In this work the nonaxial ordering and spin relaxation of PD-Tempone spin probe in several liquid crystalline solvents exhibiting smectic A and B phases were studied utilizing methods previously employed by Polnaszek and Freed for the study of nematic liquid crystals. The results reported here for the isotropic and nematic phases are generally in accord with those obtained previously. An analysis of isotropic hyperfine shifts, changes in the ordering tensor, and anomalous relaxation behavior in the smectic phases suggest a model in which the PD-Tempone probes are partially expelled from the dipolar region of the liquid crystalline molecules toward the more flexible hydrocarbon end chains as a result of the packing of the smectic layers, and concomitantly the probes increasingly experience a slowly relaxing local structure (SRLS) in a cavity-like location. Differences in observations from different types of smectic liquid crystals are interpreted in terms of their differing structures based on X-ray studies. It is shown that the angular dependent line widths in the smectic phases are significantly affected by the size and shape of the sample. These inhomogeneous broadening effects are discussed in detail in terms of static distortions of the smectic layering induced by wall effects and magnetic-field induced torques, and are in reasonable agreement with predictions of a simple model. The residual homogeneous widths are discussed in terms of combined models of anisotropic rotation and anisotropic viscosity as well as associated SRLS models. For the former case, the problem of defining the rotational diffusion tensor, which must be time dependent in any axis system, is discussed in some detail.

I. Introduction

In parts 1 and 2 we presented detailed studies of anisotropic ordering, line shapes, and relaxation for the weakly ordered perdeuterated 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-4-piperidone N-oxide (PD-Tempone)3 and the highly ordered cholestanate (CSL) spin probe,2 respectively, dissolved in nematic liquid crystalline solvents. In the present work we extend such studies to liquid crystalline solvents exhibiting smectic A and B phases.

There already exist a number of ESR studies of highly ordered spin probes in thermotropic liquid crystals exhibiting smectic phases.3-7 However, as was pointed out in II, the use of such spin probes as CSL in these phases usually requires a "slow-tumbling" analysis if correct results on ordering and relaxation are to be obtained. With the exception of that work2 (on the nematic phase) such analyses have not been employed. Therefore the analysis and interpretation of much of the previous work, based upon motional narrowing theory, is open to question.

We have chosen, in the present work, to concentrate on the PD-Tempone probe, which, because it is smaller and more weakly ordered, allows one to rigorously apply the simpler motional narrowing theory in most cases. We have already shown that the use of this radical offers the advantages that (1) one can achieve a high degree of spectral resolution for accurate spin-relaxation studies, because inhomogeneous broadening due to unresolved intramolecular proton or deuteron interactions is minimized; and (2) we now have extensive results in isotropic8 and ordered phases1,2,6,11 using this spin probe to serve as a basis for comparing and understanding new results in the smectic phases. We have indeed found that these two features enabled us to obtain new insights into the dynamical properties of these phases as monitored by the PD-Tempone probe.

An important feature in spin-relaxation studies in smectic phases is the ability to align the director in these phases by the applied dc magnetic field and to have the samples retain this alignment even when they are then rotated relative to the direction of the dc magnetic field2-7 (i.e., "tilted"). Our results are consistent with this now familiar observation. However, largely because of the increased resolution, we found that the line widths and shapes will, in general, show angular-dependent effects which depend upon the size and shape of the sample. This feature, which was not fully considered in previous studies, must be adequately dealt with if meaningful studies of spin relaxation as a function of sample "tilt" angle are to be performed as discussed in this work.

II. Experimental Section

(A) Preparation of Samples. The liquid crystals N-(p-butoxybenzylidene)-p-n-octylaniline (40,8) and 4-n-octyl-4-cyanobiphenyl (8CB) were purchased from Shawnee Chemical Co. and BDH Chemicals Ltd. respectively, while N-(p-butoxybenzylidene)-p-n-hexylaniline (40,6) was synthesized by condensing equimolar quantities of 4-n-butoxybenzaldehyde and 4-n-hexylaniline in absolute ethanol.12 The molecular structures of these liquid crystals are shown in Figure 1. The 40,8 and 40,6 were purified by several recrystallizations from absolute ethanol till a constant melting point was achieved. The 8CB was used without further purification, since the transition temperatures were found to be in good agreement with published values. The nitroxide free radical, perdeuterated 2,2,6,6-tetramethyl-4-piperidone N-oxide (PD-Tempone), shown in Figure 2, was synthesized by standard methods13 as previously discussed by Hwang et al.8 Two sizes of cylindrical sample tubes were used for preparing the ESR samples: (1) 0.5 mm o.d., 2 mm i.d. pyrex and (2) 0.9 mm o.d., 0.5 mm i.d. capillary tubes. The radical solutions (5 x 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻⁴ M) were prepared by degassing on a vacuum line and were sealed off under a vacuum of 10⁻⁴ torr.

(B) ESR Spectrometer. The ESR measurements were performed on a Varian E-12 spectrometer using 10-KHz field modulation. The temperature in the active region of the cavity was controlled by a Varian E-257 variable temperature control unit to a long term stability of ±0.1 °C. The other aspects of the experimental methods are as described earlier1,2,10,11

(C) Aligning the Director in the Liquid Crystal Phases. The sample was first heated to the isotropic or nematic...
phase, while in the cavity of the E-12 spectrometer with a 3-kG magnetic field. In the nematic phase, the director is aligned parallel to the magnetic field of the spectrometer. In the nematic phase, the director remained fixed in the sample independent of whether the sample tube was rotated in the high field. By this procedure the director was aligned in the SA phase. With the exception of 8CB in the 2-mm tube, smectic A phase was formed. This procedure was cycled a few times near the nematic-smectic A phase transition region. By this procedure the director was aligned in the SA phase. With the exception of 8CB in the 2-mm tube, the director remained fixed in the sample independent of whether the sample tube was rotated in the high field. Also, the sample retained a fixed alignment through the SB phase (under 3 kG) when the SB phase was prepared by carefully lowering the sample temperature from the SA phase which had previously been aligned as described. ESR spectra taken from samples from each phase prepared in this manner were reproducible with respect to even the temperature studied, but rather it is sufficient to interpolate between a small set of such measurements for each phase, because (1) \( \langle \sigma_D \rangle \) does not change very much with quantum number, to obtain the coefficients \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) once \( \langle \sigma_D \rangle \) is determined in this manner, it is usually more accurate to determine one line width, and then use the relative derivative amplitudes of the three lines to accurately determine the relative intrinsic widths of these lines. The three intrinsic line widths are fitted to the equation

\[
T_2^{-1}(M_j) = A + BM_j + CM_j^2
\]

where \( M_j \) is the Z component of the \(^{14}\)N nuclear spin quantum number, to obtain the coefficients \( A, B, \) and \( C \).

It is not really necessary to determine \( \langle \sigma_D \rangle \) at every temperature studied, rather it is sufficient to interpolate between a small set of such measurements for each phase, because (1) \( \langle \sigma_D \rangle \) does not change very much with temperature, and (2) the corrections to the line shape from the deuteron inhomogeneous broadening are not very great. We normally did not encounter any difficulties in determining \( \langle \sigma_D \rangle \) for the 0° tilt angle of the magnetic field. Measurements of the angular variation of \( \langle \sigma_D \rangle \) did indeed pose difficulties and will be discussed in section IIIID. The theoretical basis for the angular variations is given in Appendix A.

III. Results and Discussion

(A) Magnetic Parameters. The rigid limit spectra of PD-Tempone at -152 °C in the different solvents were recorded in order to obtain the magnetic parameters. The parameter \( A_z \) was easily determined from the spectrum. Since the ratio of \( A_z/A_x \) (where \( A_x \) is the isotropic hy-
perfine constant) in the liquid crystals we studied (40,8, 40,6, 8CB) was found to be the same as in phase V, and their absolute values are very close (cf. Table II), the other magnetic parameters $A_n$, $A_v$, were simply scaled by the same factor of $a_N$(iso)/$a_N$(phase V) for the isotropic phase. In the $S_A$ and $S_B$ phases, the director was "locked-in" by the high field as stated previously, so the "isotropic" values of $a_N$ in these phases could be obtained from the measurement of the angular dependence of $\langle a \rangle$. The angular dependence of the hyperfine coupling is given by (cf. Appendix A, eq A12):

$$\langle a \rangle = [\tilde{a}_+^2 \cos^2 \theta + \tilde{a}_-^2 \sin^2 \theta]^{1/2}$$

$$\simeq a_N + \gamma_0 (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1)$$

(2a)

and the approximate equality is for small $\chi$ (due to weak ordering) as is the case for PD-Tempone. We found from the results that the $a_N$ values in the $S_A$ and $S_B$ phases are slightly smaller than those for the isotropic phase. This could be explained simply as follows: the PD-Tempone is gradually expelled by the liquid crystal molecules to the flexible end chain region, a matter to be discussed in detail shortly. Therefore the magnetic parameters in these phases were further scaled in the same manner as above. For the nematic phase, the director follows the 3-kG magnetic field, so we took a mean of the values for the isotropic and smectic A phases.

The isotropic $a_N$ values of PD-Tempone in different phases was determined in the same way (cf. eq A12). The isotropic $a_N$ value was found to be constant $a_N = 2.00802 \pm 0.00001$ in all phases, and this is the same value as that for phase V solvent. We therefore concluded that the $g$ values and most likely the $g$ tensor is insensitive to any variation in environment in the liquid crystalline solvents, and we used the $g$ tensor values previously obtained for phase V. Figure 4 shows the very good agreement between theory and experiment for the angular dependences of $\langle a \rangle$ and $\langle g \rangle$ in the different phases and different solvents. The experimental results were identical for 40,6 and 40,8 no matter whether 2- or 0.5-mm i.d. samples were used. However, since 2-mm i.d. samples of 8CB followed the field, they gave no angular variation of $\langle a \rangle$ or $\langle g \rangle$. Table II gives the magnetic parameters we used for 40,6, 40,8, and 8CB. In order to develop a basis for understanding the variations of $a_N$ (and also $g$) in the different phases and different solvents, we sought to develop good empirical relations between $a_N$ (and $g$) and some measure of solvation effects.

A number of methods have been developed for estimating the polarity of solvents, and they have been reviewed and compared. It is pointed out that the polarity of a solvent depends on a variety of intermolecular

---

### TABLE II: Magnetic Parameters for PD-Tempone in Liquid Crystals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>40,6 and 40,8</th>
<th>8CB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isotropic</td>
<td>Nematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{ex}$</td>
<td>5.61 ± 0.02</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{qv}$</td>
<td>5.01 ± 0.2</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$A_{2v}$</td>
<td>33.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>33.5 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\langle a \rangle$</td>
<td>14.77 ± 0.03</td>
<td>14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_N$</td>
<td>14.75 ± 0.02</td>
<td>14.70 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Error limits are given for the experimentally determined values of the hyperfine interaction. All other values have been obtained by scaling as described in the text.\(^{a}\) All measured $g$ values were $g_x = 2.00802 \pm 0.00001$, so the $g$ tensor determined for phase V (cf. ref 1) was used in all cases: $g_x = 2.00999 \pm 0.00002; g_y = 2.00692 \pm 0.00005; g_z = 2.00215 \pm 0.0001$.\(^{b}\) From ref 1.\(^{c}\) From ref 1.\(^{d}\) (A) $= I(A_x + A_y + A_z)$.\(^{e}\) From ref 1.\(^{f}\) The Journal of Physical Chemistry, Vol. 83, No. 3, 1979 381
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to a variety of spin probes in many solvents to establish
useful empirical relations for variation of $a_N$ (as well as
proton and deuteron "$a"$ values) with solvent.
We note in all cases the decrease in $a_N$ in going from the
isotropic $\rightarrow$ nematic $\rightarrow$ smectic A $\rightarrow$ smectic B phases.
One expects, from Figure 5, that this decrease will correlate
with a changing "effective" location of the PD-Tempone
such that it is gradually expelled from the region where
it is in proximity to the dipolar portions of the liquid
crystal molecules to regions where it is in greater proximity
to the hydrocarbon chains (e.g., the typical $a_N$ for the
isotropic phases of the liquid crystalline solvents is close
to that for acetone or di-n-butylphthalate, but in smectic B it is approaching that of decane). One expects an
increased packing with the lower temperature phases.
Thus, while the PD-Tempone, with a dipolar end, might
prefer a location closer to the dipolar region of the solvent
molecules, it can probably find more available space in
regions of the flexible hydrocarbon chains as the packing
of the liquid crystalline molecules becomes denser.
(B) Order Parameters and Potential Expansion Coefficients. (1) Results. The $a$ and $g$ values in the
different phases for different solvents are shown in Figure 6.
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Figure 5. The experimentally determined variation of $a_N$ and $a_D$ for
PD-Tempone with $E_T$ (the molar transition energy scale) in different
solvents. The straight lines are drawn through the experimental data
represented by the solid circles, corresponding to those solvents for
which $E_T$ has been independently determined. (Water is an exception.)
For those solvents for which $E_T$ data are not available, we show the
experimental $a_N$ values on this straight line by open circles, and this
sets the $E_T$ value. The $a_N$ values were then plotted using these results
for $E_T$. The $a_N$ and $a_D$ phases in (40,6) or (40,8) are represented by
a cross.

