

Gravitational potential in spherical topologies

Quentin Vigneron¹, Boudewijn Roukema^{1,2}

¹ Institute of Astronomy, Faculty of Physics, Astronomy and Informatics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Grudziadzka 5, 87-100 Toruń, Poland

² Univ Lyon, Ens de Lyon, Univ Lyon1, CNRS, Centre de Recherche Astrophysique de Lyon UMR5574, F-69007, Lyon, France

E-mail: qvigneron@gmail.com, qvignero@astro.uni.torun.pl,
boud@astro.uni.torun.pl

25 January 2022

Abstract.

Using the non-Euclidean Newtonian theory developed by Vigneron, we calculate the gravitational potential of a point mass in all the globally homogeneous regular spherical topologies, i.e. whose fundamental domain (FD) shape and size are unique, for which the FD is a platonic solid. We provide the Maclaurin expansion of the potential at a test position near the point mass. We show that the odd terms of the expansion can be interpreted as coming from the presence of a non-zero spatial scalar curvature, while the even terms relate to the closed nature of the topological space. Compared to the point mass solution in a 3-torus, widely used in Newtonian cosmological simulations, the spherical cases all feature an additional, attractive first order term. In this sense, close to a mass point, the gravitational field would differ between spherical and Euclidean topologies. The correction terms remain isotropic until an order that depends on the choice of spherical topology, the Poincaré space having the potential that remains isotropic to the highest (fifth) order. We expect these corrections to have a negligible effect on scales small with respect to the size of the topological space. However, at scales where the Maclaurin expansion becomes inaccurate, the significance of the effect remains unknown. This motivates future N -body simulation work with the non-Euclidean Newtonian theory to see if a topology different to the 3-torus has observable effects on structure formation.

1. Introduction

In the Λ CDM model, three cosmological expansion scenarios are possible depending on the Thurston topological class adopted for the spatial 3-manifold: spherical, Euclidean or hyperbolic [1] (the other five classes, which forbid local isotropy, are not described by the Λ CDM model). Each of these classes corresponds to an ensemble of topological spaces whose covering space is, respectively, the 3-sphere \mathbb{S}^3 , the Euclidean 3-plane \mathbb{E}^3 , or the hyperbolic 3-plane \mathbb{H}^3 . However, due to the homogeneity hypothesis of the model, the specific choice of topology within a class does not affect the global expansion. In contrast, taking into account the presence of inhomogeneities allows for the search of the

specific topology (e.g. multiply connected) of our Universe by searching for correlations of matter distributions using either catalogues of extragalactic objects (the methods of cosmic crystallography of type I pairs [2], type II pairs [3, 4], or quadruplet methods to seek weak signals [5–8]), or the CMB map (the method of circles in the sky, [9–12]). These studies currently give typical lower bounds of around 10 to 20 $(\text{Gpc}/h)^3$ (e.g. [8, 13–15]) for the comoving volume of our Universe for the topological classes studied so far. These methods are all based on some form of the spatial correlations of the matter distribution at an early time slice or projected forward to the comoving spatial section. Thus, they do not probe the potential effects of topology on the dynamics, either global or local, of our Universe that were derived heuristically in the context where inhomogeneities are present in the model universe [16]. To our knowledge, little has been done to study these effects (see for instance [17]). Since Newton’s theory is defined on a Euclidean topology (i.e. on a 3-manifold that lies in the Euclidean Thurston topological class), until recently, the only theory that could allow for the study of effects of non-Euclidean topologies in cosmology was general relativity. However, simulations solving the Einstein equation exactly in a cosmological context (e.g. [18] and references therein) are still far from reaching the precision that is possible with Newtonian N -body simulations, which, currently, are typically performed using codes that only enable a Euclidean topology, in the form of the 3-torus. For brevity, we refer to a topological space in a Thurston class (on which either a homogeneous or inhomogeneous metric could be imposed) as ‘a topology’.

An extension of Newton’s theory to non-Euclidean topologies (i.e. a topology that lies in a non-Euclidean class) has been developed by [19], called *non-Euclidean Newtonian theory* (NEN theory). Two different ‘non-Euclidean Newtonian theories’ are proposed in [19], with the argument that only the second one (in Section 4.5 of [19]) is physical and should be considered as the ‘right’ NEN theory. Currently, this theory is only defined for spherical and hyperbolic topologies (it does not describe the other five classes of 3-dimensional topological spaces of the Thurston classification). This theory allows for the encoding of non-linearities and all the global properties (e.g. topology) of general relativity; and is simpler to use. In particular, the N -body description exists in this theory, making ‘fast’ N -body cosmological simulations in spherical or hyperbolic topologies practical. While this theory predicts that for a general inhomogeneous model there are no additional effects (with respect to Λ CDM) induced by the topology on the global expansion of the universe, i.e. the cosmological backreaction vanishes, the theory still allows us to probe the local effects of non-Euclidean topologies by calculating the gravitational field.

In this paper we are interested in the small-scale effects of global topology as predicted by NEN theory. To do this, we calculate the gravitational potential near a point mass in the ‘regular’ multiply connected manifolds of the spherical topology, by which we mean those with a Platonic solid as their unique fundamental domain shape and that are single-action spherical 3-manifolds (see Sections 3.1, 3.2 Table 1). In a sense, this improves on [20] by using NEN theory [19], which, as explained in

Section 2.1, is much better physically justified. While there are an infinite number of spherical 3-manifolds, we consider the regular ones characterised this way, because their homogeneity and isotropy identifies them as those spherical manifolds, apart from the 3-sphere itself, that are most in line with the motivation of the cosmological principle. These appear to be the simplest homogeneous 3-manifolds for the purposes of calculation, apart from the 3-sphere itself.

In Section 2 we summarise the system of equations of NEN theory [19], and simplify it for the case of a single point mass in a spherical topology. Section 3 presents our characterisation of the ‘regular’ spherical topologies and the Maclaurin expansion series of the gravitational potential near the point mass in each of these topologies (3-manifolds). We interpret these results in Section 4 and conclude in Section 5.

