arXiv:1204.5833v1 [math.DG] 26 Apr 2012

PIECEWISE MINIMAL SURFACES INTERPOLATING BETWEEN TWO REAL ANALYTIC CURVES

RUKMINI DEY

Abstract. This paper is about interpolating minimal surfaces between two real analytic curves, a and b , each of which are simple real analytic curves, using the Björling-Schwarz formula in the domain where it is valid, changing the normal distributions on inital curves. We insert curves $l_1, ...l_L$ at specific locations and claim that there exists piecewise minimal surfaces interpolating between a to l_1, l_2 to l_3, $...l_L$ to b

1. Introduction

This paper is about interpolating minimal surfaces between two real analytic curves, a and b ,each which are simple closed real analytic curves. We insert curves $l_1, ...l_L$ at specific locations and claim that there exists piecewise minimal surfaces interpolating between a to l_1, l_2 to l_3, $...l_L$ to b. We use the Björling-Schwarz formula in the domain where it is valid, changing the normal distributions on initial curves.

We claim that the minimal surface interpolating between l_i and l_{i+1} follows the algorithm that it chooses that initial normal on l_i such that the area between this curve and the curve l_{i+1} is minimised – at every stage it follows this algorithm like in the case of geodesics – while interpolating between l_i and l_{i+1}.

In general it has been proved by Douglas and many others, that there are connected minimal surfaces spanning two curves when they are close, and gave the criterion of how close they ought to be to have such a solution, but how many solutions are there and whether it is a stable surface still seems to be open and can perhaps be understood by Thom catastrophe theory in some cases, [1]. In this paper the problem is different, in the sense that we insert "wire frames" (curves) in between the two curves a and b at specific locations and interpolate between the "wire frames". The "wire mesh" on which the "wire frames" are supported is the homotopy surface between the two curves a and b. Our approach is completely different from Douglas. Though the result can possibly proved by a concatenation of Plateau's problem, our proof is novel and elementary. We use a different notion of closeness of two real analytic curves such that there is a topologically cylindrical minimal surface joining them.

The arrangement in the paper is as follows:

In section (2) we mention the solution to the Björling problem.

In section (3) we prove theorem (3.5). In order to formulate the statement of the theorem, we prove lemmas (3.1) to (3.4). While proving theorem (3.5), we need lemmas (3.6) - (3.10). Then in the same section (3) we prove the main theorem, namely, theorem (3.11). In section (4) we write an appendix which enables us to use the infinite dimensional inverse function theorem.

2. The Björling problem

Given a real analytic strip S in R^3, the Björling problem is the problem of finding a minimal surface containing this strip in the interior. This was solved by H.A. Schwarz, [2].

Consider a real-analytic strip $S = \{(c(t), n(t)) : t \in I\}$ consisting of the real analytic curve $c : I \to R^3$ with $c'(t) \neq 0$ (or zero only at isolated points) and of a real analytic vector field $n : I \to R^3$ along c , with $|n(t)| \equiv 1$ and $< c'(t), n(t) > \equiv 0$.

Assume I is an open interval in R. The Björling problem consists in finding a minimal surface $X : \Omega \to R^3$ with $I \subset \Omega$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:

$$X(u, 0) = c(u) \qquad \text{for} u \in I$$

$$N(u, 0) = n(u) \qquad \text{for} u \in I$$

N being the normal of $X, N : \Omega \to R^3$.

Theorem 2.1. *For any prescribed real-analytic strip $S = \{(c(t), n(t)) : t \in I\}$, the corresponding Björling problem has exactly one solution $X(u, v)$, given by*

$$X(u, v) = Re\{c(w) - i \int_{u_0}^{w} n(\tilde{w}) \times dc(\tilde{w})\},$$

$w = u + iv \in \Omega$, $u_0 \in I$, where Ω is a simply connected domain with $I \subset \Omega$ in which the power-series expansions of both c and n are converging

For a proof of the theorem see [2].

Remarks 1. The uniqueness is to be understood in the following sense: If $\tilde{X}(u, v)$, $w = u + iv \in \tilde{\Omega}$ is another solution, then $X(u, v) = \tilde{X}(u, v)$ for $u + iv \in \Omega \cap \tilde{\Omega}$.

2. The formula above means the following: One determines holomorphic extenstions $c(u + iv)$ and $n(u + iv)$ of the real-analytic functions $c(t)$ and $n(t)$, $t \in I$, to a suitable simply connected domain Ω with $I \subset \Omega$, and then one determines the line integral $\int_{u_0}^{w} n(\tilde{w}) \times dc(\tilde{w}) = \int_{u_0}^{w} n(\tilde{w}) \times c'(\tilde{w}) d\tilde{w}$ where $c'(w)$ is the complex derivative of the holomorphic function $c(w)$.

3. We generalize this formula for $X(u, v)$ to the case when I is a closed interval and c is a closed real analytic curve in R^3 and n is real analytic with $n(0) = n(1)$. The domain where the minimal surface $X(u, v), n)$ can be parametrised by u and v is where the closed curve $X(u, v(u), n)$ has a single component, when you cut off the minimal surface at $v = v(u)$ for all $v(u) \in [0, v_{max}]$. Note that $X(u, v(u), n)$ remains closed in this region.

Another way to describe is the following: For each n, $X(u, v)$ is parametrised by the cylinder, $u \in S^1$, $v \in [v_{min}, v_{max}]$. In this region, the correspondence $c(u) \to X(u, v(u)) = d(u)$ is one to one and onto, i.e. if $c(u_1) \to d(u_1)$ and $c(u_2) \to d(u_2)$, $u_1 \neq u_2$, then $d(u_1) \neq d(u_2)$. If this happens then (u, v) is a valid coordinate for parametrising the surface. We illustrate with a diagram when it fails to hold.

