



Ants and bracket generating distributions in dimensions 5 and 6[☆]

Andrei Agrachev^a, Paweł Nurowski^{b,*}

^a Scuola Internazionale Superiore di Studi Avanzati, via Bonomea, 265 34136 Trieste, Italy

^b Centrum Fizyki Teoretycznej, Polska Akademia Nauk, Al. Lotników 32/46, 02-668 Warszawa, Poland



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 18 March 2021

Received in revised form 19 July 2022

Accepted 15 September 2022

Available online 8 November 2022

Keywords:

Nonholonomic systems with symmetry

Linear constraints

Abnormal extremals

ABSTRACT

We consider a mechanical system of three ants on the floor, in two situations. In the first situation ants move according to **Rule A**, which forces the velocity of any given ant to always point at a neighboring ant; in the second situation ants move according to **Rule B**, which forces the velocity of every ant to be parallel to the line defined by the two other ants. We observe that **Rule A** equips the 6-dimensional configuration space of the ants with a structure of a homogeneous (3, 6) distribution, and that **Rule B** foliates this 6-dimensional configuration space onto 5-dimensional leaves, each of which is equipped with a homogeneous (2, 3, 5) distribution. The symmetry properties and the local invariants of these distributions are determined.

In the case of **Rule B** we study and determine the singular trajectories (abnormal extremals) of the corresponding distributions. We show that these satisfy an interesting system of two ODEs of Fuchsian type.

© 2022 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Rules of motion

This article is next in the series of papers (Agrachev, 2007; Agrachev & Sachkov, 1999; An & Nurowski, 2014; Bor, Lamonedá, & Nurowski, 2018; Bor & Montgomery, 2009; Bryant & Hsu, 1993; Eastwood & Nurowski, 2020a, 2020b; Hill & Nurowski, 2022) presenting simple nonholonomic mechanical systems which are homogeneous models of various parabolic geometries (Čap & Slovák, 2009). The recent examples of such systems included in this series are very good tools to view in physical terms the main concepts of the parabolic geometry theory. Rather than model the dynamics of the mechanical systems in question, in our case instead of describing the dynamics of the movements of the ants, these papers provide visual examples to illustrate geometry of nonholonomic constraints, and make a direct connection between an abstract mathematical theory (parabolic geometry) and physics (nonholonomic mechanics).

Although nonholonomic mechanical systems are only briefly mentioned in the usual classical mechanics university courses

[☆] Support: The research leading to these results has received funding from the Norwegian Financial Mechanism 2014–2021 with project registration number 2019/34/H/ST1/00636. It was also partially supported by the Polish National Science Centre (NCN) via the grant number 2018/29/B/ST1/02583. The material in this paper was not presented at any conference. This paper was recommended for publication in revised form by Associate Editor Aneel Tanwani under the direction of Editor Daniel Liberzon.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: agrachev@sissa.it (A. Agrachev), nurowski@cft.edu.pl (P. Nurowski).

there are plenty of them in real life. Even those with linear nonholonomic constraints are in abundance: such systems like a skate blade on the plane, a car, trailers, robotic joints and many other man created devices provide examples. Also modeling of movements of animals, such as a movement of a snake, or a falling cat, results in studying systems with nonholonomic constraints.

This short note provides yet another set of examples of this sort. More specifically, we consider three *trained* ants on the floor, idealized as three points \vec{r}_1 , \vec{r}_2 and \vec{r}_3 on the plane, which move according to the rules imposed on them by their trainer.

The rules are the **Rules A** and **B** below, and we will analyze two *separate* situations: that the ants move by obeying either **rule A only**, or **rule B only**. Here are the rules:

Rule A: At every moment of time the velocity vector of a given ant, $\frac{d\vec{r}_i}{dt}$, should be *aligned* with the direction $\vec{r}_{i+1} - \vec{r}_i$ of the line defined by the ant at \vec{r}_i and the next ant at \vec{r}_{i+1} .

Rule B: At every moment of time the velocity vector of a given ant, $\frac{d\vec{r}_i}{dt}$, should be *parallel* to the direction $\vec{r}_{i+1} - \vec{r}_{i+2}$ of a line defined by the other two ants.

• In both rules, $i, j = 1, 2, 3$, and the sum of two indices, $i + j$ is counted modulo 3. We will assume this convention about sums of indices also in the following.

Regardless whether the situation is governed by **rule A** or **B**, the configuration space M of the considered mechanical system is six dimensional. It can be, for example, (locally) parametrized by six real numbers corresponding to the $2 \times 3 = 6$ coordinates $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3)$ of the three points $\vec{r}_i = (x_i, y_i)$ in a

chosen Cartesian coordinate system (x, y) on the plane. In this parametrization the movement of the system of ants is described in terms of a curve $m(t) = (x_1(t), y_1(t), x_2(t), y_2(t), x_3(t), y_3(t))$, and its velocity at time t is given by $\dot{m}(t) = (\dot{x}_1(t), \dot{y}_1(t), \dot{x}_2(t), \dot{y}_2(t), \dot{x}_3(t), \dot{y}_3(t))$.

Now, since **rule A** imposes that $\frac{d\vec{r}_i}{dt} \parallel (\vec{r}_{i+1} - \vec{r}_i)$ and **rule B** imposes that $\frac{d\vec{r}_i}{dt} \parallel (\vec{r}_{i+1} - \vec{r}_{i+2})$, we see that the movement of ants under the **rule A** has velocities constrained according to:

$$(y_{i+1} - y_i)\dot{x}_i - (x_{i+1} - x_i)\dot{y}_i = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad \text{RuleA,}$$

and that the movement of ants under the **rule B** have velocities constrained according to:

$$(y_{i+1} - y_{i+2})\dot{x}_i - (x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})\dot{y}_i = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad \text{RuleB.}$$

In both cases the velocity constraints of the systems, the *nonholonomic* constraints as they are called, are *linear*. Thus the space of admissible velocities at each point q of the configuration space M is a *vector subspace* D_q of the tangent space T_qM . Since in both cases we have *three* independent velocity constraints at each point $q \in M$ the vector spaces D_q are 3-dimensional, and as such, collected point by point, define rank *three* distributions \mathcal{D} on M .

Let us first make a brief analysis of the geometry of the pair (M, \mathcal{D}) in the case of ants moving under **rule A**.

2. The rule ‘every ant is chased by precisely one other ant’ results in a (3, 6) distribution

In case of **rule A** the distribution \mathcal{D} of admissible velocities on M is given by the *annihilator* of the following three 1-forms:

$$\omega_i = (y_{i+1} - y_i)dx_i - (x_{i+1} - x_i)dy_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

or which is the same, is spanned by the three vector fields

$$Z_i = (x_{i+1} - x_i)\partial_{x_i} + (y_{i+1} - y_i)\partial_{y_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \quad (1)$$

on M ,

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3).$$

Taking the commutators (Lie brackets) of the vector fields Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 spanning the distribution \mathcal{D} we get three new vector fields

$$Z_{i,i+1} = [Z_i, Z_{i+1}] =$$

$$(x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})\partial_{x_i} + (y_{i+1} - y_{i+2})\partial_{y_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Now, calculating $Z_1 \wedge Z_2 \wedge Z_3 \wedge Z_{12} \wedge Z_{31} \wedge Z_{23}$, one gets

$$Z_1 \wedge Z_2 \wedge Z_3 \wedge Z_{12} \wedge Z_{31} \wedge Z_{23} =$$

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^3 (y_i x_{i+1} - x_i y_{i+1}) \right)^3 \partial_{x_1} \wedge \partial_{y_1} \wedge \partial_{x_2} \wedge \partial_{y_2} \wedge \partial_{x_3} \wedge \partial_{y_3},$$

so it follows that the six vector fields $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, Z_{12}, Z_{31}, Z_{23}$ are *linearly independent* at each point m of the configuration space M , *except* the points on the singular locus, where coordinates of m satisfy

$$32A = \sum_{i=1}^3 (y_i x_{i+1} - x_i y_{i+1}) = 0. \quad (2)$$

Since the number A defined above is the *area* of the triangle having the three ants as its vertices, we see that this happens for those configurations when three ants stay on a line.

At this stage we recall a concept of the *growth vector* of a vector distribution. Given any vector distribution \mathcal{D} we consider the following sequence $\{\mathcal{D}^l\}$ of derived distributions: The 0th element of this sequence is $\mathcal{D}^0 = \mathcal{D}$, and distributions \mathcal{D}^l , with $l = 0, 1, \dots$, are defined recursively as $\mathcal{D}^{l+1} = [\mathcal{D}^l, \mathcal{D}^l] + \mathcal{D}^l$. Here

$[\mathcal{D}^l, \mathcal{D}^l]$ denotes the set consisting of all linear combinations¹ of all commutators of vector fields forming the distribution \mathcal{D}^l . The *growth vector* of \mathcal{D} is a vector (r_0, r_1, \dots, r_K) , whose integer components r_l are the respective *ranks* of the derived distributions \mathcal{D}^l , $r_l = \text{rank}(\mathcal{D}^l)$. Note that the growth vector typically vary from point to point, but there are important examples of distributions, such as those considered in this paper, when the growth vector is *constant* over large open sets. Note also that the last number r_K in the sequence (r_0, r_1, \dots, r_K) cannot exceed the dimension n of the manifold M on which the distribution \mathcal{D} resides, $r_K \leq n$. If the last component r_K of the growth vector of a distribution \mathcal{D} is equal to the dimension n of the manifold M , then the distribution \mathcal{D} is called *bracket generating*. If a bracket generating distribution \mathcal{D} is in addition a velocity distribution of a mechanical system, such system is *controllable*.

