arXiv:2302.01095v1 [gr-qc] 2 Feb 2023

Hints at a relationship between friction and relativistic physics*

E. Minguzzi†

Abstract

In applied mechanics Reye's law (1860) establishes, via energy arguments, that the mass of the debris produced by dry friction in the contact of rigid bodies is proportional to the work done by friction forces. This result has long been used for the determination of the distribution of pressure in the contact of rigid bodies, and hence for the design of brakes. In this work I show that, when bodies losing mass due to friction are treated, as they should, as variable mass systems, a relationship analogous to the relativistic mass formula is recovered. This result suggests that mathematical structures typical of relativistic physics could have been discovered prior to 1905, without making any reference to electromagnetism, group theory or the speed of light. Also this result could point to the existence of a physical theory depending on two constants, the speed of light (Reye's constant) and a universal frictional deceleration with respect to an absolute frame. The limit of the theory for vanishing friction would give Special Relativity, as the absolute frame would become unobservable, while the limit for the speed of light going to infinity would lead to Aristotelian mechanics, i.e. a classical mechanics type theory presenting universal friction. Finally, I present a reference frame transformation that displays these features and I apply the theory to some open cosmological problems.

1 Introduction

In the last two decades I have been working on the foundations of relativity theory and causality [1], while teaching courses in Rational (Analytical) Mechanics to students in mechanical engineering. I enjoyed teaching these courses as I learned a lot particularly exploring results in mechanics that do not typically belong to the curriculum of a physicist. This work is the result of one such exploration in which my two interests in the foundations of relativity physics and in mechanics went to interact.

*Talk at the conference DICE2022, Spacetime - Matter - Quantum Mechanics 'Quantum riddles and spacetime oddities', Castiglioncello, Sep. 19-23, 2022.

†Dipartimento di Matematica Applicata "G. Sansone", Università degli Studi di Firenze, Via S. Marta 3, I-50139 Firenze, Italy. E-mail: ettore.minguzzi@unifi.it

As a physicist I have always been puzzled by the following question: given two rigid bodies sharing a flat surface, how is the pressure between them going to distribute? If the normal force is N and the area of contact is A, it could be tempting to answer: $p = N/A$. However, this looks just as the simplest possible answer though not necessarily the correct one. For instance, should we expect this answer to change if the two bodies are in relative motion? Should the pressure depend on the relative velocity at the contact point? At first, I really did not think much about this question because I supposed that a correct answer would necessarily rely on a study of the deformation of the bodies and hence on elements of elasticity theory. Only in this way, I thought, one could really elaborate some argument leading to the justification of some pressure distribution.

My arguments appeared to be correct but were in fact, as I would later realize, quite wrong. The problem of finding the distribution of pressure had been already solved in 1860 by the German mathematician Reye through an ingenious argument that involved the consideration of friction and that completely disregarded elasticity [2]. His argument is elegant and marries well with the idealized notion of rigid body that is so much used in mechanics. There is really no need to abandon the rigid body idealization just to solve the pressure distribution problem.

A historical note: Karl Theodore Reye (1838–1919) was a German mathematician who contributed significatively to projective geometry. He studied at the polytechnic in Hanover and in Zürich, where he turned to theoretical physics under the influence of Rudolf Clausius. When he was 22, in 1860, he published the landmark paper [2] "On the theory of pivot friction" where he established a successful theory of wear under friction.



Figure 1: Karl Theodore Reye

In his study Reye considers the friction of two bodies A and B, sliding one against the other on a common surface Σ under friction. One of the bodies, say A, is considered hard so that friction wears out just the (soft) body B. It can be assumed that a given proportion of the work done by friction forces goes in the breaking of the intermolecular bonds and hence in the detachment of mass from the soft body. He then establishes [2]

Reye's wear law (1860): The wear, that is the mass of the debris pro-

duced, is proportional to the work done by friction forces:

$$m_{debris} = \frac{1}{c^2}|L_f| \tag{1}$$

where c is Reye's constant (it has dimensions of a velocity and it depends on the type of materials at contact). He also showed how to use this formula to deduce the pressure distribution on the contact surface via geometrical arguments (we shall see some examples in a moment, uniform pressure turns out to be untenable). The experimental verification of the law was sufficiently good, in fact resistance to wear was defined and measured based on its validity [3].

Opatowski [4] wrote in 1942:

> The importance of wear by friction is, in some mechanical organs, particularly brakes, so great, that the ideas which Reye published 80 years ago still form today the theoretical basis for their design.