3. The interpolating minimal surfaces

Let a and b_1 be two closed, compact, real-analytic curves in R^3 which can be simultaneously parametrised by u. Let us define the area between the two curves as

$A(a, b_1) = inf\{$ area of piecewise differentiable surfaces joining a and $b_1.\}$

Let $N = \{n$ a normal distribution $||\text{n(u)}| = 1\}$, the set of all normals on the initial curve a.

Let $u \in I$ parametrise the curve a and b_1. I is a closed interval in the complex plane parametrised by $w = u + iv$.

Let Ω_k be a bounded domain, containing I such that $w \in \Omega$, $w = u + iv$, $u \in I$ and v varies over a bounded set. $\Omega_k = \{|w| < k \in Z\}$

Let our n vary over $N_k = \{n | n$ real analytic, $|n(w)| \leq k\}$, where $n(u)$ is the initial normal distribution (described on components of $a(u)$ as in section (2), and $n(w)$ is the analytic continuation of n to domain $\Omega(n)$ where where $\Omega(n)$ is the domain of convergence of $n(w)$ and $a(w)$.

Let $X(a, u, v, n)$ be the surface parametrised by N_k , with initial curve a and let $A(n)$ be its area, $u \in I$,and such that when we cut off the surface at $v = v(u)$ the curve $X(a, u, v(u), n)$ has only 1 component for all v such that $v(u) \in [0, v_{max}]$.

(notation as in the Björling problem, except we have mentioned the explicit dependence on the initial curve a and the normal distribution n)

Let $A(a, n, \Omega(n))$ be the area of the minimal surface $X(u, v, n)$ such that $n \in N_k$.

However, N_k is not closed. Here is an example explaining why it is not closed:

Let $n_m(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(cos(mu), sin(mu), 1)$ be a sequence of faster and faster spinning normals on I. Consider their analytic continuations

$n_m(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(cos(mz), sin(mz), 1)$, $m \to \infty$. If n_m belongs to N_k , i.e. they are bounded uniformly is $I \times [\frac{-l}{m}, \frac{l}{m}]$, where l is independent of m. As $m \to \infty$, this domain shrinks and these functions donot converge to any holomorphic function.

Thus $N_k = \{n = n(w) | |n| \leq k\}$ is uniformly bounded, but is not compact.

Defintion $A(a, X(u, v(u), n))$ = the area between the curve a and the curve $X(a, u, v(u), n)$ in the region where $u - v$ parametrization is valid, $n = n(u)$ is a normal distribution on a. (We have kept the dependence on n and a purposefully.)

Lemma 3.1. *If n_l is a sequence such that the domain on which $|n_l| \leq k$ shrinks, i.e. is contained in $I \times [-\epsilon_l, \epsilon_l]$, such that $v(u) \in [-\epsilon_l, \epsilon_l]$ with $\epsilon_l \to 0$ then $A(a, X(u, v(u), n_l)) \to 0$.*

Proof. Recall that

$$X(u, v) = Re\{a(w) - i \int_{u_0}^{w} (n(\tilde{w}) \times a'(\tilde{w}))d\tilde{w}\},$$

$w = u + iv \in \Omega$, $u_0 \in I$, which implies $X_u = Re(a') - iRe([n \times a'])$ and $X_v = -Im(a') + iIm([n \times a'])$, where $a' = \frac{da}{dw}$.

$A(a, X(u, v(u), n_l)) = \int_{u_0}^{u+iv(u)} |X_u \times X_v| dudv$ This formula holds since u, v can parametrise $X(u, v, n_l)$, by assumption.

Quantities like $|a'|$ and $|n \times a'|$ are bounded and terms like $|n_l|$ and $|n_l|^2$ are uniformly bounded.

Thus $|X_u \times X_v|$ is uniformly bounded by $R(k)$. Thus $A(a, X(u, v(u), n_l)) \leq R(k)$ where $R(k)$ is a uniformly bounded constant. Thus $A(a, X(u, v(u), n_l) \to 0$ as $l \to 0$. □

Let $v = v(u)$ be a function of u. In the domain $\Omega(n)$ the formula for the area of the minimal surface between a and $X(a, u, v(u), n)$ is

$A(n, v) = A(a, X(a, u, v(u), n) = \int_0^1 \int_0^{v(u)} |X_{\tilde{u}} \times X_{\tilde{v}}| d\tilde{u}d\tilde{v}$.

Given n,

$A = \int_{u_0}^{u+iv} |X_u \times X_v| dudv$

as the function v changes, A changes. Notice if A changes, the function $v = v(u)$ also changes since $X(a, u, v(u), n)$ has to be different. We will interchange the role of A and v. Given n,

$A = \int_{u_0}^{u+iv} |X_u \times X_v| dudv$. Hence, $\frac{dA}{dv} \neq 0$. By inverse function theorem, there is a neighbourhood W about A and a neighbourhood about v such that $v = v(A)$.

Then

$A(n) = Area(a, X(a, u, v(A)(u), n))$.....$Eq(1)$

i.e. the surface can be parametrised by u and A instead of u and v.

Definition: Let $A_{max}(n) = maxA(n)$ i.e. the furthest you can go with n and well defined $u - v$ coordinates.

Definition: Let N' be all those infinite sequences $\{n_i\}$ of normal distributions such that the domain $|n_i(w)| < R$ shrinks as $i \to \infty$ for every R.

Definition: Let $A_{max}(a) = inf_{n \in N/N'} A_{max}(n)$.

Lemma 3.2. *$A_{max}(a)$ is not zero or infinity, given a curve a.*

Proof. Suppose $A_{max}(a) = 0$.

Then there is a sequence $A_{max}(n_j)$ such that $A_{max}(n_j) \to 0$.

Suppose given $\delta > 0$, there is an n_j such that $A_{max}(n_j) < \delta/2$, for all $j > j_0$.

