

Spacetime and Euclidean Geometry¹

Dieter Brill* and Ted Jacobson*,[†]

* *University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4111*

[†] *Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, 98bis bd. Arago, 75014 Paris, France*

Abstract

Using only the principle of relativity and Euclidean geometry we show in this pedagogical article that the square of proper time or length in a two-dimensional spacetime diagram is proportional to the Euclidean area of the corresponding causal domain. We use this relation to derive the Minkowski line element by two geometric proofs of the *spacetime Pythagoras theorem*.

Introduction

Spacetime diagrams are helpful for understanding relativity since they focus attention on the invariant relations between events, light rays, observers, etc. rather than on coordinate dependent quantities. An inherent limitation of such diagrams is that, in general, the Euclidean lengths of lines in the diagram do not correspond to proper time or proper length in spacetime. In this pedagogical article we use the principle of relativity, together with Euclidean geometry, to show that nevertheless the *square* of proper time or length of a line segment is proportional to the Euclidean *area* of the corresponding causal domain. This observation allows visual interpretation of relativistic effects, such as time dilation and the twin effect. We use this relation between Minkowski interval and Euclidean area to derive the Minkowski line element by proving the *spacetime Pythagoras theorem*.

Minkowski space and Euclidean space

In a two-dimensional spacetime diagram a spacetime, i.e. a Minkowski space, is represented on a Euclidean plane. This is possible since, like the points in the Euclidean plane, the events in spacetime can be labeled by pairs of real numbers, for example time and space coordinates. What other properties of Minkowski space can this mapping faithfully reproduce?

¹This article is dedicated to Michael P. Ryan on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. Mike's passion for, and deft practice of, both geometry and pedagogy is legendary at Maryland. We are pleased with this opportunity to present our pedagogical effort to elucidate the geometry of Minkowski spacetime, the most homogeneous of cosmologies.




Figure 1: The different directions in Minkowski space.

Euclidean and Minkowski spaces admit identical translation symmetry groups that act in the same way on their respective spaces. Therefore the mapping can be chosen to preserve the translation symmetry. A straight line can be characterized as a curve that is sent to itself by the translations in one direction. Since the translations are preserved by the mapping, so are the straight lines.²

Given the Minkowski interval, i.e. the proper time or length between two points on a line, the interval between any two other points on the same line is determined by the translational symmetry. The Euclidean distance along a line in a spacetime diagram is therefore *proportional* to the corresponding Minkowski interval. The obstacle to representing all aspects of Minkowski geometry in a Euclidean diagram is that the proportionality factor depends upon the line.

This obstacle arises because, unlike in Euclidean space, not all Minkowski lines are equivalent (Fig. 1). That is, Minkowski space is not *isotropic*. According to relativity, the lightrays through a point p are determined independent of the motion of any source. They therefore divide up the spacetime into four intrinsic regions: the future, past, right space, and left space of p . A *timelike* line segment has one endpoint to the future of the other, and represents the inertial motion of a free particle. For a *spacelike* segment neither endpoint lies to the future of the other. The borderline case, with endpoints connected by a light ray, is called a *lightlike* or *null* segment. The light rays on all diagrams in this paper are shown as dashed lines, while the

²For a more systematic treatment of the consequences of translation symmetry, as well as an axiomatic development of all of Minkowski Space geometry, see Ref. [1]. For a different axiomatization, based on the relation of causal connection between points, see Ref. [2].

timelike and spacelike lines are solid.

In drawing a spacetime diagram one must select two independent directions to represent the light rays. This choice breaks the Euclidean rotation symmetry. It is common to orient the diagram so that the timelike line bisecting the angle between the light rays runs vertically up the diagram. The vertical direction then corresponds to pure time translations in some particular frame, while the horizontal direction corresponds to pure space translations in that frame. It is also common to choose the relation between the vertical and horizontal scales so that the two sets of light rays are perpendicular to each other in the Euclidean sense, and therefore make angles of 45 degrees from the vertical. With such choices of scaling, horizontal and vertical segments of the the same Euclidean length represent intervals of Minkowski length and time with ratio equal to the speed of light.

Although common, the choice of a right angle between light rays is not mandatory. The constructions and proofs in this paper could all be carried out with an arbitrary angle, but we shall adopt the right angle because it makes the diagrams and proofs a little easier to follow, and because it is the standard and familiar choice.