2. Non-Euclidean Newtonian theory

2.1. What is NEN theory?

An NEN theory was already proposed before that of Ref. [19] by [20, 21], based on the introduction of a non-zero spatial curvature into the Poisson equation. However, that theory suffers from two major problems: it cannot describe expansion, and in spherical topologies, the gravitational field of a point mass is necessarily matched by a white hole (a repulsive singular gravitational field) at the antipode of the point mass, making the theory physically dubious (see Section 3 in [19] for a detailed discussion of the problems).

The approach of [20, 21] is to consider the Poisson equation as a fundamental feature of a Newtonian-like theory, whatever the topology. In [19], we instead constructed an NEN theory where Galilean invariance is considered to be a fundamental principle of a Newtonian-like theory no matter the topology, by using the concept of Galilean manifolds (see [22]) and a minimal modification of the Newton–Cartan equations. We defined two NEN theories with this approach, but only one (that of Section 4.5 of [19]) turned out to be physically reasonable, and we argued that it should be considered as the ‘right’ extension of Newton’s theory for non-Euclidean topologies. This theory solves, in particular, the two problems quoted above that were present in the proposal of [20, 21]. The detailed construction of this theory can be found in [19], showing, in particular, how the 3-dimensional gravitational system of equations can be obtained from the 4-dimensional spacetime system. Thus, we adopt this gravitational system, i.e. featuring the gravitational field. We present its general form in Section 2.2 and the specific form used for calculations in the current paper in Section 2.3.

2.2. General form of the gravitational system in the NEN theory

The gravitational system of the NEN theory as derived by [19] is defined on a *closed* 3-manifold Σ whose topology belongs to the class of spherical or hyperbolic topologies of

the Thurston classification.‡ NEN theory is currently defined only for these two classes, but may be extended in a later study to the remaining five non-Euclidean irreducible classes of 3-dimensional closed topologies of the Thurston classification.

The most general form of the gravitational system in NEN theory is§:

$$g^a = (\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) v^a + v^c D_c v^a + 2v^c (H\delta_c^a + \Xi_c^a) - (a_{\neq\text{grav}})^a, \quad (1)$$

$$D_c g^c = -4\pi G \widehat{\rho} - \widehat{\Xi_{cd}\Xi^{cd}}, \quad (2)$$

$$D_{[a} g_{b]} = 0. \quad (3)$$

These equations are completed by

$$\mathcal{R}_{ab} = \frac{\mathcal{R}(t)}{3} h_{ab}, \quad (4)$$

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) h_{ab} = 2 (H h_{ab} + D_{(a} v_{b)} + \Xi_{ab}), \quad (5)$$

$$(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta) \rho = -\rho (3H + D_c v^c), \quad (6)$$

and the expansion law

$$3 \left(\dot{H} + H^2 \right) + 4\pi G \langle \rho \rangle_\Sigma - \Lambda = - \langle \Xi_{cd}\Xi^{cd} \rangle_\Sigma \quad ; \quad \langle \rho \rangle_\Sigma = \frac{M_{\text{tot}}}{V_\Sigma(t)}, \quad (7)$$

where:

- \mathbf{g} is the gravitational field,
- \mathcal{L}_β is the Lie derivative with respect to the vector β . This vector is a free parameter that corresponds to a choice of spatial coordinates (see the next section).
- \mathbf{v} is the spatial velocity of the fluid,
- \mathbf{D} is the Levi-Civita connection relative to the metric \mathbf{h} whose Ricci tensor \mathcal{R} is given by formula (4),
- $H = \partial_t V_\Sigma / (3V_\Sigma)$ is the expansion rate of Σ with $V_\Sigma(t)$ its volume,
- Ξ is a traceless (i.e. $\Xi_c^c := 0$) and transverse (i.e. $D_c \Xi_a^c := 0$) tensor,
- $\mathbf{a}_{\neq\text{grav}}$ is the non-gravitational 3-acceleration acting on the fluid,
- ρ is the mass density of the fluid, and M_{tot} is the total mass in Σ ,
- The operator $\widehat{}$ acts on a scalar ψ as $\widehat{\psi} := \psi - \langle \psi \rangle_\Sigma$, with $\langle \psi \rangle_\Sigma(t) := \frac{1}{V_\Sigma} \int_\Sigma \psi \sqrt{\det(h_{ab})} d^3x$ being the average over the whole volume of Σ .

‡ Cosmology textbooks often use the term ‘open’ to refer uniquely to hyperbolic curvature and the associated universe expansion history; and ‘closed’ to refer to spherical curvature and the associated expansion history. Here, we do not adopt this confusing terminology, and instead use the language of topological manifolds, since general-relativistic cosmology requires the Universe to be a pseudo-Riemannian 4-manifold.

§ We assumed that the harmonic 2-form ω present in the system (68)–(54) in [19] is zero. This is expected if these equations result from the non-relativistic limit of general relativity (see Appendix B in [23]).

The gravitational system (1)–(7) is algebraically equivalent to the gravitational system in classical Newton’s theory with the presence of an anisotropic expansion (see [23] for details on this classical system). The only difference is the spatial Ricci tensor \mathcal{R} , relative to the spatial metric \mathbf{h} and its connection \mathbf{D} , which is not zero but given by formula (4). This curvature tensor allows these equations to be defined on either a spherical or hyperbolic topology. If we assume \mathcal{R} to be zero, then we retrieve Newton’s equations exactly.

Equation (1) corresponds to Newton’s second law for the spatial acceleration of the fluid spatial velocity (this is also the Navier–Stokes equation, since it is written for a fluid), with $(\partial_t - \mathcal{L}_\beta)v^a + v^c D_c v^a$ being the spatial acceleration corresponding to the spatial velocity \mathbf{v} in any coordinate system, i.e. covariantly defined; equations (2) and (3) are constraint equations on the gravitational field, which (3) constrains to be irrotational; equation (5) is the evolution equation for the spatial metric; equation (6) is the continuity equation; equation (7) is the expansion law for the volume of the manifold Σ .