We are on domain of convergence of n_j , namely $\Omega(n_j)$. Because we removed N', the domain $\Omega(n_j)$ doesnot shrink as $j \to \infty$.

Now since $N/N' = \cup_{k \in Z}(N_k/N')$,

$n_j \in N_{k_j}/N'$, i.e. $|n_j(w)| \leq k_j$ on the closure of its domain of convergence, i.e. on $I \times [\epsilon_j, \epsilon_j]$ such that there exists, δ such that $\epsilon_j > \delta > 0$ for all j. Let the δ in the beginning of the proof be this δ.

The idea is that since $|n(u)| = 1$ on I for all normals and this is the infinitesimal area element, the area spanned by the normal in the Björling formula couldnot be zero, if the domain of boundedness doesnot shrink.

By Taylor expansion, for each u,

$$X_{ju}(u + i\epsilon) = X_{ju}(u) + X_{juv}(u + iv_0) \times i\epsilon.$$

and similarly for $X_{jv}(u + i\epsilon)$, by mean value theorem, where $v_0 \leq \epsilon$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& |X_{ju}||X_{jv}|(u + i\delta) \\
= \;& |X_{ju}(u) + X_{juv}(u + iv_0) \times i\delta||X_{jv}(u + iv_0) + X_{jvv}(u + iv_0) \times i\delta| \\
\geq \;& ||X_{ju}(u)| - |X_{juv}(u + iv_0)|\delta|||X_{jv}(u)| - |X_{jvv}(u + iv_0)|\delta|| \\
\geq \;& ||X_{ju}||X_{jv}|(u) - (|X_j v(u)||X_{juv}| + |X_{ju}(u)||X_{jvv}|(u + iv_0))\delta \\
+ \;& (|X_{jvu}(u + iv_0(u))||X_{jvv}(u + iv_0)|)\delta^2|
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^1 \int_0^\delta |X_{ju}||X_{jv}|(u + iv)dvdu \\
\geq \;& \int_0^1 \int_0^\delta |X_{ju}||X_{jv}|(u + i\delta)dvdu \\
\geq \;& \int_0^1 \int_0^\delta ||X_{ju}||X_{jv}|(u) - (|X_j v(u)||X_{juv}| + |X_{ju}(u)||X_{jvv}|(u + iv_0))\delta \\
+ \;& (|X_{jvu}(u + iv_0)||X_{jvv}(u + iv_0(u))|)\delta^2|dvdu \\
\geq \;& \int_0^1 \int_0^\delta |1 - (|X_{jv}(u)||X_{juv}| + |X_{ju}(u)||X_{jvv}|(u + iv_0(u)))\delta \\
+ \;& (|X_{jvu}(u + iv_0)||X_{jvv}(u + iv_0)|)\delta^2|
\end{aligned}$$

Since $c_j < |(|X_{jv}(u)||X_{juv}| + |X_{ju}(u)||X_{jvv}|(u + iv_0))|)(u + iv_0) < C_j$ on I and $I \times v_0$ which is compact. $d_j < |(||X_{juv}| + |X_{jvv}|)(u + iv_0)|) < D_j$. If $c_j = c$ and $C_j = C$, $d_j = d$ and $D_j = D$ and i.e. independent of j then, $1 - C\delta - D\delta^2$ can be made positive and greater than half by taking δ small enough such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_0^1 \int_0^\delta |1 - (|X_{jv}(u)||X_{juv}| + |X_{ju}(u)||X_{jvv}|(u + iv_0(u)))\delta \\
+ \;& (|X_{jvu}(u + iv_0)||X_{jvv}(u + iv_0)|)\delta^2| \\
\geq \;& |\delta - C\delta^2 - D\delta^3| \geq \delta/2.
\end{aligned}$$

since we can choose δ as small as we like, so that δ^2 and δ^3 are much smaller.

If the $C_j's$ and $D_j's$ goes to infinity as $j \to \infty$ then fixing a δ there exists a j_0 such that for all $j > j_0$ $C_j\delta^2 + D_j\delta^3 - \delta$ can be made positive and greater than $\delta/2$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^1 \int_0^\delta |1 - (|X_{jv}(u)||X_{juv}| + |X_{ju}(u)||X_{jvv}|(u+iv_0))\delta \\ + \quad & (|X_{jvu}(u+iv_0)||X_{jvv}(u+iv_0)|)\delta^2| \\ \geq \quad & |\delta - C_j\delta^2 - D_j\delta^3| \\ \geq \quad & \delta/2 \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts that $A_{max}(n_j) < \delta/2$.
Thus $A_{max}(a) \neq 0$. □

Lemma 3.3. *All values in $[0, A_{max}(a))$ are taken by the surfaces $X(u, v(u), n)$ as n varies.*

Proof. Let A be any number in $[0, A_{max}(a))$.

Let $A = A_{max}(a) - \epsilon$.

By defintion of inf, there exists sequence $A_{max}(n_i) > A_{max}(a)$ converging to $A_{max}(a)$ and thus there exits n_0 s.t. $A < A_{max}(a) < A_{max}(n_0)$. Cutting off the surface $X(u, v(u), n_0)$ at a certain $v_0 = v_0(u)$ we can achieve area A using the same normal n_0. (This is because area A and v can be interchanged by the IFT). $Eq(1)$ holds, i.e. $A = A(n_0) = Area(a, X(a, u, v(A(n_0))(u), n_0)$, □

Lemma 3.4. *If there exists a curve b_1 such that*
$A(a, b_1) \in [0, A_{max}(a))$ then equation (1) is satisfied, i.e.
$A = Area(a, X(u, v(A)(u), n))$ for all $A \in [0, A(a, b_1)]$.

Proof. Let $A < A(a, b_1)$ be the area between two curves a and b_1.

n_0 be any normal such that $A(a, b_1) = A(n_0)$ is achieved by the normal.