Squares and triangles

In this section we introduce some concepts basic to space-time geometry that will be used in the following.




Figure 2: (a) Minkowski square, (b) similar triangles and (c) causal domain.

We already remarked that an inertial particle trajectory is represented by a timelike line segment. A second particle at rest with respect to the first corresponds to a parallel line segment, as illustrated by the two timelike sides AB and CD of the parallelogram in Fig. 2a. The diagonals of this parallelogram are light rays, so a light ray from A reaches point F in the

center, and is reflected back to B. Thus an observer along AB (or CD) considers F to be simultaneous with the midpoint E between A and B. Similarly all other points on the line EF are considered simultaneous by this observer. Since EF is related to AC by a translation, the points on AC are also simultaneous with respect to AB. The segments AB and AC are said to be *Minkowski-perpendicular*. A parallelogram like ABCD, with lightlike diagonals, is a *Minkowski square*. The angle between Minkowski-perpendicular lines is bisected by a light ray, but this property holds only when the diagram is scaled so that the light rays are perpendicular.

A pair of timelike lines that are not parallel represent inertial particles with a relative velocity. The principle of relativity demands that all such lines be equivalent. Fig. 2b depicts two triangles OGH and OIJ, each consisting of two timelike sides and one lightlike side. The directions of the timelike sides are the same for the two triangles. In order that neither direction be preferred the ratios of the corresponding proper times must be equal, i.e.

$$\frac{(OH)_m}{(OG)_m} = \frac{(OJ)_m}{(OI)_m}, \quad (1)$$

where for example $(OG)_m$ denotes the proper time along OG.³ The two triangles are therefore *similar* in Minkowski space.

Right triangles KML and KNL, each with two lightlike sides and a timelike hypotenuse, are shown in Fig 2c. We call these *null triangles*. Together they make up the rectangle formed by the two pairs of light rays departing from the endpoints K, L of the timelike segment. We call this rectangle the *causal domain* of the timelike segment. It is also the causal domain of the spacelike segment given by the other diagonal (MN) of the rectangle.

Minkowski interval and Euclidean area

For a vertical or horizontal segment it is easy to see that the causal domain is a (Euclidean) square whose area is proportional to the square (second power) of the proper time or length of the segment, respectively.⁴ The same turns out to be true for segments that are neither vertical nor horizontal, that is,

³This ratio is nothing but the relativistic Doppler shift factor relating the reference frames determined by the two timelike lines. Bondi's k-calculus [3] is a presentation of special relativity in which this ratio—the k-factor—is given the central role.

⁴If the horizontal and vertical scales are chosen respectively to equal the Minkowski length and the speed of light times the Minkowski time, then the proportionality factor is one-half.




Figure 3: The area of null triangles is proportional to the square of their timelike sides.

The square of the proper time or length along any segment is equal to the (Euclidean) area of its causal domain times a fixed proportionality constant.

The same proportionality holds also for the area of the square built on a timelike segment, since according to Fig. 2a that area is always twice the area of the causal domain. We now give a proof of this statement.

Figure 3 shows two timelike segments of different directions (velocities), OA and OB, with A and B lightlike related. We construct the null triangles OCB and OCA that represent the right half of the two segments' causal domains, and the null line DB.

Let $\mathcal{A}(OA)$ be the area of OA's causal domain, which is twice the area of the null triangle OCA, and similarly for $\mathcal{A}(OB)$. Because the two null triangles have the common base OC, and because OC and DB are parallel, we have the proportionality,

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}(OA)}{\mathcal{A}(OB)} = \frac{(OA)_e}{(OD)_e} = \frac{(OA)_m}{(OD)_m}, \quad (2)$$

where the subscripts e and m refer to Euclidean length and Minkowskian time respectively. Because the triangles ODB and OBA are Minkowski-similar, we have

$$\frac{(OA)_m}{(OB)_m} = \frac{(OB)_m}{(OD)_m}, \quad \text{hence} \quad \frac{\mathcal{A}(OA)}{\mathcal{A}(OB)} = \frac{(OA)_m^2}{(OB)_m^2}. \quad (3)$$

In other words, the area ratio of the two causal domains is equal to the ratio of the square of the proper times along their timelike diagonals.

Our argument applies only for segments related by a *null* line BA. However, since Euclidean lengths along a single timelike segment are proportional to the corresponding proper times, and the area scales with the square of the Euclidean length, the result is valid for any pair of causal domains.