Ξ is called the transverse shear and is also present in Newton’s theory, where it can model, in particular, an anisotropic expansion. If this term is assumed to be zero, then there exists a coordinate system, i.e. a choice of β , in which the spatial metric takes the simple form $h_{ab} = a^2(t)\tilde{h}_{ab}(x^i)$ with $\dot{a}/a = H$ and where the Ricci tensor $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ associated to $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}$ is $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{ab} = a^2\mathcal{R}_{ab} = \mathcal{R}_i/3\tilde{h}_{ab}$, where the subscript i stands for initial. The coordinate system implying this form of the spatial metric corresponds to $\beta = -\mathbf{v}$ and is called a *Galilean coordinate system* (see Section V in [23]). In this system, the spatial metric has no local dynamics as it is separated in space and time.

2.3. Simplified form of the gravitational system in the NEN theory

Hereafter, we set $\beta = -\mathbf{v}$ and $\Xi = 0$. This latter choice, in addition to implying a separation between the space and time dependence of the spatial metric, is also in agreement with the fact that there is no observational evidence of a global anisotropy in the expansion of our Universe. Thus, we end up with the following simplified gravitational system, where we introduce the gravitational potential Φ , defined by $\mathbf{g} = -\mathbf{D}\Phi$:

$$(\partial_t - v^c D_c)v^a + 2v^a H = -h^{ac} D_c \Phi + (a_{\neq \text{grav}})^a, \quad (8)$$

$$(\partial_t - v^c D_c)\rho = -\rho(3H + D_c v^c), \quad (9)$$

$$h^{cd} D_c D_d \Phi = 4\pi G \hat{\rho}, \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\rho}$ is the overdensity defined by applying the $\hat{}$ operator (Section 2.2) to the density ρ , and the expansion law

$$3\left(\dot{H} + H^2\right) + 4\pi G \frac{M_{\text{tot}}}{V_\Sigma(t)} - \Lambda = 0, \quad (11)$$

where we have in spherical coordinates (ξ, θ, φ)

$$h_{ab} = \frac{6 a^2(t)}{\mathcal{R}_i} \text{diag} [1, \text{sinn}^2 \xi, \text{sinn}^2 \xi \sin^2 \theta]_{ab}, \quad (12)$$

with a being dimensionless and $\dot{a}/a = H$ and

$$\text{sinn} \xi := \begin{cases} \sinh \xi, & \text{if } \mathcal{R}_i < 0 \text{ (hyperbolic)} \\ \sin \xi, & \text{if } \mathcal{R}_i > 0 \text{ (spherical)}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

As in cosmology based on Newton's equations, the density in the Poisson equation arises as the difference from the average density on Σ , i.e. it is the density deviation $\hat{\rho}$ rather than the absolute density ρ . This is the main difference with respect to the NEN theory proposed by [20, 21], which used the absolute density that led to a white hole (see Section 3 in [19]).

We see that the expansion law is the same as in Newton's theory, which corresponds to Friedmann's expansion law, and this holds for any inhomogeneous solution for the velocity \mathbf{v} . This implies that in a Newtonian-like theory, there are no effects of the inhomogeneities in the global expansion (such an effect is often called the cosmological backreaction in general relativity), no matter the class of topology chosen (here Euclidean, spherical or hyperbolic). The only difference with Newton's theory that might come from a non-Euclidean topology will therefore be a local influence on the gravitational potential and the fluid velocity, i.e. on structure formation. A full study of the latter case is beyond the scope of this work. We expect that it would best be performed using N -body numerical simulations adapted to this system. Here, we will consider the influence of the change of topology on the gravitational potential created by a single point mass.

3. Gravitational potential in the regular spherical topologies

3.1. Topological terminology

For an introduction to topology-related terminology in the context of cosmic topology, see [10, 27], and for the spherical case, see [25]. Key terms include the 3-manifold itself Σ (here referred to loosely as 'a topology', to focus on topological properties); the covering space $\tilde{\Sigma}$ (which in the case of interest here is $\tilde{\Sigma} = \mathbb{S}^3$); the group Γ of holonomies (a particular type of smooth mapping from $\tilde{\Sigma}$ to itself) that relates these: $\Sigma = \tilde{\Sigma}/\Gamma$; 'holonomy', 'homotopy' and 'homology' are all distinct topological terms. Applying every mapping γ_i that is a member of Γ to a single 'tile' – a fundamental domain (filled-in polyhedron in this case) of Σ – gives a full tiling of, in our case, the 3-sphere. We use the index 0 for the identity holonomy: $\gamma_0(x) = x, \forall x \in \Sigma$. The fundamental domain shape of Σ is not, in general, unique – for instance the Klein bottle (a two-dimensional manifold) can be tiled by either a hexagon or a rectangle.

space Σ	initial FD	names	single action	N_Σ
M_1	tetrahedron	$L(5, 3)$ [24]	no	5
M_2	cube	$L(8, 3)$ [24]	no	8
M_3	cube	quaternion space, 4-sided prism space, S^3/D_2^* [25, Sect. 4.1]	yes	8
M_4	octahedron	$S^3/Q_8 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ [24, Tab. 4]	no	24
M_5	octahedron	S^3/D_{24} [24, Tab. 4]	no	24
M_6	octahedron	octahedral space, S^3/T^* [25, Sect. 4.1]	yes	24
M_7	dodecahedron	Poincaré homology 3-sphere, Poincaré dodecahedral space, S^3/I^* [25, Sect. 4.1]	yes	120
M_8	dodecahedron	$S^3/P_{24} \times \mathbb{Z}_5$ [24, Tab. 4]	no	120

Table 1. List of the eight orientable spherical topologies definable with a Platonic solid fundamental domain (FD) [26, Tables 1, 3],[24, Table 1]. Columns indicate the 3-manifold name Σ defined in [24, Table 1]; the shape of the initial choice of FD for defining the space; other names; whether or not the space is guaranteed to be globally homogeneous by being a single-action spherical 3-manifold [25, 4.1]; the number N_Σ of copies of the FD that tile \mathbb{S}^3 .

3.2. Spherical topologies

Among 3-dimensional spaces, there are exactly eight orientable spherical topologies that can be defined starting from a Platonic solid as a fundamental domain [26, Tables 1, 3]. These are labelled M_1, \dots, M_8 in [24, Table 1]. We list these in Table 1.

