# A FLEXIBLE POLYHEDRON WITHOUT SELF-INTERSECTIONS IN EUCLIDEAN 3-SPACE, ALL OF WHOSE DIHEDRAL ANGLES CHANGE DURING A FLEX

V.A. ALEXANDROV AND E.P. VOLOKITIN

ABSTRACT. We construct a sphere-homeomorphic flexible self-intersection free polyhedron in Euclidean 3-space such that all its dihedral angles change during some flex of this polyhedron. The constructed polyhedron has 26 vertices, 72 edges and 48 faces. To study its properties, we use symbolic computations in the Wolfram Mathematica software system.

*Key words*: Euclidean 3-space, flexible polyhedron, dihedral angle, small diagonal of a polyhedron, segment-triangle intersection algorithm.

UDK: 514.1

MSC: 52C25, 65D18, 68U05

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

In this article, a compact polyhedral surface in Euclidean 3-space  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with or without boundary, all of whose faces are triangles, and which a priori can have self-intersections of any type is called a *polytope*.

A polyhedron P is called *flexible* if its spatial shape can be changed continuously (i.e., without jumps) only by changing its dihedral angles, i.e., if P can be included in a continuous family of polyhedra  $\{P_t\}_{t\in[\alpha,\beta)}$  such that  $P = P_{\alpha}$  and, for any  $t \in (\alpha,\beta)$ ,  $P_{\alpha}$  and  $P_t$  are combinatorially equivalent, their corresponding faces are congruent, while  $P_{\alpha}$  and  $P_t$  themselves are not congruent. We call such a family  $\{P_t\}_{t\in[\alpha,\beta)}$  a *flex* of P, and we call t the *parameter* of the flex.

The first examples of flexible polyhedra without boundary in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  were constructed by R. Bricard in 1897 in [1]. All of them have self-intersections and are combinatorially equivalent to a regular octahedron (which is why they are called flexible octahedra). Moreover, in [1] a classification of all flexible octahedra in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  is given. Nowadays, flexible octahedra are commonly called Bricard octahedra. One can read more about them, e.g., in [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

The theory of flexible polyhedra began to flourish after R. Connelly constructed a flexible polyhedron in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  in 1977 in [6] that is homeomorphic to a sphere and has no self-intersections. As the theory of flexible polyhedra developed, they turned out to have many remarkable properties; for example, for every orientable flexible polyhedron without boundary in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , its integral mean curvature [7], volume [8, 9, 10, 11], and every Dehn invariant [12] are preserved diring the flex.

At the same time, there are still many interesting open questions in the theory of flexible polyhedra. These include the following problem posed by I.Kh. Sabitov:

**Problem 1.** Is there a flexible polyhedron in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , without boundary and without self-intersections, for which all dihedral angles change during the flex?

Its formulation can be found, e.g., in [13, p. 182] and [11, Problem 1.3].

The absence of self-intersections is fundamentally important in Problem 1. Indeed, it is easy to see (see Lemma 1 below) that every dihedral angle of any Bricard octahedron changes during the flex. But all Bricard octahedra have self-intersections.

Theorem 1 gives a positive answer to Problem 1 and is the main result of this article.

**Theorem 1.** In Euclidean 3-space  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , there exists a polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  with the following properties:

- (i)  $\mathscr{P}$  has only triangular faces, has no self-intersections and is homeomorphic to the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$ ,
- (ii) there exists a flex of  $\mathscr{P}$  such that none of its dihedral angles remains constant.

As we were finishing this article, A.A. Gaifullin sent us the graduate work of O.A. Zaslavsky [14], defended under his supervision in 2019 at the Chair of Higher Geometry and Topology of the Mathematics and Mechanics Department at Lomonosov Moscow State University. It turned out that the polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  constructed by us from the formulation of Theorem 1 had already been constructed in [14]; moreover, it was constructed specifically to answer Problem 1. It also turned out that O.A. Zaslavsky argues for the absence of self-intersections in  $\mathscr{P}$  differently than we do, and does not substantiate the fact that all dihedral angles change. The results of O.A. Zaslavsky's graduate work [14] have not yet been published in a refereed journal. Therefore, we decided to publish our proof of Theorem 1.

The plan of the article is as follows. In § 2 we clarify the terminology and recall the construction and properties of the Bricard's octahedron of the first type. In § 3 we recall the information we need about the construction and properties of the Steffen's flexible polyhedron. In § 4 we modify the Steffen's polyhedron so that it can be used to construct the polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  of Theorem 1. In § 5 we propose an algorithm for solving the problem of whether a given polyhedron we verify that it has no self-intersections; by applying its computer implementation to the modified Steffen's polyhedron we verify that it has no self-intersections. In § 6 we explicitly construct a polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  of Theorem 1 and, using the algorithm of § 5 and the *Mathematica* software system [15], verify that it has no self-intersections. In § 7 we construct a special 1-parameter flex of  $\mathscr{P}$  in which none of dihedral angles of  $\mathscr{P}$  remains constant; in this section, we again make use of *Mathematica*. Finally, in § 8 we gather the results of previous sections to obtain a proof of Theorem 1 and formulate open problems related to Problem 1.

## 2. Clarification of terminology and Bricard octahedron of type 1

Since the article will feature polyhedra with self-intersections, it makes sense to clarify the terminology associated with this now.

Let M be an abstract two-dimensional manifold glued from a finite number of Euclidean triangles  $\Delta_k, k = 1, ..., n$ . It is possible that M has a non-empty boundary. Let  $f : M \to \mathbb{R}^3$  be a continuous mapping whose restriction to each  $\Delta_k$  is a linear isometric embedding. Then we call f(M) a polyhedron or polyhedral surface in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . If  $\delta \subset M$  coincides with one of  $\Delta_k$ 's, or with its side or vertex, then we call  $f(\delta)$  a face, edge, or, respectively, a vertex of the polyhedron f(M). A diagonal of a polyhedron is a straight line segment that connects two of its vertices, but is not an edge. A diagonal is called small if its ends belong to adjacent faces.

We say that f(M) has no self-intersections, if  $f: M \to \mathbb{R}^3$  is injective. We call  $x \in f(M)$  a point of self-intersection of f(M), if its complete preimage  $f^{-1}(x) \subset M$  consists of more than one point.

An octahedron is a polyhedron f(M) (convex or non-convex, self-intersecting or not) such that the abstract manifold M is combinatorially equivalent to the regular convex octahedron shown in Fig. 1. Unless otherwise stated, we use notations of Fig. 1 for the vertices of an arbitrary octahedron.



FIGURE 1. Designations of the vertices of a regular tetrahedron.

For our purposes it will be sufficient to recall the construction of only the Bricard octahedron of type 1. For the constructions of Bricard octahedra of types 2 and 3, we refer the reader to the articles [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] and the literature cited therein.

Consider a disk-homeomorphic polyhedron  $\mathscr{D}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  consisting of four triangles  $A_1B_1C_2$ ,  $B_1A_2C_2$ ,  $A_2B_2C_2$ , and  $B_2A_1C_2$ . Its boundary is the closed spatial broken line  $A_1B_1A_2B_2$ , from which we require that the lengths of its opposite sides are equal to each other, i.e., we require that  $|A_1B_1| = |A_2B_2|$  and  $|B_1A_2| = |B_2A_1|$  (see the left part of Fig. 2).



FIGURE 2. Polyhedron  $\mathscr{D}$  and Bricard octahedron of type 1  $\mathscr{B}$ .

Let  $N_A$  denote the midpoint of the segment  $A_1A_2$  and  $N_B$  denote the midpoint of the segment  $B_1B_2$ (see the central part of Fig. 2). If  $N_A \neq N_B$ , then we denote by  $\lambda$  the line passing through  $N_A$  and  $N_B$ (see the central part of Fig. 2). If  $N_A = N_B$ , then we denote by  $\lambda$  the line passing through the point  $N_A = N_B$  perpendicular to the plane containing the segments  $A_1A_2$  and  $B_1B_2$ .

First of all, we note that the quadrilateral  $A_1B_1A_2B_2$  is mapped onto itself under the rotation of the entire space  $\mathbb{R}^3$  around the line  $\lambda$  by 180°. This is obvious if  $N_A = N_B$ . If  $N_A \neq N_B$ , then the equality of triangles  $A_1B_1B_2$  and  $A_2B_1B_2$  implies  $|A_1N_B| = |A_2N_B|$  (see the central part of Fig. 2). Therefore, the triangle  $A_1A_2N_B$  is isosceles. This means that its median  $N_AN_B$  is also its height, i.e. the line  $\lambda = N_AN_B$  is perpendicular to the line  $A_1A_2$ . Therefore, when the entire space is rotated around  $\lambda$  by 180°, the points  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  exchange places. Similarly, starting from the triangles  $A_1A_2B_1$  and  $A_1A_2B_2$  we conclude that the line  $\lambda = N_AN_B$  is perpendicular to the line  $B_1B_2$ , and therefore the points  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  also exchange places when rotating around  $\lambda$  by 180°. Thus, we have proved that under such a rotation the quadrilateral  $A_1B_1A_2B_2$  is mapped into itself.

Now we glue the polyhedron  $\mathscr{D}$  and its image under the rotation of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  around  $\lambda$  by 180° along the sides of the quadrilateral  $A_1B_1A_2B_2$  (see the right part of Fig. 2). The resulting polyhedron is a Bricard octahedron of type 1. We denote it by  $\mathscr{B}$ . The image of the point  $C_2$  under the rotation of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  around  $\lambda$  by 180° is denoted by  $C_1$ .

It follows directly from the above construction that  $\mathscr{B}$  is combinatorially equivalent to an octahedron, has self-intersections and allows a one-parameter flex (recall that, by definition, the Euclidean distance between at least some two vertices of the polyhedron is not preserved during the flex).

To prove Theorem 1 we need one well-known property of the Bricard octahedra (of all types, not just type 1). We formulate and prove it in the form of Lemma 1.

**Lemma 1.** Let a Bricard octahedron be located in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  in such a way that none of its dihedral angles is equal to 0 or  $\pi$ . Then the value of each of its dihedral angles does not remain constant during the flex.