Figure 4. (A) The angular dependence of $a$ and $g$ in the smectic
A phases of (40,6), (40,8), and 8CB for PD-Tempone. Solid circles
are for (40,6) at $T = 50.7$ °C; open triangles are for (40,8) at $T = 63.6$
°C; open squares are for 6CB at $T = 28.6$ °C. The curves are the
theoretical prediction from eq 3. For (40,6) and (40,8) these results
are independent of whether 2- or 0.5-mm sample tubes were used.
(b) The angular dependence of $a$ and $g$ in the smectic B phases
of (40,8) and (40,6) for PD-Tempone. The solid circles are for (40,6)
$T = 34.5$ °C and open triangles are for (40,8) at $T = 47.0$ °C. These
results are independent of whether 2- or 0.5-mm sample tubes are used.

forces as well as hydrogen bonding between the solvent and
the solute. The idea of the empirical methods is to use
a particular solvent-dependent standard process. The
most comprehensive solvent scale given is the $E_T$
or molar transition energy scale based upon the use of pyridinium
$N$-phenolbetaine, which gives a very large displacement
of the solvatochromic band in different solvents ($E_T$
(kcal/mol) = $2.86 \times 10^{-3} \sigma^2$ where $\sigma$ is the absorption
maximum in cm$^{-1}$). We have found the $E_T$ scale very
useful for representing solvent variation of $a_N$ (and $a_D$).
This is shown in Figure 5. The basis of the linear
relations between $a_N$ ($a_D$) and $E_T$ are the six or seven
solvents for which both $E_T$ has been determined, and
we have measured values of $a_N$ and $a_D$. Only in the case of
water solvent was there a large discrepancy with the linear
relation from the other solvents. This is not surprising
given the very unique properties of water as a solvent.
Thus we chose to redefine the $E_T$ value appropriate for
PD-Tempone in water. The $E_T$ values for the other
solvents, in particular the liquid-crystalline solvents, were
then determined using this graph. It is interesting to note
that we generally find good agreement between the $E_T$
determined from the $a_N$ and that determined (but with less
sensitivity or accuracy) from $a_D$. The general (and
well-known) trends are for $a_N$ to increase with increasing
solvent polarity while $a_D$ decreases. However, this appears to be no problem for the
empirical $E_T$ values (cf. Figure 5) with the exception of
water. Results like ours in Figure 5 can easily be extended

\[
\langle D_{\text{N}} \rangle_x = \frac{(a - a)(g - g) - (g - g)(a - a)}{(a - a)(g - g) - (g - g)(a - a)}
\]
\[
\langle D_{\text{N}} + D_{\text{D}} \rangle_x = \frac{\sqrt{6}[(a - a)(g - g) - (g - g)(a - a)](g - g)(a - a) - (g - g)(a - a)}{(g - g)(a - a) - (g - g)(a - a)}
\]
(3a)
(3b)
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Figure 6. The variation of $\langle a \rangle$ and $\langle g \rangle$ with temperature for PD-Tempone in (A) (40,6), (B) (40,8), (C) 8CB. The solid circles are for $\langle a \rangle$ and the open circles are for $\langle g \rangle$.

show the $y$ ordering vs. temperature for the different liquid crystals in Figure 7. The results for 40,6 and 40,8 show similar temperature dependences, i.e., the ordering is almost constant in the $S_B$ phase, increasing gradually with increasing temperature in the $S_A$ phase, and decreasing in the nematic phase. The same type of temperature dependence of order parameter $\langle (g_o) \rangle$ has been observed in EMBAC (cf. Figure 1) by NMR methods.\(^5\) Note that the ordering is nearly axially symmetric about the molecular $y$ axis in the smectic phases, but there is a non-negligible nonaxial $\langle D_{00} + D_{20} \rangle$ in the $S_B$ which changes sign in the $S_A$ phase and becomes almost negligible. The angular-dependent results for $\langle a \rangle$ and $\langle g \rangle$ in the smectic B phase in 40,6 and 40,8 shown in Figure 4B, as well as the very good alignment of these phases is consistent with this phase being $B_2$ (and not $B_1$).\(^5\) We are not aware of a previous determination of the symmetry of this phase for these smectics.

Figure 7. The variation of the order parameters with temperature $\langle D_{00} \rangle$, (open circles) and $\langle D_{00} + D_{20} \rangle$, (closed circles) for PD-Tempone in the different phases of (A) (40,6), (B) (40,8) and (C) 8CB.

In the $S_A$ phase of 8CB, $\langle D_{00} \rangle$ decreases with increasing temperature, which is the reverse of the behavior of 40,6 and 40,8. Note that in Figure 6 there are hints of pre-transitional effects in the isotropic phase just at the $I \rightarrow N$ phase transition (see below).

In order to perform relaxation studies, one must know the coefficients in the potential which determines the distribution function for the orientation of PD-Tempone. As in I we used the two term ordering tensor defined by

$$\langle D_{00}(\Omega) \rangle = \int d\Omega P_{eq}(\Omega) D_{00}(\Omega)$$ \hspace{1cm} (4a)

where $\Omega$ represents the Euler angles between the molecular coordinate system and the laboratory system, and $P_{eq}(\Omega)$ the equilibrium distribution function given by

$$P_{eq}(\Omega) = \exp(-U(\Omega)/kT) / \int d\Omega \exp(-U(\Omega)/kT)$$ \hspace{1cm} (4b)
where $U(\Omega)$ is the mean restoring potential for PD-Tempone in the field of nematic solvent molecules, which we approximate with two terms:

$$U(\alpha,\beta,0)/kT \approx -\lambda \cos^2 \beta - \rho \sin^2 \beta \cos^2 \alpha$$  

The coefficients $\lambda$ and $\rho$ are obtained, via this set of equations, from the results on $(D_{x0})$ and $(D_{y0} + D_{z0})$, and they are shown in Figure 8 vs. temperature for the different solvents.

(2) Discussion of Order Parameters. Before attempting to explain the opposite trends in PD-Tempone ordering vs. temperature for the $S_\alpha$ phases of 40,8 and 40,6 on the one hand and 8CB on the other, it is useful to consider differences between them as found from X-ray studies on related liquid crystals.  In most liquid crystals, the polar segments of the molecules are in the middle with hydrocarbon chains extending outward (e.g., 40,6 and 40,8, cf. Figure 1).  This type of molecule tends to form monolayer $S_\alpha$ phases, and the lamellar thickness is typically equal to or slightly less than the molecular length, presumably due to a slight interpenetration of the layers, and/or to departures of the hydrocarbon chains from their fully extended conformations.  However, certain cyano Schiff bases and cyanobiphenyls with alkyl or alkoxy end groups such as 8CB (cf. Figure 1) are found to exhibit a bilayer type of $S_\alpha$ phase, where the lamellar spacing is about 1.5 times the molecular length.  This is believed due to the fact that these molecules each have a polar and a long-chain nonpolar end and must adjust to the tendencies of these groups to interact with similar groups.  When the temperature is lowered, the first type of liquid crystal (40,6; 40,8) exhibits a decrease in its interlamellar spacing, while the second type (8CB) exhibits an increase.  The type 1 contraction is expected as the thermal motions of the hydrocarbon chains decrease, so the packing forces are more effective.  The type 2 expansion must be due to a tendency of the like ends of the molecules to draw closer, a process that is prevented by the interdigitated bilayer arrangement of this $S_\alpha$ phase.  (In fact it has been observed that some type 2 liquid crystals not only experience an increase in the interlamellar spacing with increased pressure, but also yield a "re-entrant" nematic phase by super-cooling the $S_\alpha$ phase, in order to achieve an energetically more favorable packing.)

Thus the PD-Tempone molecule, which appears to be gradually expelled (with decreasing temperature) from the highly ordered polar region to the less ordered hydrocarbon regions might be expected to exhibit decreased average ordering as the flexible end chains interpenetrate more, and their dynamical motions interfere with their ordering.  Further aspects of this model are discussed below in the context of the spin relaxation results.  [Note that a highly ordered spin probe such as CSL appears to show increasing order with decreasing temperature in the $S_\alpha$ phase (but this result has yet to be corrected for slow tumbling effects), most likely because this large molecule is ordered so as not to be affected much by the effects of the end chain flexibility, and instead it experiences the increased ordering of the central polar portion of the liquid crystal molecules as the temperature is reduced.]  Now, in the case of 8CB, the hydrocarbon chains should experience reduced packing with decreased temperature, so the site occupied by the PD-Tempone shows less interference, and its ordering increases more naturally with decreased temperature.

Furthermore, let us note that for all three liquid crystals the PD-Tempone exhibits very nearly axially-symmetric ordering about its molecular $y$ axis (cf. Figure 2) in the $S_\alpha$ phase, while this was not the case in the nematic.  This observation is consistent with our model involving the expulsion of PD-Tempone toward the flexible hydrocarbon chains and its experiencing random ordering fluctuations along its $x$-$z$ plane (that is parallel to the smectic layers), which have a near-zero net average.  (This point is not really strictly sound because the smectic layering is parallel to the smectic $x'$-$y'$ plane, and only because of the partial ordering of the PD-tempone is its molecular $x$-$z$ plane partially aligned parallel to the smectic $x'$-$y'$ plane.)

The changes in PD-Tempone ordering in going from $S_\alpha \rightarrow S_\alpha$ appear to suggest (1) that the degree of ordering in the two phases is comparable; but (2) there is somewhat larger anisotropy of ordering in the $x$-$z$ plane probably due to decreased flexible motion of the hydrocarbon chains which might otherwise tend to average out such ordering.  This is discussed further below.

One might wish to interpret the pretransitional effects that appear for $(a)$ and $(g)$ (cf. Figure 6), in terms of the quasi-critical fluctuations in ordering in the isotropic phase near the $I \rightarrow N$ phase transition.  One finds from Lan-
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Figure 9. The variation of \(-B\) and \(C\) with temperature in (A) (40,6), (B) (40,8), and (C) 8CB. The closed circles are for \(-B\) while the open circles are for \(C\).

dau-deGennes mean-field theory that there is a non-zero order parameter \(S^{(0)}\) for the liquid crystalline solvent which obeys the following expansion as a function of magnetic field strength \(B\):

\[
S^{(0)}(B) = \eta B^2 + \text{H.O.T.}
\]

where

\[
\eta = \frac{\partial S^{(0)}}{\partial B} \bigg|_{B=0} = \frac{2\chi_a}{9a(T - T_c^*)}
\]

is the "paranematic susceptibility", \(\chi_a\) is the anisotropy in the diamagnetic anisotropy, \(T_c^*\) is the "apparent" critical \(T\), and \(a\) is the appropriate mean-field constant. With typical estimates of \(a \approx 4 \times 10^5 \text{ erg/K cm}^3\), \(T - T_c^* \approx 1 \text{ C}\), \(\chi_a \approx 10^{-6}\) cgs, and \(B \approx 3.3\) kG, one gets \(S^{(0)} \approx 5 \times 10^{-6}\) or an effect much too weak to see. Now \(\eta\) may be directly related to the phenomenon of magnetic birefringence which has been carefully studied by light scattering, yielding experimental results in complete agreement with the mean-field theory. Thus, it is quite clear that our ESR observations cannot be interpreted in terms of such a small static \(S^{(0)}\) (and hence an even smaller ordering of the probe). However, the dynamic effects of the quasi-critical fluctuations are now known to cause large ESR line width anomalies, and usually associated with the line width contributions from the spin relaxation are the dynamic frequency shifts from the nonsecular and pseudosecular contributions. It seems quite reasonable, therefore, to ascribe pretransitional effects on (a) and (g) to the dynamic frequency shifts in the ESR resulting from the quasi-critical fluctuations.

(C) Line Width Analysis and Discussion. The ESR spectra of PD-Tempone in these three solvents are all in the motional narrowing region. The line width coefficients

Figure 10. The variation of \(A\) and \(A'\) with temperature in (A) (40,6), (B) (40,8), and (C) 8CB. The residual \(A'\) was calculated using an anisotropic rotation model.
$A$, $B$, and $C$ (cf. eq 1) vs. temperature are shown in Figures 9 and 10. We found that the line widths obtained for the isotropic, nematic, or $S_A$ and $S_B$ phases at 0° tilt angle are all independent of the sample size as one would normally expect. The significance of this observation will be explored in the next section.

We note in Figure 9 that in all cases in the isotropic phase the $C$ and $B$ parameters are nearly equal at a given $T$. This is the expected normal behavior for PD-Tempone in isotropic phases. Near the isotropic–nematic phase transition there are clear indications of an anomalous increase in $B$ and $C$, an effect which is more prominent on the nematic side, and has been related by Rao et al. to quasi-critical fluctuations at this weak first-order transition. This effect obscures somewhat the nonanomalous portions of $B$ and $C$ in the nematic phase. These portions are perhaps clearest in the case of 40,8 showing a characteristic increase with decreasing temperature. The change from $N$ to $S_A$ is characteristically abrupt with no hint of any pretransitional effect, which could be due to a very narrow temperature range that shows quasi-critical behavior; but this has yet to be investigated. Notice in the $S_A$ phases of 40,6 and 40,8 the $C/B$ ratio is greater than one and appears to be increasing with decreasing temperature, but it is not much different from unity for 8CB. The transition from $S_A \rightarrow S_B$ again yields abrupt changes in $B$ and $C$, and the $S_B$ phase is characterized by (1) values of $C$ and $B$ which are markedly reduced from the higher temperature $S_A$ phases, or the opposite of what is normally expected; and (2) ratios of $C/B \geq 2$ which again are abnormal. The values of $A$ are shown for all phases and solvents in Figure 10. The low temperature phases show characteristic increase in $A$ with decrease in $T$, while the highest $T$ regions show the reverse behavior, as is normally expected. 

Again we focus mainly on the $B$ and $C$ coefficients, which may be interpreted in terms of the rotational dynamics of the PD-Tempone in the (ordered) fluids. Our analysis is in accordance with the methods we have previously used. (In particular, one used eq 2.28–2.31 of I.) We consider the phases separately, starting with the high temperature isotropic phases.