Having said this, we summarize our observations about the velocity distribution \mathcal{D} of the three ants moving under **rule A**: The *growth vector* of this distribution is $(3, 6)$ everywhere, except those points in the configuration space which correspond to the three ants staying on a line. A short term for describing this property of \mathcal{D} is to say that \mathcal{D} is a $(3, 6)$ distribution. In particular, the control system $\dot{q} = u_1 Z_1(q) + u_2 Z_2(q) + u_3 Z_3(q)$, associated with the ants moving under **rule A**, is controllable.

Rank 3 distributions have *differential invariants* (Bryant, 2006). We recall, that two distributions \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 on respective manifolds M_1 and M_2 are (locally) equivalent,² if and only if there exists a (local) diffeomorphism $\phi : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ transforming distribution \mathcal{D}_1 to distribution \mathcal{D}_2 . In particular the statement about rank 3 distributions having invariants, means that there are locally *nonequivalent* rank 3 distributions on 6-dimensional manifolds. Actually, there are *infinitely many* of nonequivalent ones. Among them the $(3, 6)$ distributions are generic, and the growth vector $(3, 6)$ distinguishes them locally from, for example, distributions with the growth vector $(3, 5)$; these latter distributions are rank 3 distributions \mathcal{D} in dimension 6 such that in the sequence $\mathcal{D}^0 = \mathcal{D}$, $\mathcal{D}^{l+1} = [\mathcal{D}^l, \mathcal{D}^l] + \mathcal{D}^l$, with $l = 0, 1, \dots$, the distribution \mathcal{D}^1 is *involutiv*³ and has rank 5. More importantly, there are locally nonequivalent $(3, 6)$ distributions.

One way of characterizing distributions locally is to determine their Lie algebra of symmetries. Given a manifold M and distribution \mathcal{D} , the Lie algebra of symmetries of \mathcal{D} consists of vector fields X on M such that $[X, \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathcal{D}$. Here $[X, \mathcal{D}]$ denotes the space consisting of commutators (Lie brackets) of the vector field X with all vector fields belonging to \mathcal{D} . Equivalently, a vector field X is a symmetry of \mathcal{D} , if the local flow ϕ_t^X of X satisfies $(\phi_t^X)_* \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{D}$. It is known (Bryant, 1979, 2006) that for rank 3 distributions with the growth vector $(3, 6)$ the maximal algebra of symmetries is attained for the distribution locally given in Cartesian coordinates (q^i, p_j) in \mathbb{R}^6 as the annihilator of three 1-forms $\lambda_i = dp_i + \epsilon_{ijk} q^j dq^k$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Here we used the Einstein summation convention stating that repeated indices are summed over; we also used the totally skew-symmetric Levi-Civita symbol ϵ_{ijk} in \mathbb{R}^3 , which is zero when any two indices are the same, and otherwise, is $+1$ or -1 , depending on the sign of permutation of the three indices ijk . This maximally symmetric distribution has its Lie algebra of symmetries isomorphic to the 21-dimensional Lie algebra $\mathfrak{spin}(4, 3)$ (see Bryant, 1979, 2006).

¹ With functional coefficients.

² The equivalence of distributions \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_2 is denoted by $\phi_* \mathcal{D}_1 = \mathcal{D}_2$ to remind that the equivalence is obtained by the diffeomorphism ϕ . The notation encodes the property that the vectors spanning the distribution \mathcal{D}_1 at point q in M_1 , after being transformed by ϕ to the point $\phi(q)$ in M_2 , span there the same vector subspace of the tangent space $T_{\phi(q)}M_2$ as the vector space $\mathcal{D}_2(\phi(q))$ of the distribution \mathcal{D}_2 .

³ Some mathematicians prefer the term *integrable* here.

Since the velocity distribution \mathcal{D} of the system of three ants moving according **rule A** has growth vector (3, 6) almost everywhere, it is interesting to ask what is its Lie algebra of symmetries. The answer is given by the following Theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *The Lie algebra of all symmetries of the velocity distribution \mathcal{D} of the system of three ants moving according **rule A** is isomorphic to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$. In coordinates $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3)$ in \mathbb{R}^6 , as in (1), the 8 independent local symmetries of $\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$ are:*

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \partial_{x_1} + \partial_{x_2} + \partial_{x_3}, \\ X_2 &= \partial_{y_1} + \partial_{y_2} + \partial_{y_3}, \\ X_3 &= y_1 \partial_{x_1} + y_2 \partial_{x_2} + y_3 \partial_{x_3}, \\ X_4 &= x_1 \partial_{y_1} + x_2 \partial_{y_2} + x_3 \partial_{y_3}, \\ X_5 &= x_1 \partial_{x_1} + x_2 \partial_{x_2} + x_3 \partial_{x_3}, \\ X_6 &= y_1 \partial_{y_1} + y_2 \partial_{y_2} + y_3 \partial_{y_3}, \\ X_7 &= x_1 y_1 \partial_{x_1} + x_2 y_2 \partial_{x_2} + x_3 y_3 \partial_{x_3} + y_1^2 \partial_{y_1} + y_2^2 \partial_{y_2} + y_3^2 \partial_{y_3}, \\ X_8 &= x_1^2 \partial_{x_1} + x_2^2 \partial_{x_2} + x_3^2 \partial_{x_3} + x_1 y_1 \partial_{y_1} + x_2 y_2 \partial_{y_2} + x_3 y_3 \partial_{y_3}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.2. We proved this theorem by explicitly solving the symmetry equations $[X, \mathcal{D}] \subset \mathcal{D}$ for the velocity distribution \mathcal{D} on \mathbb{R}^6 , with coordinates $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3)$, as in (1). A reader can convince himself that the eight vector fields X_i from the Theorem are really the symmetries of \mathcal{D} by taking Lie brackets of X_i s with all the velocity distribution generators Z_i and observing that all these brackets belong to $\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$. Another way of seeing that $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$ is included in the symmetry algebra is to observe that the mechanical system of ants moving by **rule A** is defined in terms of no other notions than *points, lines* and their *incidence relations*⁴ in the plane. These are notions of the *projective geometry* on the plane. A convenient *model* of this geometry is the geometry of *points and lines* lying in the plane $z = 1$ of the Cartesian space \mathbb{R}^3 with coordinates (x, y, z) . In this model *lines* and *points* in the $z = 1$ plane are the respective intersections of those planes or lines in \mathbb{R}^3 , which contain the \mathbb{R}^3 space origin $(x, y, z) = (0, 0, 0)$. Since the Lie group $\mathbf{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ naturally acts on the planes and lines passing through the origin in \mathbb{R}^3 , it also acts on the intersection of these planes and lines with the plane $z = 1$, namely on the *lines* and *points* in the $z = 1$ plane. This $\mathbf{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ action on the lines and points lying in the $z = 1$ plane is *not effective*, as the scaling group element, a multiple λI of the identity in $\mathbf{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, stretches planes and lines in \mathbb{R}^3 merely, and in turn does not move the corresponding lines and points in the $z = 1$ plane. The group that acts effectively on lines and points in the $z = 1$ plane, is a group $\mathbf{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, which is an 8-dimensional *quotient* Lie group $\mathbf{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})/(\lambda I)$. And this group, the *projective linear group* $\mathbf{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$, is the *symmetry group* of the *projective geometry on the plane*, i.e. of the *geometry of lines and points in the plane*. Therefore if we look for a group of symmetries of the ants-under-**rule A**-distribution- \mathcal{D} , a distribution that is entirely defined in terms of projectively invariant notions such as *points, lines and their incidence in the plane*, this group must contain $\mathbf{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ – a group whose *Lie algebra* is the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$. The local symmetries of the distribution are given in terms of the Lie algebra of its group of (local) symmetries. Therefore the ants' distribution \mathcal{D} must be *at least* $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$ *symmetric*. Actually, our Theorem says *more*: the Lie algebra of symmetries of \mathcal{D} is *equal* to $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$. This does not follow from the simple arguments mentioned in this remark. We proved it by explicitly solving the symmetry equations.

⁴ Such as 'a point lying on a line' or 'lines intersecting themselves or not', etc.

Remark 2.3. Thus although the symmetry of this (3, 6) distribution is far from being maximal among all (3, 6) distributions, the ants distribution \mathcal{D} , considered in this section, can be locally identified with one of the *homogeneous models* of (3, 6) distributions, a model that lives on the homogeneous manifold $\mathbf{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})/\mathbb{T}^2$, where \mathbb{T}^2 is the maximal torus in $\mathbf{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})$. That, this is the case is obvious from the explicit formulas for the symmetry vector fields X_i in **Theorem 2.1**. Indeed, the symmetry vector field X_1 is a local version of the *scaling of all coordinates* x_1, x_2 and x_3 *by the same number*; likewise the symmetry vector field X_2 is a local version of the *scaling of all coordinates* y_1, y_2 and y_3 *by (perhaps) another number*. Looking at Eqs. (1) defining generators Z_i of the distribution, one sees that such *scalings* do not change these generators at all. This shows that these two symmetries belong to the *isotropy subalgebra*, and since $[X_1, X_2] = 0$, the corresponding local *isotropy group* is a direct sum $H \oplus H$ of two copies of a 1-dimensional Lie group H .⁵ Thus, if we want to have a *global model* of the ants-under-**rule A**-manifold- M , i.e. a 6-dimensional manifold \tilde{M} whose local portions are in one to one correspondence with those parts of M on which the distribution \mathcal{D} is (3, 6), we may take $\tilde{M} = \mathbf{PGL}(3, \mathbb{R})/\mathbb{T}^2$. This is because $H \oplus H$ globalizes to the 2-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{S}^1 \oplus \mathbb{S}^1$, where the circle \mathbb{S}^1 has e.g. a group structure of the *complex numbers* $z \in \mathbb{C}$, whose modulus is equal to one, $|z| = 1$.