Two of these can be equivalently constructed using a lens fundamental domain [25, Section 4], giving a lens-space name to the manifold of the form $L(p, q)$, for p, q coprime and $0 < q < p$, where p copies of the lens fundamental domain of central thickness $2\pi/p$ fill the 3-sphere, each matched after a rotation of $2\pi q/p$. Section 3 of [24] shows that M_1 is equivalent to $L(5, 3)$ and M_2 is equivalent to $L(8, 3)$. Since $q > 1$ in both cases, these are globally inhomogeneous, in the sense that the distance between a test particle and its image in a neighbouring tile (within the covering space) are dependent on the particle's position. For example, in M_1 , a test particle on the rim of the lens is $6\pi/5$ from its neighbouring image, while a test particle lying on the symmetry axis of the lens is only $2\pi/5$ from its neighbouring image. For a more formal definition of global homogeneity and the role of Clifford translations, see [25, Section 4.1].

Among the six remaining spaces, M_3, \dots, M_8 , the fundamental domain used for the construction is either the cube, the octahedron, or the dodecahedron. Thus, the three 4-polytopes that cover the 3-sphere with 5, 16 or 600 tetrahedral tiles do not correspond to the tilings of a globally homogeneous and orientable (spherical) topological space.

The cubic, octahedral, and dodecahedral tiles only correspond to one 4-polytope each, tiling the 3-sphere with eight tiles, 24 tiles, and 120 tiles, respectively.

Spherical spaces that are single-action spherical 3-manifolds are necessarily globally homogeneous [25, 4.1]. This gives us M_3 , M_6 , and M_7 as topologies of interest. Thus, these three are globally homogeneous spherical 3-manifolds with a Platonic solid fundamental domain. The list of ‘well-proportioned’ spaces studied earlier [20, 28] includes the truncated cube space \mathbb{S}^3/O^* , which we exclude since its FD is not a Platonic solid. In contrast, that list excludes M_3 , which is the 4-sided prism space. It is clear that M_3 is well-proportioned: the regular 4-sided prism is a regular cube.

These properties of the eight 3-manifolds that lead to our selection of those that we study, M_3 , M_6 , and M_7 , are summarised in Table 1.

3.3. Gravitational system for a point mass in spherical topologies

In this paper we want to calculate the gravitational potential of a point mass M in the regular spherical topologies. We consider the mass to be at rest and for simplicity we assume it is placed at the north pole of the 3-sphere with initial curvature radius 1, i.e. $\mathcal{R}_i = 6$. The gravitational potential Φ_Σ at a point (ξ, θ, φ) on Σ created by this mass is given by the equation

$$h^{cd}D_cD_d\Phi_\Sigma = 4\pi GM \left(\delta_\Sigma^{(0,0,0)}(\xi, \theta, \varphi) - \frac{1}{V_\Sigma} \right), \quad (14)$$

$$h_{ab} = a^2(t)\text{diag}(1, \sin^2 \xi, \sin^2 \xi \sin^2 \theta), \quad (15)$$

where $\delta_\Sigma^{(0,0,0)}(\xi, \theta, \varphi)$ is the Dirac field, centred on the coordinates $(0, 0, 0)$, of the Riemannian manifold (Σ, \mathbf{h}) .

To solve (14) we use the same method as in [20] by splitting the equations over all the images of M in the covering space \mathbb{S}^3 . We have

$$\delta_\Sigma^{(0,0,0)}(\xi, \theta, \varphi) = \sum_{\gamma_i \in \Gamma} \delta_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{\gamma_i((0,0,0))}(\xi, \theta, \varphi). \quad (16)$$

Using $V_\Sigma = V_{\mathbb{S}^3}/N_\Sigma$, where N_Σ is the number of images of the fundamental domain of Σ on \mathbb{S}^3 , we have

$$\left(\delta_\Sigma^{(0,0,0)}(\xi, \theta, \varphi) - \frac{1}{V_\Sigma} \right) = \sum_{\gamma_i \in \Gamma} \left(\delta_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{\gamma_i((0,0,0))}(\xi, \theta, \varphi) - \frac{1}{V_{\mathbb{S}^3}} \right). \quad (17)$$

By linearity of the Laplacian, we can write Φ_Σ in the form

$$\Phi_\Sigma = \sum_{\gamma_i \in \Gamma} \Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{\gamma_i((0,0,0))}, \quad (18)$$

with each $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{\gamma_i((0,0,0))}$ solution of the equation

$$h^{cd}D_cD_d\Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{\gamma_i((0,0,0))} = 4\pi GM \left(\delta_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{\gamma_i((0,0,0))}(\xi, \theta, \varphi) - \frac{1}{V_{\mathbb{S}^3}} \right). \quad (19)$$

In other words, the gravitational potential of one point mass in Σ corresponds to the sum of the potential (as calculated in \mathbb{S}^3) of all the point mass images on \mathbb{S}^3 . Thus, it is sufficient to solve the Poisson equation for a single generic image in \mathbb{S}^3 , i.e. we need to solve

$$\partial_\xi^2 \Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{(0,0,0)} + 2 \cot \xi \partial_\xi \Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{(0,0,0)} = 4\pi GM \left(a^2 \delta(\xi) - \frac{1}{2\pi^2 a} \right). \quad (20)$$

The solution is

$$\Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{(0,0,0)}(t, \xi) = -\frac{GM}{a} [(\cot \xi) (1 - \xi/\pi) + A], \quad (21)$$

where A is an integration constant. It is not physical and sets the convention we want to take for the value of $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{(0,0,0)}$ at $\xi = \pi$. Imposing $\Phi_{\mathbb{S}^3}^{(0,0,0)}(t, \pi) = 0$ corresponds to $A = 1/\pi$.