Time dilation

As a first application of the relation between area and spacetime interval one can see immediately in Fig. 4a that of two timelike intervals AC, AC' with the same vertical projection, the slanted one has the shorter proper time. This is the relativistic time dilation or twin effect. Fig. 4a shows half of the twin's round trip (a round trip would be obtained by reflecting the figure about the dotted horizontal line): the area of the rectangle AB'C'D' is less than that of the square ABCD, for the shaded areas have equal narrow width, but the one that is part of the rectangle is shorter than the one that is part of the square. As the relative velocity of the tilted segment increases, its causal domain area goes to zero, and hence so does its proper time.




Figure 4: (a) Time dilation (b) locus of points at fixed future timelike interval from O.

The locus of spacetime points P, P', ... that are at a constant future timelike interval from a given origin O is shown in Fig. 4b. This locus is given by $(OP)^2 \propto \mathcal{A}(OP) = uv$, where u, v are the null coordinates of P, so the locus is a *hyperbola*. Similarly the points at constant past timelike separations,




Figure 5: Pythagorean theorem, (a) Euclidean (b) Minkowskian.

and at constant spacelike separations from O are also hyperbolae.

Spacetime Pythagoras theorem

Since spacetime intervals are determined by Euclidean areas in a spacetime diagram, we can use Euclidean geometry to establish the *spacetime Pythagoras theorem*. This is the fundamental Minkowskian formula, relating time and space measurements t and x of an interval by one observer to the proper time measurement T of that interval by another observer,

$$T^2 = t^2 - x^2. \quad (4)$$

Figure 5 shows a geometrical view of the terms in this equation and compares it to the familiar Euclidean interpretation of the Pythagorean theorem for right triangles. In the Minkowski case, two sides of the triangle are Minkowski-perpendicular, as appropriate for the time and space components of the hypotenuse displacement defined by a given observer. The square on the hypotenuse also has Minkowski-perpendicular sides, and is a parallelogram with lightlike diagonals as explained above. The example of Fig. 5b is a special case since the triangle sides are also perpendicular in the Euclidean sense. However, the principle of relativity implies that if the theorem holds for this case it must hold for any Minkowski right triangle.

There are many ways to prove the spacetime Pythagoras theorem, just as there are in the Euclidean case [4]. Here we mention just two, the first using causal domains and the second using the more traditional squares on the sides of the triangle. Another proof, using spacetime tiling, was given in Ref. [5].




Figure 6: A spacetime triangle and the causal domains of its sides.

The first proof is illustrated in Fig. 6, which shows a right triangle with a vertical timelike side, a horizontal spacelike base, and a timelike hypotenuse, together with their causal domains. The intersection of the domain of the the hypotenuse with that of the vertical timelike side is the white rectangle. The dark grey rectangle is the rest of the domain of the vertical side. The light grey rectangle is the union of the rest of the domain of the hypotenuse and the domain of the spacelike side. The light and dark grey rectangles have the same length and width, and therefore the same area, since the causal domains of the vertical and horizontal sides of the triangle are Euclidean squares. Hence the domain area on the vertical timelike side is equal to the sum of those on the hypotenuse and spacelike side. Since the areas are proportional to the squared Minkowski lengths, this establishes (4).

The second proof uses squares on the sides of the triangle, and is more closely analogous to a Euclidean proof. The latter is shown in Fig. 7. Rearrangement of the four triangles as shown converts the empty area from the two squares on the smaller sides to the single square on the hypotenuse. This is perhaps the most elegant and elementary geometric proof of the Euclidean Pythagoras theorem.

The corresponding proof in the Minkowski case is shown in Fig. 8. The figure on the left differs from that in Fig. 7 only by the orientation of triangles 3 and 4.⁵ Rearrangement of the four triangles as shown converts the empty unshaded area from the larger square to the rhombus plus the smaller square.

⁵We flipped these orientations so that the rearrangement in Fig. 8 involves just sliding, with no flipping.




Figure 7: Proof by rearrangement in the Euclidean case.




Figure 8: Proof by rearrangement in the Minkowskian case.

Thus the rhombus area is the *difference* of the areas of the larger and smaller squares. The rhombus is also the Minkowskian square on the hypotenuse, since it is a parallelogram with lightlike diagonals. Therefore we have again established (4).