Remark 2.4. We close this section, with a remark that the vector space over the real numbers spanned by the symmetry vector fields $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5 - X_6$ form a Lie algebra isomorphic to the *semidirect product* of the simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and the commutative Lie algebra \mathbb{R}^2 . This product is denoted by $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$, so that

$$\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2 = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5 - X_6).$$

Here vector fields X_1 and X_2 on \mathbb{R}^6 correspond to translations in the plane in respective directions ∂_x and ∂_y . The vector fields X_3, X_4 and $X_5 - X_6$ correspond to the linear transformations of the plane with unit determinant. In particular we have the following identifications of the respective Lie algebra elements:

$$X_3 \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, X_4 \sim \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } X_5 - X_6 \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

3. The rule 'each ant moves in a parallel to the line defined by the other two' is not so simple

Now, applying **rule B** to the movement of the three ants, we find that their velocity distribution \mathcal{D} is given by the annihilator of the three 1-forms

$$\omega_i = (y_{i+1} - y_{i+2})dx_i - (x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})dy_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

It can be spanned by the three vector fields

$$Z_i = (x_{i+1} - x_{i+2})\partial_{x_i} + (y_{i+1} - y_{i+2})\partial_{y_i}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3 \tag{3}$$

on M ,

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3).$$

The commutators of the vector fields Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 spanning \mathcal{D} are

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{i,i+1} &= [Z_i, Z_{i+1}] = \\ &= (x_i - x_{i+2})\partial_{x_i} + (x_{i+2} - x_{i+1})\partial_{x_{i+1}} + \\ &= (y_i - y_{i+2})\partial_{y_i} + (y_{i+2} - y_{i+1})\partial_{y_{i+1}}, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

And now the story is *different* than in the case of **rule A**. Calculating $Z_1 \wedge Z_2 \wedge Z_3 \wedge Z_{12} \wedge Z_{31} \wedge Z_{23}$, one gets

$$Z_1 \wedge Z_2 \wedge Z_3 \wedge Z_{12} \wedge Z_{31} \wedge Z_{23} = 0.$$

⁵ All 1-dimensional Lie groups are locally isomorphic!

So the rank of the derived distribution $\mathcal{D}^1 = [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] + \mathcal{D}$ is smaller than 6. The velocity distribution \mathcal{D} for the rule B is not bracket generating! Actually one easily finds that there is precisely one linear relation between the vector fields $(Z_1, Z_2, Z_2, Z_{12}, Z_{31}, Z_{23})$, namely

$$Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_3 + Z_{12} + Z_{31} + Z_{23} = 0. \tag{5}$$

This shows that the velocity distribution \mathcal{D} for the ants moving under **rule B** has the growth vector $(3, 5)$. The first derived distribution \mathcal{D}^1 has rank 5 and is involutive! The 6-dimensional configuration space M of ants being in a motion obeying **rule B** is foliated by 5-dimensional leaves. Once ants are in the configuration belonging to a given 5-dimensional leaf in M they can not leave this leaf by moving according **rule B**! This system is non-controllable: its configuration space splits into 5-dimensional orbits.

Now the question arises about the function that enumerates the leaves of the foliation of the distribution \mathcal{D}^1 . What is the feature of motion of the ants whose preservation forces the ants to stay on a given leaf?

There is a quick algebraic answer to this question:

To see it, note that

$$d(\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3) = 0.$$

this means that there exists a function F such that

$$dF = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3.$$

One can directly check that

$$F = 32 A,$$

where A is as in (2). Since all three vector fields Z_i as in (3) annihilate ω_i , and thus they annihilate the 1-form $\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3 = 32dA$, and in turn they annihilate the one form dA , then they are tangent to the 5-dimensional submanifolds $A = \text{const}$ in M .

This shows that the ants under **rule B** move in a way such that the triangle having them as its vertices has always the same area! This proves the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *The triangle with vertices formed by three ants moving according **rule B** has in every moment of time the same area.*

Apart of the algebraic proof of this proposition given above, it can be also seen by a 'pure thought' observing that any movement of the three ants obeying **rule B** is a superposition of three primitive moves: an ant $\#i$ moves, and ants $\#(i + 1)$ and $\#(i + 2)$ rest, for each $i = 1, 2, 3$. In each of the three primitive situations, since the vertex $\#i$ of the triangle moves in a line parallel to the corresponding base $\#(i + 1) - \#(i + 2)$ of the triangle, the area of the triangle formed by the ants $\#1, \#2$ and $\#3$ is obviously unchanged. Since the general movement according to **rule B** is a linear combination of the three primitive movements preserving the area, it also preserves the area.

So we see that the movement of the ants according to **rule B** stratifies the configuration space: once in an initial position the ants defined a triangle Δ of area A , they move on a 5-dimensional submanifold M_A of M whose configuration points correspond to triangles Δ' having the same area A as Δ . For each fixed A , the three vector fields (Z_1, Z_2, Z_3) as in (3) are tangent to the five manifold M_A . They define a distribution $\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(Z_1, Z_2, Z_3)$ there, whose growth vector is $(3, 5)$.

The 3-distribution \mathcal{D} on each leaf M_A is actually a square of a rank 2-distribution \mathcal{D} . By this we mean that there is a rank 2-distribution \mathcal{D} such that its first derived distribution $\mathcal{D}^1 = [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] + \mathcal{D}$ equals \mathcal{D} . Indeed, consider

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(Z_1 - Z_2, Z_3 - Z_1)$$

with Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 as in (3). Since $[Z_1 - Z_2, Z_3 - Z_1] = -Z_{12} - Z_{31} - Z_{23}$, with Z_{ij} as in (4), then using relation (5) we get

$$[Z_1 - Z_2, Z_3 - Z_1] = Z_1 + Z_2 + Z_3$$

and consequently

$$[Z_1 - Z_2, Z_1 - Z_3] \wedge (Z_1 - Z_2) \wedge (Z_3 - Z_1) = 3Z_3 \wedge Z_2 \wedge Z_1.$$

This shows (i) that for each $A = \text{const}$ the commutator $[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}]$ is tangent to M_A and (ii) that the first derived distribution of \mathcal{D} on M_A is the entire 3-distribution, $[\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] + \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}$. Thus we have just established the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *The 6-dimensional configuration space M of three ants moving on the plane according to **rule B** is foliated by 5-dimensional submanifolds M_A consisting of configuration points defining triangles of equal area A on the plane. The ants obeying **rule B** must stay on a given leaf M_A of the foliation during their motion. Their velocity distribution \mathcal{D} of rank 3, defines a rank 2 distribution \mathcal{D} , which is the 'square root' of \mathcal{D} ,*

$$\mathcal{D} = [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] + \mathcal{D}.$$

The rank 2 distribution \mathcal{D} has the growth vector $(2, 3, 5)$ on each leaf M_A .

We recall that rank 2 distributions with growth vector $(2, 3, 5)$ on 5-dimensional manifolds have local differential invariants (Cartan, 1910). In particular their symmetry algebra can be as large as 14-dimensional Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_2^* of the split real form⁶ of the simple exceptional complex Lie group \mathbf{G}_2 . This happens for the rank 2 distribution given on a 5-dimensional quadric $p_i q^i = 1$ in \mathbb{R}^6 , with coordinates (q^i, p_i) , as the annihilator of three 1-forms $\lambda_i = dp_i + \epsilon_{ijk} q^j dq^k, i = 1, 2, 3$.

The rank 2 distribution \mathcal{D} on each 5-dimensional leaf M_A has a 5-dimensional Lie algebra of symmetries corresponding to the Lie group of affine transformations of the plane preserving area. In coordinates $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3)$ in $M = \mathbb{R}^6$ the Lie algebra of these transformations is spanned by the five symmetry vector fields $(X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4, X_5 - X_6)$ from Remark 2.4. Denoting by S a vector field

$$S = a_1 X_1 + a_2 X_2 + a_3 X_3 + a_4 X_4 + a_5 (X_5 - X_6),$$

with $a_\mu = \text{const}, \mu = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, one can directly check that for A given by (2) and for Z_i given by (3) we have:

$$S(A) = 0,$$

$$[S, Z_1 - Z_2] \wedge (Z_1 - Z_2) \wedge (Z_3 - Z_1) = 0$$

and

$$[S, Z_3 - Z_1] \wedge (Z_1 - Z_2) \wedge (Z_3 - Z_1) = 0.$$

We invoked this algebraic argument, if the reader would not agree with us that the $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ symmetry of the rank 2 distribution \mathcal{D} is obvious.