Since $A(a, b_1) \in [0, A_{max}(a))$, by the previous lemma, n_0 exists and also, $A(n_0) = Area(a, X(a, u, v(A(n_0))(u), n_0)$, since by inverse function theorem, we can interchange v and A.

There exists a neighbourhood V of $v(n_0)$ and a neighbourhood W of $A(n_0)$ such that $Eq(1)$ holds, i.e. $A(n) = Area(a, X(a, u, v(A(n))(u), n)$, $n \in V$.

If $A = A(a, b_1) \in W$, we are done. Take the surface corresponding to the same normal n_0. Applying IFT $v = v(A)$. Since A doesnot belong to W, suppose $v(A) < v(A(n_0))$. Cut off the surface $A(a, u, v(A(n_0))(u), n_0)$ at $v(A) = v(A)(u)$. Then $Eq(1)$ holds again, i.e. $Area(a, X(a, u, v(A)(u), n_0) = A$. □

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose a be a closed, simple, real analytic curve in R^3 parametrised by $u \in I$. Suppose b_1 is a closed,simple, real analytic curve in R^3 such that b_1 can be simultaneously parametrised by $u \in I$ and $A(a, b_1) \in [0, A_{\max}(a))$. Then there exists a connected surface, composed of piecewise minimal surfaces which contains the curves a and b_1.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that a has just one component. Let $A(a, b) = inf_S\{$ area of piecewise differentiable surfaces S which contain the curves a and b $\}$.

We showed in the Lemma(3.1) that N_k, when n is restricted to $\Omega(n)$, form a uniformly bounded set, but not necessarily closed (example given).

$$\begin{aligned} B &= \{\text{minimal surfaces with a the initial curve and n the normal distribution }\} \\ &= \{X | X = X(u, v(u), n) = Re\{a(\tilde{w}) - i\int_{u_0}^{w} n(\tilde{w}) \times da(\tilde{w})\} \end{aligned}$$

where $w = u + iv$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} BdB_\delta &= \{d(u) = X(u, v_0(n)(u), n) : \\ &\quad \text{such that X(u, 0, n) and X(u, v}_0\text{(n)(u), n)} \\ &\quad \text{are spanned by the minimal surface X(u, v(n)(u), n)) such that} \\ &\quad A(X(u, 0, n), X(u, v_0(n)(u), n)) = \delta, \text{ as n varies on N.}\} \end{aligned}$$

BdB_δ is composed of closed curves $d(u)$'s such that the area between them and the initial curve a is δ.

Lemma 3.6. *Given any initial curve $c = c(u)$, (which could be $a = a(u)$) and given any $\delta > 0$ such BdB_δ is non-empty, i.e. there exists some n on c such that $A(c, X(u, v(n)(u), n)) \geq \delta$*

Proof. Let $n_M(u) = (e^{-iMu}, e^{-iMu}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}})$. It has analytic continuation: $n_M(w) = (e^{-iMw}, e^{-iMw}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}})$.

In other words, $n_M(w) = (e^{-iMu}e^{Mv}, e^{-iMu}e^{Mv}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}})$.

$$\begin{aligned} |X_u| &= |Re(c'(w)) - iRe(n_M \times c')| \\ &= |-iRe(c'(w)) - Re(n_M \times c')| \\ &\geq |-|(n_M(w) \times c^{prime}(w))| - iRe(c'(w))| \\ &= ||(n_M(w) \times c'(w))| + iRe(c'(w))| \end{aligned}$$

since $-Re(n_M \times c') \geq -|(n_M \times c')|$.

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} |X_v| &= |-Im(c'(w)) + iIm(n_M \times c')| \\ &= |-iIm(c'(w)) - Im(n_M(w) \times c'(w))| \\ &\geq |-iIm(c'(w)) - |(n_M(w) \times c'(w))|| \\ &= |iIm(c'(w)) + |(n_M(w) \times c'(w))|| \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |X_u| &\geq ||(n_M(w) \times c'(w))| + iRe(c'(w))| \\ &\geq ||n_{M1}c_2' - n_{M2}c_1'| + iRe(c'(w))| \\ &\geq |e^{Mv}|c_2' - c_1'| + iRe(c'(w))| \\ &\geq e^{Mv}|c_2' - c_1'| \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $|X_v| \geq e^{Mv}|c_2' - c_1'|$

Let $I \times [0, \tau]$ be the neighbourhood such that $|c_2' - c_1'| \geq \epsilon$, i.e. it excludes the zeores of c' etc. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_0^{v_0} \int_0^1 |X_u| X_v| du dv \\ \geq & \int_0^{\tau} \int_0^1 |X_u| X_v| du dv \\ \geq & \int_0^{\tau} \int_0^1 e^{2Mv} |c_2' - c_1'|^2 du dv \\ \geq & \int_0^{\tau} \int_0^1 e^{2Mv} \epsilon^2 du dv \\ = & (e^{2M\tau} - 1)\epsilon^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now, fixing ϵ fixes τ and now, one can take M large enough, such that $(e^{2M\tau} - 1)\epsilon^2 > \delta$ for any δ

Thus this particular normal achieves infinite area. □

Let $BdB_{\delta,k}$ be the subset of BdB_δ parametrised by a subset of N, namely N_k. Let

$$\begin{aligned} BdB_{\delta,k} = & \{d(u) = X(u, v_0(n)(u), n) = d_1(u) \cup d_2(u) ... \cup d_l(u) : \\ & \text{such that X(u, 0, n) and X(u, } v_0\text{(n)(u), n)} \\ & \text{are spanned by the minimal surface X(u, v(n)(u), n)) such that} \\ & A(X(u, 0, n), X(u, v_0(n)(u), n)) = \delta, \text{ as n varies on } N_k\} \end{aligned}$$

Then $BdB_\delta = \cup_1^k BdB_{\delta,k}$, since $N = \cup_1^k N_k$.