*Proof.* Assume the converse, i.e., assume that one of the dihedral angles remains constant. Without loss of generality, we can assume that this is the angle at the edge  $A_1B_1$  (recall that we use the same notation for the vertices as in Fig. 1). Then the length of the diagonal  $C_1C_2$  is constant during the flex. Hence the lengths of all edges of the tetrahedra  $A_1B_1C_1C_2$  and  $A_1B_2C_1C_2$  remain constant. Thus all dihedral angles of these tetrahedra remain constant. Therefore, the dihedral angle at the edge  $A_1B_2$  of the Bricard octahedron is constant (indeed, it is equal to the dihedral angle of  $A_1B_2C_1C_2$  at  $A_1B_2$ ).

Observe that the triangle  $A_1C_1C_2$  is non-degenerate in the sense that its vertices do not lie on the same line (otherwise the dihedral angle at the edge  $A_1B_1$  of the Bricard octahedron would be equal to 0 or  $\pi$ , which contradicts the conditions of Lemma 1). Consequently, the tetrahedra  $A_1B_1C_1C_2$  and  $A_1B_2C_1C_2$  are adjacent to each other along the nondegenerate face  $A_1C_1C_2$ . This means that the dihedral angles at the edges  $A_1C_1$  and  $A_1C_2$  of the Bricard octahedron are either the sum or the difference of the dihedral angles at the same edges in the tetrahedra  $A_1B_1C_1C_2$  and  $A_1B_2C_1C_2$ , and therefore are also constant during the flex.

Thus, we have proven that if the dihedral angle at the edge  $A_1B_1$  of the Bricard octahedron is constant during the flex, then the dihedral angles at its edges  $A_1B_2$ ,  $A_1C_1$  and  $A_1C_2$  are also constant. In other words, we have proven that if, under the conditions of Lemma 1, a vertex is incident to an edge, the dihedral angle at which remains constant, then the dihedral angles of all edges incident to this vertex remain constant. It immediately follows that the dihedral angles remain constant for all edges of the Bricard octahedron, and therefore the lengths of all its diagonals remain constant. The latter, however, contradicts our definition of the flex. This contradiction proves Lemma 1.

## 3. Steffen polyhedron $\mathscr{S}$

As is known, the flexible Steffen polyhedron, denote it by  $\mathscr{S}$ , is obtained by gluing together a certain tetrahedron, denote it by  $\mathscr{T}$ , and two copies of the same Bricard octahedron of type 1, denote it by  $\mathscr{B}$ . Gluing is carried out along congruent faces. In § 3 we resemble this well-known construction. It can also be found, for example, in [3] and the literature mentioned there. Additional insight into the flex of  $\mathscr{S}$  can be obtained via the computer animation [16].

Let the tetrahedron  $\mathscr{T} = T_1T_2T_3T_4$  (see the left side of Fig. 3) have the following edge lengths:  $|T_1T_4| = 17$ ,  $|T_1T_2| = |T_1T_3| = |T_2T_4| = |T_3T_4| = 12$ , and  $|T_2T_3| = 11$ .  $\mathscr{T}$  will not change its spatial shape during the flex of  $\mathscr{S}$ . Therefore, throughout §§ 3–7 we assume that the points  $T_j$  (j = 1, ..., 4) occupy a fixed position in space.

Let  $\mathscr{B} = A_1 A_2 B_1 B_2 C_1 C_2$  be a Bricard octahedron of type 1 (see the upper right part of Fig. 3), whose edges have the following lengths:  $|A_1 C_1| = |B_1 C_2| = |A_2 C_2| = |B_2 C_1| = 12$ ,  $|A_2 C_1| = |B_1 C_1| = |A_1 C_2| = |B_2 C_2| = 10$ ,  $|A_1 B_1| = |A_2 B_2| = 5$ , and  $|A_1 B_2| = |A_2 B_1| = 11$ .

Let us move  $\mathscr{B}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by means of an orientation-preserving motion so that the following pairs of points coincide:  $T_1$  and  $C_1$ ,  $T_2$  and  $B_2$ , and  $T_3$  and  $A_1$ . Note that here we do not care whether  $\mathscr{T}$ intersects  $\mathscr{B}$ , after the above mentioned motion, somewhere outside the faces  $T_1T_2T_3$  and  $A_1B_2C_1$ . In this case, we say that we have glued  $\mathscr{T}$  and  $\mathscr{B}$  along  $T_1T_2T_3$  and  $A_1B_2C_1$ . Since we want the result of gluing two polyhedra to be a polyhedron again, here and below we mean that both faces along which the gluing was made are deleted. We denote the result of gluing  $\mathscr{T}$  and  $\mathscr{B}$  by  $\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}$ .

Now consider another copy  $\overline{\mathscr{B}} = \overline{A_1}\overline{A_2}\overline{B_1}\overline{B_2}\overline{C_1}\overline{C_2}$  of the Bricard octahedron of type 1 which is obtained from  $\mathscr{B}$  by an orientation-preserving motion of  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Thus, each edge of  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$  has the same length as the corresponding edge of  $\mathscr{B}$ . For example,  $|\overline{A_1}\overline{C_1}| = |A_1C_1| = 12$ .

Glue  $\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}$  and  $\mathscr{B}$  along the faces  $T_2 T_3 T_4$  and  $\overline{A}_1 \overline{B}_2 \overline{C}_1$ , i.e., move  $\mathscr{B}$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by means of an orientationpreserving motion so that the following pairs of vertices coincide:  $T_2$  and  $\overline{B}_2$ ,  $T_3$  and  $\overline{A}_1$ , as well as  $T_4$  and  $\overline{C}_1$  (see the lower right part of Fig. 3). The polyhedron obtained as a result of such gluing is denoted by  $(\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \mathscr{B}$ . Obviously, it is homeomorphic to the disk.

Since  $\mathscr{B}$  and  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$  are Bricard octahedra, the positions of the vertices  $C_2$  and  $\overline{C}_2$  of  $(\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}}$  are not determined uniquely by the above gluing  $\mathscr{T}$  and  $\mathscr{B}$  and the subsequent gluing  $\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}$  and  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$ . In fact, after such gluing,  $C_2$  and  $\overline{C}_2$  can lie at any points of the circle  $\gamma$  defined by the following conditions:  $\gamma$  is located in a plane perpendicular to the segment  $T_2T_3$ ; the center of  $\gamma$  is the midpoint of  $T_2T_3$ ; the radius of  $\gamma$  is equal to  $\sqrt{|A_1C_2|^2 - |A_1B_2|^2/4} = \sqrt{10^2 - 11^2/4} = (3/2)\sqrt{31} \approx 8.35$ . Thus, by choosing some position of  $C_2$  on  $\gamma$ , we can (without changing the position of  $\mathscr{T}$  in space) bend the Bricard octahedron  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$  so that  $\overline{C}_2$  coincides with  $C_2$ . In this position we glue the polyhedron  $(\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}} \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}}$  with itself along the faces  $A_1B_2C_2$  and  $\overline{A_1B_2C_2}$ . Denote the resulting polyhedron by  $((\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}})_{\overline{C}_2=C_2}$ . Observe that, in order  $((\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}})_{\overline{C}_2=C_2}$  is a polyhedron, in the course of gluing we remove not only the internal

5



FIGURE 3. Gluing the Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{S}$ .

points of the glued faces  $A_1B_2C_2$  and  $\overline{A_1B_2C_2}$  (this was already explained above), but also the internal points of the segment  $A_1B_2 = \overline{A_1B_2}$  (which, therefore, is not an edge of  $((\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}})_{\overline{C_2}=C_2})$ ).

It follows directly from the construction that  $((\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}})_{\overline{C}_2=C_2}$  form a continuous family of combinatorially equivalent polyhedra with congruent corresponding faces, and that the polyhedra corresponding to different positions of the point  $\overline{C}_2 = C_2$  on  $\gamma$  are not congruent to each other. Thus, this family is a flex of any of the polyhedra included in it, or, equivalently, any polyhedron in this family is flexible. Let us select one polyhedron in this family as follows.

Let us denote by X the midpoint of the segment  $T_1T_4$ , by Y the midpoint of the segment  $T_2T_3$ , and by Z the intersection point of the ray  $\overrightarrow{XY}$  with the circle  $\gamma$ . If the point  $\overline{C}_2 = C_2$  coincides with Z, then we call  $((\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}})_{\overline{C}_2 = C_2}$  the Steffen polyhedron and denote it by  $\mathscr{S}$ . We consider it a generally known fact that  $\mathscr{S}$  has no self-intersections. Note, however, that the technology we develope in § 5 for checking the absence of self-intersections in a polyhedron allows us to strictly prove that  $\mathscr{S}$ , as well as any polyhedron  $((\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}})_{\overline{C}_2 = C_2}$ , sufficiently close to  $\mathscr{S}$ , indeed has no self-intersections. Although this will not be needed in this article, we can even specify that  $((\mathscr{T} \sqcup \mathscr{B}) \sqcup \overline{\mathscr{B}})_{\overline{C}_2 = C_2}$  has no self-intersections provided the angle between the segments XZ and  $XC_2$  is less than 7.5°.

Using the following agreements, we assign a permanent designation to each vertex V of  $\mathscr{S}$  and always use it in §§ 5–7:

• if, before gluing, V belonged to only one of the polyhedra  $\mathscr{T}$ ,  $\mathscr{B}$  or  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$ , then we reserve for it the designation that it had on that polyhedron;

• if V is the result of gluing a vertex W of  $\mathscr{T}$  with a vertex of  $\mathscr{B}$  and/or  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$ , then we assign the vertex  $V \in \mathscr{S}$  the designation that W had on  $\mathscr{T}$ ;

• if V is the result of gluing a vertex W of  $\mathscr{B}$  with a vertex of  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$ , then we assign the vertex  $V \in \mathscr{S}$  the designation that W had on  $\mathscr{B}$ .

For example, in the process of construction of  $\mathscr{S}$ , we first glued the vertices  $T_3 \in \mathscr{T}$  and  $A_1 \in \mathscr{B}$ , and then glued the resulting point to the vertex  $\overline{A}_1 \in \overline{\mathscr{B}}$ . In accordance with what has been said, we denote the resulting vertex of  $\mathscr{S}$  by  $T_3$ . Another example: at the last stage of construction of  $\mathscr{S}$ , we glued together the vertices  $C_2 \in \mathscr{B}$  and  $\overline{C}_2 \in \overline{\mathscr{B}}$ . Hence, we denote the resulting vertex of  $\mathscr{S}$  by  $C_2$ .