We are now in a position to state the theorem, which will be proven in the subsequent sections of the article:

Theorem 3.3. *The Lie algebra of all symmetries of the velocity distribution \mathcal{D} of the system of three ants moving on the plane according to **rule B** is isomorphic to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ of*

⁶ Similarly to the complex Lie group $\mathbf{SO}(3, \mathbb{C})$ which has two real forms $\mathbf{SO}(3)$ and $\mathbf{SO}(1, 2)$, the complex simple exceptional Lie group \mathbf{G}_2 has also two real forms. One of these forms is compact, like $\mathbf{SO}(3)$, and the other is non-compact, like $\mathbf{SO}(1, 2)$. This second non-compact real form of complex group \mathbf{G}_2 is denoted by \mathbf{G}_2^* , with the Lie algebra denoted by \mathfrak{g}_2^* ; in the structural theory of simple Lie groups the real Lie group \mathbf{G}_2^* is called the split real form of complex \mathbf{G}_2 . It is this real form of the complex Lie group \mathbf{G}_2 , namely the split \mathbf{G}_2^* , that is relevant in the geometry of $(2, 3, 5)$ distributions.

group of motions on the plane preserving volume. The distribution is one of the homogeneous models of (2, 3, 5) distribution, which can be locally realized on the 5-manifold being the group $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$.

The fundamental invariant of \mathcal{D} , its harmonic curvature encapsulated in the so called Cartan quartic, is of algebraic type D, or what is the same, has no real roots.

Remark 3.4. The definition of the Cartan quartic for (2, 3, 5) distributions is beyond the scope of this article (see [Cartan, 1910](#), and [An & Nurowski, 2018](#), p. 94, for details). Here, we only mention that it gives a neat way of expressing the lowest order local differential invariant of any (2, 3, 5) distribution. This is given as a certain totally symmetric tensor C_{ABCD} , $A, B, C, D = 1, 2$, with respect to the action of the $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ group. The tensor C_{ABCD} has five real components $A_1 = C_{1111}, A_2 = C_{1112}, A_3 = C_{1122}, A_4 = C_{1222}, A_5 = C_{2222}$ which are used to encapsulate it in the quartic, the Cartan quartic, of a (2, 3, 5) distribution. This quartic reads: $C(z) = A_1 + 4A_2z + 6A_3z^2 + 4A_4z^3 + A_5z^4$, with a complex variable $z \in \mathbb{C}$. The number and multiplicities of roots of this quartic, considered as polynomial in variable z , provide particularly simple invariants of a (2, 3, 5) distribution. A number of cases for the number of roots and their multiplicities may happen. Here we only say that the Cartan quartic of a (2, 3, 5) distribution is of type D, if the Cartan quartic has one pair of mutually complex conjugated roots, each of them having multiplicity two.

Remark 3.5. A reader who is interested in the Cartan's approach to the geometry of the distribution \mathcal{D} can now jump directly to Section 6. [Theorem 3.3](#) is proven there in the spirit of Cartan's 5-variables paper ([Cartan, 1910](#)). There is however another approach to the analysis of invariant properties of distributions used by geometric control theorists, which we discuss now. This approach uses the important notion of singular trajectories (or abnormal extremals). In the next two sections we will determine these trajectories for ants distributions, and will prove [Theorem 3.3](#) using the ideas related to them.

4. Singular trajectories for ants' movement

We start this section with generalities about singular trajectories for vector distributions, and then we apply this to determine these trajectories for the distributions associated with the ants movement under the **rules A and B**.

Let $\mathcal{D} \subset TM$ be a smooth vector distribution on a smooth manifold M and $\mathcal{D}^\perp \subset T^*M$ be its annihilator. We denote by $\mathcal{D}_0^\perp \subset \mathcal{D}^\perp$ the bundle \mathcal{D}^\perp with the removed zero section.

Recall that the cotangent bundle T^*M is equipped with a canonical symplectic form σ .

Definition 4.1. A Lipschitz curve $t \mapsto \lambda(t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$, in \mathcal{D}_0^\perp is called a singular or an abnormal extremal of \mathcal{D} if $\dot{\lambda} \in \ker(\sigma|_{\mathcal{D}^\perp})$. The projection of $\lambda(\cdot)$ to M is called singular trajectory or abnormal geodesic.

Let us explain the geometric meaning of the introduced notions and thus motivate the terminology. We will do it without going to analytic details which can be found in first chapters of the book ([Agrachev, Barilari, & Boscain, 2020](#)). Let

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{D}} = \{\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow M \mid \dot{\gamma}(t) \in \mathcal{D}_{\gamma(t)}M, 0 \leq t \leq 1\},$$

be the space of integral curves of the distribution \mathcal{D} and $F_t : \Omega_{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow M$ be the evaluation map, $F_t(\gamma) = \gamma(t)$. Then singular trajectories are just critical points of the "boundary map" $(F_0, F_1) : \Omega_{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow M \times M$.

Moreover, let γ be a singular trajectory; the curve

$$t \mapsto \lambda(t) \in T_{\gamma(t)}^*M \setminus \{0\}, \quad 0 \leq t \leq 1,$$

is a singular extremal if and only if

$$\lambda(t)D_\gamma F_t = \lambda(s)D_\gamma F_s, \quad \forall t, s \in [0, 1].$$

Here $D_\gamma F_t : T_\gamma \Omega \rightarrow T_{\gamma(t)}M$ is the differential of F_t at γ , $\lambda(t) : T_{\gamma(t)}M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda(t)D_\gamma F_t$ is the composition of the linear map $D_\gamma F_t$ and linear form $\lambda(t)$

We see that $\lambda(t)$ plays the role of "Lagrange multipliers" corresponding to critical points. Indeed, γ is a critical point of the map (F_0, F_1) if and only if there exists a pair of covectors $(\lambda(0), \lambda(1)) \neq 0$ such that $\lambda(0)D_\gamma F_0 = \lambda(1)D_\gamma F_1$. Moreover, if γ is a critical point of the "boundary map", then the restriction of the curve γ to any segment $[t, s] \subset [0, 1]$ is also a critical point of the boundary map.

To effectively compute singular extremals, we use the Pontryagin Maximum Principle which exploits the Hamiltonian language. Given a smooth function $h : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, Hamiltonian vector field \vec{h} on T^*M is defined by the identity $dh = \sigma(\cdot, \vec{h})$. The Poisson bracket $\{a, b\}$ of two functions on T^*M is defined by the formula $\{a, b\} = \langle db, \vec{a} \rangle = \sigma(\vec{a}, \vec{b})$ and provides $C^\infty(T^*M)$ with the structure of a Lie algebra.

For any subset $S \subset T_\lambda(T^*M)$, we denote by $S^\perp \subset T_\lambda(T^*M)$ the skew-orthogonal complement of S ,

$$S^\perp = \{\xi \in T_\lambda(T^*M) \mid \sigma(\xi, S) = 0\};$$

then $(S^\perp)^\perp = \text{Span} S$. If λ is a regular point of a function $a : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $a(\lambda) = c$, then $T_\lambda a^{-1}(c) = \ker d_\lambda a = \vec{a}(\lambda)^\perp$.

Assume that vector fields Z_1, \dots, Z_k on M generate the distribution \mathcal{D} , i.e.

$$\mathcal{D}|_q = \text{Span}(Z_1(q), \dots, Z_k(q)), \quad \forall q \in M.$$

We define $h_i : T^*M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, k$, by the formula:

$$h_i(\lambda) = \langle \lambda, Z_i(q) \rangle, \quad \forall \lambda \in T_q^*M, q \in M.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{D}^\perp = \bigcap_{i=1}^k h_i^{-1}(0), \quad T_\lambda \mathcal{D}^\perp = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \ker d_\lambda h_i$$

and

$$(T_\lambda \mathcal{D}^\perp)^\perp = \text{Span}\{\vec{h}_1(\lambda), \dots, \vec{h}_k(\lambda)\}.$$

We have: $\ker(\sigma|_{\mathcal{D}^\perp}) = (T\mathcal{D}^\perp) \cap (T\mathcal{D}^\perp)^\perp$. Hence a curve $t \mapsto \lambda(t)$ in T^*M is a singular extremal if and only if there exist real functions $t \mapsto u_i(t)$, $t \in [0, 1]$, usually called control function, such that

$$\dot{\lambda}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^k u_i(t)\vec{h}_i(\lambda(t)) \quad \text{and} \quad h_i(\lambda(t)) \equiv 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

More notations: we set $h_{ij} = \{h_i, h_j\}$, $H_{ij} = \{h_{ij}\}_{i,j=1}^k$ and we have:

$$h_{ij}(\lambda) = \langle \lambda, [Z_i, Z_j](q) \rangle, \quad \forall \lambda \in T_q^*M, q \in M.$$

We differentiate identities $h_i(\lambda(t)) \equiv 0$ in virtue of the differential equation and obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^k u_j(t)h_{ij}(\lambda(t)) \equiv 0.$$

In other words, $u(t) \in \ker H_{ij}(\lambda(t))$.