Let $A(d, b_1) = inf\{$ area between the curve d and b_1 by piecewise differentiable surfaces containing d and b_1 $\}$.

We will show that $A = min_{c \in BdB_\delta} A(c, b_1)$ is achieved by some

$c = X(u, v_0(n_0)(u), n_0)$ because $BdB_{\delta,k}$ is compact for each k and $A(c, b_1)$ is continuous w.r.t. c.

Lemma 3.7. *$BdB_{\delta,k}$ is parametrized by a closed subset K of N_k i.e. a compact subset K of N_k, since N_k is uniformly bounded.*

Proof. The idea is that we can leave out N' since the end-curves obtained by the infinite sequences in N' donot acheive area δ.

We know that N_k is uniformly bounded. Suppose K is not closed, i.e. there is a sequence $n_i \in K$ such that such that n_i doesnot converge to a holomorphic function. Since n_i doesnot converge to a holomorphic function, in any domain containing I, the domain $\Omega(n_i)$ on which n_i converges and $|n_i| \leq k$ shrinks as $i \to \infty$, i.e. $|w| \leq \epsilon''$, where $\epsilon'' \to 0$ as $i \to \infty$. Now if the domain shrinks the area of the minimal surface spanned by the Björling problem (and parametrised by N_k also shrinks Lemma(3.2). Thus, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists i_0 such that for all $i > i_0$, $A(a, X(u, v(n_i)(u), n_i)) < \epsilon << \delta$.

Since $BdB_{\delta,k} = \{c | A(a, c) = \delta\}$ the $X(u, v(n_i)(u), n_i)$ for n_i, $i \geq i_0$ donot lie in $BdB_{\delta,k}$.Thus if n_i doesnot converge to a holomorphic function, then only finitely many n_i , $i = 1, ...i_0$ belong to K. Thus K is closed and bounded and hence compact, by Montel's theorem, (page 32 , [5]). □

Lemma 3.8. *$BdB_{\delta,k}$ is compact.*

Proof. This holds because K is compact and $X = X(u, v(n)(u), n)$ will be shown to be continuous w.r.t $n \in K$. We will show that given $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $\tau > 0$ s.t. if $|n(w) - \tilde{n}(w)| \leq \tau$ on C (a compact subset of Ω), and $n \in K$ then

$\sup_{\omega \in C} |\mathrm{X(u, v_0(n), n) - X(u, v_0(\tilde{n}), \tilde{n})}| \leq \epsilon$.

This is because

$$\begin{aligned} & |\mathrm{Re}\{-i \int_{u_0}^{u+iv_0(n)(u)} n(w) \times dc(w) + i \int_{u_0}^{u+iv_0(\tilde{n})(u)} \tilde{n}(w) \times dc(w)\}| \\ = \; & |\mathrm{Re}\{-i \int_{u_0}^{u+iv_0(n)(u)} (n(w) - \tilde{n}) \times dc(w) + i \int_{u+iv_0(n)}^{u+iv_0(\tilde{n})(u)} \tilde{n}(w) \times dc(w)\}| \\ \leq \; & \tau \times M \times \tilde{M} + \delta' \times M \times l(R) \leq \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

where $|v_0(n)(u)| \leq \tilde{M}$, since C is compact and $v_0(n)$ is a continuous function of n, $|dc| \leq M$ and $|\tilde{n}(w)| \leq k$. Also, $sup_{u \in I} |v_0(n)(u) - v_0(\tilde{n})(u)| \leq \delta'$ since $|n(w) - \tilde{n}(w)| \leq \tau$. We can choose τ suitably such that RHS is less than ϵ. □

Lemma 3.9. *$BdB_{\delta,k}$ is parametrised by N_k/N' and BdB_δ is parametrised by N/N'*

Proof. $BdB_{\delta,k}$ is parametrised by a compact set K, namely, N_k/N'. Thus $BdB_\delta = \cup_{k \in Z} BdB_{\delta,k}$ is parametrised by $\cup_{k \in Z}(N_k/N') = N/N'$ □

Lemma 3.10. *There exists a small enough δ such that $A = min_{c \in BdB_\delta} A(c, b_1)$ is achieved by some $c = X(u, v_0(n_0)(u), n_0) \in BdB_\delta$.*

Proof. Let c_i be a minimizing sequence of curves in BdB_δ for

$A = inf_{\{c \in BdB_\delta\}} A(c, b_1)$. (Here δ is to be determined).

Let $c_i = Re\{a(u + iv_i(u)) - i \int_{u_0}^{u+iv_i(u)} n_i(w') \times da(w')\}$

such that $A(a, c_i) = \delta$, and $A(c_i, b_1)$ is minimized as $i \to \infty$. $A \leq A_k = inf_{\{c \in BdB_{\delta,k}\}} A(c, b_1)$. Thus, c_i is a minimising sequence for A_k for each k. For k fixed, $BdB_{\delta,k}$ is a compact set.

Then there is a convergent subsequence of c_i such that $c_i \to c_{0,k}$ on $BdB_{\delta,k}$

$c_{0,k}(u) = Re\{a(u + iv_{i,k}(n_{0,k})) - i \int_{u_0}^{u+iv_{i,k}} n_{0,k}(w') \times da(w')\}$. ($c_{0,k}$ has only one componet, since $u - v$ coordinates are valid) and A_k is achieved by this $c_{0,k}$.

$A_k = A(c_{0,k}, b_1)$.

Now , we let $k \to \infty$ where we show that $c_{0,k}$ converges to a holomorphic function c_0, on compact subsets of Ω. Let C be a compact subset of Ω.