#### 4. Construction of a modified Steffen polyhedron $\mathcal{M}$

By construction, the edge  $T_1T_4$  of the Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{S}$  has length 17. Direct calculations show that the internal dihedral angle at this edge is equal to  $\arccos(45/287) \approx 80^{\circ}59'$ . Let us change the length of  $T_1T_4$  so that it becomes equal to  $\sqrt{334} \approx 18.28$ . We do not change neither the lengths of the remaining edges of  $\mathscr{S}$ , nor the designations of its vertices. The resulting polyhedron is called a *modified Steffen polyhedron* and is denoted by  $\mathscr{M}$ . Direct calculation shows that the dihedral angle of  $\mathscr{M}$  at the edge  $T_1T_4$  is equal to 90°. It is clear directly from the construction of  $\mathscr{M}$  that it is combinatorially equivalent to a sphere, has only triangular faces, and is flexible. The development of  $\mathscr{M}$  is shown in Fig. 4. The reader can scan it, print it on a larger scale on thick paper and glue together a model of  $\mathscr{M}$ . This will simplify the understanding of our further constructions. We especially emphasize that by construction the vertex  $C_2 \in \mathscr{M}$  coincides in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  with the point Z constructed in § 3.



FIGURE 4. The development of a modified Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{M}$ . It must be bent so that the internal dihedral angle of  $\mathscr{M}$  is less than 180° at the edges drawn with solid lines and is greater than 180° at the edges drawn with dotted lines. The sides of the development with identical vertices need to be glued in pairs; more precisely, one must glue in pairs the sides connected to each other by circular arcs, two sides  $T_2C_2$ , and two sides  $T_3C_2$ .

We associate with  $\mathscr{M}$  the following Cartesian coordinate system in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . The origin is at the point X, which was defined in § 3 as the midpoint of the segment  $T_1T_4$ . We choose the *x*-axis so that it passes through the point  $T_3$  and  $T_3$  has a positive *x*-coordinate. We choose the *y*-axis so that it passes through the point  $T_2$  and  $T_2$  has a positive *y*-coordinate. And we choose the *z*-axis so that it passes through the point  $T_1$  and  $T_1$  has a positive *z*-coordinate. We use this and only this coordinate system in §§ 4–7.

Vertex  $A_2$  is connected by edges of  $\mathscr{M}$  with its three vertices  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$  and  $C_2$ , whose coordinates are known to us directly from the constructions of  $\mathscr{M}$  and of the coordinate system. They are shown in Table 1. Using *Mathematica* we solve symbolically the system

$$\begin{cases} |A_2T_1|^2 = 10^2, \\ |A_2T_2|^2 = 5^2, \\ |A_2C_2|^2 = 12^2 \end{cases}$$
(1)

7

of three algebraic equations of the second degree with respect to the coordinates of  $A_2$ , and we obtain two exact (i.e., expressed in radicals) solutions. It is obvious that the two points in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  corresponding to these solutions are symmetrical to each other with respect to the plane passing through the vertices  $T_1$ ,  $T_2$  and  $C_2$ . Considering the model of  $\mathscr{M}$ , we conclude that vertex  $A_2$  corresponds to the solution whose z-coordinate is the largest (since only in this case the inner dihedral angle of  $\mathscr{M}$  at edge  $A_2T_2$ is less than 180°; the latter agrees with the development shown in Fig. 4). We put the exact values of the coordinates of vertex  $A_2$  found in this way on Table 1. The approximate values of the coordinates of vertices shown in Table 1 are not used in our reasoning and are presented solely to make it easier for the reader to imagine the spatial form of  $\mathscr{M}$ . For example, the fact that the approximate value of the *x*-coordinate of point  $A_2$  is negative suggests that  $A_2$  (and therefore  $\mathscr{M}$ ) is not contained in the quarter of the space consisting of the points with positive *x*- and *y*-coordinates.

	x-coordinate	y-coordinate	z-coordinate
$T_1$	0	0	$\frac{\sqrt{167}}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.13$
$T_2$	0	$\frac{11}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 7.77$	0
$T_3$	$\frac{11}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 7.77$	0 O	0
$T_4$	0	0	$-\frac{\sqrt{167}}{\sqrt{2}} \approx -9.13$
$C_2$	$\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.79$	$\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.79$	0
$A_2$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}-2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx -1.19$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 8.89$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx 4.72$
$B_1$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 2.79$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2} + 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 0.05$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx -0.46$
$\overline{A}_2$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2} + 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 0.05$	$\frac{\omega_2 \sqrt{2} - 2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 2.79$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx 0.46$
$\overline{B}_1$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 8.89$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2} - 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx -1.19$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx-4.72$

TABLE 1. Exact and approximate values of the coordinates of the vertices of  $\mathcal{M}$ . All decimal places in approximate values are correct, i.e., are written without taking into account rounding rules. To shorten expressions for exact values, the following notation is used:  $\rho = 167(1712315512948039256 + 297671463726717927\sqrt{31}), \omega_1 = 237(670333576 - 497644539\sqrt{31}), \omega_2 = 3(26431711823 - 892912093\sqrt{31}), \omega_3 = 2798420941 - 176443707\sqrt{31}.$ 

Similarly, we find the exact coordinates of the vertex  $B_1$ . To do this, we use the fact that  $B_1$  is connected by edges of  $\mathscr{M}$  with its three vertices  $T_1$ ,  $T_3$  and  $C_2$ . But this time, from two solutions to the corresponding system of three algebraic equations of the second degree, similar to system (1), we choose the one with the smallest z-coordinate. We put the exact values of the coordinates of  $B_1$  found in this way on Table 1.

We check the correctness of the above described method for recognizing the coordinates of  $A_2$  among solutions of system (1) and the coordinates of  $B_1$  among solutions of a similar system by calculating the length of  $A_2B_1$  through the coordinates of its ends given in Table 1. Symbolic calculations in *Mathematica* show that this length is indeed equal to 11.

The coordinates of the vertices  $\overline{A}_2$  and  $\overline{B}_1$  can be found in the same way as we found the coordinates of the vertices  $A_2$  and  $B_1$ . However, these calculations can be avoided using the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.** The modified Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{M}$  transforms into itself under the action of rotation of the entire space  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by 180° around the line XY passing through the points X and Y, constructed in § 3, i.e. under the rotation of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  defined by the matrix

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Using Table 1, we directly verify that  $L(T_1) = T_4$ ,  $L(T_2) = T_3$ ,  $L(T_3) = T_2$ ,  $L(T_4) = T_1$ , and  $L(C_2) = C_2$ . Therefore, the distances from the point  $L(A_2)$  to the vertices  $T_3$ ,  $T_4$ , and  $C_2$  are the same as the distances from the point  $\overline{B}_1$  to the specified vertices. Indeed,  $|L(A_2)T_3| = |L(A_2)L(T_2)| = |A_2T_2| = |A_2B_2| = 5$  and  $|\overline{B}_1T_3| = |\overline{B}_1\overline{A}_1| = 5$ ;  $|L(A_2)T_4| = |L(A_2)L(T_1)| = |A_2T_1| = |A_2C_1| = 10$  and  $|\overline{B}_1T_4| = |\overline{B}_1\overline{C}_1| = 10$ ;  $|L(A_2)C_2| = |L(A_2)L(C_2)| = |A_2C_2| = 12$  and  $|\overline{B}_1C_2| = 12$ . In addition, both points  $L(A_2)$  and  $\overline{B}_1$  lie on the same side of the plane passing through the vertices  $T_3$ ,  $T_4$ , and  $C_2$ . Indeed, according to Fig. 4, the inner dihedral angle of  $\mathscr{M}$  at both edges  $\overline{B}_1T_3 = \overline{B}_1\overline{A}_1$  and  $A_2T_2 = A_2B_2$  (and hence the edge  $L(A_2)L(T_2) = L(A_2)L(B_2)$ ) is less than 180°. Hence,  $L(A_2) = \overline{B}_1$ .

Reasoning in a similar way, we can prove that the distances from  $L(B_1)$  to the vertices  $T_2 = L(T_3)$ ,  $T_4 = L(T_1)$ ,  $C_2 = L(C_2)$  are the same as distances from  $\overline{A}_2$  to the specified vertices. In addition, by analogy with what was said above, it can be proven that both points  $L(B_1)$  and  $\overline{A}_2$  lie on the same side of the plane passing through  $T_2$ ,  $T_4$ , and  $C_2$ . Hence,  $L(B_1) = \overline{A}_2$ .

Thus, we are convinced that the set of vertices of  $\mathcal{M}$  (as well as the sets of its edges and faces) is mapped onto itself by L. This means that  $\mathcal{M}$  is mapped onto itself by L.  $\Box$ 

The proof of Lemma 2 yields  $\overline{B}_1 = L(A_2)$  and  $\overline{A}_2 = L(B_1)$ . Using these relations, we can find coordinates of  $\overline{A}_2$  and  $\overline{B}_1$  without additional calculations and thereby complete filling out Table 1.

So,  $\mathscr{M}$  has 9 vertices, 21 edges and 14 faces, and has the symmetry described in Lemma 2. The study of flexible and nonrigid frameworks (and therefore polyhedra) with symmetry is in itself an interesting and nontrivial problem, see, e.g., [17] and literature cited there. But we will achieve our goals in the most direct and elementary way, without using general results on the effect of symmetry on the rigidity and flexibility of frameworks.

## 5. Do the polyhedra $\mathscr{M}$ and $\mathscr{S}$ have self-intersections?

To solve Problem 1 we must be able to answer to decide whether a given polyhedron has selfintersections. To simplify and unify our reasoning, in § 5 we describe an algorithm that makes it possible to guarantee the absence of self-intersections for the polyhedra  $\mathscr{S}$ ,  $\mathscr{M}$  and  $\mathscr{P}$  (the latter will be built in § 6) and, of course, not only for them.

The problem of finding intersections and self-intersections of polyhedral surfaces arises in a variety of problems in mathematics and applied mathematics, computer graphics and video games. There are many variations of this problem and dozens of algorithms designed to solve them, see, for example, [18], [19], [20], [21], [22] and the literature mentioned there. However, existing algorithms are not suitable for us for the following reasons:

• we want to solve the problem of finding self-intersections without using of floating point arithmetic, i.e., we allow ourselves to use only symbolic calculations (which we de facto execute in *Mathematica*);

• we want the algorithm to be logically as transparent as possible, and therefore we do not analyze "exceptional cases"; instead, the algorithm must notify us of the occurrence of each such case (i.e., we are not interested in either complete automation of calculations or optimization of their complexity and speed).

9

Therefore, we are forced to develop our own algorithm, the description of which we proceed to.