Although there were much posterior derivations of Eq. (1), most notably by Archard [5] (1953), or by M. M. Khrushchov and M. A. Babichev (1960) for the metal-metal contact, these were actually derivations based on other laws valid in specific contact models. It is no surprise that the same law (1) can be reached starting from several different microscopical mechanisms, based on microscopic laws that apply only in specific circumstances. The strongest argument seems Reye's as it is based on energy considerations alone and as is, for this reason, universal, i.e. independent of specific microscopic models.

In Italy Reye's law, also called Reye's assumption, entered very early in the program of the university course "Meccanica applicata alle macchine" (Mechanics of machines) and has always been a traditional topic of study, particularly for its usefulness in the design of brakes.

Villaggio [6] states that Reye's work was first introduced in university courses in Italy by Modesto Panetti. Panetti wrote a paper on applications of Reye's law in 1908 [7] while first editions of his university book [8] introducing Reye's law to students in engineering were published in 1913. However, I found that this account is not completely accurate. The teaching of "Meccanica applicata alle macchine" started earlier in the "Scuola d'applicazione per gli ingegneri" established in Turin in 1860. The course was first thought by Prospero Richelmy, from the foundation of the school to 1880, then by Ferdinando Zucchetti till 1882 and then by Scipione Cappa assisted by Elia Ovazza for several years [9]. It was Cappa who introduced in his 1890 university book Reye's law [10] devoting to it considerable space (also cited in [11]). As the Italian tradition of "Meccanica applicata alle macchine" originated from this school, it appears likely that most Italian University professors, including Panetti, learned of Reye's work from Cappa's 1890 book and posterior editions. Some early references dealing with Reye's law are [12, 13], while as more recent references [14, 15] can be mentioned.

Early sources in English that mention Reye's work are certainly less numerous and include the 1891 translation 'The Constructor' by Henry Harrison Suplee of F. Reuleaux classic, or Weisbach book [16].

Reye's law admits an infinitesimal formulation. Denoting with m the mass of the soft body B, with W_f the power of the friction force (necessarily negative), with $\boldsymbol{F}_f$ the friction force and with $\boldsymbol{v}$ velocity of B relative to A,

$$\dot{m} = \frac{1}{c^2} W_f = \frac{1}{c^2} \boldsymbol{F}_f \cdot \boldsymbol{v} = -\frac{1}{c^2} F_f v,$$

where we used the fact that the friction force is oriented opposite to the relative velocity.

The power of friction forces might depend on the region of the contact surface Σ considered. Thus the body B might wear out more at some points than others. The previous formula has to be applied on a small region of Σ of area ΔA, then $F_f = \mu p \Delta A$, where μ is the friction coefficient and p is the pressure. Denoting with ρ the density, we have $\mathrm{d}m = -\rho \Delta A \mathrm{d}h$, where h is the width of the wear out part. As a result

$$\dot{h} = \frac{\mu}{\rho} \frac{1}{c^2} pv.$$

This equation shows that wear is proportional to the product of pressure and velocity at the contact point. Geometrical considerations impose specific forms for the function $h : \Sigma \to \mathbb{R}$ and hence for the product pv. This ultimately allows the determination of the pressure distribution.

For instance, Figures 2 and 3 show what happens to a block that loses mass due to wear depending on different geometrical constraints imposed on it.




Figure 2: A block loses mass due to friction while it moves. The block is aided by an idealized device that avoids its tilting. As a result pressure is uniformly distributed as $\dot{h}$ does no depend on the contact point.

An interesting design of a brake is depicted in Figure 4. Here the hard part A is the wheel, while the soft part B is the block that is pushed horizontally towards the wheel by a force $\boldsymbol{Q}$. As the wheel spins with angular velocity ω the relative velocity at each contact point might depend on time but is actually independent of the point and hence of θ. As a result the pressure is proportional to $\dot{h}$. The geometrical constraint, accurately show in the figure, shows how the block wears as it translates. The result is $\dot{h} \propto \cos\theta$ which implies $p = a \cos\theta$ for some constant a. The constant a could be determined by using the range of θ and the friction coefficient μ by imposing that the contact force between wheel and block equals Q.




Figure 3: A block loses mass due to friction while it moves. As it is pushed by a force R, and the angular velocity is negligible, the pressure distributes so as to balance the mechanical momentum with respect to G. This results in an uneven pressure distribution and hence in the (slow) tilting of the block. In first approximation the pressure distribution must be linear, $p = a + bx$, as h varies linearly with the horizontal coordinate x.




Figure 4: A simple brake in which, by Reye's law, $p = a\cos\theta$, for some constant $a > 0$.