(1) Isotropic Phase. One finds that for PD-Tempone in the isotropic phase, one is in the region where nonsecular contributions to $A$, $B$, and $C$ are expected to be important (i.e., $\omega_0^2 S_{02}^2 \sim 1$). That is, for 40,6 and 40,8 the accessible range of rotational correlation time, $\tau_R$, is about 10–30 ps, while for 8CB it is somewhat longer: 30–100 ps. We find just as in I, that the results can be interpreted either by employing some anisotropy for rotation about the molecular $y$ axis (i.e., $N_y = 4.3 \pm 0.3$ for 40,6; $N_y = 3.8 \pm 0.2$ for 40,8; and $N_y = 1.4 \pm 0.2$ for 8CB), or else by correcting the nonsecular spectral density function to become $\tau_R(1 + \epsilon \tau_R^2 \omega_0^2)$, where the adjustable parameter $\epsilon \geq 1$, is believed to be indicative of deviation from simple Brownian rotational diffusion. The theory$^{5}$ for $\epsilon$ relates it to the finite lifetime of the fluctuating torques causing the rotational motion of the PD-Tempone. The results can all be “explained” with $N \approx 1$ (which is typical of PD-Tempone in simple liquids) and $\epsilon = 10 \pm 2$ for 40,6, $\epsilon = 7 \pm 1$ for 40,8, and $\epsilon = 3 \pm 1$ for 8CB. The value for 8CB is in keeping with our previous results on isotropic phases, while those for 40,6 and 40,8 are somewhat greater. As we noted in 1, it is not possible to distinguish between the contributions from the two sources from such data in the isotropic phase, because the $I \rightarrow N$ phase transition prevents studying lower temperature regions of the isotropic phase where the effects of $\epsilon$ are suppressed.$^8$ In I we adopted the point of view of using $\epsilon \sim 4.5$ by comparison with other nonnematic solvents. If we do that here we would then obtain ($N_y = 1.9 \pm 0.4$ for 40,8, $N_y = 1.6 \pm 0.2$ for 40,8, and $N_y = 0.97 \pm 0.36$ for 8CB). There was one case in I similar to our present observations on 40,6 and 40,8. It was for the solvent BEPC (cf. Figure 1) which yielded $N_y = 2.3 \pm 0.6 \epsilon = 4.6$. The question of the “best” set of $\epsilon$ and $N_y$ is discussed further below.

As before, the $\tau_R$ values $[R = (R_p R_s)^{1/2}$ and $\tau_R = (6R)^{-1}$ with $R_p$ and $R_s$ the respective parallel and perpendicular components of the rotational diffusion tensor] are virtually the same for any of the sets of $\epsilon$ and $N_y$ which fit the data. They are plotted in Figures 11 vs. $1/T$ and show the characteristic increase with decreasing $T$. The activation energies from these $\tau_R$ values appear in Table III, and are found to be of the order expected for liquid crystal solvents (cf. I). The rather large difference in $E_a$ between 40,8 and 40,6, despite their very similar molecular structure is, however, surprising.

A preliminary analysis of the A' results shown in Figure 10 in terms of the spin-rotational mechanism was made in the manner of Hwang et al.$^8$ (Note A' is that portion of $A$ in eq 1 which remains after dipolar and $g$ tensor contributions are substracted.) In that work it was shown...
that in the high temperature regions one expects $A_i = A_i^2 T_{\phi}^{-1}$ where $A_i^2$ is a constant equal to $0.5 \times 10^{15} G s$ from simple spin-rotation theory for the PD-Tempone g values. In normal liquids it ranged from 6 to $10^{15} G s$, and was estimated as $15.7 \times 10^{15} G s$ for phase V. At lower temperatures, the $A_i^2$ increases anomalously with $T_{\phi}$ and this makes it difficult to obtain $A_i$ unless high enough temperature results are obtained. Fortunately, we were limited in this respect, and estimated $A_i^2$ by fitting our data of the form $A_i^2 = A_i^2 + A_i^2$ (where $A_s$ is the constant for the anomalous $A_i^2$ dependence upon $T_{\phi}$ at lower temperatures). We obtained values for $A_i^2$ of 19.4, 17.8, and $29.1 \times 10^{15} G s$ for 40,6, and 8CB, respectively. These are high and would tend to suggest large deviations from simple rotational diffusion theory. However, because of the difficulty in extracting $A_i^2$ from our results, they should be confirmed by $T_1$ measurements before they are analyzed further.

(2) Nematic Phase. The nematic phase results require an analysis which includes reorientation in the potential field of the oriented solvent molecules. This was performed as in 1 utilizing the ordering terms $B_i$ and $C_i$ in Figure 8. Actually, because of the narrow range of the nematic phases, especially in 40,6 and 8CB it was difficult to separate out quasi-critical effects associated with the $N \rightarrow 1$ phase transition from the “background” contributions to $B$ and $C$ which determine $T_{\phi}$ (this is particularly true for the C values of 40,6). In the best case, viz. 40,6, the lower temperature nematic results could be fitted to an $\epsilon = 4.5$ and $N_\phi = 2.5$ near the $N \rightarrow S_A$ transition and increasing to an $N_\phi \approx 4$ at higher $T$, but the residual contributions from the quasi-critical effects to this latter value remain uncertain until more careful analysis is made of them. For these slower motions ($T_{\phi} = 50-60 ps$), the use of an $\epsilon \approx 10$ yields $N_\phi$ values only very slightly smaller than those obtained for $\epsilon \approx 4.5$ (i.e., about 0.2-0.3 less). Similar, but less definitive results are obtained for 40,8 and 8CB. We may note that in 1 the results for 8CB yielded an $N_\phi = 1.6 \pm 0.2$ while that for BOPC (which could not be studied in the isotropic phase) was $N_\phi = 9.4 \pm 1.5$. All other cases yielded $N_\phi = 1$. One can see from Table 111 that BOPC has the longest hydrocarbon end chains of all liquid crystals shown (and the longest overall molecular length), with 40,6, 40,8, and 8CB somewhere in between BOPC and BEPC in this characteristic. This suggests some correlation between chain length and the estimated $N_\phi$ values. (This correlation would be consistent with the explanation of these results in terms of the SRLS model that is discussed below.)

It was found in 1 for the case of the nematic solvents phase IV and phase V, that (even though $N_\phi = 1$), when $T_{\phi} > 10^8 s$, there is an anomalous increase in $T_{\phi}(C)/T_{\phi}(B)$ from unity (here $T_{\phi}(C)$ and $T_{\phi}(B)$ are the $T_{\phi}$ values estimated from the $C$ and $B$ line width parameters, respectively, with $N_\phi = 1$ unless stated otherwise). For the present solvents, the $N \rightarrow S_A$ phase transition prevented the achievement of such slow $T_{\phi}$ values in the nematic phase. For such slow motions, one had to consider the effects of the different models on the nonzero spectral densities (in particular the pseudosecular spectral densities). In that work the effects of (1) anisotropic rotation; (2) anisotropic viscosity; (3) fluctuating torques, and (4) slowly relaxing local structure (SRLS) were considered in detail and further elaborated in the pressure-dependent work of Hwang et al.

This reference gives summaries of all these mechanisms.) It turns out that $T_{\phi}(B)$ is a good index of the correlation time of PD-Tempone for these models especially when nonsecular terms are not important. For model (2) anisotropic viscosity, one has $T_{\phi}(B) = T_{\phi}(A)$, while for model (3) $T_{\phi}(B)$ is only affected by an $\epsilon_\phi$, which was required to be close to unity while $T_{\phi}(C)$ is affected by $\epsilon_\phi \approx 1$ as well. For model (1) anisotropic rotational diffusion the predicted value of $T_{\phi}(B)$ is significantly less affected by varying $N_\phi$ than is $T_{\phi}(C)$ (an example of this is given below). While for model (4), SRLS (when we restrict ourselves to $T_{\phi}$ values $< 10^9 s$) there is a simple relation between the estimate of $N_\phi$ and the estimate of the SRLS parameters as shown below. Thus, for convenience, we plot $T_{\phi}(B)$ values for all the ordered phases in Figure 11 (except as noted). We have used these $T_{\phi}(B)$ values as our best estimates of activation energies in these phases independent of our attempts at detailed analysis of the models. (The results in 1 and in Hwang et al. were shown for models 2 and 3 corresponding to our present use of $T_{\phi}(B)$, as well as for model 1). One notes from Table 111 that the $E_a$ values for the solvents 40,6 and 40,8 are a little increased in the nematic phase over their isotropic values (such was the case for phase V solvent.) The $E_a$ value for 8CB appears to be markedly reduced, although its magnitude is highly uncertain because of the very limited temperature range of this phase. (A similar trend appears for the case of BEPC, cf. 1.) These results suggest that the microscopic molecular dynamics are not markedly changed by the $1 \rightarrow N$ transition (except perhaps for 8CB).

(3) Smectic A Phase. The results for the smectic A phases are somewhat easier to handle than were those for the nematic phases, because of the absence of any quasi-critical effects persisting into the phase. The results for 40,6 and 40,8 are quite similar with some differences for 8CB. There is an increase in $T_{\phi}$ values in passing through the $N \rightarrow S_A$ phase transition for 40,6 and 40,8. This is, however, associated with a large decrease in $E_a$ for these solvents in the $S_A$ phase. This appears contrary to what would be expected for the more viscous $S_A$ phase. The ordering tensor for PD-Tempone was found to exhibit significant changes (cf. Figures 7 and 8 and section B) that reflect less the increased ordering expected for the $S_A$ phase than the changed nature of the ordering of PD-Tempone. All these observations seem to support our point of view that the PD-Tempone is expelled more into the hydrocarbon regions of the smectic layers due to the smectic
packing (as compared to the nematic phase in which polar interactions of the > N-O group with the central portions of 40,6 and 40,8 are favored). One would anticipate a reduced $E_a$ if the reorientation of PD-Tempone is induced by the flexible motions of the hydrocarbon chains. In fact, this explanation is supported by the observation that the $E_a$ for PD-Tempone in hydrocarbon solvents (e.g., hexane and decane) is about 3-5 kcal/mol, while for a nonmesogenic solvent with a central dipolar region and hydrocarbon end chains (e.g., di-n-butyl phthalate) one obtains an $E_a$ of 8.5 kcal/mol. The case for S8C appears to show an opposite trend in the N $\leftrightarrow$ S8 phases, although, unfortunately the range of the nematic phase is too scanty to obtain reliable results on $E_a$ in this phase. A preliminary interpretation of this phase would be that in the nematic phase the PD-Tempone is already expelled into the hydrocarbon regions, but the expansion of the interlayer spacings with decreasing temperature somehow allows the PD-Tempone back into a region closer to $\equiv$C=N groups. Further experiments with other liquid crystals related to S8C would be useful here.

In the cases of 40,6 and 40,8 one finds $\tau_B(C)/\tau_B(B)$ range from 1.24 to 1.42 and from 1.11 to 1.33, respectively, as $T$ is decreased. These results may be fitted to a model of anisotropic diffusion where $N_x$ increases gradually from 2.0 (near the $N \rightarrow S8$ transition) to 2.8 (near the $S8 \rightarrow S8$ transition) for 40,6 and ranging from 1.6 to 2.6 for 40,8. (The anisotropic viscosity model requires more drastic variations in $N_x$ of 6 to 15 for 40,6 and 3 to 11 for 40,8 and is thus less preferred as an explanation.) The case of S8C, in which $\tau_B(C)/\tau_B(B)$ ranges from 0.97 to 0.90 as $T$ is decreased, is fit with a model in which $N_x$ decreases from 1.0 to 0.4, or alternatively one can use x axis ordering to yield an $N_x$ increasing from 1.0 to 1.6. (In this case anisotropic viscosity fails miserably even requiring negative values of $N_x$ at the lower temperatures.) Our own preference is a SRLS model,10 which allows us to translate an $N_x$ $\sim$ 2 (or an $N_x$ $\sim$ 2) into an $S^0_2 \tau_x \sim \tau_B$ (where $S^0_2$ is the order parameter for the SRLS and $\tau_x$ its relaxation time, cf. section 5). The increase in $N_x$ as $T$ decreases would thus be consistent with an increase in $S^0_2$, even while the mean orientation by the PD-Tempone is decreasing in this phase for 40,6 and 40,8. This is not at all unreasonable in the context of our model in which the flexible end chains are interpenetrating more, and their dynamical motions interfere with their average, but not necessarily their instantaneous, ordering.

(4) Smectic B Phase. The ordering tensor for the $S8 \rightarrow S8$ transition was characterized by only a small change in $\langle \Delta D(\alpha) \rangle$, but a significant change in $\langle \Delta D(\beta) + \Delta D(\beta') \rangle$ which goes from near zero (but positive) values in $S8_A$ to substantial negative values in $S8_B$. This amounts to a substantial increase in $\langle \Delta D(\alpha) \rangle$ and decrease in $\langle \Delta D(\beta) + \Delta D(\beta') \rangle$ (both of which are negative), cf. Table IV. Thus, the freezing-in of the smectic layered structure, which characterizes the $S8_B$ phase, appears to require the PD-Tempone to realign itself in a new region, or more likely (see below) there is some partial constraining of the hydrocarbon end chains, so the fluctuations in ordering in the molecular $x$-$z$ plane (or more rigorously the smectic $x'$-$y'$ plane), which we have suggested tend to average out in the $S8_A$ phase, no longer so in the $S8_B$ phase. [In the case of the $N \rightarrow S8$ transition, the ordering tensor increases, but the relative changes of the components are, at least to a rough approximation, of the same order (cf. Table IV.)]

The changes in spin relaxation in crossing the $S8 \rightarrow S8$ transition are even more dramatic. First, there is a significant decrease in both $\tau_B(B)$ and $\tau_B(C)$ in passing into the $S8_B$ phase, although the $E_a$ values do not appear to be altered significantly for 40,8 (the result for 40,6 in the $S8_A$ phase is rather uncertain), and secondly the $\tau_B(C)/\tau_B(B)$ ratio increases from 1.3 to 1.8 in 40,6 and from 1.3 to 2.15 in 40,8. This is further evidence of the changed character of the local environment of PD-Tempone that occurs at this phase transition.

As the temperature decreases in the $S8_B$ phase, $\tau_B(B)$ and $\tau_B(C)$ both increase as expected, while the ratio $\tau_B(C)/\tau_B(B)$ remains nearly constant till the $S8_B \rightarrow$ solid transition is reached.