Recall that, according to §2, a polyhedron is the image f(M) of an abstract two-dimensional manifold M, glued from a finite number of Euclidean triangles  $\Delta_k$ ,  $k = 1, \ldots, n$ , under the action of a continuous map  $f: M \to \mathbb{R}^3$  whose restriction to each triangle  $\Delta_k$  is a linear isometric embedding. The point  $\mathbf{x} \in f(M)$  is a self-intersection point of f(M) if its complete inverse image  $f^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) \subset M$  consists from more than one point.

Our algorithm is based on the following considerations.

Let  $\mathbf{x} \in f(M)$  be a self-intersection point of f(M) and let  $u, v \in M$  be two distinct points in  $f^{-1}(bfx)$ . Denote by  $\Delta_{k_i}$ , i = 1, 2, two different Euclidean triangles from which M is glued, such that  $u \in \Delta_{k_1}$  and  $v \in \Delta_{k_2}$ . Recall that in § 2 we agreed to call the triangles  $f(\Delta_{k_1})$  and  $f(\Delta_{k_2})$  faces of f(M). Fig. 5 illustraits why, for any mutual arrangement of  $f(\Delta_{k_1})$  and  $f(\Delta_{k_2})$ , at least on one of these triangles has a point  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  of intersection of a face and an edge of f(M). Thus, the problem of whether a polyhedron f(M) has self-intersections is reduced to the problem of whether a closed triangle and a closed segment in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  intersect.



FIGURE 5. Self-intersection point  $\mathbf{x}$  of a polyhedron f(M) belonging to faces  $f(\Delta_{k_i}) \subset f(M)$ , i = 1, 2. The point  $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}$  is a point of intersection of a face and an edge of f(M).

To solve the last problem, we use the oriented volume of a tetrahedron. As is known, if  $\mathbf{x}_k = (x_{k,1}, x_{k,2}, x_{k,3})$ , k = 0, 1, 2, 3, are position vectors of the vertices of a tetrahedron in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , then the oriented volume  $\operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$  of this tetrahedron can be calculated using one of the following formulas:

$$\operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{x}_{0}, \mathbf{x}_{1}, \mathbf{x}_{2}, \mathbf{x}_{3}) = \frac{1}{6} \begin{vmatrix} 1 & x_{0,1} & x_{0,2} & x_{0,3} \\ 1 & x_{1,1} & x_{1,2} & x_{1,3} \\ 1 & x_{2,1} & x_{2,2} & x_{2,3} \\ 1 & x_{3,1} & x_{3,2} & x_{3,3} \end{vmatrix} = \frac{1}{6} \begin{vmatrix} x_{1,1} - x_{0,1} & x_{1,2} - x_{0,2} & x_{1,3} - x_{0,3} \\ x_{2,1} - x_{0,1} & x_{2,2} - x_{0,2} & x_{2,3} - x_{0,3} \\ x_{3,1} - x_{0,1} & x_{3,2} - x_{0,2} & x_{3,3} - x_{0,3} \end{vmatrix}.$$
(2)

Recall that the oriented volume of a tetrahedron is equal to its "usual" volume if the triple of vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{x}_0$  is right-oriented; is equal to the number opposite to the "usual" volume, if the triple of vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{x}_0$  is left-oriented, and is equal to zero if the vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{x}_0$  is left-oriented, and is equal to zero if the vectors  $\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_3 - \mathbf{x}_0$  is left-oriented.

So, let a closed triangle  $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  be defined by the coordinates of its vertices  $\mathbf{y}_k = (y_{k,1}, y_{k,2}, y_{k,3})$ , k = 1, 2, 3 and a closed segment  $I \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  is given by the coordinates of its vertices  $\mathbf{z}_j = (z_{j,1}, z_{j,2}, z_{j,3})$ , j = 1, 2. If both determinants

$$6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{z}_1), \qquad 6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{z}_2)$$
(3)

are nonzero and have the same sign, then  $\mathbf{z}_1$  and  $\mathbf{z}_2$  lie srictly to one side of the plane containing  $\Delta$  (see the left side of Fig. 6). Consequently, in this case *I* does not intersect the plane containing  $\Delta$ , and



FIGURE 6. Various cases of mutual arrangement of a triangle  $\Delta$  with vertices  $\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3$ and a segment I with endpoints  $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2$ .

hence  $I \cap \Delta = \emptyset$ . If both determinants (3) are nonzero and have different signs, then  $\mathbf{z}_1$  and  $\mathbf{z}_2$  lie to opposite sides of the plane containing  $\Delta$  (see the central and right parts of Fig. 6). In this case, to figure out whether I and  $\Delta$  intersect, we need to calculate three more determinants:

$$6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2), \qquad 6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3), \qquad 6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{y}_1).$$
(4)

If all determinants (4) are non-zero and have the same sign, then  $I \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset$ . This case is schematically shown in the central part of Fig. 6. To understand why  $I \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset$ , for each point **x** lying on the boundary of the triangle  $\Delta$ , we denote by  $\pi(\mathbf{x})$  the half-plane bounded by the line containing I and passing through **x**. The fact that all three determinants in (4) have the same sign, implies that, when **x** goes around the boundary of  $\Delta$  once, moving all the time in the same direction, the half-plane  $\pi(\mathbf{x})$  also always rotates in the same direction and makes a complete turn around the straight line containing I. This means that the boundary of  $\Delta$  is linked to the staight line containing I. Taking into account that the ends of I lie on opposite sides of the plane containing  $\Delta$ , we conclude that  $I \cap \Delta \neq \emptyset$ .

Similarly, if all three determinants in (4) are nonzero, but not all of them have the same sign, then after  $\mathbf{x}$  circles the boundary of  $\Delta$  once, moving all the time in the same direction, the half-plane  $\pi(\mathbf{x})$  will return to its original position, but will not make a complete turn around the straight line containing I. This means that the boundary of  $\Delta$  and the line containing I are not linked curves. Therefore, in this case  $I \cap \Delta = \emptyset$ .

This algorithm does not work in "exceptional" cases, when at least one of the determinants in (3) and (4) is zero. In principle, it can be improved by introducing new functions, somewhat similar to the determinants in (3) and (4), the use of which will allow us to fully understand each of the "exceptional" cases. But we expect that for the polyhedra  $\mathcal{M}$ ,  $\mathscr{S}$  and  $\mathscr{P}$ , i.e., for the polyhedra of interest to us, there will be no "exceptional" cases at all or they will be very few so that we can study each of them individually. Therefore, in order to avoid complicating the algorithm, when encountering an "exceptional" case, our algorithm only states that the question of the existence of intersections of  $\Delta$  and I requires additional study.

More specifically, our algorithm can be formulated as follows:

Step 1. [Preliminary work for compiling lists of vertices, edges and faces.]

Enumerate the vertices of the abstract manifold M in an arbitrary way. Denote the rth vertex of M by  $v_r$ . The set S of all unordered pairs  $s = (v_p, v_q)$  of vertices of M such that  $v_p$  and  $v_q$  are connected by an edge of M is called the *list of edges* of M. The set T of all unordered triples  $t = (v_i, v_j, v_k)$  of vertices of M such that  $v_i, v_j$  and  $v_k$  are vertices of some face of M is called the *list of faces* of M. Fix a linear order < on the Cartesian product  $T \times S$  of T and S. Generate a list of all vertices  $\mathbf{x}_r = f(v_r) \in \mathbb{R}^3$  of the polyhedron f(M), in which every  $\mathbf{x}_r$  is given by its coordinates in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . Finally, create an empty auxiliary file.

Step 2. [This step begins exhaustion of all pairs  $(t, s) \in T \times S$  and verification whether the intersection  $f(t) \cap f(s)$  is empty. The first time we perform Step 2, we set (t, s) equal to the least element of the ordered set  $(T \times S, <)$ . When Step 2 is repeated, the selection of (t, s) occurs in Step 5. In order to bring the notation closer to those previously used in § 5, we assume that the face  $t \,\subset M$  has vertices  $u_1, u_2, u_3$ , and the edge  $s \subset M$  has vertices  $w_1, w_2$ . We denote the face  $f(t) \subset f(M)$  by  $\Delta$ , denote its vertices by  $\mathbf{y}_k = f(u_k) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , k = 1, 2, 3, and write these vertices in coordinates in the form  $\mathbf{y}_k = (y_{k,1}, y_{k,2}, y_{k,3}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ . Similarly, we denote the edge  $f(s) \subset f(M)$  by I, denote its ends by  $\mathbf{z}_j = f(w_j) \in \mathbb{R}^3, j = 1, 2$ , and write these ends in coordinates in the form  $\mathbf{z}_j = (z_{j,1}, z_{j,2}, z_{j,3}) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ .]

Using the notation just introduced, we can describe Step 2 as follows:

• if t and s are not incident to each other, i.e., if  $u_k \neq w_j$  for all k = 1, 2, 3 and all j = 1, 2, then go to **Step 3**;

• if t and s have exactly one common point, i.e., if the equality  $u_k = w_j$  holds for only one pair of indices k, j, then go to Step 4;

• if t and s have more than one common point (i.e., if for any j = 1, 2 there is k = 1, 2, 3 for which the equality  $u_k = w_j$  holds or, which is the same, if s is a side of t), then directly from the definition, it is clear that the pair (s, t) does not generate self-intersections of f(M), and we go to **Step 5**.

**Step 3.** [The case when t and s are not incident to each other.]

Calculate two determinants  $6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{z}_1)$  and  $6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{z}_2)$  (see formulas (2), (3)). Then, • if at least one of these two determinants is equal to zero, then write the message "The question whether f(t) and f(s) do intersect requires additional study" to the auxiliary file, and go to **Step 5**;

• if both determinants are non-zero and have the same sign, then we conclude that  $f(t) \cap f(s) = \emptyset$ , write nothing to the auxiliary file, and go to **Step 5**;

• if both determinants are non-zero and have different signs, then calculate three more determinants  $6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2)$ ,  $6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3)$ ,  $6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{y}_1)$  (see formulas (2), (4)), and proceed as follows:

 $\diamond$  if at least one of these three determinants is equal to zero, then write the message "The question whether f(t) and f(s) do intersect requires additional study" to the auxiliary file, and go to **Step 5**;

 $\diamond$  if all three determinants are non-zero and have the same sign, then we conclude that  $f(t) \cap f(s) \neq \emptyset$ , write the message "f(t) and f(s) intersect" to the auxiliary file, and go to **Step 5**;

♦ if all three determinants are non-zero but not all have the same sign, then we conclude that  $f(t) \cap f(s) = \emptyset$ , write nothing to the auxiliary file, and go to **Step 5**.