As a further example we can consider a cylindrical annulus of mass m spinning over a flat horizontal surface (Fig. 5). The interior radius of the annulus is r while the exterior radius is R. If the axis of the cylinder does not tilt as it wears (we might assume that there is some mechanism preventing it from happening), the function $\dot{h}$ is constant (Fig. 7). Indeed, if the cylinder were to wear in an inhomogeneous way that would lead to more friction precisely in those regions that are less worn and that are therefore more exposed to contact

and friction (Fig. 6). We conclude that the product of pressure and velocity is constant, and since the latter is proportional to the distance ρ from the axis, $p = a/\rho$ for some constant a. From here it is easy to calculate that $a = \frac{mg}{2\pi(R-r)}$.




Figure 5: The surface of contact Σ. Friction and relative velocity depend on the region considered.




Figure 6: Inhomogeneous wearing (B) naturally leads to more load and friction in those regions that have previously lost less mass, and that are, as a result, more exposed. Ultimately, the stationary configuration is that of homogeneous wearing as illustrated in figure 7.




Figure 7: Homogeneous wearing follows from the request that the axis does not tilt.

2 Variable mass system

So far we were concerned with the problem of the pressure distribution and we assumed, as it is reasonable in practical problems, that the loss of mass is negligible when it comes to consider the dynamics of a body. Let us study the dynamical problem by assuming that Reye's law is exact, also well beyond the regimes of velocity in which it has been verified, and let us solve the dynamical equations with all rigor, by using the laws of classical mechanics.

Rigorously speaking, a body that loses mass should be treated as a variable mass system and hence the first cardinal equation of dynamics should be replaced by the Painlevé and Seeliger formula (1890). This formula follows from the conservation of momentum and is familiar from rocket theory [17]. In the block example we shall write (see Fig. 8)

$$m\dot{\mathbf{v}} = \mathbf{F}_f - \dot{m}(\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_d) \tag{2}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_d$ is the velocity of the debris after detachment. In our case the debris do not move with respect to the hard body A (the horizontal plane) and so $\mathbf{v}_d = 0$.




Figure 8: The block loses mass. The debris come to rest in the reference frame of the horizontal plane (hard body A).

Denoting with $\mathbf{p} := m\mathbf{v}$ the linear momentum we obtain the system of equations

$$\dot{m} = \frac{1}{c^2}\mathbf{F}_f \cdot \boldsymbol{v} = -\frac{1}{c^2}\, a_f p, \quad \text{(Reye)} \tag{3}$$

$$\dot{\mathbf{p}} = \mathbf{F}_f = -a_f m\hat{\mathbf{v}}. \quad \text{(Painlevé and Seeliger)} \tag{4}$$

where we used the formula for Coulomb's dynamical friction $\mathbf{F}_f = -\mu mg\hat{\mathbf{v}} = -ma_f\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ and where we introduced the constant $a_f := \mu g$, which is a characteristic acceleration related to friction. Actually many of the below calculations generalize to a_f dependent on velocity, and hence to Stokes friction.

2.1 A puzzling result

Multiplying Eq. (3) by m, multiplying scalarly Eq. (4) by $\frac{1}{c^2}\,\mathbf{p}$, and taking the difference we obtain that there is a constant $\tilde{m}$ such that

$$m^2 - \frac{1}{c^2}\mathbf{p}^2 = \tilde{m}^2, \tag{5}$$

or equivalently

$$m = \frac{\tilde{m}}{\sqrt{1-\frac{v^2}{c^2}}}, \qquad v < c \qquad if\ \tilde{m} > 0, \tag{6}$$

$$mc^2 = p\,c, \qquad v = c, \qquad if\ \tilde{m} = 0, \tag{7}$$

$$m = \frac{|\tilde{m}|}{\sqrt{\frac{v^2}{c^2}-1}}, \qquad v > c \qquad if\ \tilde{m} \text{ is imaginary}, \tag{8}$$

Observe that both $v(t)$ and $m(t)$ are time dependent, due to the presence of friction and wear. The just obtained result tells us that they maintain a relationship in time.

As we can see, such relationship is formally coincident with the relativistic mass formula, where in the parallelism Reye's constant c corresponds to the speed of light. The three cases might be called bradyonic, luxonic and tachyonic.

The physical interpretation of $\tilde{m}$ in the bradyonic case can be read off the above formula, that is, $\tilde{m}$ is the mass for $v \to 0$, namely the mass that the block will have after wearing by friction is completed, i.e. after the block has come to rest with respect to the frame of the horizontal plane.