By continuity of n, given any k, there exists a R such that if $u \in I$, $|w - u| < R$ imples $|n(w) - n(u)| < k$, i.e $|n(w)| < k + 1$ since $|n(u)| = 1$. We can cover C by finitely many neighbourhoods of the form $\{w \in C || w - u| < R\}$. Thus $n \in N_{k_0}$ for some k_0 big enough.

Then, $c_{0,k}|_C \in BdB_{\delta,k_0}$ for all k.

Since BdB_{δ,k_0} is compact, the set $c_{0,k} \to c_0$, uniformly on C. This is true for all compact sets $C \subset \Omega$. Then, by topology of uniform convergence of compact sets, $c_0 = lim_{k \to \infty} c_{0,k}$. Since $c_{0,k}$ are each holomorphic, the limit c_0 is also holomorphic (page 230, [4]) and c_0 achieves A. $A(a, c_{0,k}) = \delta$ implies, $A(a, c_0) = \delta$. Let $c_0 = \lim_{k \to \infty} c_{0,k} = \lim_{k \to \infty} X(u, v_{0,k}(u)), n_{0,k})$. By inverse function theorem, (in the appendix), in a neighbourhood of a in R^3 there exists a small enough tubular neighbourhood (in sup-norm topology) , such that $X^{-1}(c_0) = (n_0, v_0)$ n_0 is a normal distribution on a. Then $c_0 = X(u, v_0(u), n_0)$. Take δ small enough such

that BdB_δ is contained in this neighbourhood. Then $c_0 \in BdB_\delta$ since we already had $A(a, c_0) = \delta$. This is the end of the lemma. □

We continue with the proof of thereom (3.5). If $A = 0$ then $b_1 = c$ and we are done. If $A \neq 0$ then we apply the following process. First we give a figure to illustrate what is going on:

Suppose d , c and e are all the curves in $BdB_\delta(n)$ as n varies over N. Of $A(c, b_1)$, $A(d, b_1)$ and $A(e, b_1)$ suppose $A(e, b_1)$ is the minimum. Then we proceed with the Björling problem, with the initial curve e, as shown in the figure below:

Note: In the following, we supress the dependence of v and n on u.

Let $X(u, v_0, n_0) = Re\{a(w) - i\int_{u_0}^{u+iv} n_0(w') \times da(w')\}$.

We shall prove that there exists v_2 and n (both functions of u) such that $X(u, v_2, n) = b_1(u)$. This would imply that the minimal surface $X(u, v_2, n)$ passes through b_1.

First we reparametrize $X(u, v(n), n)$ by $A(n)$ instead of $v(n)$. This can be done in $\Omega(n)$ by the inverse function theorem, where recall $\Omega(n)$ is the domain where a and n converge and where parametrisation by u, v is possible. Thus $X = X(u, v(n), n) = X(u, v(A(n)), n)$ and $Eq(1)$ holds, i.e. $A(n) = Area(a, X(u, v(A(n)), n)$.

To show this we will show that

$$A(X(u, v, n), b_1) = A(a, b_1) - A(a, X(u, v, n)) \qquad (2.1)$$

$\forall v$ such that $A(a, (X(u, v, n)) \in [\delta, A(a, b_1)]$

If we can show this fact, then if $A(a, X(u, v', n')) = A(a, b_1)$

then $A(X(u, v', n'), b_1) = 0$, i.e. $X(u, v', n') = b_1$ and the minimal surface will pass through a and b_1.

Thus it remains to prove equation (2.1). First we show that equation (2.1) is true for $A(a, X(u, v_0, n_0)) = \delta$. Now the set $T = \{s \in [\delta, A(a, b_1)]$ where equation(1) holds $\}$ is clearly closed in $[0, A(a, b_1)]$. Next we show that if $s_0 \in T$ and $s_0 < A(a, b_1)$ then equation (1) holds for $s_0 + \delta'$ where $\delta' > 0$ and δ' sufficiently small. This implies $T = [\delta, A(a, b_1)]$. Thus equation (2.1) will be proved.

First we show equation (2.1) holds for $s = \delta$. Since every minimal surface containing a has to pass through BdB_δ, δ small enough, we use an arbitrary curve τ:

$$\begin{aligned} A(a,b_1) &= inf\{\text{ area of piecewise differentiable surfaces joining a and}b_1\} \\ &= inf_{\tau\in BdB_\delta}\{inf_{\text{ surfaces joining a and }\tau}(area(a,\tau)) \\ &\quad +inf_{\text{ surfaces joining }\tau\text{ and }b_1}(area(\tau,b_1))\} \\ &= inf_{\tau\in BdB_\delta}\{A(a,\tau)+A(\tau,b_1)\} \\ &= inf_{\tau\in BdB_\delta}(\delta+A(\tau,b_1)) \\ &= \delta+A(c_0,b_1) \end{aligned}$$

Thus $A(c_0,b_1) = A(a,b_1)-\delta$, i.e. $A(X(u,v_0,n_0),b_1) = A(a,b_1)-A(a,X(u,v_0,n_0))$ Thus equation (1) holds for $s = \delta$.

Now we will show that if equation (2.1) holds for $s_0 \in [\delta, A(a,b_1)]$, then for $\delta' > 0$ and sufficiently small it holds for $s_0+\delta'$.

Let $X(u,v_3,n_3) = e(u)$ be a curve such that $A(a,e) = s_0$.

Let $Y(u,v,n) = Re\{e(w) - i\int n(w)\times de(w)\}$ where n is a normal distribution along e.