Step 4. [The case when t and s have exactly one common point.]

Calculate two determinants  $6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{z}_1)$  and  $6 \operatorname{Vol}(\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \mathbf{y}_3, \mathbf{z}_2)$  (see formulas (2), (3)). Taking into account that at least one of them is equal to zero, proceed as follows:

• if one of these determinants is not equal to zero, then we conclude that f(s) does not lie in the plane containing f(t) and the pair (s,t) does not contribute to self-intersections of f(M); in this case write nothing to the auxiliary file, and go to **Step 5**.

• if both of these determinants are equal to zero, then we conclude that f(s) lies in the plane containing f(t); in this case write the message "The question whether f(t) and f(s) do intersect requires additional study" to the auxiliary file, and go to **Step 5**.

**Step 5.** [Move to the next pair (t, s) or terminate the algorithm.] Do this:

• if (t, s) is not the maximal element of the linearly ordered set  $(T \times S, <)$ , then replace (t, s) with the next element in the order and go to **Step 2**;

• if (t, s) is the maximal element of  $(T \times S, <)$ , then output the auxiliary file and finish the algorithm. The main result of § 5 is the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.** Modified Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{M}$  is combinatorially equivalent to some partition of the sphere, has only triangular faces, has no self-intersections, and is flexible.

*Proof.* It follows directly from the construction of  $\mathscr{M}$  that it is combinatorially equivalent to the triangulation of the sphere shown in Fig. 4, and is flexible.

We checked the absence of self-intersections using the algorithm described above, implemented in *Mathematica* using exclusively symbolic calculations. Table 1 provides us with the list of vertices of  $\mathcal{M}$  and expressions in radicals for all their coordinates. Lists of edges and faces of  $\mathcal{M}$  can be easily compiled

using Fig. 4. The calculation time was about 0.01 of a second. Our algorithm found no self-intersections of  $\mathcal{M}$  or "exceptional" cases requiring additional study. Based on this, we consider Lemma 3 proven.  $\Box$ 

Although this is not necessary for solution of Problem 1, we have verified that Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{S}$  has no self-intersections. To do this, we applied to  $\mathscr{S}$  reasoning and calculations similar to those given in the proof of Lemma 3. Our algorithm found no self-intersections of  $\mathscr{S}$  or "exceptional" cases requiring additional study.

## 6. Construction of polyhedron $\mathscr{P}$

Let  $\mathscr{M}$  be the modified Steffen polyhedron constructed in § 4. Let  $K : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$  be the rotation around the z-axis by 90° such that  $K(T_3) = T_2$ . In the coordinate system constructed in § 4 and associated with  $\mathscr{M}$ , the rotation K corresponds to the matrix

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
 (5)

Let us consider the images of  $\mathscr{M}$  under the action of the maps  $K, K^2 = K \circ K$  and  $K^3 = K \circ K^2$ , and glue them along the coincided faces. We denote the resulting polyhedron by  $\mathscr{P}$ . It has 26 vertices, 72 edges and 48 faces.

Informally speaking, the main idea of constructing  $\mathscr{P}$  is to "surround" the edge  $T_1T_4$  of  $\mathscr{M}$  with isometric copies of  $\mathscr{M}$  so that  $T_1T_4$  is no longer an edge of  $\mathscr{P}$  and, thus, the question "whether the dihedral angle attached to  $T_1T_4$  is constant" makes no sense. However, for what follows, such a general idea of  $\mathscr{P}$  will not be sufficient. Therefore, we are forced to go into detail.

We denote the vertices of polyhedron  $K(\mathscr{M})$  with the same letters as the corresponding vertices of  $\mathscr{M}$ , but we provide them with a prime. Moreover, we use the same convention as in § 3, namely: if a vertex of  $K(\mathscr{M})$  coincides with a vertex of  $\mathscr{M}$  so that they must be glued together and must be considered as a single vertex of  $\mathscr{P}$ , then for this vertex we always use the notation that it had in  $\mathscr{M}$ . For example, vertex  $T'_1 = K(T_1)$  coincides with  $T_1$  and in  $\mathscr{P}$  is denoted by  $T_1$ ; vertex  $T'_4 = K(T_4)$ coincides with  $T_4$  and is denoted by  $T_4$ ; finally, vertex  $T'_3 = K(T_3)$  coincides with  $T_2$  and is denoted by  $T_2$ . Using these notations we can say that  $\mathscr{M}$  and  $K(\mathscr{M})$  are glued along the coinciding faces  $T_1T_2T_4$ and  $T'_1T'_3T'_4$ , which after gluing "disappear" so that they are not faces of  $\mathscr{P}$ .

Similarly, we denote the vertices of polyhedra  $K^2(\mathscr{M})$  and  $K^3(\mathscr{M})$  with the same letters as the corresponding vertices of  $\mathscr{M}$ , but we provide their with two and three primes, respectively. Moreover, if some vertex of  $\mathscr{P}$  appears in our constructions several times, then we assign to it the name that contains the minimum number of primes. For example, in this notation  $K^3(\mathscr{M})$  and  $\mathscr{M}$  are glued along the coincided faces  $T_1'''T_2'''T_4'''$  and  $T_1T_3T_4$ ; and vertex  $T_2'''$  of  $K^3(\mathscr{M})$  receives the designation  $T_3$  in  $\mathscr{P}$ .

Using these notations and Table 1 we can easily find the coordinates of any vertex of  $\mathscr{P}$ . For example,

$$\begin{aligned} A_2''' &= K^3(A_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} A_2 = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962}, -\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2} - 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998}, \frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2} + 22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \end{pmatrix} \approx (8.89, 1.19, 4.72), \end{aligned}$$

where the expressions  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3$  and  $\rho$  are defined in the caption to Table 1.

The list of all vertices of  $\mathscr{P}$  along with their coordinates is given in Table 2.

We formulate the properties of  $\mathscr{P}$  related to our research in the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** Polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  is combinatorially equivalent to some triangulation of the sphere, has no self-intersections, and is flexible.

*Proof.* It follows directly from the construction of  $\mathscr{P}$  that it is combinatorially equivalent to a triangulation of the sphere and is flexible.

13

	x-coordinate	y-coordinate	z-coordinate
$T_1$	0	0	$\frac{\sqrt{167}}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.13$
$T_2$	0	$\frac{11}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 7.77$	$0^{\sqrt{2}}$
$T_3$	$\frac{11}{\sqrt{2}} \approx 7.77$	$\overset{\vee}{\overset{0}{0}}$	0
$T_4$	0	0	$-\frac{\sqrt{167}}{\sqrt{2}} \approx -9.13$
$C_2$	$\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.79$	$\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.79$	0
$A_2$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}-2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{\underline{1}230304047998} \approx -1.19$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 8.89$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx 4.72$
$B_1$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 2.79$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}+2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 0.05$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx -0.46$
$\overline{A}_2$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}+2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 0.05$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 2.79$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx 0.46$
$\overline{B}_1$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 8.89$	$\frac{\omega_1 \sqrt{2} - 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx -1.19$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx-4.72$
$T'_2$	$-\frac{11}{\sqrt{2}} \approx -7.77$	0	0
$C'_2$	$-\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx -9.79$	$\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.79$	0
$A'_2$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx -8.89$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}-2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx -1.19$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx 4.72$
$B'_1$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}+2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998}\approx-0.05$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 2.79$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx -0.46$
$\overline{A}'_2$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx -2.79$	$\frac{\omega_1 \sqrt{2} + 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 0.05$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx 0.46$
$\overline{B}'_1$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}-2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998}\approx 1.19$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 8.89$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx-4.72$
$T_2''$	0	$-\frac{11}{\sqrt{2}} \approx -7.77$	0
$C_2''$	$-\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx -9.79$	$-\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx -9.79$	0
$A_2''$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}-2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 1.19$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx -8.89$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx 4.72$
$B_1''$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx -2.79$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}+2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998}\approx-0.05$	$\frac{\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx -0.46$
$\overline{A}_2''$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}+2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998}\approx-0.05$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx -2.79$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx 0.46$
$\overline{B}_1''$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx -8.89$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}-2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 1.19$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx-4.72$
$C_{2}'''$	$\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx 9.79$	$-\frac{11+3\sqrt{31}}{2\sqrt{2}} \approx -9.79$	0
$A_2^{\prime\prime\prime}$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 8.89$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}-2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 1.19$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx 4.72$
$B_{1}'''$	$\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2} + 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx 0.05$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx -2.79$	$\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}} \approx -0.46$
$\overline{A}_{2}^{\prime\prime\prime}$	$\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}-2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962} \approx 2.79$	$-\frac{\omega_1\sqrt{2}+2(200-33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998}\approx-0.05$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}-22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx 0.46$
$\overline{B}_1^{\prime\prime\prime}$	$\frac{\omega_1 \sqrt{2} - 2(200 - 33\sqrt{31})\sqrt{\rho}}{1230304047998} \approx -1.19$	$-\frac{\omega_2\sqrt{2}+2\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962}\approx-8.89$	$-\frac{167\omega_3\sqrt{2}+22\sqrt{\rho}}{15573468962\sqrt{167}}\approx -4.72$

TABLE 2. Exact and approximate values of the coordinates of the vertices of  $\mathscr{P}$ . The expressions  $\omega_1$ ,  $\omega_2$ ,  $\omega_3$  and  $\rho$  are defined in the caption to Table 1. All decimal places in approximate values are correct.

We checked the absence of self-intersections using the algorithm that was described in § 5 and was implemented in *Mathematica* using exclusively symbolic calculations. Table 2 provides us with the list of vertices of  $\mathscr{P}$  and expressions in radicals for all their coordinates. Lists of edges and faces of  $\mathscr{P}$  are given in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. The calculation time was less than 0.1 of a second. Our algorithm found no self-intersections of  $\mathscr{P}$  or "exceptional" cases requiring additional study.

# 7. Special flex $\mathscr{P}(t)$ of polyhedron $\mathscr{P}$

Let us start by discussing the flex of the modified Steffen polyhedron  $\mathcal{M}$ .

