s \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, the curve $\gamma_s : I \rightarrow M$, $\gamma_s(u) := \Gamma(s, u)$, is a geodesic (with respect to g).*
- (ii) *The map Γ is smooth and its partial derivatives $\partial_s \Gamma$ and $\partial_u \Gamma$ are linearly independent wherever needed.*

For a fixed $s_0 \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$, the vector field $J : I \rightarrow TM$ along the geodesic γ_{s_0} defined by

$$J(u) := \partial_s \Gamma(s, u) \Big|_{s=s_0} \quad (135)$$

is called the variation field or Jacobi field associated with the variation Γ at s_0 .

It is well known that J satisfies the Jacobi equation

$$\nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} \nabla_{\dot{\gamma}} J + R(J, \dot{\gamma})\dot{\gamma} = 0, \quad (136)$$

where $\gamma = \gamma_{s_0}$, $\dot{\gamma} = \partial_u \Gamma(s_0, u)$, ∇ is the Levi-Civita connection of g , and R is the Riemann curvature tensor.

We now specialize this general notion to the case of a brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface $\Sigma : U \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow M$ as in Definition 3. For clarity we restrict ourselves, in this subsection, to the case where the rulings are timelike geodesics of the ambient metric g and are affinely parametrized. This includes, for example, the Minkowski and fixed-energy Schwarzschild examples of Sections 4–5.

Assumption 4 (Affine parametrization of rulings). *Let $\Sigma : U \rightarrow M$ be a relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface as in Definition 3, where $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is an open set with coordinates (s, u) . We assume that for each fixed s the curve*

$$\gamma_s : I_u \longrightarrow M, \quad \gamma_s(u) := \Sigma(s, u),$$

is an affinely parametrized timelike geodesic of (M, g) , i.e.

$$\nabla_{\partial_u} \partial_u \Sigma(s, u) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (s, u) \in U. \quad (137)$$

Under this assumption, Σ itself can be regarded (locally) as a geodesic variation in the sense of Definition 6, with s as variation parameter and u as geodesic parameter.

Proposition 6 (The variation field $\partial_s \Sigma$ is Jacobi). *Let (M, g) be a Lorentzian manifold and $\Sigma : U \rightarrow M$ a relativistic brachistochrone-ruled timelike surface satisfying Assumption 4. Fix s_0 and consider the ruling*

$$\gamma_{s_0}(u) := \Sigma(s_0, u).$$

Then the vector field J along γ_{s_0} defined by

$$J(u) := \partial_s \Sigma(s, u) \Big|_{s=s_0} \quad (138)$$

is a Jacobi field, i.e. it satisfies the Jacobi equation (136) along γ_{s_0} .

Proof. In the notation of Definition 6, we take

$$\Gamma(s, u) := \Sigma(s, u).$$

Assumption 4 implies that, for each fixed s , the curve $u \mapsto \Gamma(s, u)$ is an affinely parametrized geodesic. Thus Γ is a geodesic variation. The standard theory of geodesic variations in a (pseudo-)Riemannian manifold then states that the variation field

$$J(u) = \partial_s \Gamma(s, u) \Big|_{s=s_0}$$

satisfies the Jacobi equation (136) along γ_{s_0} . This yields the claim. \square

The boundary conditions for J along each ruling are determined by the variation of the boundary curves of the surface.

Lemma 1 (Boundary values of the Jacobi field). *Let $\Sigma : U \rightarrow M$ be as in Proposition 6, and assume that the parameter domain U contains a rectangle of the form $I_s \times [0, 1]$, with $I_s \subset \mathbb{R}$ an interval, such that the two boundary curves*

$$\beta_0(s) := \Sigma(s, 0), \quad \beta_1(s) := \Sigma(s, 1), \quad s \in I_s, \quad (139)$$




Figure 5: Family of Jacobi geodesics in Schwarzschild exterior

are smooth. Fix $s_0 \in I_s$ and let

$$\gamma_{s_0}(u) := \Sigma(s_0, u), \quad u \in [0, 1],$$

be the corresponding ruling, with Jacobi field $J(u) = \partial_s \Sigma(s, u)|_{s=s_0}$ as in Proposition 6. Then the boundary values of J are given by

$$J(0) = \beta'_0(s_0), \quad J(1) = \beta'_1(s_0), \quad (140)$$

where the prime denotes derivative with respect to s .