Let $Y(u,v_0(n),n)$, v_0 changing with n, be the curves such that
$A(e,Y(u,v_0(n),n)) = \delta'$.
Let

$$\begin{aligned} BdB_{\delta'} &= \{\text{curves Y(u, v}_0\text{(n), n) such that the curves Y(u, 0, n) and} \\ &\quad Y(u,v_0(n),n) \text{ have area between them to be } \delta' \text{ as n varies over N}\} \end{aligned}$$

This is non-empty, by Lemma (3.6). If we take δ' small enough, then all minimal surfaces through e pass through $BdB_{\delta'}$. By the same argument as before, we can conclude that on $BdB_{\delta'}$, $A(Y(u,v_0(n_0),n_0),b_1)$ achieves a minimum. Let f_0 be the curve which achieves this minimum. Then

$$\begin{aligned} A(e,b_1) &= inf_{f\in BdB_{\delta'}}\{A(e,f)+A(f,b_1)\} \\ &= \delta'+A(f_0,b_1). \end{aligned}$$

Since equation (1) holds for s_0, $A(e,b_1) = A(a,b_1)-s_0$ Then

$$\begin{aligned} A(f_0,b_1) &= A(e,b_1)-\delta' \\ &= A(a,b_1)-s_0-\delta' \end{aligned}$$

Now $A(a,f_0) \geq A(a,b_1)-A(b_1,f_0)$ since $A(a,b) \leq A(a,f_0)+A(f_0,b_1)$

Then, $A(a,f_0) \geq A(a,b_1)-(A(a,b_1)-s_0-\delta') = s_0+\delta'$. But $A(a,e) = s_0$, $A(e,f_0) = \delta'$. Therefore, $A(a,f_0) \leq s_0+\delta'$, by the definition of the area between two curves. Thus, in fact $A(a,f_0) = s_0+\delta'$.

Then $A(f_0,b_1) = A(a,b_1)-(s_0+\delta')$ Thus equation (2.1) is proved. This the end of the proof of the Theorem(3.5). □

Theorem 3.11. *Suppose a be a real analytic curve in R^3 with simple closed real analytic curves as components parametrised by $a = a(u)$, $u \in I$ as in the Björling problem . Suppose b is a real analytic curve in R^3, with simple closed real analytic curves as components parametrised by $b = b(u)$, $u \in I$ such that $A(a,b)$ is finite. Then there exists a connected surface made out of piecewise minimal surfaces, which contains the curves a and b.*

Proof. a and b are simple closed curves, in R^3. They are homotopic. For instance, if $u \in [0,1]$ simultaneously parametrize the curves, then there is the straightline homotopy, $H : I \times I \to R^3$ given by $H(u,s) = sa(u) + (1-s)b(u)$. Let $H(u,s)$ be the straightline homotopy surface between a and b. It is compact. Let l and m be the curves for $s = s_0$ and $s = s_1$ where we let s_0 and s_1 vary. Let us denote by $A_{max}(l)$ as in Lemma (3.3) where we have replaced the initial curve a by the curve l. Take pairwise curves l and m on this surface such that $A(l,m) < A_{max}(l)$, i.e. area between l and m is less than $A_{max}(l)$. Let us take $l_1 = a$ and $m_n = b$. Let $B(l,m)$ be an open set on the homotopy surface which contains the curves l and m. Then $\cup_{l,m} B(l,m)$ is an open cover of the homotopy surface. Since the latter is compact, finitely many of these open sets covers the homotopy surface. Let $B(l_1,m_1) \cup B(l_2,m_2) \cup .... \cup B(l_n,m_n)$ cover the homotopy surface. Then there are minimal surfaces between l_i and m_i, $i = 1,...n$, since $A(l_i,m_i) < A_{max}(l_i)$ and we can apply Theorem (3.5). Of course these piecewise minimal surfaces willnot, in general coincide with the homotopy surface.

□

Remark: When the curves a and b are far apart, there cannot be a single minimal surface joining them. But if you insert "wire frames" m_1, ...,l_{n-1}, m_{n-1}, l_n in between them, then there are piecewise minimal surfaces, interpolating between a and b, which connect l_i to m_i, $i = 1,...,n$. The "wire mesh" supporting these "wire frames" is the homotopy surface.

4. Appendix

4.1. **The derivative w.r.t n and v.** Let $n = n(u)$ and $v = v(u)$ be two functions of u, as before. Let $P^u(n(u),v(u)) = \mathrm{Re}\{\mathrm{c(w)} - \int_{\mathrm{u_0}}^{\mathrm{u+iv(u)}} [\mathrm{n}(\tilde{\mathrm{w}}) \times \mathrm{c}'(\tilde{\mathrm{w}})]\mathrm{d}\tilde{\mathrm{w}}\}$ be a curve parametrised by u which is obtained by cutting off the solution of the Björling problem at $v = v(u)$.

$P(n,v) = \{P^u(n(u),v(u)), u \in I\}$, is a family.

We show that $P^{u-1}(c_0(u))$ exists for all u and if $n = n(u)$ and $c = c(u)$ are real analytic w.r.t. u.

Hence $P^{-1}(c_0) = (n,v)$ i.e. $P(n,v) = c_0$ such that

$c_0(u) = \mathrm{Re}\{\mathrm{c(u + iv(u))} - \int_{\mathrm{u_0}}^{\mathrm{u+iv(u)}} [\mathrm{n}(\tilde{\mathrm{w}}) \times \mathrm{c}'(\tilde{\mathrm{w}})]\mathrm{d}\tilde{\mathrm{w}}\}$

1) The derivative w.r.t n:

Let A^{u_1} be the Frechet derivative of P^{u_1} w.r.t n i.e.

$lim_{h\to 0}||\frac{P^{u_1}((n+h)(u_1),v(u_1)-P(n(u_1),v(u_1))}{||h||(u_1)} - A^{u_1}\frac{h}{||h||(u_1)}|| \to 0$

where $||h||(u_1) = \int_{u_0}^{u_1+iv(u_1)} |h(\tilde{w})|d\tilde{w}$.