In our models **A** and **B**, $H_{ij}(\lambda)$ is a nonzero 3×3 -matrix, $\forall \lambda \in T_q^*M \setminus \{0\}$, $q \in M$. Hence the anti-symmetric matrix H_{ij} has a one-dimensional kernel spanned by the vector

$(u_1, u_2, u_3) = (h_{23}, h_{31}, h_{12})$. It follows that any singular extremal, up-to a reparametrization, is a solution of the differential equation

$$\dot{\lambda} = h_{23}(\lambda)\vec{h}_1(\lambda) + h_{31}(\lambda)\vec{h}_2(\lambda) + h_{12}(\lambda)\vec{h}_3(\lambda). \tag{6}$$

Moreover, \mathcal{D}^\perp is an invariant submanifold of the dynamical system (6) on T^*M . Indeed, $\frac{d}{dt}h_i(\lambda(t)) = h_{ij}h_j + h_{ji}h_{li} = 0$ in virtue of (6), where $i \neq j \neq l$. It follows that, up-to reparametrizations, singular extremals are exactly trajectories of the dynamical system (6) starting at nonzero elements of \mathcal{D}^\perp . Note that the right-hand side of (6) is anti-symmetric with respect to permutations of the indices $(1, 2, 3)$.

The projection of Eq. (6) to M has a form:

$$\dot{q} = h_{23}Z_1(q) + h_{31}Z_2(q) + h_{12}Z_3(q) = \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i Z_i(q).$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{d}{dt}h_{j,j+1}(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i \langle h_i, h_{j,j+1} \rangle(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i \langle \lambda, [Z_i, [Z_j, Z_{j+1}]] \rangle. \tag{7}$$

In both models **A** and **B**, $\text{Span}(Z_i, [Z_j, Z_{j+1}], i, j = 1, 2, 3)$ is a Lie algebra. This is a 6-dimensional Lie algebra of the group of affine transformations of the plane in the case **A** and a 5-dimensional algebra of the group of area preserving affine transformations of the plane in the case **B**. In the last case we have: $\sum_{i=1}^3 (Z_i + [Z_i, Z_{i+1}]) = 0$.

Anyway, in both cases vector fields $[Z_i, [Z_j, Z_{j+1}]]$ are linear combinations of the vector fields $Z_1, Z_2, Z_3, [Z_2, Z_3], [Z_3, Z_1], [Z_1, Z_2]$ with constant coefficients. Hence the function $\lambda \mapsto \langle \lambda, [Z_i, [Z_j, Z_{j+1}]] \rangle$ is a linear combination of functions

$$h_1(\lambda), h_2(\lambda), h_3(\lambda), h_{23}(\lambda), h_{31}(\lambda), h_{12}(\lambda), \quad \lambda \in T^*M, \tag{8}$$

with the same constant coefficients. If $\lambda \in \mathcal{D}^\perp$, then first three elements of the sequence (8) vanish and last three elements are just u_1, u_2, u_3 . Coming back to (7) we obtain that \dot{u}_i is a quadratic function of $u_1, u_2, u_3, i = 1, 2, 3$.

A straightforward calculation of Lie brackets gives:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_1 = -u_1(u_1 + u_2) \\ \dot{u}_2 = -u_2(u_2 + u_3) \\ \dot{u}_3 = -u_3(u_3 + u_1), \end{cases} \tag{A}$$

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_1 = u_1(u_2 - u_3) \\ \dot{u}_2 = u_2(u_3 - u_1) \\ \dot{u}_3 = u_3(u_1 - u_2). \end{cases} \tag{B}$$

Now we focus on the case **B** and postpone for the future the apparently more complicated case **A**. Recall that in this case $u_1 + u_2 + u_3 = 0$. Moreover, the product $u_1 u_2 u_3$ is the first integral of system (B) and thus the system is integrable. In addition, system (B) is anti-symmetric with respect to the permutation of variables and the central reflection $(u_1, u_2, u_3) \mapsto (-u_1, -u_2, -u_3)$. The fact that $u_1(t)u_2(t)u_3(t) = \text{const}$ along trajectories of (B) implies that $u_i(t)$ do not change sign. We see that it is enough to study the system in the domain $u_1, u_2 \geq 0, u_3 = -u_1 - u_2$.

Let $z_1 = x_1 + iy_1, z_2 = x_2 + iy_2, z_3 = x_3 + iy_3$ be the vertices of the triangle; then $Z_i = \langle z_{i+1} - z_{i+2}, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} \rangle, i = 1, 2, 3$. Singular trajectories are solutions of the system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{z}_1 = u_1(z_2 - z_3) \\ \dot{z}_2 = u_2(z_3 - z_1) \\ \dot{z}_3 = u_3(z_1 - z_2), \end{cases}$$

where u_1, u_2, u_3 satisfy (B).

Let $z_0 = \frac{1}{3}(z_1 + z_2 + z_3)$ be the barycenter of the triangle. A direct differentiation gives that $\dot{z}_0(t) \equiv 0$, i.e. the barycenter moves along a straight line with constant velocity.

Moreover, given a triangle and a straight line through its barycenter, there is exactly one singular trajectory whose barycenter moves along this line.

We set $\zeta_i = z_i - z_0, i = 1, 2, 3$, so that $\zeta_1 + \zeta_2 + \zeta_3 = 0$. Now we eliminate variables $u_3 = -u_1 - u_2$ and $\zeta_3 = -\zeta_1 - \zeta_2$ from the differential equations and arrive to the system:

$$\begin{cases} \dot{u}_1 = u_1(u_1 + 2u_2) \\ \dot{u}_2 = -u_2(2u_1 + u_2), \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \dot{\zeta}_1 = (u_1 + u_2)\zeta_1 + u_1\zeta_2 \\ \dot{\zeta}_2 = -u_2\zeta_1 - (u_1 + u_2)\zeta_2. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

We also have: $\dot{z}_0 = u_1\zeta_2 - u_2\zeta_1 = \text{const}$. Another polynomial first integral of system (9) is already mentioned function $u_1 u_2 (u_1 + u_2)$.

System (9) can be easily solved; the solution is expressed in elliptic functions. We denote by e the velocity of the barycenter of the triangle, $e = u_1\zeta_2 - u_2\zeta_1$, it does not depend on t . We have

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\zeta}_1 = (u_1 + 2u_2)\zeta_1 + e \\ \dot{\zeta}_2 = -(2u_1 + u_2)\zeta_2 + e. \end{cases}$$

In other words,

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\zeta}_1 = \frac{\dot{u}_1}{u_2}\zeta_1 + e \\ \dot{\zeta}_2 = -\frac{\dot{u}_2}{u_2}\zeta_2 + e. \end{cases}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_1(t) &= \frac{u_1(t)}{u_1(0)} \zeta_1(0) + \int_0^t \frac{u_1(\tau)}{u_1(\tau)} d\tau e, \\ \zeta_2(t) &= \frac{u_2(t)}{u_2(0)} \zeta_2(0) + \int_0^t \frac{u_2(\tau)}{u_2(\tau)} d\tau e. \end{aligned}$$

Let $u_1^2 u_2 + u_1 u_2^2 = c$; then $2u_1 u_2 = \sqrt{u_1^2 + 4u_1 c} - u_1^2$ and we obtain $\dot{u}_1 = \sqrt{u_1(u_1^3 + 4c)}$. Similarly, $\dot{u}_2 = \sqrt{u_2(u_2^3 + 4c)}$. Hence

$$\int_{r_1}^{u_1} \frac{dv}{\sqrt{v(v^3 + 4c)}} = t = \int_{u_2}^{r_2} \frac{dv}{\sqrt{v(v^3 + 4c)}},$$

where $r_1 = u_1(0), r_2 = u_2(0)$. So t is presented as elliptic integrals of u_1 and u_2 . Relations between the constants:

$$r_1 r_2 (r_1 + r_2) = c, \quad r_1 \zeta_2(0) - r_2 \zeta_1(0) = e.$$

Another alternative way to study the same system is to try to eliminate variables u_1, u_2 and focus completely on the vertices of the triangles. Let $v_1 = u_1 + u_2, v_2 = u_1 u_2$ be elementary symmetric functions of u_1, u_2 and $\delta = u_1 - u_2$ the discriminant. We have:

$$\dot{v}_1 = \delta v_1, \quad \dot{v}_2 = -\delta v_2, \quad \dot{\delta} = v_1^2 + 2v_2, \quad \delta^2 = v_1^2 - 4v_2.$$

The case $v_1 = 0$ corresponds to the constant trajectory (recall that we are working in the domain $u_1, u_2 \geq 0$). Let $v_1 \neq 0$. The case $v_2 = 0$ corresponds to a singular trajectory with a fixed vertex of the triangle. This is a singular trajectory whose barycenter moves along the line connecting the barycenter with the vertex.

The equations are very simple in this case. We leave the calculations to a reader as an exercise and formulate only the final result: Let $z_1(t) = \text{const}$, then, for all t , the passing through z_1 median of the triangle is a segment of one and the same straight line, the opposite to z_1 side of the triangle remains parallel to itself and the length of this side is regulated by the constant area condition.

Now turn to the main case $v_2 \neq 0$. We see that $\delta > 0$; the permutation of u_1 and u_2 changes the sign of δ and we can restrict ourselves to the study of the parts of trajectories in the domain $\delta > 0$. Let us make a time substitution in our system and introduce new time s according to the rule $\frac{ds}{dt} = \delta$. Then $\frac{dv_1}{ds} = v_1$, $\frac{dv_2}{ds} = -v_2$. Hence $v_1(s) = c_1 e^s$, $v_2(s) = c_2 e^{-s}$.