These observations are somewhat reminiscent of observations made for PD-Tempone in phase V about the nematic to solid transition (as a function of pressure, cf. ref 10, Figure 6a). In this earlier study, the $C/B$ ratio (or alternatively $\tau_B(C)/\tau_B(B)$) was found to gradually increase in the nematic phase as the $N \rightarrow C$ transition was approached, while in the (unordered) crystalline phase the $C/B$ ratio is unusually large at the phase transition, but $C/B$ approaches unity as one moves away from the transition and deeper into the crystalline phase. Furthermore, $\tau_B(B)$ and $\tau_B(C)$ actually decrease as one moves deeper into the crystalline phase. (However, $\tau_B(B)$ values on either side of the $N \rightarrow$ solid transition were found to be comparable.) These results were interpreted in terms of the probe being located in a cavity in the solid phase with a structure like that in the nematic phase, except that increasing the pressure freezes out movement of the solvent molecules, so the motion of the spin probe becomes less hindered. The large $C/B$ ratio would then be due to a SRLS effect which is then frozen out and disappears with increased pressure.

While there are some important differences in our present observations of the $S8_A \rightarrow S8_B$ transition and also, very importantly, the $\tau_B$ values are nearly two orders of magnitude shorter in the present case than observed in the SRLS effect which is then frozen out and disappears with increased pressure.


TABLE IV: Typical Order Parameters for PD-Tempone in Liquid Crystal Solvents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$T$ (°C)</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$S_A$</th>
<th>$S_B$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\alpha)_{\text{a}}$</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta D(\alpha)_{\text{b}}$</td>
<td>+0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta D(\alpha)_{\text{c}}$</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta)_{\text{a}}$</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta)_{\text{b}}$</td>
<td>+0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta)_{\text{c}}$</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{a}}$</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{b}}$</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{c}}$</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{d}}$</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{e}}$</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{f}}$</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{g}}$</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{h}}$</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>40,6</td>
<td>$\Delta D(\beta')_{\text{i}}$</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contribution to the observed line widths. This model remains essentially unchanged throughout the $S_B$ phase. From the point of view of activation theory, the similarity in $E_a$ for the $S_A$ and $S_B$ phases (e.g., 40,8) would imply a similarity in structure of the cavity in the two phases, but the difference in preexponential factors imply that the fact that one can show that quite generally $z_{5}$ the coefficients of the terms linear in $S_1$ must vanish. We see in the above expressions that they are indeed small.) However, one finds that for reasonable values of $S_1^2 \leq 0.1, D_0(0) = \tau(0)$ and $D_0(0) = \tau(2)$, so we will ignore these small corrections.

The SRLS term has been generalized to the case of ordered fluids, and one obtains for an axially symmetric local order parameter, $S_1$

$$J_{KM}(\omega) = J_{SRLS}(\omega) + J_{\text{KL}(\omega)} + J_{\text{KL}(\omega)}$$

where $J_{SRLS}(\omega)$ is the spectral density for overall rotational reorientation (e.g., $1/5(\tau_{\text{KL}} + 1 + \omega^2\tau_{\text{KL}}^2)$) for isotropic fluids with $\tau(0) = \tau(2) = \tau$, while, in principle, includes the corrections analogous to those of eq 8 and 9 for the isropic phase, while

$$J_{\text{KL}(\omega)} + J_{\text{KL}(\omega)} = \frac{1}{5}[5\kappa(\omega M)]^2 \frac{S_1}{S_1^2} \left[ \frac{1}{1 + \omega^2\tau_x^2} \right]$$

where $\tau_x^{-1} = \tau_T^{-1} + \tau_x^{-1} \approx \tau^{-1}$ and $\kappa(0,M)$ are given in Table VI. The generalization for nonaxially symmetric long-range as well as local ordering is given in Appendix B. One may now look at the effect of the SRLS correction. This is first done for the simpler expressions (eq 7) appropriate for isotropic liquids, when we assume $\omega_x^2\tau_x < 1$ (where $\omega_x$ are the $^{14}$N spin-flip frequencies) which appears reasonable in light of the very rapid $\tau_1$ values obtained in this work (cf. Figure 10), for which $\omega_x^2\tau_x \ll 1$ is certainly true. For isotropic fluids and anisotropic rotational rotation one has $\tau(0)/\tau(2) = \frac{1}{2}R_1 + 1$ with $N = R_1/R$. Now suppose there is isotropic rotation (i.e., $\tau(0) = \tau(2)$) but a SRLS mechanism given by eq 7 but ignoring any effects of $S_1$ on $D_0(0)$ and $D_2(0)$ is present. Then there will be an "apparent" $\tau(0) = S_1^2\tau_T$, and therefore an "apparent" $N' = (3/2)[\tau(0)/\tau(2)]^{-1/3}$. Thus we see how a satisfactorily fit of the ESR relaxation data to a model of anisotropic rotational diffusion could be equally well fit by a SRLS model. One then would need independent considerations, such as those discussed above, to distinguish between them. [However, in the work of I and ref 10, where $\omega_x^2\tau_x \approx 1$, the line width effects of the two models become distinguishable.] One finds that for weak ordering, such as that experienced by PD-Tempone, the $\kappa(K,M)$ correction factors in eq 11 or their generalization in Appendix B are not large; they do not differ very significantly from unity. Thus the main point we have made here (viz. that the effects of SRLS lead to an "apparent" $N' \neq 1$) is essentially unchanged. Further $K$-dependent relaxation from SRLS can result from the effects of a nonaxial local ordering of the probe (cf. Appendix B).

It is suggested in Appendix B that $\tau_x = \tau_x(M)$, and this can further modify the "apparent" effects of SRLS, i.e., the $M$ dependence would lead to the same type of line width effects as an anisotropic rotation or viscosity or else in terms of the SRLS mechanism. Combination models are discussed in Appendices B and C.

Last of all, we note that we have not introduced any consideration of jump types of models. We show in Appendix D that this is not important for the weakly ordered PD-Tempone probe.

(D) Angular Dependence of the Line Widths. In this work, as is typical in magnetic resonance studies, the magnetic field was employed to align the director in the sample. In the nematic phases, because the director follows the dc magnetic field ($\approx 3$ kG), it is impossible to study the angular dependence of the line width unless other
external constraints are introduced (e.g., electrical fields and/or very thin glass plates\(^6\)). We have studied the angular dependences for the smectic A and smectic B phases. The results already discussed showed that, with the exception of 8CB in the larger 2 mm i.d. tubes, the \(S_A\) and \(S_B\) phases had their alignments “locked-in” so the director could be tilted relative to the magnetic field without reorienting. The orientational dependence of the \(g\) shifts and hyperfine shifts are in complete agreement independent upon the tube diameter even though the results of these results below.

We first simulated the ESR spectra at various orientations to obtain the appropriate (angular dependent) \((a_D)\) for correcting the line widths due to deuteron inhomogeneous broadening (cf. Figure 3). This lead to the surprising result that the angular dependences of the \((a_D)\) appear to be different for the two different tube diameters. Just as surprising was the observation that the angular dependences of \(C\) and \(B\) (as well as \(C/B\)) were very much dependent upon the tube diameter even though the results for \(0^\circ\) tilt (as well as \(90^\circ\) tilt) were found to be virtually independent of tube size. Typical angular variations of \(B\) and \(C\) are shown in Figures 12-14. We discuss aspects of these results below.

First of all, we wish to examine the importance of having accurate \((a_D)\) values in order to obtain the correct values of line width parameters \(A\), \(B\), and \(C\) for the PD-Tempone probe. Based upon our initial uncertainty of the correct angular dependence of \((a_D)\), we considered the implications of using different values of \((a_D)\). In this way, one rapidly becomes convinced that significant changes in the \((a_D)\) used will (1) have virtually no effect on the \(C/B\) ratio; (2) have only a marginal effect on the values of \(C\) and \(B\); (3) have an appreciable effect on the values of \(A\). Thus, for example, a dramatic 40% increase in postulated \((a_D)\) (from \(-0.0222\) to \(-0.0309\)) is found to decrease \(A\) by 25%, while \(B\) and \(C\) are only decreased by 4.5% and the \(C/B\) ratio only varies by 0.5%, for lines with intrinsic width ca. 0.2 G. A less dramatic increase of \((a_D)\) of 14% yielded respective decreases in \(A, B, C\), and \(C/B\) of 6.5, 1.4, 1.1, and \(-0.2\). We thus concluded that our results for \(C/B\) as well as \(B\) and \(C\) could be regarded as reliable even when there was some uncertainty in the correct values of \((a_D)\) required. The angular-dependent results for \((a_D)\) given in Table I for 40,6 are the most reliable ones we obtained. The reasons for this are discussed below. The angular dependence of the \((a_D)\) is expected to follow the relation \((a_D) = [a_D+1/2(3\cos^2\theta-1)/\chi(\theta)]\) (see Appendix A). One finds from Table I that for \((a_D)\) this is approximately, but not exactly, obeyed unlike the results for \((a_N)\), which were in exact agreement.

It is our belief that these anomalous observations may be explained in terms of inhomogeneous broadening due to a static distribution of the directors in the smectic phases which results from the effects of (i) the strength, geometry, and smoothness of the anchoring of the smectic layering by the tube walls, (ii) the elastic constants determining the strength of the smectic ordering in the bulk of the phase, and (iii) the effects of the magnetic-field induced torques (due to the diamagnetic anisotropy of the samples), which try to reorient a tilted director into an alignment parallel to the magnetic field. Thus, in the extreme case of 8CB, the anchoring forces as transmitted

---

**Figure 12.** Angular dependence of \(B\) and \(C\) in (40,6) when the director is tilted by angle \(\theta\) with respect to the magnetic field. The open circles are the experimental data taken with 2-mm i.d. cylindrical tube; closed circles are taken with 0.5-mm i.d. tube: (A) smectic A phase, (B) smectic B phase.

**Figure 13.** Angular dependence of \(B\) and \(C\) in (40,6). The open circles are taken with 2-mm i.d. cylindrical tube the and closed circles are taken with 0.5-mm i.d. tube: (A) smectic A phase; (B) smectic B phase.

**Figure 14.** Angular dependence of \(B\) and \(C\) in 8CB smectic A phase. The experimental data are taken in 0.5-mm i.d. tube.
by the aligning forces (elastic constants) of the smectic phase are too weak to maintain a fixed alignment for 2-mm diameter tubes, but not for 0.5-mm tubes, as the sample is tilted relative to the magnetic field. Nevertheless, even when the sample axis appear to be well aligned by beam's eye view, the correct variation of $\alpha_0$ with tilt (and by simple optical methods), there is a small static distribution of directors.

The presence of this source of small inhomogeneity superimposed upon the smectic phase is also indicated from about the 0.95--0.96 range. Since it appeared difficult to deconvolute these two sources of small inhomogeneity from each other, we chose a rather simple criterion for distinguishing the effects of static director distributions. The composite lines observed in the absence of such effects are very nearly antisymmetric about their centers (cf. Figure 3). However, we found that the composite lines, where such effects were believed to be present, were asymmetric. We therefore used such an asymmetry as a measure of these effects, i.e., one lets $R$ be the ratio of the low-field to high-field extrenum amplitude of a hyperfine line. Then an $R \neq 1$ is a definite indication of inhomogeneous broadening. Our results for $R$ are summarized in Table V. We find that only in the case of 40.6 and 0.5-mm tubes, are the values of $R$ in the $S_0$ and $S_0$ phases in the range of 0.98--1.02, which we regard as antisymmetric within experimental error. [Also, in 8CB in 2-mm tubes, where the magnetic field completely re-aligns the director, very good line shape symmetry is observed independent of the sample angle.] We thus regard our angular-dependent results for $\langle \alpha_0 \rangle$, $A$, $B$, $C$, and $C/B$ for 40.6 in 0.5-mm tubes as our most reliable, which if not entirely devoid of effects of static director fluctuations, then they are at least small. On the other hand, our results for 40.8 show worse asymmetries for 0.5-mm tubes than for 2-mm tubes. We suspect that some intermediate size tube would be optimum for this solvent. Significant asymmetries are observed for 8CB in 0.5-mm tubes.

Our further objectives will be to (1) analyze the most reliable results (viz. 40.6 solvent and 0.5-mm diameter tube) in terms of spin relaxation (section E) and (2) to examine further aspects of the problem of static distributions of directors in the smectic phases (section F).

(E) Angular Dependence of the Spin Relaxation. We have seen in the previous section that the angular-dependent line widths in the smectic phases typically include both inhomogeneous broadening associated with these phases as well as the homogeneous widths due to spin relaxation. However, in the case of 40.6 in 0.5-mm tubes, we were able to sufficiently remove the former, that we could attempt an analysis of the latter in terms of spin relaxation. Our analysis of angular-dependent relaxation is again based upon equations given in 1,27,28. We further attempted to employ in our analysis of the angular-dependent results, the fits at $\theta = 0^\circ$ found using the models of anisotropic rotation and of anisotropic viscosity. These are shown in Figure 15. In the case of $S_0$, neither the model with $N = 2.81$, $\bar{N} = 1$ nor the model with $N = 1$, $\bar{N} = 11.5$ showed satisfactory agreement with the angular dependent results (although they agree with the $\theta = 0^\circ$ results).