Using the embedding of the 3-sphere in \mathbb{E}^4 , as presented in Appendix A, and describing the positions of the images as 4-vectors \mathbf{Y}_i , the potential of one point mass in any spherical topologies is

$$\frac{a}{GM} \Phi_\Sigma(t, \mathbf{X}) = -N_\Sigma A - \sum_{\mathbf{Y}_i \in \{\gamma_i \in \Gamma\}} \left[\frac{\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_i}{\sqrt{1 - (\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_i)^2}} (1 - \arccos(\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_i) / \pi) \right]. \quad (22)$$

The positions \mathbf{Y}_i for the spaces M_6 and M_7 in Table 1 can be found in Gausmann et al. [25, Appendix B], while the positions for M_3 can be found in Clifton et al. [29, Table 3].

Remark. We only consider globally homogeneous topologies, so changing the position of the point mass only changes the gravitational field by a 4-dimensional rotation on the 3-sphere. This is not the case for an inhomogeneous topology. Applying the full group of holonomies Γ to the point mass yields a set of images whose geometry varies, depending on the position of the point mass in Σ , which we can think of as its position in one ‘copy’ of the fundamental domain.

3.4. Solutions

We are interested in the form of the potential close to the point mass. We calculate the Maclaurin expansion series of the potential as function of the distance $r = a\xi$ to that point mass, where we define the different orders Φ_n with

$$\frac{1}{GM} \Phi_\Sigma(t, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} \Phi_n(r, \theta, \varphi) r^n. \quad (23)$$

We provide the results for each topology in Table 2 where we only give the orders that remain isotropic (i.e. depend only on r) and write them as a function of the volume $V_\Sigma := 2\pi^2 a^3 / N_\Sigma$ of the manifold (i.e. volume of the fundamental domain, if defined) and its curvature \mathcal{R} (if non-zero). We also provide the solution in the case the manifold is \mathbb{E}^3 , \mathbb{T}^3 (with $V_{\mathbb{T}^3} = a^3$) and \mathbb{H}^3 . The zeroth order Φ_0 is not shown as it depends on the value of A present in the sum (22). We stress that $\Phi_0 \neq -N_\Sigma A$.

Topology	N_Σ	Φ_{-1}	Φ_1	Φ_2	Φ_3	Φ_4	Φ_5
Euclidean (infinite or Thurston-type)							
\mathbb{E}^3		-1	0	0	0	0	0
\mathbb{T}^3		-1	0	$-\frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{1}{V_\Sigma}$	0	-	0
Spherical							
\mathbb{S}^3	1	-1	$\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}$	$-\frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{1}{V_\Sigma}$	$\frac{1}{45} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^2$	$-\frac{2\pi}{45} \frac{\mathcal{R}/6}{V_\Sigma}$	$\frac{2}{945} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^3$
M_3	8	-1	$\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}$	$-\frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{1}{V_\Sigma}$	$\frac{1}{45} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^2$	-	$\frac{2}{945} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^3$
M_6	24	-1	$\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}$	$-\frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{1}{V_\Sigma}$	$\frac{1}{45} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^2$	-	$\frac{2}{945} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^3$
M_7	120	-1	$\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}$	$-\frac{2\pi}{3} \frac{1}{V_\Sigma}$	$\frac{1}{45} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^2$	$-\frac{2\pi}{45} \frac{\mathcal{R}/6}{V_\Sigma}$	$\frac{2}{945} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^3$
Hyperbolic (infinite)							
\mathbb{H}^3		-1	$\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}$	0	$\frac{1}{45} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^2$	0	$\frac{2}{945} \left(\frac{\mathcal{R}}{6}\right)^3$

Table 2. Maclaurin expansion of the gravitational potential ($GM = 1$) near a point mass in the infinite flat space and the 3-torus (given by formula (4.24) in [30]); in all the regular spherical topologies, as function of \mathcal{R} and V_Σ when they are non-zero; and for the simply connected hyperbolic case as given below in (26). The two natural conventions for the zeroth order Φ_0 are shown in table 3 and 4. The rows with N_Σ refer to quotients of \mathbb{S}^3 (Table 1). The dashed cells correspond to orders which are not isotropic, featuring a dependence on θ or φ . The case of a point mass in the hyperbolic 3-plane \mathbb{H}^3 is also presented to support the interpretations of these results made in Section 4.2, in this case $\mathcal{R} = -6$. However, \mathbb{H}^3 has the same topology as \mathbb{E}^3 , so these are the same topological 3-manifold, but with different curvatures (see the discussion in Section 4.3 concerning the physical relevance of this solution).

Two natural conventions are possible for setting the value of the constant A as a function of the topology.

- (i) Require $\Phi_0 = 0$. This is equivalent to requiring the vanishing of the potential at infinity in \mathbb{E}^3 . The values of A for this convention are given in Table 3. Using formula (22) with these values in N -body numerical simulations would avoid the need to calculate the zeroth order for each particle, which might increase numerical efficiency.
- (ii) Require the average of the potential over the volume of Σ to be zero:

$$\int_{V_\Sigma} \Phi_\Sigma(t, \mathbf{X}) a^3 \sin^2 \xi \sin \theta \, d\xi \, d\theta \, d\varphi = 0. \quad (24)$$

In this convention, adopted in crystallography and plasma physics for \mathbb{T}^3 , we have $\Phi_0 \neq 0$. The value of Φ_0 in this case (called the Madelung constant) is generally interpreted as the total interaction energy created by one particle in Σ [e.g. 31]. However, it is unclear if this interpretation is meaningful in the case of spherical topologies. The values of $\Phi_0 V_\Sigma^{1/3}$ (i.e. scaled to be adimensional at a fixed volume) in this convention are provided for completeness in Table 4. These are obtained by choosing $A = -1/(2\pi)$ for each topology.

Topology	N_Σ	Integration constant A for $\Phi_0 = 0$	
		Analytical	Numerical
\mathbb{S}^3	1	$\frac{1}{\pi}$	0.3183
M_3	8	$\frac{1}{4\pi}$	0.0796
M_6	24	$\frac{(9 - 4\sqrt{3}\pi)}{108\pi}$	-0.0376
M_7	120	$\frac{1}{60\pi} - \frac{1}{50}\sqrt{10 + \frac{22}{\sqrt{5}}} - \frac{1}{18\sqrt{3}}$	-0.1159

Table 3. Values of the constant A in formula (22) if we impose the convention $\Phi_0 = 0$, as a function of the regular spherical topologies.