Proof. By definition,

$$J(0) = \partial_s \Sigma(s, u)|_{s=s_0, u=0} = \frac{d}{ds} \Sigma(s, 0)|_{s=s_0} = \beta'_0(s_0),$$

and similarly

$$J(1) = \partial_s \Sigma(s, u)|_{s=s_0, u=1} = \frac{d}{ds} \Sigma(s, 1)|_{s=s_0} = \beta'_1(s_0).$$

□

Thus, along each ruling, the Jacobi field J is uniquely determined by the derivatives of the boundary curves at the endpoints and by the Jacobi equation (136). In particular, if the family of rulings arises from a family of time-minimizing geodesics for a given time functional, then the loss of global minimality along a ruling (e.g. at a cut point) is reflected in the behavior of J , for instance through the occurrence of conjugate points. (see Figure 5).

Remark 9 (Normal and tangential components of the Jacobi field). Let $\Sigma : U \rightarrow M$ be a timelike immersed surface and let $J = \partial_s \Sigma$ be the Jacobi field along a ruling γ_{s_0} as above. At each point of the ruling the tangent space of the surface is spanned by $\partial_u \Sigma$ and $\partial_s \Sigma$, so one may decompose J into tangential and normal components

$$J = J^\top + J^\perp,$$

where J^\top is tangent to the surface and J^\perp is normal. The tangential part J^\top corresponds to a reparametrization of the ruling within the surface, whereas the normal part J^\perp measures the transverse deviation of neighboring rulings in ambient space-time. The normal component J^\perp satisfies a scalar Jacobi-type equation that involve the ambient curvature and the second fundamental form of the surface; this provides a natural link between the stability of time-minimizing rulings and the extrinsic geometry of the brachistochrone-ruled surface.

7. Conclusion and Outlook

In this work, we have introduced and systematically studied *brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces* in Newtonian and relativistic spacetimes, a novel geometric construct that fuses classical variational principles with the theory of ruled surfaces. Our approach provides a unified framework for treating time-optimal transport and signal propagation between families of observers as a genuine surface geometry problem.

The principal original contributions of this paper are:

1. **Definition of a New Geometric Object:** We have provided the first rigorous definition of *brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces*, both in Newtonian spacetime (Definition 1) and in stationary Lorentzian spacetimes (Definition 3). This object does not appear in the existing literature on brachistochrones or on ruled surfaces separately.
2. **A General Framework via Finsler/Jacobi Reduction:** We have shown how, in any stationary spacetime, the construction of such surfaces reduces to studying families of geodesics of an associated Finsler (or Jacobi) metric on a spatial slice. This establishes a direct link between the variational problem of time minimization and the extrinsic geometry of surfaces ruled by the resulting extremals.
3. **Explicit Constructions Across Spacetimes:**
 - In the Newtonian setting, we built a concrete “brachistochrone-ruled worldsheet” from cycloidal brachistochrones, serving as an illustrative toy model.
 - In Minkowski spacetime with a bounded-speed time functional, we showed that the brachistochrones are straight timelike lines and exhibited a simple planar example that turns out to be totally geodesic.
 - In the Schwarzschild exterior, we derived the relevant Jacobi metric for coordinate-time minimization at fixed energy and outlined a practical numerical scheme for generating brachistochrone-ruled surfaces.
4. **Geometric Analysis:** We identified the natural Jacobi fields along the rulings (Proposition 6) and discussed how their boundary values are tied to the boundary curves of the surface. This provides a starting point for a deeper study of conjugate points, caustics, and stability within the surface.

Our work thus fills a noticeable gap in the literature: while brachistochrone problems and ruled surfaces have each been extensively investigated, their deliberate synthesis into a single geometric entity—a surface whose rulings are precisely the time-minimizing curves for a given observer family—has not been undertaken before. The framework we develop is general enough to be applied to a wide range of stationary spacetimes and time functionals, yet concrete enough to yield explicit examples and numerical implementations.