$\mathscr{P}\cap\mathscr{M}$	$\mathscr{P}\cap K(\mathscr{M})$	$\mathscr{P}\cap K^2(\mathscr{M})$	$\mathscr{P}\cap K^3(\mathscr{M})$	
$T_1T_2$	$T_1T_2'$	$T_1T_2''$	Ø	7
$T_1T_3$	Ø	Ø	Ø	7
$T_1A_2$	$T_1 A'_2$	$T_1 A_2''$	$T_1 A_2^{\prime\prime\prime}$	5
$T_1B_1$	$T_1B'_1$	$T_1B_1''$	$T_1 B_1'''$	5
$T_2T_4$	$T_2'T_4$	$T_{2}''T_{4}$	Ø	7
$T_2C_2$	$T_2'C_2'$	$T_{2}''C_{2}''$	$T_3 C_2'''$	6
$T_2A_2$	$T_2^{\prime}A_2^{\prime}$	$T_{2}''A_{2}''$	$T_3 A_2^{\overline{\prime\prime\prime}}$	5
$T_2\overline{A}_2$	$\overline{T'_2A'_2}$	$T_2''\overline{A}_2''$	$T_3\overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime}$	5
$T_3T_4$	Ø	Ø	Ø	7
$T_3C_2$	$T_2C'_2$	$T'_{2}C''_{2}$	$T_{2}''C_{2}'''$	6
$T_3B_1$	$T_2 B_1^{\prime}$	$\overline{T_2'B_1''}$	$T_{2}''B_{1}'''$	5
$T_3\overline{B}_1$	$T_2\overline{B}'_1$	$T_2'\overline{B}_1''$	$T_2''\overline{B}_1'''$	5
$T_4\overline{A}_2$	$T_4 \overline{A}_2'$	$T_4 \overline{A}_2''$	$T_4 \overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime}$	5
$T_4\overline{B}_1$	$T_4 \overline{B}'_1$	$T_4 \overline{B}_1''$	$T_4\overline{B}_1^{\prime\prime\prime}$	5
$C_2A_2$	$C'_2 A'_2$	$C_2'' A_2''$	$C_2'''A_2'''$	5
$C_2B_1$	$C_2'B_1'$	$C_{2}''B_{1}''$	$C_2'''B_1'''$	5
$C_2\overline{A}_2$	$C'_2 \overline{A}'_2$	$C_2''\overline{A}_2''$	$C_2^{\prime\prime\prime}\overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime}$	5
$C_2\overline{B}_1$	$C_2'\overline{B}_1'$	$C_2''\overline{B}_1''$	$C_2^{\prime\prime\prime}\overline{B}_1^{\prime\prime\prime}$	5
$A_2B_1$	$A_2^{\overline{i}}B_1^{\overline{i}}$	$A_2^{\ddot{\prime}\prime}B_1^{\ddot{\prime}\prime}$	$A_{2}^{\bar{i}''}B_{1}^{\bar{i}''}$	5
$\overline{A}_2\overline{B}_1$	$\overline{A}_2'\overline{B}_1'$	$\overline{A}_2''\overline{B}_1''$	$\overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime}\overline{B}_1^{\prime\prime\prime}$	5

TABLE 3. List of all 72 edges of polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$ . The sign  $\varnothing$  marks cells that are intentionally left empty because the edge corresponding to such a cell has already appeared (in another row) in one of the columns located to the left. The right column contains the numbers of lemmas, from the proof of which it follows that the dihedral angle at each edge in this row is not constant.

$\mathscr{P}\cap\mathscr{M}$	$\mathscr{P}\cap K(\mathscr{M})$	$\mathscr{P}\cap K^2(\mathscr{M})$	$\mathscr{P}\cap K^3(\mathscr{M})$
$T_1 T_2 A_2$	$T_1T_2'A_2'$	$T_1 T_2'' A_2''$	$T_1 T_3 A_2'''$
$T_1T_3B_1$	$T_1T_2B'_1$	$T_1T_2'B_1''$	$T_1 T_2'' B_1'''$
$T_1 A_2 B_1$	$T_1 A_2' B_1'$	$T_1 A_2'' B_1''$	$T_1 A_2''' B_1'''$
$T_2T_4\overline{A}_2$	$T_2'T_4\overline{A}_2'$	$T_2''T_4\overline{A}_2''$	$T_3T_4\overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime}$
$T_2C_2A_2$	$T_2'C_2'A_2'$	$T_2''C_2''A_2''$	$T_3 C_2''' A_2'''$
$T_2C_2\overline{A}_2$	$T_2'C_2'\overline{A}_2'$	$T_2''C_2''\overline{A}_2''$	$T_3 C_2^{\prime\prime\prime} \overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime}$
$T_3T_4\overline{B}_1$	$T_2 T_4 \overline{B}'_1$	$T_2'T_4\overline{B}_1''$	$T_2''T_4\overline{B}_1'''$
$T_3C_2B_1$	$T_2 C'_2 B'_1$	$T_2'C_2''B_1''$	$T_2''C_2'''B_1'''$
$T_3C_2\overline{B}_1$	$T_2 C_2' \overline{B}_1'$	$T_2' C_2'' \overline{B}_1''$	$T_2''C_2'''\overline{B}_1'''$
$T_4\overline{A}_2\overline{B}_1$	$T_4 \overline{A}'_2 \overline{B}'_1$	$T_4 \overline{A}_2'' \overline{B}_1''$	$T_4 \overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime} \overline{B}_1^{\prime\prime\prime}$
$C_2 A_2 B_1$	$C'_2 A'_2 B'_1$	$C_2'' \bar{A_2''} \bar{B_1''}$	$C_2''' \bar{A}_2''' \bar{B}_1'''$
$C_2 \overline{A}_2 \overline{B}_1$	$C_2' \overline{A}_2' \overline{B}_1'$	$C_2'' \overline{A}_2'' \overline{B}_1''$	$C_2^{\prime\prime\prime}\overline{A}_2^{\prime\prime\prime}\overline{B}_1^{\prime\prime\prime}$

TABLE 4. List of all 48 faces of polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$ .

In order to define such a flex, we need to specify the positions of all vertices of  $\mathcal{M}$  as continuous functions of some parameter t so that the distance between any two vertices connected by an edge of  $\mathcal{M}$  does not depend on t, and the distance between at least two vertices not connected by an edge

is not constant. We denote each of these functions by the same symbol as the corresponding vertex of  $\mathscr{M}$ . For example, the vertex  $C_2 \in \mathscr{M}$  corresponds to the function  $C_2(t)$ . The values of these functions for a fixed t are declared to be the vertices of the polyhedron  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  and, by definition, we put that the correspondence "the vertex of  $\mathscr{M} \leftrightarrow$  the value of the function of the same name" defines the combinatorial equivalence of polyhedra  $\mathscr{M}$  and  $\mathscr{M}(t)$ . Finally, since the choice of parameter t is arbitrary, we assume without loss of generality that  $\mathscr{M}(0) = \mathscr{M}$ .

The functions corresponding to the vertices of  $\mathcal{M}$  are defined as follows.

We assume that the vertices  $T_j$ , j = 1, ..., 4, do not change their positions in space, i.e., by definition, we assume  $T_j(t) = T_j$  for all t, where  $T_j$  has the coordinates given in Table 1.

Since the vertex  $C_2(t)$  is connected in  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  by edges to the vertices  $T_2(t) \equiv T_2$  and  $T_3(t) \equiv T_3$ , then it lies on the circle  $\gamma$ , determined by the following conditions:  $\gamma$  lies in a plane perpendicular to the segment  $T_2T_3$ ; the center of  $\gamma$  coincides with the middle point of  $T_2T_3$ ; the radius of  $\gamma$  is equal to  $\sqrt{|A_1C_2|^2 - |A_1B_2|^2/4} = 3\sqrt{31/2}$ . It is the movement of  $C_2(t)$  along  $\gamma$  that sets the flex of  $\mathscr{M}$  (here we do not care whether  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  has self-intersections). Indeed, the positions of the five vertices  $C_2(t)$ ,  $T_j(t)$  $(j = 1, \ldots, 4)$  of  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  uniquely determine the position of every of its other four vertices  $A_2(t)$ ,  $B_1(t)$ ,  $\overline{A_2}(t)$  and  $\overline{B_1}(t)$ , because each of the latter vertices is connected in  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  by three edges to some of the five vertices  $C_2(t)$ ,  $T_j(t)$   $(j = 1, \ldots, 4)$ . Taking into account that the position of each vertex of  $\mathscr{M}(t)$ changes continuously and is known for t = 0 from Table 1, we are convinced that the positions of  $A_2(t)$ ,  $B_1(t)$ ,  $\overline{A_2}(t)$  and  $\overline{B_1}(t)$  are uniquely determined by the positions of  $C_2(t)$ ,  $T_j(t)$   $(j = 1, \ldots, 4)$  for all tsufficiently close to zero (namely, until the three edges mentioned above are not in the same plane). That is why we say that the flex  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  of  $\mathscr{M}$  is defined by the position of  $C_2(t)$ .

Let us discuss the flex of polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$ .

By construction,  $\mathscr{P}$  is obtained by gluing four copies of  $\mathscr{M}$ , namely, by gluing together polyhedra  $\mathscr{M}, K(\mathscr{M}), K^2(\mathscr{M})$  and  $K^3(\mathscr{M})$ . Here, as before,  $K : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$  is the rotation around z-axis by 90°; in particular, the matrix of K in the coordinate system constructed in § 4 which is associated with  $\mathscr{P}$  is given by (5). From what was said at the beginning of § 7 it is clear that, similarly to the movement of vertex  $C_2 \in \mathscr{M}$  along the circle  $\gamma$ , each of the vertices  $C'_2 \in K(\mathscr{M}), C''_2 \in K^2(\mathscr{M})$  and  $C'''_2 \in K^3(\mathscr{M})$  can be moved along the corresponding circle  $K(\gamma), K^2(\gamma), K^3(\gamma)$  independently of each other and of the motion of  $C_2$ . After the positions of the vertices  $C_2(t), C''_2(t), C''_2(t)$  and  $C'''_2(t)$  are given (and taking into account that the positions of the vertices  $T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4, T'_2$  and  $T''_2$  do not change during the flex and are known to us from Table 2), we can uniquely find the positions of all other vertices of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$ . To reflect the possibility of independent changing the positions of  $C_2, C''_2, C''_2$  and  $C'''_2$ , we say that  $\mathscr{P}$  admits a 4-parameter flex.

However, in accordance with the definition of a flexible polyhedron given in § 1, when proving Theorem 1 we need some special flex  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  of  $\mathscr{P}$ , depending on one real parameter t. We distinguish it from the 4-parameter flex of  $\mathscr{P}$  just described by the following three conditions:

- $\mathscr{P}(0) = \mathscr{P};$
- for t = 0, the speed of  $C_2(t)$  is equal to (0, 0, 1);
- for all  $t, \mathscr{P}(t)$  is invariant under the rotation  $K : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{R}^3$  around z-axis by 90°.