While we do not expect the value of A for convention (i) to have physical significance, the value of Φ_0 in convention (ii) could be interpreted physically, as is the case in the relation between crystallography and the 3-torus [31].

4. Discussion

4.1. Isotropic terms

Table 2 shows the terms of the expansion series of each regular spherical topology through to the highest isotropic term, i.e. that does not depend on θ or φ . For \mathbb{S}^3 , i.e. the 1-cell topology, the solution is formula (21) and is therefore isotropic at full order. This is not the case for the other regular spherical topologies, where the isotropic property of the gravitational potential is violated at a high order, which depends on the topology. The Poincaré space, which tiles \mathbb{S}^3 with 120 cells, is the most isotropic space, in the sense that the potential remains isotropic up to and including the fifth order, which corresponds to the fourth order for the gravitational field $\mathbf{g} := -\mathbf{D}\Phi$.

We expect that anisotropic terms for these and other spherical topologies are generically much more common than the isotropic terms. However, averaging of observations under the assumption of intrinsic isotropy often enables the extraction of information with a minimum of free parameters: it will generally be easier to infer isotropic terms than anisotropic ones. Nevertheless, investigating if these anisotropic terms are useful for distinguishing different topologies would be worth followup work.

4.2. Interpretation of the even and odd orders

In Table 2, we see that the spherical topologies have the same isotropic odd orders of their expansion series at fixed curvature, and the same even orders at fixed volume. For the 3-torus, the first order is missing with respect to the spherical cases, but again, the

Topology	N_Σ	$\Phi_0 V_\Sigma^{1/3}$ for $\int_{V_\Sigma} \Phi dV = 0$
Euclidean		
\mathbb{T}^3	–	2.837
Spherical		
\mathbb{S}^3	1	1.290
M_3	8	2.581
M_6	24	2.733
M_7	120	2.847

Table 4. Values of $\Phi_0 V_\Sigma^{1/3}$ (adimensional value at fixed volume) in case (ii), in which we impose the integral convention (24), as a function of the regular spherical topologies. These values are obtained with the choice $A = -1/(2\pi)$, which cancels the average of the potential for each topology. We also provide the value in the case of \mathbb{T}^3 given by the zeroth order of the Ewald summation [30, 31].

second order is the same at fixed volume. To interpret this remarkable feature let us consider the solution of the Poisson equation (10) in \mathbb{H}^3 , which can be thought of as \mathbb{R}^3 on which a non-zero spatial curvature of the form $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \mathcal{R}_i/(3a^2) h_{ij} = -2/a^2 h_{ij}$ is imposed: we have $D_c D^c \Phi_{\mathbb{H}^3} = 4\pi GM \delta_{\mathbb{H}^3}$, which leads to

$$\partial_\xi^2 \Phi_{\mathbb{H}^3} + 2 \coth \xi \partial_\xi \Phi_{\mathbb{H}^3} = 4\pi GM \delta_{\mathbb{H}^3}, \quad (25)$$

where $\text{sinn}(\xi) = \sinh(\xi)$ in formula (13). The solution is

$$\Phi_{\mathbb{H}^3} = -\frac{GM}{a(t)} \coth(\xi). \quad (26)$$

We give the expansion series around $\xi \sim 0$ of this solution, as a function of the distance $r = a\xi$ from the origin, in the last line of Table 2. The odd positive orders are the same as in the spherical topologies when normalised by the scalar curvature. However, the even terms are missing.

Thus, it appears that we can interpret the odd (positive) orders as an effect of non-zero spatial curvature, as these are present for the spherical topologies, but are absent for \mathbb{T}^3 and \mathbb{E}^3 , where $\mathcal{R} = 0$. Moreover, we can interpret the even orders to be an effect of the closedness (volume finiteness, in this context) of the manifold, as these are missing for \mathbb{H}^3 and \mathbb{E}^3 (which are both open manifolds), but are present (isotropic at second order) for all the spherical topologies (which are necessarily closed) and for \mathbb{T}^3 . However, while the odd terms depend solely on the curvature, the even terms can depend on both, and not solely on the volume. This is the case for the fourth (isotropic) order.

In summary, it appears that, apart from the usual infinite Euclidean -1 -th order, the odd (isotropic) orders indicate curvature and the even (isotropic) orders indicate finiteness.

4.3. Is the solution in \mathbb{H}^3 physical?

While of interest in the current work, the solution of the Poisson equation in the infinite space \mathbb{H}^3 would not normally be considered to be physical as a non-Euclidean Newtonian gravitational potential in the sense of NEN theory, which prioritises topological classification over geometrical properties. Thus, for two manifolds having the same topology, only one Newtonian-like theory should be considered physically valid. In particular, if the topology of the manifold is that of \mathbb{E}^3 , we should necessarily take a zero Ricci tensor, and use (Euclidean) Newton's theory. So, because \mathbb{H}^3 and \mathbb{E}^3 are the same topological space, but not the same Riemannian manifold in the sense that the Riemann structures defined on the manifolds are different, there exists only one Newtonian gravitational field, which is that given by considering the Ricci tensor to be zero. Thus, the solution of the equation $D_c D^c \phi = 4\pi GM\delta$ with $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \mathcal{R}/3h_{ij}$ and $\mathcal{R} < 0$ should not normally be considered as the Newtonian gravitational potential in the corresponding topological space.

For clarification, the procedure for calculating the Newtonian gravitational field in a 3-manifold in NEN theory is the following:

- (i) We choose the topology of the manifold Σ in which we want to calculate the Newtonian gravitational field.
- (ii) Following the procedure proposed in [19], the Ricci tensor that needs to be considered should be the 'simplest' one that can be defined in the topological space Σ . If the topology is irreducible in the sense given by the Thurston decomposition (so necessarily closed), then \mathcal{R}_{ij} is given by the spatial metrics in [27]; and if the topology is that of \mathbb{E}^3 , then one must take $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = 0$.