---

**TABLE V: Line Shape Asymmetries for 40.6, 40.8, and 8CB in Different Phases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Low Field ($M = +1$)</th>
<th>Center ($M = 0$)</th>
<th>High Field ($M = -1$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. 40.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isotropic</td>
<td>1.00 (0.971)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.979)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nematic</td>
<td>1.01 (0.979)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.987)</td>
<td>0.97 (0.980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_0$</td>
<td>1.023 (0.939)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.864)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>1.020 (0.962)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.881)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.704)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.918 (0.859)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.906)</td>
<td>0.98 (1.045)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>0.900 (0.854)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.927)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.900 (0.926)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.943)</td>
<td>1.02 (0.979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_0$</td>
<td>0.996 (0.934)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.921)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.943)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.999 (0.915)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.914)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.933)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.001 (0.986)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.911)</td>
<td>0.98 (0.928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>1.006 (0.925)</td>
<td>1.00 (0.938)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.997 (0.940)</td>
<td>1.002 (0.949)</td>
<td>0.998 (0.961)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. 40.8** |                     |                  |                      |
| Isotropic | 0.98 (1.031) | 0.96 (0.990) | 0.98 (0.963) |
| Nematic | 1.01 (0.981) | 0.96 (0.997) | 0.94 (0.963) |
| $S_0$ | 1.118 (0.99) | 0.97 (0.96) | 0.80 (0.92) |
| 22.5 | 1.02 (1.14) | 0.97 (0.95) | 0.85 (0.87) |
| 45 | 1.00 (1.14) | 0.97 (0.93) | 0.95 (0.94) |
| 67.5 | 0.88 (1.10) | 0.99 (0.96) | 1.10 (1.03) |
| 90 | 0.87 (0.99) | 0.99 (0.92) | 1.01 (1.00) |

| **C. 8CB** |                     |                  |                      |
| Isotropic | 0.99 (0.985) | 0.96 (0.956) | 0.98 (0.985) |
| Nematic | 1.03 (1.001) | 0.96 (0.974) | 0.94 (0.966) |
| $S_0$ | 1.12 (1.007) | 0.91 (0.983) | 0.86 (0.963) |
| 22.5 | 1.12 (1.007) | 0.92 (0.983) | 0.87 (0.963) |
| 45 | 1.02 (1.007) | 0.93 (0.983) | 0.90 (0.963) |
| 67.5 | 0.90 (1.007) | 1.05 (0.983) | 1.09 (0.963) |
| 90 | 0.91 (1.007) | 1.04 (0.983) | 1.05 (0.963) |

*a Table entries are for $R = \langle$ low field max amplitude/$\langle$ high field max amplitude $\rangle$ in a derivative ESR spectrum. Numbers first given are for 0.5-mm i.d. tubes; those in parentheses are for 2.0-mm i.d. tube. Precision ranges from ±0.001 to ±0.01.

---

Now, in principle, there is no reason not to consider models with combined anisotropic rotation and viscosity. However, there is a fundamental theoretical problem in developing such a model. This results from the fact that the principal axis systems for the two types of anisotropy (the molecular and lab frames respectively) are rapidly fluctuating with respect to one another. Therefore, the diffusion tensor \( R(t) \) defined in any coordinate frame will, in general, still be time dependent. This problem is discussed at some length in Appendix C, where general forms of the diffusion operator are considered which yield time-independent relaxation eigenvalues even when \( R(t) \) is still time dependent in any one frame.

We show in Figure 15 predictions using a particular form, which minimizes adjustable parameters, and may be written simply when we momentarily neglect the effects of ordering as

\[
\Gamma_0 D_{2xM}(\theta) = R_1 \{L(L+1) + (N - 1)K^2 + (N - 1)M^2\} D_{2xM}(\theta) \quad (12)
\]

This is subject to the restriction that \( N \geq 1 \) and \( \tilde{N} \geq 1 \) (cf. Appendix C). We first fixed \( N = \tilde{N} \) and found the optimum set of values for \( L, N \) which fit the \( \theta = 0^\circ \) results. These values were then used to predict the experimental results for \( \theta \neq 0^\circ \) as shown in Figure 15. We see in Figure 15A that this exhibits considerably improved agreement with experiment, even yielding exact agreement at \( \theta = 90^\circ \) within experimental error. (Recall that the \( \theta = 0^\circ \) and \( \theta = 90^\circ \) experimental results for \( B \) and \( C \) are quite insensitive to effects of inhomogeneous broadening associated with sample tube size and shape.) We have varied the ratio \( N/\tilde{N} \) between the two limiting cases (i.e., \( N = 1 \) or \( \tilde{N} = 1 \), but we find the best agreement for \( N = \tilde{N} \). Also, we have tested a simple case based on a model in Appendix C such that \( L(L+1) \) in eq 12 is changed to \( 2L(L+1) \) (cf. eq C7) and \( N = \tilde{N} \). This case could not even yield agreement with the \( \theta = 0^\circ \) results for any values of the adjustable parameters.

Similar analyses were made for the \( S_0 \) phase as shown in part in Figure 15B. In this case the model based upon eq 12 and \( N = \tilde{N} \approx 7 \) to 8 showed an improved shape of angular dependence for \( B \) vs. \( C \) compared to the original results for \( N = 40 \) to 50 and \( \tilde{N} = 1 \), but the predictions for \( \theta = 90^\circ \) are displaced from the experimental results. Variations of the models, as discussed for the \( S_0 \) case, did not improve the fits.

As we discussed for the results at \( \theta = 0^\circ \), we believe the angular-dependent effects are most likely due to a SRLS mechanism rather than actual anisotropic rotation or diffusion. We note from the general discussion of Appendix B, that one can generate dependences of the \( J_{2xM}(w) \) on both \( K \) and \( M \), so that, following the lines given in section C6, one could go about fitting the angular dependence to these models with considerable leeway in the adjustable parameters \( \tau_r(M) \) and \( S_0^K \).

Clearly, we have not exhaustively studied all possible combination models. Nor do our present experimental results necessarily warrant them. However, we are encouraged by the improved agreement to believe that angular-dependent relaxation studies can provide a basis for studying such phenomena. Clearly, one requires (1) accurate forms of the orienting potential; (2) adequate knowledge of the orientation dependence of any unresolved protons or deuteron splittings; and (3) adequate knowledge of any effects of static distribution of directors due to distortions in the smectic phases.

F. Static Distribution of Directors. We now consider in further detail static distributions of directors and their effect on the line width and line shape as a function of tilt angle \( \theta \) of the mean director with respect to the magnetic field. We may for this case write as the derivative line shape function (cf. I)

\[
I(B_o,\theta,\gamma) = \int_0^{2\pi} \sin \frac{\gamma'}{\gamma} \ d\gamma' \times \int_0^{\pi} d\gamma \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \rho(\gamma)(12)
\]

\[
\int_0^{\pi} \sin \gamma'd\gamma' \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \rho(\gamma)(12) \quad (13)
\]

where \( \rho(\gamma) = (\rho_\gamma,\rho_\phi) \) are the Euler angles for a particular director \( \hat{r} \) relative to the lab frame as shown in Figure 16. The lab frame is defined by the magnetic field along the \( x \) axis and the mean director \( \hat{r}_m \) in the \( x-z \) plane. The particular \( \rho(\gamma) \) is tilted from \( \hat{r}_m \) by polar and azimuthal angles \( \theta' \) and \( \phi' \), respectively, and

\[\cos \phi' = \cos \theta \cos \phi' - \sin \theta \sin \phi' \cos \phi' \]

\[B(\rho(\gamma)) \text{ is the resonant field for spin probes at } \rho \text{. It is given by eq A12 and A13 where } D_B(0,\theta,0) \text{ is replaced by} \]

\[
D_B(0,\theta,\phi') = \sum_N D_{2N}(0,\theta',\phi') D_{2N}(0,\theta,0) =
\]

\[
\frac{4\pi}{5} \sum_N (-)^N Y_{2N}(\theta',\phi') Y_{2N}(\theta,0) = D_B(0,\theta,0) \quad (14)
\]

Also \( P_\rho(\gamma) \text{ is the distribution function for the angles } \theta',\phi'. \) A simple form used by others \( 1,5,6,30-33 \text{ is } P_{\rho}(\gamma) = e^{-(\gamma'_{\min} - \gamma')} \text{ independent of } \gamma, \text{ but the } \phi' \text{ dependence has usually been ignored, although this is not strictly correct for } \theta \neq 0. \text{ We wish to consider more appropriate forms for this distribution function, in particular, the effects of the magnetic interaction between the magnetic field and the diamagnetic susceptibility of the mesophase. The interaction energies which are most important in the smectic phase include } 34,36 (1) \text{ the smectic layering free energy, represented by } 1/2 B_B u_{\theta}^2 \text{ where } B_B \text{ is the elastic constant for compression of the layers and } u(\theta) \text{ measures the displacement of the smectic layer from equilibrium at point } \vec{r} \text{; (2) the free energy of spay distortion: } 1/2 K_1 (u_{\theta}^2 + u_{\phi}^2) \text{ where } K_1 \text{ is the associated elastic constant; the magnetic free energy: } 1/2 \chi_4 u(\theta) B^2 = -1/2 \chi_4 B_0 \cos^2 \psi, \text{ where } \chi_4 \text{ is the anisotropy in the diamagnetic susceptibility. Thus we have}

\[
F_{\text{ens}} = \gamma B \left( \frac{u_{\theta}}{u_{\phi}} \right)^2 + \gamma K_1 \left( \frac{\partial^2 u_{\theta}}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2 u_{\phi}}{\partial y^2} \right) - \gamma \chi_4 B_0 \cos^2 \phi
\]

(15)
for the smectic free energy per unit volume in the bulk of the phase. If we now identify $n_a$ with the normal to the smectic layers at equilibrium, then $\langle n(\vec{r}) \rangle$ representing a particular director at $\vec{r}$, would be characterized by the distortions $n_{\alpha} = -a_{\alpha} / a \ll 1$ and $n_{\gamma} = -a_{\gamma} / a \ll 1$.

Another important consideration is that of the boundary effects on wall alignment. It is known that glass walls typically tend to align the smectic layers parallel to the wall. (When this alignment is strong one speaks of “strong anchoring.”) This alignment cannot be satisfactorily achieved in cylindrical capillary tubes. (In fact one may anticipate in such cases an alignment where the smectic layers form in concentric cylinders about the tube axis. This is known as a myelinic texture.) Thus, the alignment procedure that is typically used, which involves cycling from the nematic to smectic A phases in the presence of very large magnetic fields, relies on the magnetic free energy to favor the alignment of the smectic layers to be perpendicular (for positive diamagnetic anisotropy) to the field. Samples prepared in this way may still experience distortions at the wall surfaces which are not perpendicular to the magnetic field (as well as distortions due to wall imperfections). Unfortunately, little is known about the strength of these boundary effects, so one usually only considers the effects of strong anchoring. We shall outline an approximate discussion of distortions leading to a static distribution of directors on this basis, and use it to discuss our experimental situation.

One starts by integrating eq 15 over all $\vec{r}$ and then Fourier analyzing by letting

$$u(\vec{q}) = \sum_\vec{q} u(\vec{q}) e^{i \vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}}$$

(16)

(where $q_c$ is the cutoff wave vector, where $q_c \sim \pi / b$ with $b$ a molecular dimension) so that

$$n_{\alpha}(\vec{q}) = i q_{\alpha} u(\vec{q})$$

(17a)

and

$$n_{\gamma}(\vec{q}) = -i q_{\gamma} u(\vec{q})$$

(17b)

Note that the fact that $u(\vec{r})$ is real requires that $u(-\vec{q}) = u^*(\vec{q})$ in eq 16. Thus we obtain

$$F_{vol} = \frac{V}{2} \sum_{\vec{q}} \left[ B q_{\alpha}^2 + K_1 q_{\alpha}^4 + \chi_B q_{\alpha}^2 (q_{\gamma}^2 \cos \theta + q_{\gamma}^2 \cos^2 \theta) \right] |u(\vec{q})|^2$$

(18)

where $q_{\alpha}^2 = q_{\alpha}^2 + q_{\gamma}^2$. In order to obtain this simple result for the contribution of the magnetic free energy, we have dropped terms linear and cubic in the $u(\vec{q})$. The linear term does disappear upon integrating over $\vec{r}$ [i.e., one uses $1 / V \int e^{i \vec{q} \cdot \vec{r}} d\vec{r} \propto \delta(\vec{q})$], while the cubic terms are dropped on the assumption that the $u(\vec{q})$'s are small enough that terms higher order than quartic are not needed. Strong-anchoring boundary effects will limit the values of $q_{\alpha}$ allowed in the expansion of eq 18. It follows from eq 18 and equipartition that the mean square values of $u(\vec{q})$ are given by

$$\langle |u(\vec{q})|^2 \rangle = \frac{k_B T}{V} \left[ B q_{\alpha}^2 + K_1 q_{\alpha}^4 + \chi_B q_{\alpha}^2 q_{\gamma}^2 \cos \theta + \frac{q_{\gamma}^2}{q_{\gamma}^2} \cos^2 \theta \right]$$

(19)

and then we have

$$\langle |n_{\alpha}(\vec{q})|^2 \rangle = \frac{q_{\alpha}^2}{q_{\gamma}^2} \langle |u(\vec{q})|^2 \rangle = \left( \frac{k_B T}{V} \right) \left[ \frac{q_{\alpha}^2}{q_{\gamma}^2} + \chi_B q_{\gamma}^2 \right]$$

$$+ \lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2 - \frac{\lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2 - \lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2}{\lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2 - \lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2} \left( \cos^2 \frac{q_{\gamma}^2}{q_{\gamma}^2} + \cos^2 \frac{q_{\gamma}^2}{q_{\gamma}^2} \right)$$

(20)

where $n_{\alpha}(\vec{q}) = n_{\alpha}(\vec{q}) + i n_{\gamma}(\vec{q})$. Here we have introduced the parameters $\lambda = (K_1 / B)^{1/2} \sim a$ the layer thickness and $f_B = (K_1 / \chi_B q_{\gamma}^2)^{1/2}$ the coherence length due to the presence of the magnetic field. For typical values of $K_1 \sim 10^4$ dyn, $\lambda q_{\gamma} \sim 10^2$, $B_0 \sim 10^3$ G and $\lambda \sim 2 \times 10^{-7}$ cm (corresponding to $B = 2.5 \times 10^4$ dyn/cm$^2$), one has $\lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2 \sim 4 \times 10^{-7}$. We can now estimate $\langle |n_{\alpha}(\vec{q})|^2 \rangle \sim V / (2\pi)^3 \lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2$. We have performed this integration numerically using eq 20, and the values given above (as well as $q_c \sim \pi \times 10^7$ cm$^{-1}$) to obtain in the absence of a magnetic field:

$$\langle |n_{\alpha}(\vec{q})|^2 \rangle \sim \frac{k_B T}{K_\lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2} \times 8.88 \times 10^{-7}$$

(with a slightly greater than linear dependence upon $q_c$). We may compare this result with the equivalent result for a nematic in the one constant approximation (for which $|n_{\alpha}(\vec{q})|^2) = 2k_B T (K_1 / V (q_{\alpha}^2 + f_B^2))$) to obtain

$$\langle |n_{\alpha}(\vec{q})|^2 \rangle \sim \frac{k_B T}{K_\lambda^2 q_{\gamma}^2} \times 3.14 \times 10^{-7} \sim 0.33$$

(Because these results depend strongly upon a somewhat arbitrary choice of cutoff $q_{\alpha}$ they should only be considered in terms of rough order of magnitude estimates.) Thus we see that while $\langle n_{\alpha}(\vec{q}) \rangle$ experiences substantial fluctuations for the nematic phase, these fluctuations are greatly suppressed by the forces in the smectic phase which maintain the layer structure (from the term $1 / 2 \beta |u(\vec{q})|^2$). It is thus unlikely that in a magnetic resonance experiment, wherein one obtains the signal integrated over the whole sample, that one can anticipate any measurable effects from such weak fluctuations. Furthermore, these fluctuations are dynamic viscous modes, and their relaxation must further reduce their contribution to line widths in a magnetic resonance experiment. In fact, neither in this work nor in previous work (cf. I) have we observed any effects from the much more substantial fluctuations in the nematic phase on PD-temppor line widths.