By stretching Figs. 6 and 8 in one null direction and shrinking by an equal factor in the other null direction (u resp. v -directions of Fig. 4) we preserve all null directions and hence Minkowski-perpendicularity and squares, as well as areas; and in this way we can obtain a general Minkowski right triangle, to which the spacetime Pythagoras theorem applies.⁶ The so-transformed Figure 6 does not lend itself directly to the proof we gave above because the shaded rectangles are no longer congruent (in the Euclidean sense), although they do have equal area. However, the second proof does still work for the transformed Fig. 8, as shown in Fig. 9, because all four transformed triangles are congruent.

⁶In fact, the transformation described is just a Lorentz transformation.




Figure 9: Rearrangement proof for a general triangle.

Minkowski area and higher dimensions

Throughout this paper we have spoken of area only in the Euclidean sense. Using the notion of Minkowski area, we can give a more abstract proof of the proportionality of Euclidean area and squared proper time, which also generalizes to higher dimensional spacetimes, as follows.

In any dimension one can map Minkowski to Euclidean space in a manner that preserves the translation symmetry and hence the straight lines, and Euclidean and Minkowskian length are proportional on a given line. Moreover, since a translationally invariant volume element is determined up to a constant scalar multiple, the image of any such Minkowskian volume element under any such map is necessarily proportional to the Euclidean volume element.

Now consider a timelike segment AB of proper time T in an n -dimensional Minkowski space, and define the causal domain of AB as the intersection of the future of A with the past of B . The ratio of T^n to the Minkowski volume of the corresponding casual domain is a dimensionless number. Since a Minkowski volume element does not determine any preferred timelike direction, this ratio must be the same for all timelike intervals. The ratio of T^n to the Euclidean volume is thus also constant. This can be used to interpret three-dimensional spacetime diagrams in much the same way as we did here with two-dimensional ones.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the organizers of the Second Samos Meeting on Cosmology, Geometry and Relativity, held at Pythagoreon, Samos, Greece in September 1998, which stimulated this project. This work was supported

in part by the NSF under grants PHY-9800967 and PHY-0300710 at the University of Maryland, and by the CNRS at the Institut d’Astrophysique de Paris.

Note Added

After this article was completed we became aware of some related work. A simple geometric proof that the squared interval is proportional to the area of the corresponding causal domain (“light rectangle”) was given by Mermin [6]. His construction assumes the two intervals being compared have the same length, and is hence more symmetric than the one given in our article. A geometric proof of what we called the spacetime Pythagoras theorem was given as early as 1913 in Propositions XI and XXI of Ref. [1]. A proof by Liebscher presented with animated graphics is available online [7] (see also [8]). We are grateful to R. Salgado and D. Liebscher for steering us to these references.

References

- [1] E.B. Wilson and G.N. Lewis: “The space-time manifold of relativity. The non-euclidean geometry of mechanics and electromagnetics,” *Proc.Amer.Acad.Boston* **48**, 389-507 (1913).
- [2] A.A. Robb, *A Theory of Time and Space* (Cambridge University Press, 1914); *The Absolute Relations of Time and Space* (Cambridge University Press, 1921) [a less technical survey]; *Geometry of Time and Space* (Cambridge University Press, 1936) [a revised version].
- [3] H. Bondi, *Relativity and Common Sense: A New Approach to Einstein* (Dover, 1980); G. F. R. Ellis and R. M. Williams, *Flat and Curved Spacetimes*, (Oxford University Press, 2000).
- [4] See, for example, E. W. Weisstein, “Pythagorean Theorem,” from MathWorld—A Wolfram Web Resource, <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/PythagoreanTheorem.html/>
- [5] D. Brill, “Black holes and wormholes in 2+1 dimensions,” in *Mathematical and Quantum Aspects of Relativity and Cosmology*, Lecture Notes in Physics vol. 537, eds. Cotsakis, S. & Gibbons, G.W. (Springer, 2000) 143-179.

- [6] N. D. Mermin, "Space-time intervals as light rectangles," Am. J. Phys. **66** 1077 (1998).
- [7] <http://www.aip.de/~lie/GEOMETRIE/GeomZeit.html/>
- [8] D. E. Liebscher, *Relativitätstheorie mit Zirkel und Lineal*, 2nd Ed. (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1991).