Thus, this procedure excludes a Riemannian manifold which has the topology of \mathbb{E}^3 but a non-zero Ricci tensor, i.e. we cannot have \mathbb{H}^3 , and instead we only have \mathbb{E}^3 . This is a consequence of hyperbolic topologies in the Thurston classification only including closed manifolds. For closed hyperbolic 3-manifolds, the equation $D_c D^c \phi = 4\pi GM(\delta_\Sigma - M/V_\Sigma)$ is valid, with $\mathcal{R}_{ij} = \mathcal{R}/3h_{ij}$ and $\mathcal{R} < 0$, since V_Σ is defined (finite).

Remark. The splitting (17) is only possible because the volume of the covering space \mathbb{S}^3 is finite. For Euclidean or hyperbolic topologies, performing this decomposition 'naively' would lead to an infinite, divergent sum. In these two cases, a method to enable the calculation of the potential in a closed topology is to renormalise the divergent sum (see [30] for the case of a 3-torus and the Poisson equation using the absolute density). For example, the Ewald summation used in some N -body codes corresponds to such a renormalisation in the case of the (Euclidean) 3-torus.

5. Conclusion

In this paper we used the non-Euclidean Newtonian theory developed in [19] to calculate the expansion series of the gravitational potential near a point mass in the 'regular'

spherical topologies. Our definition of ‘regular’ yielded the hypersphere S^3 and the multiply connected spherical 3-manifolds M_3, M_6, M_7 as listed in Table 1. The results are summarised in Table 2. As in the case of the (Euclidean) 3-torus, the potential in the spherical topologies includes terms in the Maclaurin series beyond the usual $1/r$ Newtonian term. The gravitational potential is isotropic to an order that depends on the choice of topology: anisotropies appear at the fourth order for M_3 and M_6 ($N_\Sigma = 8$ and 24 cells, respectively); and at sixth order for $M_7 = \mathbb{S}^3/I^*$ (the Poincaré dodecahedral space, with $N_\Sigma = 120$). In this sense, the Poincaré space is the most isotropic multiply connected spherical topology.

This newly found uniqueness of the Poincaré space is qualitatively similar to that found with the earlier, adjacent-images heuristical approach, in which the Poincaré space was the ‘best-balanced’ [20], but is better justified physically using the current approach. What also remains qualitatively confirmed in the study of topological acceleration [16] is that the local kinematics and the integrated spacetime paths of extragalactic objects carry, in principle, information that characterises the global topology of the Universe.

We propose an interpretation for the different terms in the expansion series of the potential beyond the $1/r$ term. The isotropic even orders can be interpreted as an effect of the closedness of the manifold, because these are absent for a single point mass in \mathbb{E}^3 or \mathbb{H}^3 . The isotropic odd orders can be interpreted as an effect of non-zero spatial scalar curvature, because the first and third orders are missing for the 3-torus (used in typical cosmological Newtonian N -body simulations), where the first non-zero term is a second order term.

The sign of the first order potential term for spherical topologies is opposite to that of the $1/r$ term; differentiation to obtain the gravitational field brings the signs into agreement. This implies that for the same volume, a gravitational zeroth order attraction from nearby a point mass exists for these topologies but is absent for the 3-torus. However, because this correcting term is proportional to r/L , where L is the scale of the closed topology (with a current observational lower bound of around 10 to 20 $(\text{Gpc}/h)^3$ [e.g. 8, 13–15]), we expect it to have negligible effects on the scale of a galaxy. It remains to be seen if at the distance scales of a cluster of galaxies, cosmic voids, superclusters, or higher, where we might need to consider the full form of the gravitational potential, a spherical topology has more easily observable effects on structure formation and the statistics of redshift space distortions. Such a study could be performed by comparing a cosmological Newtonian 3-torus N -body simulation to N -body simulations based on the non-Euclidean Newtonian theory.

In this paper we only considered multiply connected quotients of the spherical Thurston class, and we focussed on the spaces most likely to have isotropic effects. Calculating the gravitational potential in multiply connected hyperbolic 3-manifolds and on anisotropic terms in the spherical cases is left to future work. Generalising the non-Euclidean Newtonian theory to all of the topologies of the Thurston classification would also be an interesting study that would provide a more complete understanding of this theory.

Data and code availability

The scripts for calculating and confirming the results in Tables 2, 3 and 4 are available as free-licensed software (GPL-2 or later) at <https://codeberg.org/boud/topoaccel>. These can be run using the free-licensed software package MAXIMA (<https://maxima.sourceforge.io/documentation.html>).

Acknowledgements

We thank Etienne Jaupart for useful discussions. Part of this work has been supported by the Polish MNiSW grant DIR/WK/2018/12. Part of this work has been supported by the Poznań Supercomputing and Networking Center (PSNC) computational grant 537.

References

- [1] Thurston W P 1982 *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6**(3), 357–381.
https://projecteuclid.org/journals/bulletin-of-the-american-mathematical-society-new-series/volume-6/issue-3/Three-dimensional-manifolds-Kleinian-groups/bams/11835487_82.full.
- [2] Roukema B F 1996 *MNRAS* **283**(4), 1147–1152, [arXiv:astro-ph/9603052].
- [3] Lehoucq R, Lachieze-Rey M and Luminet J P 1996 *A&A* **313**, 339–346, [arXiv:gr-qc/9604050].
- [4] Lehoucq R, Luminet J P and Uzan J P 1999 *A&A* **344**, 735–743, [arXiv:astro-ph/9811107].
- [5] Fujii H and Yoshii Y 2011a *A&A* **529**, A121, [arXiv:1103.1466].
- [6] Fujii H and Yoshii Y 2011b *A&A* **531**, A171, [arXiv:1105.2337].
- [7] Fujii H and Yoshii Y 2013 *ApJ* **773**(2), 152, [arXiv:1306.2737].
- [8] Roukema B F, France M J, Kazimierczak T A and Buchert T 2014 *MNRAS* **437**(2), 1096–1108, [arXiv:1302.4425].
- [9] Cornish N J, Spergel D N and Starkman G D 1998 *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **15**(9), 2657–2670, [arXiv:gr-qc/9602039].
- [10] Luminet J P and Roukema B F 1999 in M Lachièze-Rey, ed., ‘Theoretical and Observational Cosmology’ Vol. 541 of *NATO Advanced Study Institute (ASI) Series C* p. 117, [arXiv:astro-ph/9901364].
- [11] Roukema B F 2000 *MNRAS* **312**(4), 712–723, [arXiv:astro-ph/9910272].
- [12] Luminet J P, Weeks J R, Riazuelo A, Lehoucq R and Uzan J P 2003 *Nature* **425**(6958), 593–595, [arXiv:astro-ph/0310253].
- [13] Aurich R, Lustig S, Steiner F and Then H 2004 *Class. & Quantum Gravity* **21**(21), 4901–4925, [arXiv:astro-ph/0403597].