From the previous equations, taking into account that the mass m is always positive, we obtain

$$\dot{\mathbf{v}} = (\mathbf{F}_f - \dot{m}\mathbf{v})/m = -a_f(1-\frac{v^2}{c^2})\hat{\mathbf{v}}. \tag{9}$$

This equation shows that if the body has velocity c it keeps moving in straight line preserving it (luxonic case). At that speed the block velocity would be basically insensitive to friction. However, mass and linear momentum decrease (recall that $p = mv$)

$$p(t) = p(0)\,e^{-\frac{1}{c}a_f t}, \qquad \text{for } v = c. \tag{10}$$

In the bradyonic casee Eq. (9) can be integrated and gives for $a_f \neq 0$

$$v(t) = c\tanh(\varphi - \frac{a_f}{c}\,t), \qquad \text{for } 0 \leq v < c, \tag{11}$$

where φ is an integration constant (interpreted as the rapidity) related to the initial velocity ($c\tanh\varphi$). We observe that for the chosen Coulomb friction the time needed to reach a complete stop is finite, namely $t_f = c\varphi/a_f$.

The dependence of mass on time is

$$m(t) = \tilde{m}\cosh(\varphi - \frac{a_f}{c}\,t), \qquad \text{for bradyonic case.} \tag{12}$$

It becomes equal to the mass $\tilde{m}$ when the body comes to rest in A.

Let us integrate once more in the bradyonic case

$$x(t) = -\frac{c^2}{a_f}\ln\cosh(\varphi - \frac{a_f}{c}\,t) + x_f = -\frac{c^2}{a_f}\ln\cosh\Big(\frac{a_f}{c}(t_f - t)\Big) + x_f \tag{13}$$

where x_f is the coordinate of the stopping point and t_f is the stopping time.

The above 'relativistic mass formula' (6) follows just from the principles of ordinary classical mechanics and is certainly correct for small v, as Reye's law holds in that limit. Light, electromagnetism and related concepts did not enter the previous derivation. We might say that pre-1905 ordinary classical mechanics might itself suggest to investigate theories which embody mathematical results characteristic of relativistic physics.

3 Hints at new physics

The study of the previous section seems to suggest that there might be a relationship between friction and relativistic physics, in the sense that both phenomenologies might follow from a more general theory. The idea would be to develop a theory in which bodies are affected by a universal friction, and in which mass varies according to Reye's law.

The CMB radiation suggests that some privileged frame might exist after all, a frame that might exert some sort of friction on moving bodies. This friction might be extremely small but still have consequences for the formal structure of the theory.

Let us pause to recall that Newtonian Mechanics is based on the principle of Galileian invariance. As a result, the spacetime of Newtonian mechanics is a 4-dimensional affine space M endowed with a time projection $\pi : M \to T$; the space S being the model for the fibers $S_t = \pi^{-1}(t)$.

Actually, most authors develop Newtonian mechanics as Newton originally did, namely by working with a spacetime that splits as a product of space and time: $M = S \times T$. This is actually the mathematical structure of an Aristotelian spacetime with an absolute notion of 'space' and hence of 'rest' (the wordline (P, t) represents a point at 'absolute rest'). This approach to Newtonian mechanics certainly simplifies the mathematics of the theory, though the use of such an Aristotelian spacetime appears as artificial and unsatisfactory: the absolute space, which is formally present, is actually unobservable as the laws of Physics, with their Galileian invariance, do not allow for its determination.

It is interesting to observe that the original Aristotelian mechanics, with its spacetime $S \times T$, was epistemologically more satisfactory than Newtonian mechanics in the above simplified form. Indeed, Aristotle imposed that bodies

not exerted upon by forces come ultimately to rest in the absolute frame. The absolute space of Aristotelian mechanics is therefore observable.

It is often claimed that Aristotle, quite naively, did not realize that the natural state of motion of bodies is that of uniform motion, as he did not recognize the role of friction forces. However, this is not a fair historical account. As Dugas [18] points out, Aristotle was very well aware that probably, in vacuum, a body would have moved in uniform motion indefinitely. However, from that he inferred that absolute vacuum is impossible. In other words, it is not because Aristotle did not recognize the role of friction that he did not arrive at the relativity principle, but rather because he regarded the principle that every body should come to absolute rest as more fundamental than the relativity principle. Indeed, some kind of deceleration is necessary in order to give physical observability to the concept of absolute space which Aristotle was not prepared to abandon. Stated in another way, Aristotle regarded as more important the spacetime structure $S \times T$, and hence the absolute space idea, rather than the relativity principle. For this reason he had to assume the ultimate deceleration of all bodies so that the absolute rest frame could become observable.