Moreover, $u_1 = \frac{1}{2}(v_1(s) + \delta)$, $u_2 = \frac{1}{2}(v_1 - \delta)$ and we have:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\xi_1}{ds} = \frac{v_1}{\delta} \xi_1 + \left(\frac{v_1}{\delta} + 1\right) \frac{\xi_2}{2} \\ \frac{d\xi_2}{ds} = \left(\frac{v_1}{\delta} - 1\right) \frac{\xi_1}{2} - \frac{v_1}{\delta} \xi_2. \end{cases}$$

Now we make one more change of the time variable:

$$\tau = \frac{v_1(s)}{\delta(s)} = (1 - ce^{-3s})^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $c = \frac{4c_2}{c_1^2}$. Then $\frac{d\tau}{ds} = \frac{3}{2}\tau(1 - \tau^2)$ and we obtain:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{d\xi_1}{d\tau} = \frac{2\tau}{3(1 - \tau^2)} \xi_1 + \frac{\xi_2}{3\tau(1 - \tau)} \\ \frac{d\xi_2}{d\tau} = \frac{\xi_1}{3\tau(1 + \tau)} - \frac{2\xi_2}{3(1 - \tau^2)} \end{cases}$$

This is a Fuchsian system with 3 poles $-1, 0, 1$. We can rewrite it in the canonical matrix form:

$$3 \frac{d\Psi}{d\tau} = \left[\frac{1}{\tau - 1} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{\tau} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{1 + \tau} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \right] \Psi,$$

where $\Psi = (\xi_1, \xi_2)^*$. Note that the three 2×2 matrices appearing in this equation form a basis of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$. In principle, this kind of systems (with 3 poles) is resolved in the Gauss hypergeometric function. The following explicit expression is obtained by Renat Gontsov (Moscow): $\Psi(\tau) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} X\left(\frac{2\tau}{\tau+1}\right)$, where

$$X(t) = (t - 1)^{-1/3} t^{1/3} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{8}{5}(t - 1)t & 2t - 1 \\ 0 & t - 1 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} F\left(\frac{5}{3}, \frac{7}{3}, \frac{8}{3}; t\right) & -\frac{5}{4} t^{-5/3} \\ F\left(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{4}{3}, \frac{5}{3}; t\right) & t^{-2/3} \end{pmatrix}$$

and $F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma; t)$ is the Gauss hypergeometric function. Recall that

$$F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma; t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(\alpha)_j (\beta)_j}{(\gamma)_j j!} t^j,$$

where $(\alpha)_j = \alpha(\alpha + 1) \dots (\alpha + j - 1)$. We see that $\gamma - \alpha = 1$ in the explicit expression; this corresponds to the so called degenerate case of the hypergeometric equation (see Bateman & Erdelyi, 1954) and should lead to a further simplification of the expression. It would be nice to get a clear geometric interpretation of the computed singular trajectories.

Actually, all this story is a benefit performance of the number 3! It is continued in the next section.

5. Sub-Riemannian structure and Cartan quartic

Here we show how the structure of the Cartan quartic is determined by the natural symmetries of the distribution \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 5.1. *Given a triangle Δ in the plane, there exists a unique ellipse C_Δ such that C_Δ contains the vertices of the triangle and the tangent line to C_Δ at any vertex is parallel to the opposite side of the triangle.*

Proof. The desired properties are preserved by the affine transformations of the plane. To prove the existence we transform the triangle in the regular one and then take the circle that contains the vertices of the regular triangle.

To prove the uniqueness we take an ellipse C that satisfies the desired properties and transform it into a circle by an affine transformation. We see that the image of the triangle under this transformation must be regular. \square

Any ellipse defines an Euclidean metric on the plane: we say that a segment has length 1 if the endpoint of a parallel segment are the center of the ellipse and a point on the ellipse itself.

Now we can define a natural Riemannian structure on the space of triangles that is invariant with respect to the group of affine transformations. Given a curve $t \mapsto \Delta_t = \text{conv}\{z_1(t), z_2(t), z_3(t)\}$ in the space of triangles, we define the square of the length of its velocity $(\dot{z}_1(t), \dot{z}_2(t), \dot{z}_3(t))$ as the sum of squares of the lengths of the vectors $\dot{z}_i(t)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, measured in the Euclidean structure associated to the ellipse C_{Δ_t} .

The restriction of this Riemannian metric to the distribution $\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3\}$ is a sub-Riemannian metric such that the square of the length of the vector $\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i Z_i$ is equal to $\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i^2$. This is valid for both models **A** and **B**.

In what concerns the case **B**, velocities of singular trajectories form a rank 2 distribution $\mathcal{D} = \{\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i Z_i \mid \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i = 0\} \subset \mathcal{D}$. Recall that the vector fields $\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i Z_i$, $\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i = 0$ generate a 5-dimensional Lie algebra. The famous Cartan invariant of this kind of distribution (Cartan quartic) is a degree 4 homogeneous form on \mathcal{D} .

Proposition 5.2. *The Cartan quartic of \mathcal{D} is equal to the form:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i Z_i \mapsto c (u_1^2 + u_2^2 + u_3^2)^2, \quad \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i = 0,$$

where c is a constant.

Proof. Cyclic permutations of the fields Z_1, Z_2, Z_3 induce automorphisms of the Lie algebra $\text{Lie}\{Z_1, Z_2, Z_3\}$ and hence symmetries of the distribution \mathcal{D} . It follows that the Cartan quartic written as a form of u_1, u_2, u_3 must be invariant with respect to the cyclic permutations of the variables u_1, u_2, u_3 .

Consider a projective line

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}} = \{u_1 : u_2 : u_3 \mid \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i = 0\}.$$

The group of cyclic permutations of u_1, u_2, u_3 acts freely on $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$ and preserves the sets of real roots of a prescribed multiplicity of the Cartan quartic. Any orbit of this cyclic group has 3 points, hence the number of roots of a prescribed multiplicity is a multiple of 3. At the same time, if the quartic is not identical zero, then it may have 0, 1, 2 or 4 roots of a prescribed multiplicity and never 3 roots. It follows that the quartic does not have real roots.

The quartic is real, hence it is a square (or minus square) of a positive definite quadratic form on $\bar{\mathcal{D}}$. This quadratic form is invariant with respect to the action of the order 3 cyclic group, hence it is proportional to the form $\sum_{i=1}^3 u_i Z_i \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^3 u_i^2$. Indeed a nonempty intersection of the level sets of this form and any nonproportional to it quadratic form has 2 or 4 elements and cannot be preserved by a free action of the order 3 cyclic group. \square

6. The EDS associated with the (2,3,5) distribution associated with the movement of three ants

In this section we again analyze the movement of the three ants according to the **rule B**, but now from the Exterior Differential System (EDS) point of view. Our goal here will be to

give proofs of [Theorem 3.3](#) and [Proposition 5.2](#), which will be totally independent of the geometric arguments in Section 5. In particular, we aim to characterize the $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution \mathcal{D} associated with ants moving according to **Rule B** in terms of the corresponding EDS, and use it to *calculate* the formula for the Cartan quartic of \mathcal{D} . One can try to make these calculations in terms of the original Euclidean coordinates $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3)$ on the plane, but we doubt that it is possible in any finite time (even with the help of very powerful computer equipped with a good symbolic calculation program). It is why here we use totally new parametrization of the ants system, using the observation that its symmetry group is at least as large as the semidirect product $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ of the groups $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ and \mathbb{R}^2 . Actually we embed the non-controllable 6-dimensional configuration space of the ants moving according to **rule B** in the 6-dimensional group $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ and identify a chosen 5-dimensional orbit M_A of controllable movement with the group $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$. The advantage of such an approach is that given the identification of the configuration space manifold M_A with a Lie group manifold, we have a preferred set of 1-forms on M_A . This is given by the *coframe of left invariant forms*, known as the *Maurer–Cartan forms*. These are *God given* on any Lie group (see [Helgason, 1978](#) Ch.II § 7, 135–138). In the coordinates on M_A adapted to the group parameters they are easy to calculate explicitly. Having them in coordinates adapted to the symmetry of the system will be extremely helpful to find the $(2, 3, 5)$ geometric invariant 1-forms constituting the EDS described in [An and Nurowski \(2018\)](#), p. 94, encapsulating the curvature and Cartan quartic of the ants-under-**Rule-B** $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution \mathcal{D} . Having this EDS we will be able to determine the Cartan quartic of \mathcal{D} and its type.

6.1. Parametrization in terms of $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$

Let us make use of the fact that the symmetry of the ant system obeying **rule B** is at least $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ and that the reduced system can be considered on a manifold M_A being diffeomorphic to this group. Actually we parametrize all triangles on the plane by the elements of the 6-dimensional $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ group.