- [14] Aurich R 2008 *Class. & Quantum Gravity* **25**(22), 225017, [arXiv:0803.2130].
- [15] Planck Collaboration 2020 *A&A* **641**, A6, [arXiv:1807.06209].
- [16] Roukema B F, Bajtlik S, Biesiada M, Szaniewska A and Jurkiewicz H 2007 *A&A* **463**(3), 861–871, [arXiv:astro-ph/0602159].
- [17] Brunswic L and Buchert T 2020 *Class. & Quantum Gravity* **37**(21), 215022, [arXiv:2002.08336].
- [18] Macpherson H J, Price D J and Lasky P D 2019 *Phys. Rev. D* **99**(6), 063522, [arXiv:1807.01711].
- [19] Vigneron Q 2022 *arXiv e-prints* p. arXiv:2201.02112, [arXiv:2201.02112].
- [20] Roukema B F and Rózański P T 2009 *A&A* **502**(1), 27–35, [arXiv:0902.3402].
- [21] Barrow J D 2020 *Class. & Quantum Gravity* **37**(12), 125007, [arXiv:2002.10155].
- [22] Künzle H P 1972 *Annales de l'I.H.P. Physique théorique* **17**(4), 337–362.
http://www.numdam.org/item/AIHPA_1972__17_4_337_0
- [23] Vigneron Q 2021 *Phys. Rev. D* **103**(6), 064064, [arXiv:2012.10213].
- [24] Cavicchioli A, Spaggiari F and Telloni A 2009 *Topology and its Applications* **156**(4), 812–822.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166864108003623>
- [25] Gausmann E, Lehoucq R, Luminet J P, Uzan J P and Weeks J 2001 *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **18**(23), 5155–5186, [arXiv:gr-qc/0106033].
- [26] Everitt B 2004 *Topology and its Applications* **138**, 253, [arXiv:math/0104182].
- [27] Lachieze-Rey M and Luminet J 1995 *Phys. Rep.* **254**, 135–214, [arXiv:gr-qc/9605010].
- [28] Weeks J, Luminet J P, Riazuelo A and Lehoucq R 2004 *MNRAS* **352**(1), 258–262, [arXiv:astro-ph/0312312].
- [29] Clifton T, Rosquist K and Tavakol R 2012 *Phys. Rev. D* **86**(4), 043506, [arXiv:1203.6478].
- [30] Steiner F 2016 *arXiv e-prints* p. arXiv:1608.03133, [arXiv:1608.03133].
- [31] Brush S G, Sahlin H L and Teller E 1966 *J. Chem. Phys.* **45**(6), 2102–2118.
- [32] Roukema B F 2001 *MNRAS* **325**(1), 138–142, [arXiv:astro-ph/0102099].

Appendix A. Calculation of $d_{(i)}$ in \mathbb{E}^4

Using the gravitational potential of one point mass in \mathbb{S}^3 as given by formula (21), the potential in any spherical topology, given by (18), becomes:

$$\Phi_{\Sigma}(t, \xi, \theta, \varphi) = -\frac{GM}{a(t)} \sum_i \left[\cot d_{(i)} - \frac{d_{(i)} \cot d_{(i)}}{\pi} + A \right], \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $d_{(i)}$ is the *comoving* distance between the point at (ξ, θ, φ) and the i^{th} image.

A simple method to compute the $d_{(i)}$ is to use an embedding of \mathbb{S}^3 in \mathbb{E}^4 so that the metric on \mathbb{S}^3 is preserved [as in 20]: a point (ξ, θ, φ) on the 3-sphere is described by a 4-vector \mathbf{X} in \mathbb{E}^4 such that $X_\mu X^\mu = 1$, where Greek indices run from 0 to 3^{||}. The embedding is not physical but just a mathematical trick to simplify the calculation of the $d_{(i)}$. The mapping onto the 3-sphere, i.e. from $(X_\mu)_{\mu=0,1,2,3}$ to (ξ, θ, φ) , is made with hyperspherical coordinates:

$$\begin{cases} X_0 = \cos \xi, \\ X_1 = \sin \xi \sin \theta \cos \varphi, \\ X_2 = \sin \xi \sin \theta \sin \varphi, \\ X_3 = \sin \xi \cos \theta, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and the distance $d[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}]$, on the 3-sphere, between two points X_μ and Y_μ is given by

$$d[\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}] = \arccos(\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Thus, the calculation of distances on \mathbb{S}^3 corresponds to the calculation of a scalar product in \mathbb{E}^4 (introduced in observational cosmology for the spherical and hyperbolic cases in [32]). Setting the positions of the topological images of the point mass as unit 4-vectors $\mathbf{Y}_{(i)}$, we obtain $d_{(i)} = \arccos(\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_{(i)})$, with \mathbf{X} defined by (A.2), and the gravitational potential (A.1) becomes

$$\frac{a}{GM} \Phi_\Sigma(t, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{\mathbf{Y}_{(i)} \in \{\gamma_i \in \Gamma\}} - \left[\frac{\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_{(i)}}{\sqrt{1 - (\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_{(i)})^2}} (1 - \arccos(\mathbf{X} \cdot \mathbf{Y}_{(i)}) / \pi) + A \right]. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

^{||} The pull-back of the flat metric of \mathbb{E}^4 on the hypersurface defined by $X_\mu X^\mu = 1$ is a 3-metric of constant scalar curvature. This means that this embedding of the 3-sphere in \mathbb{E}^4 preserves the spatial metric.