$P^{u_1}((n+h)(u_1), v(u_1))) = \mathrm{Re}\{\mathrm{c}(\mathrm{u}_1 + \mathrm{iv}_1) - \int_{\mathrm{u}_0}^{\mathrm{u}_1+\mathrm{iv}(\mathrm{u}_1)}[(\mathrm{n}+\mathrm{h})(\tilde{\mathrm{w}}) \times \mathrm{c}'(\tilde{\mathrm{w}})]\}\mathrm{dw}$

We have to check when A^{u_1} is not invertible.

This happens when $\lim_{h\to 0}\{\frac{P^{u_1}((n+h)(u_1),v(u_1))-P^{u_1}(n(u_1),v(u_1))}{||h||(u_1)}\}$ is zero for all h such that $h \to 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{P^{u_1}((n+h)(u_1), v(u)) - P^{u_1}(n(u_1), v(u_1))}{||h||(u_1)} \\ = \quad & \frac{1}{||h||(u_1)}\{\frac{1}{2}\int_{u_0}^{u_1+iv(u_1)}[(n+h)\times c']dw - \frac{1}{2}\int_{u_0}^{u_1+iv(u_1)}(n\times c')dw + c.c.\} \end{aligned}$$

where c.c. denotes the complex conjugate.

Thus

$\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{P^{u_1}((n+h)(u_1),v(u_1))-P(n,v(u_1))}{||h||(u_1)} = \frac{1}{2}\int_{u_0}^{u_1+iv(u_1)}[\frac{h}{||h||(u_1)}\times c'](\tilde{w})d\tilde{w} + c.c.$.

Here $h = h(u)$ is real analytic and $h = h(w)$ is the complex analytic extention of h.

Thus the condition of non-invertibility of A^{u_1} is

$\lim_{h\to 0}[\frac{1}{2}\int_{u_0}^{u_1+iv(u_1)}[\frac{h}{||h||(u_1)}\times c']dw + c.c.] = 0....Eq(i)$ for all $h \to 0$

Let $h(u) = \epsilon t(u)$ where $t(u)$ is a real arbitrary vector and ϵ is a constant approaching zero.

Then $||h||(u_1) = \epsilon||t||(u_1)$

The equation $Eq(i)$ becomes

$\frac{1}{||t||(u_1)}\mathrm{Re}\int_\gamma[\mathrm{t}(\mathrm{w})\times \mathrm{c}']\mathrm{dw} = 0.$

where γ is a path joining u_0 to $u_1 + iv_1$ and $t(w)$ is the analytic continutation of $t(u)$ and $t = t(u)$ is arbitrary.

Let $t(w) = t_1(u,v) + it_2(u,v)$ and $c' = c_1'(u,v) + ic_2'(u,v)$.

Then, $Eq(i)$ becomes, $\int_\gamma(t_1(u,v)\times dc_1(u,v) - t_2(u,v)\times dc_2(u,v)) = 0$

In other words, $\int_\gamma(t_1(u,v)\times \dot{c_1}\ (u,v) - t_2(u,v)\times \dot{c_2}\ (u,v))dt = 0$

where $\gamma = \gamma(t)$ with $\gamma(0) = u_0$ and $\gamma(1) = u_1 + iv_1$.

Since $t = t(u)$ is arbitrary, we can take $t(w)$ arbitrary on γ. Thus we can take $t_1 = l_1$ such that $l_1\times \dot{c_1}=\dot{\gamma}$ and $t_2 = l_2$ such that $-l_2\times \dot{c_2}=\dot{\gamma}$ on γ.

Then the $Eq(i)$ reads $\int_0^1 \dot{\gamma}\ dt = \gamma(0) - \gamma(1) = 0$. But $\gamma(0) = u_0$ and $\gamma(1) = u_1+iv_1$ which are not the same. Thus $\dot{c_1}$ and $\dot{c_2}$ are zero a.e. on γ because otherwise one can always find l_1 and l_2. But since $c' = 0$ only at isolated points, this is not possible.

Thus we get a contradiction and $DP^{u_1} \neq 0$ because the derivative w.r.t. n, namely A^{u_1} is never zero.

2)As an aside, we compute the derivative with respect to v:

Suppose, $\lim_{h\to 0}\{\frac{P^{u_1}((n)(u_1),(v+h)(u_1)))-P^{u_1}(n(u_1),v(u_1))}{||h||}\}$ is zero for all h such that $h \to 0$

Or, $\frac{1}{||h||}\int_{u_1+iv(u_1)}^{u_1+i(v(u_1)+h(u_1))}(n\times c') + c.c. = 0.$

$(n\times c')(u_1 + iv_1) + c.c. = 0$

3) As we saw, $DP^{u_1} \neq 0$ because the derivative w.r.t. n is never zero.

Thus DP is invertible since for each u_1, DP^{u_1} is invertible.

Hence P is invertible in a small neighbourhood (in sup-norm topology) of $c = c(u)$ i.e. given any curve of the form $d = d(u)$ in the small neighbourhood of c there exits a normal distribution, n on c and a function $v = v(u)$ such that $d = P^{-1}(n, v)$, i.e. there is a minimal surface connecting c and d.

References

[1] M. J. Beeson, A. J. Tromba: The Cusp Catastrophe of Thom in the Bifurcation of Minimal Surfaces; Manuscipta Math. 46, 273-308, 1984.
[2] U. Dierkes, S. Hildebrandt, A. Küster, O. Wohlrab: Minimal Surfaces I; Springer Verlag, 1991.
[3] D. Lovett: Demonstrating Science with Soap Films: David Lovett; Institute of Physics Publishing.
[4] W. Rudin: Real and Complex Analysis; Tata McGraw-Hill, 1974.
[5] W. Rudin: Functional Analysis; Tata McGraw-Hill, 1973.
[6] J. Munkres: Topology, A First Course; Prentice-Hall of India, 1988.

Address: School of mathematics, Harish-Chandra Research Institute, Chhatnag Road, Jhusi, Allahabad, 211019; email: rkmn@mri.ernet.in