For this we take a ‘standard triangle’⁷ in \mathbb{R}^2 , which we define in terms of its vertices at $\vec{r}_1 = (0, 0)$, $\vec{r}_2 = (1, 0)$ and $\vec{r}_3 = (0, 1)$ in a chosen Cartesian system (x, y) on the plane. Now, any other triangle on the plane is obtained by acting on the vertices of the standard triangle with the group $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$. It is convenient to represent the group $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ as a group of invertible 3×3 real matrices

$$h = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & x \\ p & q & y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad aq - bp \neq 0, \quad (10)$$

and vectors $\vec{r} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ as column vectors $r = (\vec{r}, 1)^t$. Then the action of the group $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ in \mathbb{R}^2 can be read off from the action $(h, r) \rightarrow h.r$ coming from the multiplication ‘ \cdot ’ of matrices h from $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ and vectors r of the form $r = (\vec{r}, 1)^t$ from \mathbb{R}^3 . Using this action, we can transform the standard triangle with vertices \vec{r}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, to any other triangle on the plane. In this way the most general triangle on the plane will have the vertices

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{R}_1 &= h.r_1 = (x, y), & \vec{R}_2 &= h.r_2 = (a + x, p + y), \\ \vec{R}_3 &= h.r_3 = (b + x, q + y). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we locally parametrized the triangles on the plane by coordinates (x, y, a, b, p, q) in an open set of \mathbb{R}^6 identified with the affine transformation group of the plane $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$. We

⁷ Note that any choice of a ‘standard triangle’ will work; we have chosen this one because we like the origin of the Cartesian coordinate system, and the isosceles rectangular triangles.

put the three ants each one in one of the vertices $\vec{R}_1, \vec{R}_2, \vec{R}_3$ of the general triangle. We are interested in curves $m(t) = (x(t), y(t), a(t), b(t), p(t), q(t))$ in $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$, corresponding to the movement of the ants in time, and we want that these curves satisfy:

$$\frac{d\vec{R}_1}{dt} \parallel (\vec{R}_2 - \vec{R}_3), \quad \frac{d\vec{R}_3}{dt} \parallel (\vec{R}_1 - \vec{R}_2), \quad \frac{d\vec{R}_2}{dt} \parallel (\vec{R}_3 - \vec{R}_1),$$

which is the implementation of **rule B**. More explicitly this rule means that

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{x}, \dot{y}) \parallel (a - b, p - q), & \quad (\dot{a} + \dot{x}, \dot{p} + \dot{y}) \parallel (b, q), \\ (\dot{b} + \dot{x}, \dot{q} + \dot{y}) \parallel (-a, -p). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Instead of writing the $(3, 6)$ velocity distribution \mathcal{D} of the ants as in Section 3, we now write this distribution in terms on three vector fields on $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ corresponding to the three *primitive moves*.

Obviously the following three moves satisfy **rule B**:

Move 1: The first ant, with a position at \vec{R}_1 moves, the other two ants are at rest,

Move 2: The second ant, with a position at \vec{R}_2 moves, the other two ants are at rest,

Move 3: The third ant, with a position at \vec{R}_3 moves, the other two ants are at rest.

Looking at the implementation of **rule B** in (11) we see that:

• **Move 1** means that $\dot{x} = c(a - b)$, $\dot{y} = c(p - q)$, $\dot{a} = -\dot{x}$, $\dot{p} = -\dot{y}$, $\dot{b} = -\dot{x}$, $\dot{q} = -\dot{y}$, resulting in $(\dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{a}, \dot{b}, \dot{p}, \dot{q}) = c(a - b, p - q, b - a, b - a, q - p, q - p)$, or a generating vector field

$$V_1 = (a - b)(\partial_x - \partial_a - \partial_b) + (p - q)(\partial_y - \partial_p - \partial_q). \quad (12)$$

• **Move 2** means that $\dot{x} = \dot{y} = \dot{b} = \dot{q} = 0$, $\dot{a} = cb$, $\dot{p} = cq$, resulting in $(\dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{a}, \dot{b}, \dot{p}, \dot{q}) = c(0, 0, b, 0, q, 0)$, or a generating vector field

$$V_2 = b\partial_a + q\partial_p. \quad (13)$$

• **Move 3** means that $\dot{x} = \dot{y} = \dot{a} = \dot{p} = 0$, $\dot{b} = -ca$, $\dot{q} = -cp$, resulting in $(\dot{x}, \dot{y}, \dot{a}, \dot{b}, \dot{p}, \dot{q}) = c_1(0, 0, 0, -a, 0, -p)$, or a generating vector field

$$V_3 = -a\partial_b - p\partial_q. \quad (14)$$

The general move of the ants according to **rule B** is a superposition of these three primitive moves, so the velocity distribution \mathcal{D} of the ants moving in $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ according to **rule B** is

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(V_1, V_2, V_3),$$

where the vector fields V_1, V_2, V_3 are given by the respective formulas (12), (13) and (14).

Now, let us consider the determinant

$$\text{Det}(h) = aq - bp$$

of the $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ valued matrix h as in (10). One can easily check that a general vector field

$$V = f_1V_1 + f_2V_2 + f_3V_3$$

from the distribution \mathcal{D} annihilates $\text{Det}(h)$, i.e.⁸

$$\mathcal{L}_V(\text{Det}(h)) = 0, \quad \forall V \in \mathcal{D}.$$

⁸ Note that in the formula $\mathcal{L}_V(\text{Det}(h)) = 0$, we used the explicit forms of vector fields V_1, V_2 and V_3 which are given explicitly as *differential operators* in formulas (12), (13) and (14). Thus the expression $V(\text{Det}(h))$ means action of the first order differential operator V on a function $\text{Det}(h) = aq - bp$. Direct simple calculation using the explicit form of V_1, V_2 and V_3 shows that $\mathcal{L}_V(\text{Det}(h)) = 0$.

Here $\mathcal{L}_V(f)$ denotes the Lie derivative of a function f with respect to the vector field V .

Thus, as we already know, the distribution \mathcal{D} is tangent to 5-dimensional submanifolds in $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ consisting of the elements with constant determinant. Each of these submanifolds is diffeomorphic to the $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ group, i.e. the group of motions in \mathbb{R}^2 preserving volumes.

Let us now introduce a foliation of $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ by 5-dimensional submanifolds N_s defined by

$$N_s = \{h \text{ as in (10) s.t. } \text{Det}(h) = s = \text{const}\} \subset \mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2.$$

On each submanifold N_s we then have a rank 2-distribution

$$\mathcal{D} = \text{Span}(V_1 - V_3, V_2 - V_1),$$

such that it is the square root of \mathcal{D} , $\mathcal{D} = [\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{D}] + \mathcal{D}$. The distribution \mathcal{D} obviously has the growth vector $(2, 3, 5)$ on each 5-dimensional manifold N_s .

6.2. The $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution and the Maurer–Cartan forms on $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$

Since the distribution \mathcal{D} is defined on the 5-dim submanifolds of $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ diffeomorphic to $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$, and since this distribution is definitely $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ invariant, it is natural to ask how to define it in terms of the Maurer–Cartan forms on $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ or $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$.

If we view of $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ as the group of matrices h defined in (10), then the basis $(\tau^1, \tau^2, \tau^3, \tau^4, \tau^5, \tau^6)$ of the Maurer–Cartan forms on $\mathbf{GL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$ can be easily found from the formula

$$h^{-1}dh = \sum_{i=1}^6 \tau^i E_i,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} E_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & E_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & E_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ E_4 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & E_5 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & E_6 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Explicitly we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^1 &= \frac{qdb - bdq}{aq - bp}, & \tau^2 &= \frac{adp - pda}{aq - bp}, \\ \tau^3 &= \frac{qda - adq + pdb - bdp}{2(aq - bp)}, & \tau^4 &= \frac{qdx - bdy}{aq - bp}, \\ \tau^5 &= \frac{ady - pdx}{aq - bp}, & \tau^6 &= \frac{d(aq - bp)}{2(aq - bp)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that this basis of the Maurer–Cartan forms has the property that on each of the 5-dimensional submanifolds N_s , where $s = aq - bp = \text{const}$ the sixth 1-form τ^6 identically vanish,

$$\tau^6 \equiv 0 \text{ on each } N_s.$$

Now we can look for the most general linear combination (with constant coefficients!) of the Maurer–Cartan forms $(\tau^1, \tau^2, \tau^3, \tau^4, \tau^5)$ which annihilates the $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution \mathcal{D} on each N_s . Since the explicit form of the vector fields $V_1 - V_3$ and $V_2 - V_1$ spanning the $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution \mathcal{D} in coordinates (a, b, p, q, x, y) reads:

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 - V_3 &= (a - b)(\partial_x - \partial_a) + (p - q)(\partial_y - \partial_p) + b\partial_b + q\partial_q, \\ V_2 - V_1 &= (a - b)(\partial_b - \partial_x) + (p - q)(\partial_q - \partial_y) + a\partial_a + p\partial_p, \end{aligned}$$

and since these vector fields annihilate τ^6 , one easily finds that the basis of the annihilator of \mathcal{D} on N_s is given by

$$\mathcal{D}^\perp = \text{Span}(\tau^3 - \tau^5, \tau^4 + \tau^5, \tau^1 - \tau^2 - \tau^3).$$

Of course, since we restrict our attention to the leaves N_s of the foliation of M , the Maurer–Cartan forms appearing in this formula have $aq - bp = s = \text{const}$. This means that we can define the $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution \mathcal{D} on each N_s as the annihilator of the forms

$$\begin{aligned} s\theta^1 &= s(\tau^3 - \tau^5) = pdx - ady + \frac{1}{2}(qda + pdb - bdp - adq), \\ s\theta^2 &= s(\tau^4 + \tau^5) = -(p - q)dx + (a - b)dy, \\ 2s\theta^3 &= 2s(\tau^1 - \tau^2 - \tau^3) = \\ &= (2p - q)da + (2q - p)db - (2a - b)dp - (2b - a)dq. \end{aligned}$$