We see that while in Galileian mechanics friction has a negative connotation, as it spoils the uniform motion of bodies, in Aristotelian mechanics it has a positive connotation, has it is the main element that makes the absolute space observable and hence the very concept of absolute space epistemologically well posed.

A theory embodying a universal friction is naturally a theory that involves some absolute reference frame and conversely. Our sought theory is then going to share these features and additionally is going to interpolate between Special Relativity and Aristotelian mechanics.

So our idea is to explore a theory with the following features

(a) With respect to the previous treatment of the free block, it lives in one more space dimension, i.e. the surface of friction is now a volume. The normal force is, so to say, in the extra-direction, but we are concerned only to what happens in the observable 3-space.

(b) Friction acts over all bodies as in Eq. (4) via a coefficient a_f that is universal and unrelated to the chemical composition of the matter involved. Save for light, all bodies come ultimately to rest with respect to an absolute reference frame S_0, their mass m converging to the their absolute rest mass $\tilde{m}$.

(c) Mass is lost as in Eq. (3) and Reye's constant c is identified with the speed of light.

Mathematically it develops as a straightforward generalization of the previous theory for the moving block, where the equations there obtained are reinterpreted as applying to general bodies in the new theory. Of course, by proceeding in this way we shall miss a field theoretical description. Still this approach might give insights into a theory sharing the above features.




Figure 9: Limits of the theory.

The theory depends on 2-parameters a_f and c and, as mentioned, shall have two special limits, which are:

SR: For $a_f \to 0$ friction goes to zero and the absolute space ceases to exist (observe that for $a_f > 0$ we can recognize the absolute space as eventually all bodies come to rest with respect to it). In this limit the natural state of bodies is that of uniform motion (relativity principle), however, since the relativistic mass formula (6) does not depend on a_f and is preserved in the limit, one expects to recover Special Relativity rather than Galileian Relativity.

AM: For $c \to \infty$ we have by Reye's law $\dot{m} = 0$, masses are constant in time but there is still friction and the theory reduces to Aristotelian mechanics with a universal friction.

If from SR we let $c \to \infty$ we naturally obtain Galileian mechanics (GM), and similarly, from AM with $a_f \to 0$ we obtain also Galileian mechanics as bodies no more slow down to absolute rest. We arrive at the diagram of Fig. 9.

Let us show that the Lorentz transformation can be generalized so as to depend on two parameters c and a_f and so as to satisfy this scheme. Of course, we are not looking for a group of transformations as the absolute rest frame S_0 will be privileged. The group property should be recovered only for $a_f \to 0$, namely when the privileged frame becomes unobservable. We shall see in a moment that this limit group is indeed the Lorentz group.

So, let S_0 be the absolute frame that parametrizes events with coordinates (t_0, x_0, y_0, z_0), and let S be a moving frame of coordinates (t, x, y, z) whose origin moves on the abscissa of S_0.

The motion of the origin of S satisfies Eqs. (11), (13), which shows that S

will come to rest with respect S_0 at time $t_f = \frac{c\varphi}{a_f}$, its velocity at $t = 0$ being $c \tanh \varphi$.

The change of frame for $t_0 < t_f$ is[1]

$$\begin{aligned} t &= -\frac{c}{a_f} \operatorname{arcsin} \tanh(\varphi - \frac{a_f}{c} t_0) + \frac{c}{a_f} \operatorname{arcsin} \tanh(\varphi), \\ x &= \cosh(\varphi - \frac{a_f}{c} t_0) \Big(x_0 + \frac{c^2}{a_f} \log \frac{\cosh(\varphi - \frac{a_f}{c} t_0)}{\cosh \varphi} \Big). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

It is such that $(0,0,0,0) \to (0,0,0,0)$, namely the frame origins meet when the respective clocks sign zero time. As mentioned, φ is an integration constant related to the velocity of the frame S with respect to S_0 at the instant when the origins meet (this velocity is $c \tanh \varphi$). Setting $x = y = z = 0$, namely studying the motion of the origin of S, one easily obtains $x_0(t) = -\frac{c^2}{a_f} \log \frac{\cosh(\varphi - \frac{a_f}{c} t_0)}{\cosh \varphi}$, which is of the form (13), with the integration constant x_f chosen so that $x_0 = 0$ for $t_0 = 0$.