In the case of light scattering experiments, one normally does not observe even those fluctuations which require very little energy in a smectic (i.e., the pure undulation modes for which $q_{\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ so that the smectic energy term $B q_{\gamma}^2 \rightarrow 0$). Instead, one observes the effects of static distortions which are transmitted deep into the bulk (from wall distortions and/or localized defects) by the very same smectic aligning forces. Thus, for a wall undulation of wavelength $2 \pi / q_{\gamma}$, the thickness $L$ of the distorted region, i.e., the decay constant for $u(\vec{r})$ is given by $L = 1 / q_{\gamma} \lambda$ which is much larger than the result $L = 2 \pi / q_{\gamma}$ for a nematic. We could therefore expect to see ESR line shape distortions from such effects in the smectic phase, when they are observable in the nematic. Now $u(\vec{r})$ resulting from such effects could also be Fourier analyzed (cf. eq 16) [away from the sources: either the wall or localized defects], and one could then expect some statistical distribution for the $|u(\vec{q})|^2$ as well as the $\langle |n_{\alpha}(\vec{q})|^2 \rangle$.

We now wish to consider possible effects of the magnetic field, as the angle $\theta$ is varied. For the simpler case of parallel-plate smectic alignment with strong anchoring, any distortion $u(\vec{r})$ that is induced vanishes for both $z = 0$ and $d$ (where $d$ is the sample thickness), so we may restrict any modes $u(\vec{q})$ induced to $q_{\gamma} = \pi n / d$ with $n = 1, 2, 3$ and with $n = 1$ corresponding to the easiest mode to distort, since the $B(\pi / d^2)$ term is smallest. Now normally such distortions (1) are expected to require very high fields (ca. 6$k \gamma$) and (2) are expected to be of such low amplitude as to be unobservable even by light scattering. These are again due to the effects of the smectic aligning forces.
(e.g., $x_B B^2 = 2\pi (Bk/d)^{1/2}$ with $B_C$ being the critical field). However, for our samples the anchoring is not very strong. Thus, we may expect to have modes $q_t = \pi d'$, where $d' > d$ is an "effective" sample thickness, and also the restraining forces do such distortion modes are weaker because of the weaker anchoring. In those cases in which the anchoring is sufficiently weak (e.g., SCB in 2-mm tubes) there is total realignment of the smectic phases by the magnetic field, but for somewhat stronger anchoring (e.g., 40,5 and 40,8) distortions about the mean director may well be expected. These effects should enhance the $(q_t d')^2$ that will be observed.

We now return to a consideration of the above effects on eq 13. First the ESR signal involves integrating $I(B_0,\delta)$ over the whole sample. We then let

$$I(B_0,\delta) = \int d\delta' I(B_0,\delta,\delta')$$

(21)

If the distortion modes are small enough, then $I(B,\psi(F))$ (cf. eq 13) may be expanded in a Taylor's series about the equilibrium orientation $\hat{n}_m$. That is

$$I(B,\psi(F)) = I(B,\psi(F))_{n_t(\delta') = 0} +$$

$$\frac{\delta I(B,\psi(F))}{\delta n_t(\delta')} |_{n_t(\delta') = 0} [n_t(\delta')] +$$

$$\frac{\delta^2 I(B,\psi(F))}{\delta^2 n_t(\delta')} |_{n_t(\delta') = 0} [n_t(\delta')]^2 + \text{H.O.T.}$$

(22)

and $I(B_0,\delta)$ obtained by integration over $\theta'/\phi'$ with $P_{eq}(\psi(F))$. Now the nature of wall anchoring and other wall effects, etc. guarantees that $P_{eq}(\psi(F))$ will be a function of $\delta$, which is best handled by Fourier analysis. Thus, if we know from statistical and other considerations the distribution function for the $q_t$th mode, $P_{eq}(\theta'/\phi')$, we may make use of this knowledge to simplify $I(B_0,\psi(F))$ (defined in a manner similar to Appendix A of ref [25] for all values of $\phi$ for a product of the individual $P_{eq}(\psi(q_t))$ in order to obtain the absorption signal given by eq 21 which is averaged over the sample

$$I(B_0,\delta) = \int d\delta' I(B_0,\psi(F))_{n_t(\delta') = 0} +$$

$$\frac{\delta I(B_0,\psi(F))}{\delta n_t(\delta')} |_{n_t(\delta') = 0} [n_t(\delta')] +$$

$$\frac{\delta^2 I(B_0,\psi(F))}{\delta^2 n_t(\delta')} |_{n_t(\delta') = 0} [n_t(\delta')]^2 + \text{H.O.T.}$$

(23)

where the angular brackets again imply averaging over $\theta'$ and $\phi'$.

The question arises as to the importance of the higher order terms (H.O.T.) in the expansion even for small fluctuations. In particular [with $I(B_0,\psi(F))$ given by eq 13 the derivative of a Lorentzian] the term $\delta^2 I(B_0,\psi(F))/n_t(\delta')$ may be shown to involve the $(m + 1)$th derivative of the Lorentzian line shape. For a very sharp line these higher derivatives would tend to cause the Taylor's series expansion to diverge (i.e., in the limit $T_{2\gamma} \to \infty$ the Lorentzian approaches a Dirac delta function whose derivatives are increasingly more singular). Thus, it is not sufficient to require that $n_t(\delta')$ be small in order to achieve rapid convergence of the series. Another criterion for convergence should therefore be that the quantity $T_{2\gamma}^2 |(B_0,\psi(F)) - B|^2$, where $B$ is the resonant field in the absence of ordering (e.g., in the isotropic phase), be small.

Unfortunately, we have found that for PD-Tempone in the liquid crystals studied here, the ESR widths are so sharp that the Taylor's series shows no sign of convergence even after terms through fourth order are included when values are used which can lead to observable effects on the ESR.

Figure 17. The angular dependence of $B$ and $C$ for PD-Tempone calculated from a static distribution of directors and a magnetic-field pulling effect for order parameters appropriate for the $S_a$ phases: $A$ $\alpha_0 = 50$, $\beta_0 = 650$, $\sigma_0 = 5$, $\alpha_1 = 10$, $\beta_1 = 5$, $\sigma_1 = 10$, $\sigma_2 = 100$. The input homogeneous values of $B$ and $C$ assume angular independence are shown as arrows on the ordinate.

As a result of this problem, we find it necessary to perform the full integrations over $\theta'$ and $\phi'$. The simplest approach is to assume that we can replace the sum over $\phi$ modes such as those which appear in eq 23 and instead we approximate eq 21 by

$$I(B_0,\delta) = \int_0^\infty \sin \theta' d\theta' \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi' I(B_0,\psi) P_{eq}(\psi)$$

(24)

where $P_{eq}(\psi)$ is a simple distribution function in $\psi$ that implicitly includes any $\delta$ dependence. For our calculations we assumed $P_{eq}(\psi)$ in the absence of magnetic-field effects would show a "one-sided" Gaussian distribution about $\theta'$, while the effect of the magnetic field would, as suggested by eq 15, be represented by a term in $\cos^2 \psi$. That is we let

$$P_{eq}(\psi) = A e^{-a \sin^2 \theta' + \beta \cos^2 \phi'}$$

(25)

and considered various values of $a_0$ and $a_1$.

We show some of our results in Figure 17 for the $S_a$ phase and Figure 18 for the $S_b$ phase. In general, the dependence upon $\alpha_0$ and $\alpha_1$ is complex, but a comparison of Figure 17 with Figure 12A for (40,6) shows that the predictions are in reasonable agreement with experiment. We would estimate for the 0.5-mm capillary tube $\alpha_0 \sim 600$ and $a_1 \sim 5-10$, while in the 0.5-mm capillary tube $\alpha_0 \sim 900$ and $a_1 \sim 2.5$. In general, the asymmetries of the lines for the range of parameters shown are determined by the ratio $a_1/a_0$; the asymmetries are greater for larger values of this ratio, while almost no asymmetry...
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Figure 18. The angular dependence of B and C for PD-Tempone calculated from a static distribution of directors and a magnetic-field pulling effect for order parameters appropriate for the S_B phases: (A) \( \alpha_0 = 500 \) and \( (--) \alpha_1 = 0 \), \( (--->) \alpha_1 = 5.0 \), \( (----) \alpha_1 = 10 \); (B) \( \alpha_1 = 2.5 \) and \( (--) \alpha_0 = 400 \), \( (--->) \alpha_0 = 600 \), \( (----) \alpha_0 = 800 \). The input homogeneous values of B and C (assumed angular independent) are shown as arrows on the ordinate.

is predicted as \( \alpha_1/\alpha_0 \rightarrow 0 \); (e.g., for \( \alpha_0 = 500 \), \( \alpha_1 = 0 \), and \( \theta = 45^\circ \) one has for the +1, 0, and -1 lines: \( R = 0.98, 1.00, \) and \( 0.98, \) respectively; while for \( \alpha_1 \) changed to 2.5, it becomes 0.90, 1.00, and 1.08; and for \( \alpha_1 \) changed to 10 it becomes 0.73, 1.00, and 1.26). These asymmetries bear a reasonable, but not a precise, relation to the results in Table VI, (the largest discrepancy being that little or no decrease in these values). It appears that for 8CB in the 0.5-mm tube (cf. Figure 14), \( \alpha_0 \sim 400-500 \) while \( \alpha_1 \sim 1 \) or 2, which is a little surprising.

One might attempt to improve the model calculations by superposing the results for different sets of \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_0 \) (to crudely simulate different modes). This will undoubtedly have a further effect on both the predicted widths and the asymmetries, since there are small shifts of the resonance centers, primarily for the outer two lines (and are typically a little smaller than the difference in inhomogeneous broadening predicted for the two modes). However, we felt this additional effort was not at present justified.

Similar comments apply for the comparisons of Figures 12B and 13B with typical predictions for the S_B phases shown in Figure 18. Note, in particular, the rather good agreement of the results for (40,8) in 2-mm i.d. tubes with the predictions in Figure 18A.

We do wish to note that the values predicted for B and C at 0° tilt are quite insensitive to the model parameters \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_0 \) and they do lie close to the input values. This is also true to a lesser extent for 90° tilt. This prediction is in agreement with our observations.

One may wonder about the effect on these calculations of any uncertainty in the determination of the ordering tensor. Actually, such uncertainties will have virtually no effect. This may be seen from eq A12, A13, and A14. Equations A12 and A13 show that \( (a) \) and \( (g) \) are just the observed hyperfine and g shifts (except for a very small high-field correction in eq A13. It is only necessary to use these experimental values (or more precisely the curve drawn through them) in Figures 4, or alternatively the \( \langle D_{\alpha_0} \rangle \) and \( \langle D_{\alpha_0} + D_{\beta_0} \rangle \) which are directly related to them by either eq A14 or 3. Also, we have found that the inhomogeneous broadening that is predicted increases approximately linearly with the magnitude of the order parameters.

In summary we note the fact that for (40,6) it appears possible to suppress distortions by going to a smaller diameter sample (i.e., by decreasing \( d \)) is consistent with the suppression of any distortions due to (1) defects which may exist in the bulk and (2) defects from a tilted magnetic field. However the fact that for (40,8) the smaller diameter samples lead to changes in the inhomogeneous line shape characteristics (cf. Table V) is more consistent with wall distortions being transmitted to the bulk. The case of 8CB showing that, for the large tubes, the bulk solution follows the magnetic-field alignment, and the line shapes do not appear to have inhomogeneous contributions, strongly suggests the importance of magnetic-field enhanced distortions in those samples in which the smectic alignment remains otherwise fixed as the sample is reoriented in the magnetic field. These phenomena are complex and are perhaps better studied in samples with simpler anchoring geometries (e.g., parallel-plate alignment), although we do note the reproducibility and the excellent “mean alignment” (manifested by \( \langle \alpha \rangle \) and \( \langle g \rangle \)) that can be obtained by cycling with strong magnetic fields.

IV. Summary and Conclusions

We have shown in this work how the methods previously employed by Polnaszek and Freed in I to study spin relaxation in nematic liquid crystals using the weakly ordered PD-Tempone spin probe may be employed in a study of smectic phases. The observations of ordering and spin relaxation in the isotropic and nematic phases of the liquid crystals studied here (40,6, 40,8, and 8CB) were very similar to the previous results and were analyzed similarly. This includes (1) the use of a two-term orienting potential for the PD-Tempone; (2) the observation of comparable activation energies for reorientation (\( E_r \)) (except for 8CB) which are characteristic of those associated with the solvent viscosity; (3) the similarity of the relaxation behavior in these two phases.