These three 1-forms can be supplemented by the Maurer–Cartan forms

$$\begin{aligned} s\theta^4 &= -\tau^2 = pda - adp, \\ s\theta^5 &= \tau^2 - \tau^1 = -pda - qdb + adp + bdq, \end{aligned}$$

to a coframe $(\theta^1, \theta^2, \theta^3, \theta^4, \theta^5)$ on N_s . In this coframe the distribution

$$\mathcal{D} = \{V \in \Gamma(TN_s) : V \lrcorner \theta^1 = V \lrcorner \theta^2 = V \lrcorner \theta^3 = 0\}$$

and because of the boxed terms in the formulas below

$$\begin{aligned} d\theta^1 &= \theta^1 \wedge (\theta^3 + \theta^4 + \theta^5) + \theta^2 \wedge \theta^4 + \boxed{\theta^3 \wedge \theta^4}, \\ d\theta^2 &= -\theta^1 \wedge (2\theta^3 + \theta^5) - \theta^2 \wedge (\theta^3 + \theta^4 + \theta^5) + \boxed{\theta^3 \wedge \theta^5}, \\ d\theta^3 &= -\theta^3 \wedge (4\theta^4 + 2\theta^5) + \boxed{3\theta^4 \wedge \theta^5}, \\ d\theta^4 &= -2\theta^3 \wedge \theta^4 + 2\theta^4 \wedge \theta^5, \\ d\theta^5 &= \theta^3 \wedge (4\theta^4 + 2\theta^5) - 4\theta^4 \wedge \theta^5, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

its growth vector is visibly⁹ $(2, 3, 5)$. Also, the appearance of only constant coefficients in (16), visibly shows that the distribution \mathcal{D} is homogeneous with the symmetry group being at least as large as $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$.

This proves the following proposition.

Proposition 6.1. *The $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution \mathcal{D} of three ants moving on the floor according to rule B is locally equivalent to a homogeneous $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution on the Lie group $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$, which is defined as the annihilator of the three Maurer–Cartan forms $(\theta^1, \theta^2, \theta^3)$ with*

$$\theta^1 = \tau^3 - \tau^5, \quad \theta^2 = \tau^4 + \tau^5, \quad \theta^3 = \tau^1 - \tau^2 - \tau^3,$$

where τ^i s are defined in terms of the general element $h \in \mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$, as in (10), and the basis E_i in $\mathfrak{gl}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$, as in (15), by $h^{-1}dh = \sum_{i=1}^6 \tau^i E_i$.

6.3. Cartan quartic for the ants' $(2, 3, 5)$ distribution on $\mathbf{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \rtimes \mathbb{R}^2$

The Cartan quartic (Cartan, 1910) for the ants' distribution \mathcal{D} can be computed in various ways. Here we do it by calculating explicitly the conformal $(2, 3)$ signature metric (Nurowski, 2005) associated with \mathcal{D} . It follows, that in the coframe $(\theta^1, \theta^2, \theta^3, \theta^4, \theta^5)$

⁹ The appearance of the boxed terms with nonzero constant coefficients implies – by the Maurer–Cartan formula (see Helgason, 1978 Ch.II § 7, Proposition 7.2, p. 137) that the vector fields X_i dual to the forms θ^i , $X_i \lrcorner \theta^j = \delta_i^j$, satisfy in particular: $[X_4, X_5] = -3X_3 \text{ mod } X_4, X_5$, $[X_3, X_5] = -X_2 \text{ mod } X_3, X_4, X_5$ and $[X_3, X_4] = -X_1 \text{ mod } X_3, X_4, X_5$. This shows that the rank 2 distribution spanned by the vector fields X_4 and X_5 is precisely $(2, 3, 5)$ and can be identified with the ants distribution \mathcal{D} .

satisfying the system (16), the conformal representative of this metric can be taken as:

$$g = \theta^1 (45\theta^5 + 60\theta^3 + 27\theta^2 + 27\theta^1) - \theta^2 (45\theta^4 - 30\theta^3 - 27\theta^2) + 10(\theta^3)^2, \quad (17)$$

with the product between the 1-forms above being $\lambda\mu = \frac{1}{2}(\lambda \otimes \mu + \mu \otimes \lambda)$.

Calculating the Weyl tensor¹⁰ of this metric in the null coframe, and using the procedure of calculating the Cartan quartic from the conformal metric described in An and Nurowski (2014), we find that the Cartan quartic of the corresponding to (2, 3, 5) distribution \mathcal{D} is of type *D* in the parabolic geometric language (Strazzullo, 2009) or, what is the same, *has no real roots*. Moreover the metric is *not* conformal to an Einstein metric. This in particular means that the distribution \mathcal{D} is NOT G_2 flat.¹¹ Also, using the *Cartan reduction procedure* for the Cartan system associated to the distribution \mathcal{D} , as in Theorem 8 in Nurowski (2005), we established that the distribution \mathcal{D} has precisely 5-dimensional Lie algebra of symmetries. This proves Theorem 3.3 from the end of Section 3.

Acknowledgments

The idea of this work arose during discussions between the second author and Gil Bor at his house in Guanajuato, MX, and also at his office in CIMAT, in November 2015. PN is very grateful to Gil Bor and all the members of the CIMAT institute in Guanajuato for creating a very friendly working atmosphere and partial financial cover of his stay while in Mexico.

References

- Agrachev, A. A. (2007). Rolling balls and Octonions. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, 08/258(1), 13–22.
- Agrachev, A., Barilari, D., & Boscain, U. (2020). *A comprehensive introduction to sub-Riemannian geometry* (p. xviii+745). Cambridge.
- Agrachev, A. A., & Sachkov, Yu. L. (1999). An intrinsic approach to the control of rolling bodies. In *Proceedings of the 38th IEEE conference on decision and control*, Vol. 1 (pp. 431–435). Phoenix, Arizona, USA.
- An, D., & Nurowski, P. (2014). Twistor space for rolling bodies. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 326, 393–414.
- An, D., & Nurowski, P. (2018). Symmetric (2, 3, 5) distributions, an interesting ODE of 7th order and Plebański metric. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 126, 93–100.
- Bateman, H., & Erdelyi, A. (1954). *Higher transcendental functions*, Vol. I. N.Y.: Graw Hill book company.
- Bor, G., Lamóneda, L. H., & Nurowski, P. (2018). The dancing metric, G_2 -symmetry and projective rolling. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 370, 4433–4481.

- Bor, G., & Montgomery, R. (2009). G_2 And the rolling distribution. *L'Enseignement Mathématique*, 55, 157–196, arXiv:math/0612469.
- Bryant, R. (1979). *Some aspects of the local and global theory of Pfaffian systems* (Ph.D. thesis), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Bryant, R. (2006). Conformal geometry and 3-plane fields on 6-manifolds. In *RIMS symposium proceedings: vol. 1502, Developments of cartan geometry and related mathematical problems* (pp. 1–15). Kyoto University.
- Bryant, R., & Hsu, L. (1993). Rigidity of integral curves of rank two distributions. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 114, 435–461.
- Čap, A., & Slovák, J. (2009). *Math. surveys monogr.: vol. 154, Parabolic geometries I, Background and general theory*. Amer. Math. Soc.
- Cartan, E. (1910). Les systemes de Pfaff a cinq variables et les equations aux derivees partielles du seconde ordre. *Annales Scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure*, 27, 109–192.
- Eastwood, M., & Nurowski, P. (2020a). Aerobatics of flying saucers. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 375, 2335–2365.
- Eastwood, M., & Nurowski, P. (2020b). Aerodynamics of flying saucers. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 375, 2367–2387.
- Gover, A. R., & Nurowski, P. (2006). Obstructions to conformally Einstein metrics in n dimensions. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 56, 450–484.
- Helgason, S. (1978). *Differential geometry, Lie groups and symmetric spaces*. Academic Press.
- Hill, C. D., & Nurowski, P. (2022). A car as parabolic geometry. In S. Hervik, B. Kruglikov, I. Makina, & D. The (Eds.), *Lie theory and applications*, Vol. 16 (pp. 93–130). Springer.
- Nurowski, P. (2005). Differential equations and conformal structures. *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 55, 19–49.
- Strazzullo, F. (2009). *Symmetry analysis of general rank-3 Pfaffian systems in five variables* (Ph.D. thesis), Logan, Utah: Utah State University.



Andrei Agrachev



Paweł Nurowski

¹⁰ Here we use the basic invariants of the conformal pseudo-Riemannian geometry, namely the *Weyl tensor* and the *conformally Einstein condition*. The conformal geometry and the theory of its invariants is a big subject on its own. A convenient shortcut to the definitions of conformal objects and notions we use here, can be found in Sections 2.1–2.2 of Gover and Nurowski (2006).

¹¹ There are many meanings of the word *flatness* in mathematics. Usually it refers to the *zero curvature of a certain connection*. It is the meaning we use in this sentence: The Cartan \mathfrak{g}_2^* -valued Cartan connection of the (2, 3, 5) distribution \mathcal{D} associated with ants moving on a 5-dimensional orbit according to **rule B** has non-zero curvature, i.e. it is *not flat*. This has nothing to do with the word 'flatness' used in the nonlinear control theory.