For $t_0 \geq t_f$, S is at rest with respect to S_0 and the transformation is just:

$$\begin{aligned} t &= t_0, \\ x &= x_0 - \frac{c^2}{a_f} \log \cosh \varphi. \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Having established the compatibility of this transformation with our previous formulas, let us study its limits.

3.1 Aristotelian limit, $c \to \infty$

Let us first consider the (Aristotelian) limit $c \to \infty$, which corresponds to friction without mass loss (cf. Reye's law). Since the relative velocity when the origins meet is $v = c \tanh \varphi$, this limit should be taken while taking also the limit $\varphi \to 0$, and in such a way that $c\varphi \to v$ for some constant v to be interpreted as the initial relative velocity. In this limit from (14) we easily get for $t_0 < v/a_f$

$$\begin{aligned} t &= t_0, \\ x &= x_0 - \big(v t_0 - \frac{1}{2} a_f t_0^2 \big). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Observe that this is precisely the Galileian transformation from S_0 to a reference frame that is slowing down with acceleration a_f. For $t_0 \geq v/a_f$, the frame has come to rest with respect to S_0. Indeed, we get taking the limit of (15)

$$\begin{aligned} t &= t_0, \\ x &= x_0 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{v^2}{a_f}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

[1]For shortness, we omit in the transformation the equations $y = y_0$, $z = z_0$, that should nevertheless be included here as well as in Eqs. (15), (16), (17, (18).

In other words we obtain the transformation of Aristotelian mechanics in which all bodies undergo a universal deceleration till reaching absolute rest.

3.2 Special Relativity limit, $a_f \to 0$

Let us take the limit $a_f \to 0$ in Eq. (14). Observe that $t_f = \frac{c\varphi}{a_f} \to \infty$, thus we have just to consider the case $t_0 < t_f$. Let us set $v := c \tanh \varphi$, $\beta := v/c$, then we obtain from (14) in the limit

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \gamma^{-1}(\beta)\, t_0, \\ x &= \gamma(\beta)\ (x_0 - v t_0)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

This is the *Tangherlini transformation*. It is equivalent to the Lorentz transformation of Special Relativity, the only difference is a resychronization of clocks in the moving frame S

$$t_{SR} = t - \frac{v}{c^2} x, \qquad x_{SR} = x. \tag{19}$$

The Tangherlini transformation [19, 20] has been much studied up to this day [21, 22, 23]. Tangherlini's work, popularied by Mansouri and Sexl [24], was anticipated by Scott-Iversen [25] and other authors working on non-standard synchronizations in Special Relativity.

Clocks in Tangherlini's formalism are set up in such a way that the same notion of simultaneity becomes shared by all the frames. As a consequence, the speed of light is not isotropic in S (notice that the one-way speed of light depends on the synchronization adopted, as it requires two separate clocks for its measurement, while the two-way speed of light remains unaltered, see [26, 27]). Of course, in Tangherlini's formalism such a resychronization does not alter the Special Relativity physics, just its coordinate description.

4 Comparison with observations

The objective of this section is to explore the consequences of the above theory for cosmology. We will show that it predicts the Pioneer anomaly and the Hubble law, where the latter is explained through a kind of universal tired light mechanism. Couriously, the model naturally explains the observed coincidence between the Hubble constant and the Pioneer anomalous acceleration.

More generally, this model seems to be able to explain many odd phenomena that have been observed for accelerations smaller or of the order of a certain critical value a_f, although it is not able to explain other observations like the supernova light curves. Still, these results hint at the possible role of friction in the resolution of some puzzles of modern cosmology.

4.1 Pioneer anomaly

A first obvious consequence of our model is that free bodies with small velocities compared to c should show a deceleration of magnitude a_f in the absolute reference frame.

Indeed, any body should decelerate with an acceleration of magnitude a_f. The Pioneer spacecrafts do present an unmodeled acceleration approximately directed towards the Sun of magnitude [28]

$$a_P = (8.74 \pm 1.33) \times 10^{-10} m/s^2.$$

Unfortunately, according to a recent study, the anomalous acceleration seems to be non collinear with the spacecraft velocity [29], and can be accounted for by thermal radiation [30].

Also the friction model predicts a deceleration of the planets of the solar system, which decreases the radius of their orbits and hence implies an increase in the modulus of their velocity [31] (in the end $\dot{v} = a_p$, that is, the sign that one would naively expect gets inverted under Coulomb friction). However, this effect is quite small and can be cancelled by the decrease of the Sun mass due to solar wind [32].