In the smectic phases significant differences are observed. The isotropic hyperfine interactions are found to have decreased from their value in the isotropic phase. This was attributed to a (partial) expulsion of the PD-Tempone from the dipolar region of the liquid-crystalline molecules (which is preferred by the polar PD-Tempone molecule) toward the more flexible hydrocarbon end chains as a result of the packing of the smectic layers. The analysis of the hyperfine interactions was based on empirical fits of \( \alpha_N \) and \( \alpha_B \) to solvent polarity. This model is further supported by the fact that the \( E_r \) for the reorientation process are found to decrease substantially in the smectic phases to values characteristic of hydrocarbon solvents. Furthermore, there is a significant change in the nature of the rotational reorientation, that could be interpreted in terms of increased rotational anisotropy (which is exceedingly large for the smectic B phase). However we believe it is physically more reasonable to interpret our observations in terms of a slowly-relaxing local structure (SRLS) model due to the slow fluctuations of the hydrocarbon chains. In passing from \( S_1 \rightarrow S_8 \) phases one finds significant changes in (1) the hyperfine interaction which decreases further, (2) the ordering tensor, which becomes significantly more nonaxial, (3) the rate of reorientation, which increases significantly, and (4) the spin
relaxation anomaly we attribute to SRLS which also increases significantly. All these observations are consistent with a model in which the smectic B phase is more solidlike with the more rigid layer-packing causing the PD-Tempone probe to be expelled further out to the hydrocarbon end chains, and into more well-defined ‘cavities’ experiencing more slowly-relaxing fluctuations of the end chains.

Differences in results observed for 40,6 and 40,8 on the one hand and 8CB on the other (viz. (1) decreasing ordering with decreasing temperature for the former, but the opposite for the latter and (2) an apparently small $E_s$ in the nematic and a larger $E_s$ in the smectic for 8CB) is rationalized in terms of differences in the nature of the smectic A phase for these two types of liquid crystals. Thus, the 40,6 and 40,8 have interlamellar spacings that are a little smaller than the molecular length and this spacing decreases with decreasing temperature, while 8CB has a bilayer lamellar structure with an interlamellar spacing that expands with decreasing temperature. Thus, in the latter case the PD-Tempone probes may be able to move closer to the polar C=N end groups as the temperature is reduced.

An observation we have made that is of some significance for studies of spin relaxation in smectics (in particular studies of the variation of line widths with orientation of the magnetic field), is the fact that the orientation-dependent line widths show a significant dependence on the size and shape of the sample even when the hyperfine and $g$ shifts show that the sample remains well-aligned even as it is rotated (or tilted) relative to the magnetic field. This dependence on sample size was not of any significance for $0^\circ$ tilt angle, and this appears to be reasonably the case for a tilt of $90^\circ$. However, it becomes very significant for intermediate values of the tilt angle. This phenomenon is discussed in terms of inhomogeneous broadening due to static distortions of the smectic layering and to distortions of the director, which tries to remain perpendicular to the smectic layering. Such distortions may result from wall anchoring effects and/or dislocations in the bulk, as well as from torques on the smectic alignment due to a tilted magnetic field. In the smectic phase the large free-energy associated with the layering results in persistences of such distortions over much greater lengths in the sample than for nematic phases. While the effects of magnetic torques are expected to be small for well-anchored smectics, the typical magnetic resonance technique of alignment in a tube by recycling into the phase in the presence of a strong magnetic field undoubtedly leads to not very strong anchoring, as evidenced by the failure of 8CB to maintain its alignment in larger (2-mm i.d.) tubes. Only in the case of 40,6 was it possible to suppress such effects by using smaller (0.5-mm i.d.) tubes. Our simple model calculations of these effects are in semiquantitative agreement with most of the observations. In our theoretical discussion of these matters we also considered the effects of fluctuations of the director in the smectic phase, but concluded that they were much too weak to be of importance, since they are much weaker than for nematics, and no observable effects from fluctuations within the nematic phase are seen with PD-Tempone probe.

We have discussed the angular-dependent line widths for 40,6 in 0.5-mm i.d. tubes in terms of combined models of anisotropic rotation and anisotropic viscosity. The theoretical problem of how to analyze such a model, when the two relevant axis systems are rapidly fluctuating with respect to each other, so the rotational-diffusion tensor is time dependent in any reference frame, is discussed in an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE VI: Mean Square Values of the Rotation-Matrix Elements $D_{K'M'}^{KM}(\Omega)$ Including Cross Terms for Nonaxially Symmetric Ordering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa(K'<em>+K'</em>+M'_+)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K K M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{2}{5}(D_{000}^{000} - (D_{000}^{000}))$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 0 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 2 0 $-2.117$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1 1 $1.000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 2 0 $2 \cdot 10^6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 0 $0.567$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$S > 0$ to 0.8

| $K K M$ | $a_0$ | $a_1$ | $a_2$ | $a_3$ |
| 0 0 0 $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{2}{5}(D_{000}^{000} - (D_{000}^{000}))$ | 3.008 | -9.704 | 5.654 |
| 0 1 0 1.000 | 1.004 | -2.769 | 0.397 |
| 0 2 0 $-2.117$ | 1.181 | -0.097 |
| 0 1 1 $1.000$ | -1.058 | -0.307 | 0.288 |
| 2 2 0 $2 \cdot 10^6$ | 2.148 | 0.664 | -0.028 |
| 1 1 0 $0.567$ | 9.425 | 4.854 |

$S < 0$ to -0.4

| $K K M$ | $a_0$ | $a_1$ | $a_2$ | $a_3$ |
| 0 0 0 $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{2}{5}(D_{000}^{000} - (D_{000}^{000}))$ | 3.008 | -9.704 | 5.654 |
| 0 1 0 1.000 | 1.004 | -2.769 | 0.397 |
| 0 2 0 $-2.117$ | 1.181 | -0.097 |
| 0 1 1 $1.000$ | -1.058 | -0.307 | 0.288 |
| 2 2 0 $2 \cdot 10^6$ | 2.148 | 0.664 | -0.028 |
| 1 1 0 $0.567$ | 9.425 | 4.854 |

The table lists $\kappa(K'_+K'_+M'_+)$ ($a_0 + a_1 \mathbf{S} + a_2 \mathbf{S}^2 + a_3 \mathbf{S}^3$) with $\mathbf{S} = (D_{011}^{011} - (D_{011}^{011}))$. These results were calculated by Dr. C. F. Polnaszek. See Table II of ref 25 for further details.

Figure 19. The angular dependence of $\theta$ and $C$ calculated for the model of the $S_0$ phase in which the director is tilted with respect to $\lambda_{n}$ by $20^\circ$, but the projection in the $x'\prime-y'\prime$ plane is randomly oriented.
Thus the first rotation is from the laboratory axis system \((x,y,z)\) into the director axis system \((x',y',z')\) with Euler angles \(\Psi\) which may be specified by polar angles \(\theta, \varphi\) such that 
\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\sin \theta \cos \varphi \\
\sin \theta \sin \varphi \\
\cos \theta
\end{bmatrix}
\]
and then into the molecular axis system \((x'',y'',z'')\) with Euler angles \(\Omega = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)\). Since, in general, the principal axis system of the magnetic interactions \((x'',y'',z'')\) is not identical with that for the ordering (or diffusion) of the molecule in the mesophase \((x'y'z')\), one may transform from the former to the latter according to
\[
F_{\mu}' = \sum_{K} D_{\mu K}(\theta) F_{\mu K}'
\]
where \(\theta = (\alpha', \beta', \gamma')\). [Note we often drop the triple superscripts and refer to the \((x''',y''',z''')\) as \((x,y,z)\) when it is not easily confused with the lab frame.] In the motional narrowing region in the mesophase one has a non-zero average value of \(\mathcal{H}_1(\Omega)\) specified by \(\mathcal{H}_1(\Omega)\), where the averaging implied by the angular brackets is according to the prescription of eq 4a. Thus we have
\[
\langle \mathcal{H}_1(\Omega) \rangle = \sum_{L,K,M,M',\mu,i} (-1)^K D_{\mu K}(\Omega) D_{LM}(\Theta) F_{\mu K}' A_{\mu L}(M) (A3)
\]
In the case of a uniaxial director one has
\[
\langle \mathcal{H}_1(\Omega) \rangle = \langle \mathcal{D}_{L M}(0) \delta_{M,0} \rangle (A4)
\]
The positions of the resonance lines are then determined by
\[
\mathcal{H}_0' = \mathcal{H}_0 + \langle \mathcal{H}_1(\Omega) \rangle (A5)
\]
where \(\mathcal{H}_0\) is the usual zero-order Hamiltonian for isotropic liquids. Thus in the case of a single nucleus (e.g., \(N^{14}\)) one has
\[
\mathcal{H}_0 = g_s B_0 S_z + a_N S J_z (A6a)
\]
and
\[
\langle \mathcal{H}_1(\Omega) \rangle = \sum_{L,K,M} (-1)^K D_{L M}(0) D_{LM}(\Theta) A_{LM} (A6b)
\]
The solution of this Hamiltonian is formally identical with that for a single crystal Hamiltonian with axially symmetric magnetic parameters, i.e.
\[
F_{\mu}(L) = \sum_{K} (-1)^K D_{L K}(0) F_{\mu K} (A7)
\]
Thus
\[
\begin{align*}
\delta_{\parallel} &= g_s + (2/3)^{1/2} \sum_{K} (-1)^K 2\pi \xi N D_N(0) (\mathcal{D}_{L K}(0)) (A8a) \\
\delta_{\perp} &= g_s - (1/6)^{1/2} \sum_{K} (-1)^K 2\pi \xi N D_N(0) (\mathcal{D}_{L K}(0)) (A8b)
\end{align*}
\]
where \(\xi N D_N(K)\) are the irreducible components of the hyperfine tensor (in MHz), and
\[
\begin{align*}
\bar{g}_{\parallel} &= g_s + (2/3)^{1/2} \sum_{K} (-1)^K g^{(K)} (\mathcal{D}_{L K}(0)) (A9a) \\
\bar{g}_{\perp} &= g_s - (1/6)^{1/2} \sum_{K} (-1)^K g^{(K)} (\mathcal{D}_{L K}(0)) (A9b)
\end{align*}
\]
with \(g^{(K)}\) the irreducible components of the \(g\) tensor. One then defines
\[
\begin{align*}
g(\theta) &= (\bar{g}_{\parallel}^2 \cos^2 \theta + \bar{g}_{\perp}^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{1/2} (A10a) \\
a(\theta) &= (\bar{g}_{\parallel}^2 \alpha_{\parallel}^2 \cos^2 \theta + \bar{g}_{\perp}^2 \alpha_{\perp}^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{1/2}/g(\theta) (A10b)
\end{align*}
\]
and the resonant field is given by

Figure 20. Predictions of the comparison of the angular-dependence of (A) B and (B) C for Brownian motion and strong jump models of reorientation. The solid lines indicate results for weak ordering (e.g., PD-Ternpene) with \(\langle \mathcal{D}_{L K}(0) \rangle = 0.144\), while the dashed lines are for strong ordering with \(\langle \mathcal{D}_{L K}(0) \rangle = 0.557\) (e.g., CSL). The solid circles are for Brownian motion, while the open circles are for strong jump.

Appendix. Improved agreement with experiment is obtained for the \(S_A\) phase from such a model. Analogues of such combined models for the case of SRLS are also developed in an Appendix. Again we favor the SRLS mechanisms for the present physical situations. It is in our belief that studies of angular-dependent spin relaxation will, in the future, prove useful in enabling one to elucidate the details of complex dynamical processes. However, it is clear that it will be important to deal unambiguously with effects of inhomogeneous broadening in samples, anchored well enough, that they appear to have their smectic layering “locked-in” when they are tilted with respect to the magnetic field.
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Appendix A. Dependence of the ESR Spectrum on Angle of Tilt \(\Theta\)

Following I we write the perturbing Hamiltonian as
\[
\mathcal{H}_1(\Omega) = \sum_{L,K,M,M',\mu,i} (-1)^K D_{KM}(\Omega) D_{LM}(\Theta) A_{LM}(\mu)(A1)
\]
where the \(F_{\mu K}(L)\) and \(A_{LM}(\mu)\) are the irreducible tensor components of rank \(L\), with \(F_{\mu K}\) in molecule-fixed coordinates, while \(A\) is a spin operator quantized in the laboratory axes (whose \(z\) axis coincides with the applied dc field). Equation A.1 is based upon two sets of rotations of the coordinate systems. This may be seen by writing the \(A\) in molecule-fixed coordinates as
\[
A_{LM}(\mu)(L) = \sum_{L,K} D_{LM}(\Omega) D_{KM}(\Theta) A_{LM}(\mu) (A1a)
\]
\[ B(\theta) = \frac{g_n}{g} B_0 - \frac{g_s}{g} a M_N - \frac{g_s^2 (a_n^2 + a_s^2)^{1/2}}{4 g^2 a^2 B_0} (I_N(I_N + 1) - M_N^2) \]

For \( g \) values which deviate only slightly from \( g_s \), one can write

\[ \alpha(\theta) \approx (\alpha_n^2 \cos^2 \theta + \alpha_s^2 \sin^2 \theta)^{1/2} \]  

(A10c)

For PD-Tempone in which the ordering is weak eq A11 may be simplified to

\[ \alpha(\theta) \approx a_N + D_{\theta,0}(\theta,0)(2/3)^{1/2} \sum_k (-1)^k g_{R}^{(k)}(D_{\theta,0}(\Omega)) = (a) \]

(A12a)

\[ g(\theta) \approx g_s + D_{\theta,0}(\theta,0)(2/3)^{1/2} \sum_k (-1)^k g_{R}^{(k)}(D_{\theta,0}(\Omega)) = (g) \]  

(A12b)

where \( D_{\theta,0}(\theta,0) = (1/2) (3 \cos^2 \theta - 1) \), and

\[ B(\theta) \approx B_0 \left( 2 - \frac{(g)}{g_s} \right) - M_N(a) \]

\[ \frac{a_N^2}{2 B_0} [I(I + 1) - M_N^2] \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{(a)}{a_N} - 1 \right) - 2 \left( \frac{(g)}{g_s} - 1 \right) \right] \]

(A13)

where we have only kept terms to lowest power in \((D_{\theta,0}(\Omega))\). Equation A13 is the form used in eq 13.