We denote the vertices of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  by analogy with the corresponding vertices of  $\mathscr{P}$ . For example, the vertices  $C_2(t)$  and  $A_2''(t)$  of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  correspond to the vertices  $C_2 = C_2(0)$  and  $A_2''(t) = A_2''(0)$  of  $\mathscr{P}$ .

Recall that Lemma 3 from § 5 and Lemma 4 from § 6 state that polyhedra  $\mathscr{M}$  and  $\mathscr{P}$  have no selfintersections. Now we draw the reader's attention to the fact that without any additional calculations we can state that for all t sufficiently close to zero polyhedra  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  and  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  also do not have selfintersections. To prove this, observe that non of the determinants (3) and (4), calculated in the proofs of Lemmas 3 and 4, were equal to zero. Hence, they are nonzero for all t sufficiently close to zero. Having fixed any of these t and repeating the proofs of Lemmas 3 and 4 as applied to  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  and  $\mathscr{P}(t)$ , we come to the conclusion that both  $\mathscr{M}(t)$  and  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  have no self-intersections.

Let us begin to study whether  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  has a dihedral angle, the value of which remains constant for all t sufficiently close to zero. For different dihedral angles we will need different arguments.

**Lemma 5.** The dihedral angle at the edge  $A_2(t)T_1(t) \equiv A_2(t)T_1$  of polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  is not constant as a function of t.

Proof. In  $\mathscr{P}$ , the edge  $A_2T_1$  is incident to faces  $A_2B_1T_1$  and  $A_2B_2T_1$ . Both of these faces belong to the Bricard octahedron  $\mathscr{B}$ , which participated in the construction of the modified Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{M}$ , which, in turn, was used to construct polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  (see §§ 2, 3, 4, 6). The flex  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  of  $\mathscr{P}$ obviously gives rise to the flex  $\mathscr{B}(t)$  of the Bricard octahedron  $\mathscr{B}$  (indeed, the length of each edge of  $\mathscr{B}(t)$  does not depend on t, while the length of the diagonal  $C_2(t)T_1$  is obviously nonconstant as function of t). According to Lemma 1, during the flex of the Bricard octahedron  $\mathscr{B}$  the value of each of its dihedral angles does not remain constant. Hence, the value of the dihedral angle at edge  $A_2(t)T_1$ , considered either as a dihedral angle of the Bricard octahedron  $\mathscr{B}(t)$ , or as a dihedral angle of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$ , is also nonconstant.

Note that in Lemma 5 the edge  $A_2(t)T_1$  can be replaced by any edge of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$ , which is incident to two faces of any Bricard octahedron participating in the construction of  $\mathscr{P}$  (i.e., the Bricard octahedra  $\mathscr{B}$  and  $\overline{\mathscr{B}}$  in notation of § 3, as well as their images under rotations K,  $K^2$  and  $K^3$ ). There are a total of 7 such edges on each part of  $\mathscr{P}$  which corresponds to a single Bricard octahedron. Hence, there are 56 such edges on  $\mathscr{P}$ . Each row of Table 3, consisting entirely of such edges, ends with the number 5. We use this notation to fix the fact that the dihedral angles at the edges in such rows are nonconstant follows from the proof of Lemma 5. Similarly, with numbers 6 and 7 in the last column we mark those rows of Table 3 for which the inconstancy of dihedral angles at the edges in these rows follows from the proofs of Lemmas 6 and 7, respectively.

So, we already know that the dihedral angles at 56 edges do not remain constant during the special flex of  $\mathscr{P}$ . Lemmas 6 and 7 are devoted to the study of the remaining 16 dihedral angles. But before we formulate and prove them, we need to do preparatory work.

Let  $\mathbf{p}_j(t)$ , j = 1, 2, 3, 4, be points which may change their position in space in such a way that the distance between any two of them, except perhaps  $\mathbf{p}_3(t)$  and  $\mathbf{p}_4(t)$ , do not depend on t. Then, as is known (see, for example, [23, Section 3.2]), their velocities  $\mathbf{v}_i(t)$  satisfy the relations

$$(\mathbf{p}_{j}(t) - \mathbf{p}_{k}(t)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{j}(t) - \mathbf{v}_{k}(t)) = 0, \qquad j, k = 1, 2, 3, 4; \ \{j, k\} \neq \{3, 4\}, \tag{6}$$

where  $\cdot$  denotes the standard scalar product in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . It is easy to understand that if the inequality

$$(\mathbf{p}_3(0) - \mathbf{p}_4(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_3(0) - \mathbf{v}_4(0)) \neq 0$$
(7)

holds true, then the derivative, calculated at t = 0, of the dihedral angle between the triangles  $\mathbf{p}_1(t), \mathbf{p}_2(t), \mathbf{p}_3(t)$  and  $\mathbf{p}_1(t), \mathbf{p}_2(t), \mathbf{p}_4(t)$  is not equal to zero, which means the value of this dihedral angle is not constant as a function of t on some sufficiently small interval in  $\mathbb{R}$  containing 0.

**Lemma 6.** Dihedral angles at edges  $C_2(t)T_2(t) \equiv C_2(t)T_2$  and  $C_2(t)T_3(t) \equiv C_2(t)T_3$  of polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  are not constant as functions of t on some sufficiently small interval in  $\mathbb{R}$  containing 0.

Proof. By definition, put  $\mathbf{p}_1(t) = C_2(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_2(t) \equiv T_2$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_3(t) = A_2(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_4(t) = \overline{A}_2(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_5(t) \equiv T_1$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_6(t) \equiv T_4$ , and denote by  $\mathbf{v}_j(t)$ ,  $j = 1, \ldots, 6$ , the velocity of the point  $\mathbf{p}_j(t)$ . To prove the statement of Lemma 6 it is sufficient to prove inequality (7) for t = 0. We do this using symbolic computation in Mathematica.

The coordinates of the points  $\mathbf{p}_1(0) = C_2$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_2(0) = T_2$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_3(0) = A_2$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_4(0) = \overline{A}_2$ ,  $\mathbf{p}_5(0) = T_1$  and  $\mathbf{p}_6(0) = T_4$  in radicals we take from Table 1. The velocity vectors  $\mathbf{v}_1(0) = (0, 0, 1)$  and  $\mathbf{v}_2(0) = \mathbf{v}_5(0) = \mathbf{v}_6(0) = (0, 0, 0)$  are known to us by construction.

The components of the velocity vector  $\mathbf{v}_3(0)$  must satisfy the following system of linear algebraic equations, each of which is similar to equation (6):

$$\begin{cases} (\mathbf{p}_{1}(0) - \mathbf{p}_{3}(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{1}(0) - \mathbf{v}_{3}(0)) = 0, \\ (\mathbf{p}_{2}(0) - \mathbf{p}_{3}(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{2}(0) - \mathbf{v}_{3}(0)) = 0, \\ (\mathbf{p}_{5}(0) - \mathbf{p}_{3}(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{5}(0) - \mathbf{v}_{3}(0)) = 0. \end{cases}$$
(8)

Using *Mathematica*, we solve (8) and find the values of the components of  $\mathbf{v}_3(0)$  in radicals. However, they are too long to be written here. So, we present their approximate numerical values only:  $\mathbf{v}_3(0) \approx (-0.4602, -0.1074, -0.0914)$ , where all decimal places are correct (i.e., we do not apply rounding rules). Similarly, the components of the velocity vector  $\mathbf{v}_3(0)$  must estimate the system of equations.

Similarly, the components of the velocity vector  $\mathbf{v}_4(0)$  must satisfy the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} (\mathbf{p}_{1}(0) - \mathbf{p}_{4}(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{1}(0) - \mathbf{v}_{4}(0)) = 0, \\ (\mathbf{p}_{2}(0) - \mathbf{p}_{4}(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{2}(0) - \mathbf{v}_{4}(0)) = 0, \\ (\mathbf{p}_{6}(0) - \mathbf{p}_{4}(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_{6}(0) - \mathbf{v}_{4}(0)) = 0. \end{cases}$$
(9)

Using *Mathematica*, we solve (9) and find the values of the components of  $\mathbf{v}_4(0)$  in radicals. As before, they are too long to be written here and we present their approximate numerical values only:  $\mathbf{v}_4(0) \approx (-0.0470, -0.0004, 0.0004)$ .

Finally, using *Mathematica* we evaluate the expression

$$(\mathbf{p}_3(0) - \mathbf{p}_4(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_3(0) - \mathbf{v}_4(0)).$$
 (10)

The result, written in radicals, is too long to be given here; but, again with the help of *Mathematica*, we are convinced that it is non-zero in the corresponding extension of the field of rational numbers. The numerical value of expression (10) is equal to -0.5253; this gives us additional confidence in the adequacy of our symbolic calculations. Thus, the statement of Lemma 6 about the inconstancy of the dihedral angle at the edge  $C_2(t)T_2$  of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  is proven.

The statement of Lemma 6 about the inconstancy of the dihedral angle at the edge  $C_2(t)T_3$  of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  can be proven in the same way as we have just proved a similar statement for the angle at the edge  $C_2(t)T_2$ . But we prefer to avoid these additional calculations by noting that the rotation L defined in the statement of Lemma 2 maps the polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  onto itself. To present this reasoning in more detail, we introduce the notation  $\mathbf{q}_1(t) = C_2(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_2(t) \equiv T_3$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_3(t) = \overline{B}_1(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_4(t) = B_1(t)$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_5(t) \equiv T_4$ ,  $\mathbf{q}_6(t) \equiv T_1$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{w}_j(t)$ ,  $j = 1, \ldots, 6$ , the velocity of the point  $\mathbf{q}_j(t)$ . Lemma 2 implies that  $L(\mathbf{q}_j(0)) = \mathbf{p}_j(0)$  for all  $j = 1, \ldots, 6$ . We have already reflected this fact in the Table 1. Taking into account that  $\mathbf{w}_1(0) = (0, 0, 1)$  and  $\mathbf{w}_2(0) = \mathbf{w}_5(0) = \mathbf{w}_6(0) = (0, 0, 0)$ , and writing equations for finding  $\mathbf{w}_3(0)$  and  $\mathbf{w}_4(0)$  by analogy with (8) and (9), we obtain  $L(\mathbf{w}_j(0)) = -\mathbf{v}_j(0)$ ,  $j = 1, \ldots, 6$ . Hence,  $(\mathbf{q}_3(0) - \mathbf{q}_4(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{w}_3(0) - \mathbf{w}_4(0)) = -(\mathbf{p}_3(0) - \mathbf{p}_4(0)) \cdot (\mathbf{v}_3(0) - \mathbf{v}_4(0)) \neq 0$ . As we already know, this inequality implies that the dihedral angle at the edge  $C_2(t)T_3$  is nonconstant.