4.2 Hubble law

Let us now consider the distribution of galaxies. Because of friction, if they are close, say at the level of the local group, they are almost at rest. Nevertheless, by a tired light effect the Hubble law still holds. Indeed, a photon sent at time t from a galaxy and received at time $t+\Delta t$ in the Milky way undergoes a redshift (see Eq. (10))

$$1 + z = \frac{E(t)}{E(t + \Delta t)} = e^{\frac{1}{c} a_f \Delta t} \simeq 1 + \frac{1}{c} a_f \Delta t.$$

If this tired light explanation for the Hubble law is correct then we must find that the observed value

$$a_H := cH = (6.9 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-10} m/s^2$$

(if $H = (72 \pm 8)(km/s)/Mpc$) coincides with a_f, and if the above explanation for the Pioneer anomaly is correct we must expect $a_f = a_P$ and in the end

$$a_H = a_P.$$

The above figures seem to confirm this prediction. This equality has been noticed by many authors [28], but this appears to be the simplest model which accounts for it. This explanation is the more striking as it appears to be compatible with Special Relativity.

We obtained a kind of tired light explanation of the Hubble law, however, contrary to usual tired light theories, it does not assume that the loss of energy is

due to scattering with diffuse interstellar matter. The latter assumption would imply a modification in the direction of the photon, so that any galaxy would be seen as blurred and indefinite, contrary to observations. The universal friction mechanism preserves the direction of the photon and so avoids this problem.

Unfortunately, tired light explanations of the Hubble law cannot account for the supernova light curves [33]. Perhaps the Hubble law could be due to two mechanisms, namely tired light for sufficiently close cosmological objects (with the idea that close objects belong to the same vacuum state, the vacuum state playing the role of the hard body in the mechanical analogy) and cosmic expansion for far away objects (as they belong to different vacuums states, different states diverging from each other). In other words, in the empty region between two vacuum patches there would be no friction and so the dynamics would be completely relativistic (recall that the theory becomes relativistic for $a_f \to 0$, and by Eq. (10) there is no tired light effect in that limit). There would still be a redshift effect but due to the relative motion of the vacuum states. In general one would not expect these two redshift effects to match precisely so giving different Hubble constants depending on whether observations are local or cosmological. This tension has indeed been observed and is the subject of current debate.

If the Hubble law is at least locally due to tired light, then it should be expected to hold for close celestial objects as well. The expanding universe theory predicts the Hubble law at length scales which are well beyond the scale of homogeneity for which a Friedmann-Robertson-Walker approximation of the cosmological metric would make sense. A well known puzzle in cosmology is the "coldness of the Hubble flow" namely the observation that the Hubble law holds unreasonably well at the scale of the local group (1-10Mpc) with a velocity scatter with respect to the Hubble flow which is very small (40 km/s), although at that scale the matter distribution is very clumped [34]. A local tired light model for the Hubble law accounts for this observation quite easily, for according to this explanation the local Hubble law does not depend on an expansion dynamics.

5 Conclusions

Inspired by experimental evidence on how friction manifests itself in the wear of bodies, I introduced an absolute space theory in which mass decreases proportionally to the work done by a universal friction force. I showed that mass depends on velocity as in Special Relativity and that there is a characteristic velocity c which is insensitive to friction. Bodies with velocity smaller than c decelerate till they reach a status of absolute rest. Bodies with velocity c preserve their velocity while they lose mass. I argued that in the limit of vanishing friction, $a_f \to 0$, the theory becomes equivalent to Special Relativity (in its Tangherlini coordinate description) as the underlying absolute space becomes unobservable. This result shows that Special Relativity, often regarded as incompatible with the concept of absolute frame, could have been suggested by

more detailed studies of the interaction of bodies with such a frame.

I ended the paper with the exploration of some predictions of this theory. Qualitatively, and sometimes also quantitatively, it seems to be able to account for some puzzling cosmological observations. The offered explanations are non-traditional and certainly require further details and clarifications. Still the results of this work suggest that friction might have indeed an important role in cosmology, a role that in my opinion should be explored further.

Acknowledgments

I previously posted the work arXiv:1412.0010 that presented some of the arguments of this paper.