When one only has non-zero \((D_{\theta,0}(\Omega), \Omega)\) and \((D_{\theta,0}(\Omega,\Omega))\), and parallel molecular \((x,y,z)\) and \((x',y',z')\) axes, then we have

\[ \langle a \rangle - a_N = \left( a_s - a_N \right) (D_{\theta,0} + D_{\theta,0}^2)^{1/2} \times \]

\[ \left( D_{\theta,0} + D_{\theta,0}^2 \right)^{1/2} \]

(A14a)

\[ \langle g \rangle - g_s = \left( g_s - g_s \right) (D_{\theta,0} + D_{\theta,0}^2)^{1/2} \times \]

\[ \left( D_{\theta,0} + D_{\theta,0}^2 \right)^{1/2} \]

(A14b)

In the case of \( y \) ordering which is used in this paper one makes the appropriate substitutions of the axes (i.e., \( y = x', z = x, x = y \)). Equations A14 lead to eq 3 used to determine the order parameters from the hyperfine line shifts.

One may use an analogous set of formulae to deal with the unresolved deuteron (or proton) super-hyperfine structure. However, the magnetic principal axis system for each deuteron is not generally coincident with the \((x',y',z')\) system (even after averaging over rapid methyl group motions). Also, the deuterons (or protons) have anisotropic hyperfine tensors that are much larger than the isotropic hyperfine splittings, so even though the ordering in (the analogue of) eq A8a is small, these anisotropic terms make a large contribution. Thus one should use the analogue of eq A10c in place of eq A12a, with analogues of eq A8 for \( \delta_{1D} \) and \( \delta_{\perp,D} \). One finds that for the two-term ordering, eq A8 become

\[ \delta_{1D} = a_N + \chi_D \]

(A15a)

\[ \delta_{\perp,D} = a_N - \frac{1}{2} \chi_D \]  

(A15b)

with

\[ \chi_D = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} (a_{x',y',z'} - a_{x,y,z}) \]

(A16)

That is, the other non-zero components of the hyperfine tensor in the \((x',y',z')\) axes are averaged out. It would appear therefore that by measurements of \( \chi_D \) in different phases exhibiting different values of \((D_{\theta,0})\) and \((D_{\theta,0}^2)\), e.g. (the values of \( S_A \) and \( S_B \) phases) the values of \( a_{x,y,z} - a_{x,y,z} \) and \( a_{x',y',z'} - a_{x',y',z'} \) could be found. (However contributions from small, but nonvanishing ordering components such as \((D_{\theta,0}^2)\) would affect \( \chi_D \), while such components are not detected from studying \((a_N)\), because of the (near) coincidence of the \((x',y',z')\) magnetic axes and the \((x',y',z')\) ordering axes.)

**Appendix B. Generalizations of the SRLS Mechanism**

We present in Table VI a listing of the \( \kappa(k,K,M) \) and \( \kappa(k,K,M') \) for nonaxial molecular ordering to give the following result:

\[ \kappa(k,K,M) = \sum_k \kappa(k,K,M) \sum_k \kappa(k,K,M') \times \]

\[ \left( 1 + \omega^2 \tau^{-1} + \frac{\tau_{\text{R}}}{1 + \omega^2 \tau_{\text{R}}^2} \right) \]

(A17)

\[ S_{L,K,M} = S_{L,K,M}(\Psi) \]

(B3)

where \( S_{L,K,M} \) is the \( \kappa \)th irreducible tensor component of the local order parameter (assumed small in the theory), and then we let

\[ \kappa(k,K,M') = \kappa(k,K') \]  

(B4)

where \( \kappa(k,K,M) \) are averaged over the fluctuations in \( S_{L,K,M} \).

In general, the \( \tau_{\text{R}} = \tau_{\text{R}}(M) \), and this functional dependence may be inserted into eq B1. Also, \( \tau_{\text{R}} \), may in general, include a translational component due to the diffusion of the probe from one local structure environment to another. In the latter case one might also properly include some variation of \( R \) in the different local regions. One can show that for the potential of eq 5 the \( \kappa(k,K,M) \) obey the symmetry relations

\[ \kappa(k,K,M) = \kappa(-K,-M) = \kappa(k,K',-M) = \kappa(-K,-K') = \kappa(k,K,M) \]  

(B5)

Also \( K \) and \( K' \) must both be either even or odd for non-zero values of \( \kappa(k,K,M) \). We present in Table VI a listing of the values of \( \kappa(k,K,M) \) that are needed when the two-term ordering tensor based upon eq 5 applies. Note that in this
case it should be sufficient to specify the local ordering by non-zero values of just \( S_{10} \) and \( S_{20} = S_{12} \), which are real quantities, so the \( K \) and \( K' \) values in eq B1 need only include these values. In the case where the primary molecular ordering is axially symmetric, although the local ordering is not, then eq B1 simplifies to

\[
\hat{J}^{\text{SK},\text{SC},\text{OC}}(\omega) = 5\kappa(K,M)\kappa(K',M) \left[ \frac{\tau_\rho}{1 + \omega^2\tau_\rho^2} - \frac{\tau_\rho'}{1 + \omega^2\tau_\rho'^2} \right] \left\langle S_{2\xi}\kappa S_{3\xi} \right\rangle \tag{B6}
\]

where \( \kappa(K,M) = \kappa(K,K,M) \).

A model has been proposed for the \( \text{S}_2 \) phase which can explain the facts that (1) typically the interlayer spacing is less than the molecular length and (2) \( \text{S}_2 \to \text{S}_c \) transitions often occur. It is based on the idea that the molecules in the \( \text{S}_2 \) phase are actually tilted by angles \( \theta' \) and \( \varphi' \) relative to the normal to the smectic layering, but, unlike the \( \text{S}_c \) phase, there is no long-range order in \( \varphi' \). If we assume that the angle \( \varphi' \) is a random fluctuation at each local site, then we have a SRLS model, which we can represent following Freed,26 One lets the (dimensionless) orienting potential (in which we assume axial symmetry for simplicity) be given by the sum of two terms

\[
y(\Omega) = \bar{\lambda}_0 \partial_0(\Omega) + \bar{\lambda}_1 \partial_1(\Omega - \Psi) \tag{B7}
\]

where \( \Psi = (0,\theta',\varphi') \). Now since

\[
\partial_0(\Omega - \Psi) = \sum_{N=0}^\infty (-)N \partial_N(\Omega) \partial_N(\Psi) \tag{B8}
\]

we can rewrite \( y(\Omega) \) as

\[
y(\Omega) = \bar{\lambda}_0 \partial_0(\Omega) + \bar{\lambda}_1 \sum_{N=0}^\infty (-)N \partial_N(\Omega) \partial_N(\Psi) \tag{B9}
\]

where \( \bar{\lambda}_0 = \lambda_0 - \bar{\lambda}_1 \partial_0(\Psi) \) is now the effective time-independent orienting potential coefficient. Now we can let

\[
\partial^{\text{SK},\text{SC},\text{OC}}(\omega) = (1/5)\partial(0,M) \partial(0,M') \partial(0,M) \times \left[ \frac{\tau_\rho}{1 + \omega^2\tau_\rho^2} - \frac{\tau_\rho'}{1 + \omega^2\tau_\rho'^2} \right] \left\langle S_{2\xi}^2 \right\rangle \tag{B10}
\]

where \( \partial(0,M) \) is determined with respect to \( \bar{\lambda}_0 \). This result can be generalized, as before, to cases of nonaxial symmetry. Note that \( \partial(0,M) \partial(0,M') \partial(0,M') \partial(0,M) \partial(0,M') \partial(1,M) \partial(0,M) \partial(0,M') \partial(1,M') \partial(0,M) \partial(0,M') \partial(0,M) \partial(1,M) \partial(0,M) \) is similar to anisotropic viscosity \( \mu \) as eigenvalues \( \hat{R} = \hat{R}_{\mu} = \hat{R}_n \), which is the diffusion tensor of the molecule, and both are written in the \( (x',y',z') \) molecular coordinate system. The external torque \( \tau \) experienced by the molecule is related to the potential of mean torque \( U(\Omega) \) by

\[\tau = i\mu(\Omega)\] \tag{C2}

In general, even in the Brownian motion limit, \( \tau(\Omega) \) may be time dependent.24,28 We have previously used two models in which \( \tau \) becomes time independent.1 Case (1) is anisotropic rotation (e.g., molecular asymmetry) where the components of \( \tau \) in the molecular frame, which we write as \( \tau_{\mu} \), are time independent. One quickly sees that it is \( \tau\mu \), which appears in eq C1, so it becomes time independent. Case (2) is anisotropic viscosity, where the components of \( \tau \) in the lab frame, \( \tau_n \), are time independent. In this case, when we write \( \tau = \tau\mu \cdot \Omega = \tau\mu \cdot \tau_n \cdot \Omega \), the components of \( \tau \) in the lab frame are rapidly fluctuating in time. It is therefore necessary to transform the dyadic scalar product (which can be written as the scalar product of two second rank irreducible tensors plus a scalar interaction, see below) into the lab frame as

\[
\hat{\tau}_0 = \mu R_{\mu} N + [\mu R_{\mu}(N^T)]/2kT + T_n \tau_n T_n/2kT^2 \tag{C3}
\]

where

\[T_n = i\mu(\Omega)\] \tag{C4}

The operator properties of \( \tau \) and \( N \) are given else where.1,8-10 Of course, for completely isotropic motion, we have \( \mu R_{\mu} = R_{\mu} = R^T = N \cdot R_{\mu} = N \cdot R_{\mu}^T \) such that \( \mu(\Omega) = [\mu(\Omega)]^T \) is the simple rotational diffusion coefficient.

The problem of combined anisotropic diffusion and anisotropic viscosity is more complex, because, in general, it is not possible to find a single axis system which renders \( \tau(\Omega) \) time independent. However, in the spirit of the Brownian motion theory and models (1) and (2), one may obtain a simple solution for this case (3), by assuming \( \tau(\Omega) \) can be decomposed into two parts: \( \tau(\Omega) = \tau_{\mu} + \tau_n \) such that \( \tau_n \) is as in case (1) time independent in the molecular frame while \( \tau_{\mu} \) is as in case (2) time independent in the lab frame. Thus we obtain a time-independent diffusion operator (cf. eq C1 and C2) as

\[
\hat{\tau}_0 = \hat{\tau}_n + \hat{\tau}_n \tag{C5}
\]

where \( \hat{\tau}_n \) is given by eq C1 and \( \hat{\tau}_n \) is given by eq C2. We will now assume axial symmetry of both \( \tau_n \) and \( \tau_n \) in their respective frames for the purpose of simplicity of discussion, although this is not necessary (see below). Then the normalized eigenfunctions of these operators in the absence of a restoring potential are the

\[
\varphi_{\mu}(\Omega) = \left( 2L + 1 \right)^{1/2} \partial_{\mu}(\Omega) \tag{C6}
\]

and we obtain for \( U(\Omega) = 0 \).
\( \Gamma_0 \) all be real and positive. This guarantees that no nonequilibrium distribution of orientations decays to equilibrium. (Note that \( \Gamma_0 \) is defined so that positive eigenvalues lead to negative exponential decay in time.) In that case, if we assume axial symmetry (i.e., only \( R^{(2,0)} \) and \( R_n^{(2,0)} \) are the only nonzero values of \( R_m^{(p,q)} \) and \( R_n^{(p,q)} \) then one finds that we require

\[
\begin{align*}
\left[ \hat{R} - \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{\frac{6}{1}} \left( R_m^{(2,0)} + R_n^{(2,0)} \right) \right] &> 0 \\
\left( \hat{R} + \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{6}{1}} \right) &> 0 \\
\left( \hat{R} + \frac{4}{3} \sqrt{\frac{6}{1}} \right) &> 0
\end{align*}
\]

This set of requirements is less restrictive than eq C5. In the case where \( R_n^{(2,0)} = 0 \), the choice of \( \hat{R} = 1/3 (R_m + 2R_n) \) and \( (2/\sqrt{6})R_n^{(2,0)} = (R_m - R_n) \) leads to the expected requirements that \( R_m > 0 \) [from (i)] and that \( R_m > 0 \) [from (ii)].

**Appendix D. Brownian vs. Strong-Jump Reorientation and Angular-Dependent Line Widths**

In this work we have used Brownian motion models as a starting point for our analysis and the introduced non-Brownian corrections. Strong jump models are often used because of the simplicity of the results, although there is not very good theoretical justification for their use. Here we compare predictions of angular-dependent line widths for isotropic Brownian vs. strong jump models. The zero-frequency spectral densities for Brownian motion are conveniently fit to a polynomial in \( (\hat{R}_m^{(p,q)}) \) for axial symmetry. Such a table was given in ref 25, based on calculations of Polnaszek. These calculations have been refined somewhat, and the new fits appear in Table VII. With the exception of \( J_{11}(0) \), they yield slightly better fits, but the new \( J_{11}(0) \) do involve a significant numerical correction. The results in Table VII and Table I of ref 25 or the more general form of Table VI (along with the strong-collision form of \( J_{11}(0) \)) were used to compare the two models in Figure 20. One finds that for weak ordering, appropriate for PD-Tempone (e.g., the \( S_4 \) phase of SCB), the predictions from the two models are nearly the same. However, for strong ordering, appropriate for CSL, there are significant differences in the angular dependence predicted by the two models. (The results for strong ordering are only approximate for both models because we did not correct for the effect of the changing nuclear spin quantization axis as \( \theta \) is varied.)

We thus conclude that it is not necessary to distinguish between different jump models in properly analyzing the motional-narrowing results for weakly ordered PD-Tempone.
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