Note that in Lemma 6 the edges  $C_2T_2$  and  $C_2T_3$  can be replaced by their images under the action of rotations K,  $K^2$  and  $K^3$ . This means that Lemma 6 guarantees us that the eight dihedral angles of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  are not constant as functions of t. This fact is reflected in the right column of Table 3.

**Lemma 7.** Dihedral angles at edges  $T_1T_3$  and  $T_2T_4$  of polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  are not constant as functions of t on some sufficiently small interval in  $\mathbb{R}$  containing 0.

*Proof.* Lemma 7 can be proven similarly to Lemma 6. The proof is left to the reader.  $\Box$ 

Note that in Lemma 7 the edges  $T_1T_3$  and  $T_2T_4$  can be replaced by their images under the action of rotations K,  $K^2$  and  $K^3$ . This means that Lemma 7 guarantees us that the eight dihedral angles of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  are not constant as functions of t. This fact is reflected in the right column of Table 3.

Thus, Lemmas 5, 6 and 7 imply that all 72 dihedral angles of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  are not constant as functions of t on some sufficiently small interval in  $\mathbb{R}$  containing 0.

#### 8. Proof of Theorem 1 and concluding remarks

*Proof.* All components of the proof of Theorem 1 have already appeared in the previous Sections. We just need to put them together.

Let  $\mathscr{P}$  be the polyhedron constructed in § 6. According to Lemma 3,  $\mathscr{P}$  has no self-intersections, is homeomorphic to a sphere, has only triangular faces, and is flexible. Thus, statement (i) of Theorem 1 is fulfilled for  $\mathscr{P}$ .

In § 7 a special flex  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  of  $\mathscr{P}$  is constructed. According to Lemmas 5, 6 and 7, there is a sufficiently small neighborhood of 0 in  $\mathbb{R}$  in which none of the dihedral angles of  $\mathscr{P}(t)$  is constant as a function of t. Reducing the range of t to the segment  $[0, \beta)$  completely contained in this neighborhood, we obtain the family of polyhedra  $\{\mathscr{P}(t)\}_{t\in[0,\beta)}$ , whose existence proves statement (ii) of Theorem 1.

Let us formulate two open Problems 2 and 3, closely related to Problem 1.

**Problem 2.** Is there a one-parametric flexible polyhedron in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , without boundary and without selfintersections, for which all dihedral angles change during the flex?

The concept of a one-parametric flexible polyhedron is intuitively obvious. This is exactly how it was used in [13]. The definition of a *p*-parametric flexible polyhedron requires clarification. It is strictly formulated in [24]. For our purposes, it is sufficient to have an intuitive understanding that flexible Steffen polyhedron  $\mathscr{S}$  is one-parametric, and flexible polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  constructed in § 6 is 4-parametric.

Problem 2 seems interesting to us due to the fact that in mathematics there are many situations where the behavior of an object changes greatly depending on whether it depends on one parameter or on several.

It is obvious that the statement "small diagonal AB of a polyhedron  $\mathscr{R}$  does not change during the flex" is equivalent to the statement "the dihedral angle at the common edge of those two faces of  $\mathscr{R}$  which contain A and B does not change during the flex". Therefore, the following Problem 3 is a generalization of Problem 1.

**Problem 3.** Is there a flexible polyhedron in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , without boundary and without self-intersections, for which all diagonals change during the flex?

Examples show that Problem 3 is non-trivial. Indeed, Bricard octahedra have self-intersections and have no diagonals whose lengths do not change during the flex (see Lemma 1). On the other hand, Steffen flexible polyhedron  $\mathscr{S}$ , modified Steffen flexible polyhedron  $\mathscr{M}$ , and flexible polyhedron  $\mathscr{P}$  constructed in § 6 have no self-intersections, but have diagonals whose lengths do not change during the flex (namely,  $T_2T_3$  for  $\mathscr{S}$  and  $\mathscr{M}$ ; and, for example,  $T_1T_4$  and  $T_2T_3$  for  $\mathscr{P}$ ).

An additional interest to Problem 3 is added by the fact that, unlike Problems 1 and 2, it makes sense not only for orientable polyhedra. Note also that Problem 3 can be considered as a special case of the problem of which lengths of diagonals of a flexible polyhedron must be fixed so that it ceases to be flexible. Various aspects of the latter problem have been studied, for example, in [24], [25], [26].

Note that analogues of Problems 1– 3 can be posed not only in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , but also in any space of constant curvature of dimension  $\geq 3$ , as well as in spaces with an indefinite metric.

In conclusion, let us clarify that all symbolic calculations performed in the preparation of this article were performed using the computer software system *Mathematica* 12.1 [15], license 3322–8225.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank N.P. Dolbilin, A.A. Gaifullin and I.Kh. Sabitov for their interest in this study and useful discussions.

**Funding.** The work was carried out within the State Task to the Sobolev Institute of Mathematics (namely, V.A. Alexandrov was supported by Project FWNF-2022-0006 and E.P. Volokitin was supported by Project FWNF-2022-0005).

## References

- [1] Bricard R. Mémoire sur la théorie de l'octaèdre articulé // J. de Math. Sér. 5. 1897. T. 3. P. 113–148.
- [2] Lebesgue H. Octaèdres articulés de Bricard // Enseign. Math. Sér. 2. 1967. T. 13. P. 175–185.
- [3] Alexandrov V. The Dehn invariants of the Bricard octahedra // J. Geom. 2010. V. 99. P. 1–13.
- [4] Gallet M., Grasegger G., Legerský J., Schicho J. Combinatorics of Bricard's octahedra // C. R., Math., Acad. Sci. Paris. 2021. T. 359, no. 1. P. 7–38.
- [5] Mikhalev S. N. A metric description of flexible octahedra // Sb. Math. 2023. V. 214, no. 7. P. 952–981.
- [6] Connelly R. A counterexample to the rigidity conjecture for polyhedra // Publ. Math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci. 1977.
   V. 47. P. 333–338.

- [7] Alexander R. Lipschitzian mappings and total mean curvature of polyhedral surfaces. I // Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 1985. V. 288, no. 2. P. 661–678.
- [8] Sabitov I. Kh. The volume of a polyhedron as a function of its metric [in Russian] // Fundam. Prikl. Mat. 1996. V. 2, no. 4. P. 1235–1246.
- [9] Connelly R., Sabitov I., Walz A. The Bellows conjecture // Beitr. Algebra Geom. 1997. V. 38, no. 1. P. 1–10.
- [10] Sabitov I. Kh. The volume as a metric invariant of polyhedra // Discrete Comput. Geom. 1998. V. 20, no. 4. P. 405–425.
- [11] Gaifullin A. A. Flexible polyhedra and their volumes // V. Mehrmann (ed.) et al. European congress of mathematics. Proceedings of the 7th ECM, Berlin, Germany, July 18–22, 2016. Zürich: European Mathematical Society, 2018. P. 63–83.
- [12] Gaifullin A. A., Ignashchenko L. S. Dehn invariant and scissors congruence of flexible polyhedra // Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 2018. V. 302. P. 130–145.
- [13] Shtogrin M. I. On flexible polyhedral surfaces // Proc. Steklov Inst. Math. 2015. V. 288. P. 153–164.
- [14] Zaslavskij O. A. Diagonals of flexible polyhedra: graduate work [in Russian]. Moscow: Lomonosov Moscow State University, 2019.
- [15] Wolfram S. The Mathematica book. Version 4. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- [16] McClure M. Steffen's flexible polyhedron [Electronic resource] // Wolfram Demonstrations Project. 2007. URL: http://demonstrations.wolfram.com/SteffensFlexiblePolyhedron/
- [17] Clinch K, Nixon A., Schulze B., Whiteley W. Pairing symmetries for Euclidean and spherical frameworks // Discrete Comput. Geom. 2020. V. 64, N 2. P. 483–518.
- [18] Gilbert E. G., Johnson D. W., Keerthi S. S. A fast procedure for computing the distance between complex objects in three-dimensional space // IEEE Journal of Robotics and Automation. 1988. V. 4, no. 2. P. 193–203.
- [19] Glaeser G., Stachel H. Open geometry: OpenGL + advanced geometry. Berlin: Springer, 1999.
- [20] Ericson Ch. Real-time collision detection. San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, 2005.
- [21] Jiménez J. J., Segura R. J., Feito F. R. A robust segment/triangle intersection algorithm for interference tests. Efficiency study // Comput. Geom. 2010. V. 43, no. 5, 474–492.
- [22] Mount D. M. Geometric intersection. In: C.D. Toth (ed.) et al. Handbook of discrete and computational geometry. 3rd ed. Boca Raton: CRC Press, 2017. P. 1113–1134.
- [23] Connelly R., Guest S. D. Frameworks, tensegrities, and symmetry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- [24] Maksimov I. G., Sabitov I. Kh. On the notion of the combinatorial p-parametric property for polyhedra // Sib. Math. J. 2002. V. 43, no. 4. P. 661–673.
- [25] Sabitov I. Kh. On polyhedra with calculable diagonals // Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo (2), Suppl. 2002. V. 70. P. 289–294.
- [26] Sabitov I. Kh. Algebraic methods for solution of polyhedra // Russ. Math. Surv. 2011. V. 66, no. 3. P. 445–505.

SOBOLEV INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, KOPTYUG AVE., 4, NOVOSIBIRSK, 630090, RUSSIA AND DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS, NOVOSIBIRSK STATE UNIVERSITY, PIROGOV STR., 2, NOVOSIBIRSK, 630090, RUSSIA

#### ORCID iD: 0000-0002-6622-8214

Email address: alex@math.nsc.ru

SOBOLEV INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, KOPTYUG AVE., 4, NOVOSIBIRSK, 630090, RUSSIA AND DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS, NOVOSIBIRSK STATE UNIVERSITY, PIROGOV STR., 2, NOVOSIBIRSK, 630090, RUSSIA ORCID iD: 0000-0002-2646-7800

Email address: volok@math.nsc.ru