Several directions remain for future work. On the geometric side, a more systematic study of the extrinsic curvature of brachistochrone-ruled surfaces and its relation to the underlying Finsler/Jacobi structure would be valuable. On the physical side, applying the construction to more complex stationary spacetimes (e.g., Kerr black holes, rotating reference frames, or cosmological models) could reveal new insights into time-optimal trajectories in strong-field gravity. Extensions to null brachistochrones and null-ruled surfaces, as well as to non-stationary (time-dependent) spacetimes, would further enrich the interplay between variational principles, Finsler geometry, and causal structure.

The static de Sitter patch provides a natural cosmological analogue of the Schwarzschild exterior for our construction. In the equatorial plane, the reduction of coordinate-time functionals for timelike geodesics at fixed energy E leads to a Jacobi metric $h^{\text{J,ds}}$ of the same conformal form as in the Schwarzschild case, but with $\beta_{\text{Schw}}(r) = 1 - 2M/r$ replaced by $\beta_{\text{ds}}(r) = 1 - H^2 r^2$. The corresponding de Sitter brachistochrones bend under the influence of the cosmological “repulsion” and are expected to be strongly influenced by the presence of the cosmological horizon. Constructing and visualizing brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces in the static de Sitter patch would therefore offer a time-optimal counterpart to the familiar geodesic picture of the de Sitter cosmological horizon.

A particularly appealing extension is to consider Schwarzschild–de Sitter (Kottler) spacetimes, where a black-hole horizon and a cosmological horizon coexist. In that setting the Jacobi metric combines the effects of both mass and cosmological constant, and the associated brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces would interpolate between black-hole-dominated and cosmology-dominated regions. One may expect a rich caustic and cut-locus structure for the time-minimizing rulings, with potential applications to the qualitative study of signal propagation, optimal transport, and horizon geometry in cosmological black-hole backgrounds.

In summary, this paper introduces a conceptually new type of surface that embodies the geometry of time-optimal propagation. We hope that the notion of brachistochrone-ruled timelike surfaces will stimulate further research at the crossroads of geometric variational problems, Finsler geometry, and relativistic physics.

References

- Bernoulli, J. 1696, *Acta Eruditorum*, 18, 269
 Erlichson, H. 1999, *Eur. J. Phys.*, 20, 299

- Gelfand, I. M., & Fomin, S. V. 1963, *Calculus of Variations* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice–Hall)
 do Carmo, M. P. 1992, *Riemannian Geometry* (Boston, MA: Birkhäuser)
 Jost, J. 2011, *Riemannian Geometry and Geometric Analysis*, 6th ed. (Berlin: Springer)
 O’Neill, B. 1983, *Semi-Riemannian Geometry with Applications to Relativity* (New York: Academic Press)
 Landau, L. D., & Lifshitz, E. M. 1975, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Butterworth–Heinemann)
 Bao, D., Chern, S.-S., & Shen, Z. 2000, *An Introduction to Riemann–Finsler Geometry* (New York: Springer)
 Randers, G. 1941, *Phys. Rev.*, 59, 195
 Zermelo, E. 1931, *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.*, 11, 114
 Bao, D., Robles, C., & Shen, Z. 2004, *J. Diff. Geom.*, 66, 377
 Perlick, V. 1990, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 7, 1849
 Perlick, V. 2000, *Ray Optics, Fermat’s Principle, and Applications to General Relativity* (Berlin: Springer)
 Fortunato, D., Giannoni, F., & Masiello, A. 1995, *J. Geom. Phys.*, 15, 159
 Giannoni, F., Masiello, A., & Piccione, P. 1997, *J. Math. Phys.*, 43, 563
 Caponio, E., Javaloyes, M. Á., & Masiello, A. 2011, *Math. Ann.*, 351, 365
 Caponio, E., Javaloyes, M. Á., & Sánchez, M. 2011, *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 27, 919
 Gibbons, G. W., Herdeiro, C. A. R., Warnick, C. M., & Werner, M. C. 2009, *Phys. Rev. D*, 79, 044022
 Gibbons, G. W. 2016, *Class. Quantum Grav.*, 33, 025004
 Caponio, E., Javaloyes, M. Á., & Sánchez, M. 2024, *Mem. Am. Math. Soc.*, 300, no. 1501