References

[1] Minguzzi E 2019, Lorentzian causality theory, *Living Rev. Relativ.* **22** 3

[2] Reye T 1860, Zur Theorie der Zapfenreibung, *J. Der Civilingenieur* **6** 235–255

[3] Giovannini M 1935, Sulla prova di resistenza dei materiali all'usura per attrito radente, *L'Ingegnere* **13**(12) 489–496

[4] Opatowski I 1942, A theory of brakes, an example of a theoretical study of wear, *Journal of the Franklin Institute* **234**(3) 239–249

[5] Archard J 1953, Contact and rubbing of flat surfaces, *J. Appl. Phis.* **24** 981–988

[6] Villaggio P 2001, Wear of an elastic block, *Meccanica* **36** 243–249

[7] Panetti M 1908, Contributo alla teoria dei freni ad attrito, *Giornale del Genio Civile* **46** 641–658

[8] Panetti M 1947 *Meccanica Applicata* (Torino: Levrotto & Bella)

[9] Curioni G 1884 *Cenni storici e statistici sulla Scuola d'Applicazione per gl'Ingegneri fondata in Torino nell'anno 1860* (Torino: Tipografia editrice G. Candeletti)

[10] Cappa S 1890 *Lezioni di Meccanica applicata alle macchine* (Torino: Tip. e Lit. C. Giorgis)

[11] Ovazza E 1890, Sulla resistenza di attrito fra vite e madrevite, *Atti della R. Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* **26** 215–235

[12] Pomini O 1922 *Costruzione di macchine* (Milano: U. Hoepli)

[13] Rubino M 1944 *Meccanica applicata alle macchine* (Palermo: Libreria Agate, Scuola Tip. 'Boccone Del Povero')

[14] Ferrari C and Romiti A 1966 *Meccanica applicata alle macchine* (Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese)

[15] Funaioli E 1973 *Corso di meccanica applicata alle macchine Vol. I* 3rd ed (Bologna: Pàtron)

[16] Weisbach J 1870 *A manual of the mechanics of engineering of the construction of machines, with an introduction to the calculus* (New York: D. Van Nostrand)

[17] Irschik H and Holl H 2004, Mechanics of variable-mass systems-Part 1: Balance of mass and linear momentum, *Appl. Mech. Rev.* **57** 145–160

[18] Dugas R 1955 *A history of mechanics* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul LTD.)

[19] Tangherlini F R 2009, The velocity of light in uniformly moving frame. A dissertation. Stanford University (1958), *The Abraham Zelmanov Journal* **2** 44–110

[20] Malykin G B and Malykin E G 2009, Tangherlini's dissertation and its significance for physics of the 21th century, *The Abraham Zelmanov Journal* **2** 121–147

[21] Guerra V and de Abreu R 2006, On the consistency between the assumption of a special system of reference and Special Relativity, *Found. Phys.* **36** 1826–1845

[22] de Abreu R and Guerra V 2008, The principle of relativity and the indeterminacy of Special Relativity, *Eur. J. Phys.* **29** 33–52

[23] Burde G 2018, Special Relativity with a preferred frame and the relativity principle, *J. Mod. Phys.* **9** 1591–1616

[24] Mansouri R and Sexl R 1977, A test theory of Special Relativity: I. Simultaneity and clock synchronization, *Gen. Relativ. Gravit.* **8** 497–513

[25] Scott-Iversen P A 1944, XIII. Introductory notes on a reformulation of the Special Theory of Relativity, *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science* **35** 105–120

[26] Minguzzi E 2002, On the conventionality of simultaneity, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **15** 153–169

[27] Minguzzi E and Macdonald A 2003, Universal one-way light speed from a universal light speed over closed paths, *Found. Phys. Lett.* **16** 593–604

[28] Anderson J D, Laing P A, Lau E L, Liu A S, Nieto M M and Turyshev S G 2002, Study of the anomalous acceleration of Pioneer 10 and 11, *Phys. Rev. D* **65** 082004

[29] Turyshev S G, Toth V T, Ellis J and Markwardt C B 2011, Support for temporally varying behavior of the Pioneer anomaly from the extended Pioneer 10 and 11 Doppler data sets, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** 081103

[30] Turyshev S G, Toth V T, Kinsella G, Lee S C, Lok S M and Ellis J 2012, Support for the thermal origin of the Pioneer anomaly, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 241101

[31] Parkyn D G 1958, The effect of friction on elliptic orbits, *The Mathematical Gazette* **42** 96–98

[32] Krasinsky G and Brumberg V 2004, Secular increase of astronomical unit from analysis of the major planet motion, and its interpretation, *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy* **90** 267–288

[33] Leibundgut B et al 1996, Time dilation in the light curve of the distant type Ia supernova SN 1995K, *Astrophys. J.* **466** L21–L26

[34] Baryshev Y V, Chernin A D and Teerikorpi P 2001, The cold local Hubble flow as a signature of dark energy, *Astronomy and Astrophysics* **378** 729–734