



in the repulsive lattice energy term, and *q* the electronic charge. Since all the three alkaline-earth fluorides,  $CaF<sub>2</sub>$ ,  $SrF<sub>2</sub>$ , and  $BaF<sub>2</sub>$  have the same crystalline structure, *A* and *8* are the same for all three. It is also reasonable to assume that the value of *n* is the same for all the three. If this model, therefore, is rigorously applicable to all three alkaline earth fluorides, then the reduced bulk modulus  $K^*$ , defined as  $K/(q^2r_0^{-4})$ , would be equal for all three materials. In Table III, *K\** for the three alkaline-earth fluorides is shown. As can be seen,  $K^*$  is nearly equal for  $CaF_2$  and  $SrF_2$ , while for  $BaF_2$  the discrepancy is much larger. This is not surprising, since the rigid ion model is least applicable to barium fluoride.<sup>4</sup>

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The author wishes to express his indebtedness to H. E. Temple for growing the  $SrF<sub>2</sub>$  single crystal, to R. T. Smith for the x-ray orientation of the crystal, and to R. J. Paff for the thermal expansion coefficient measurements.

PHYSICAL REVIEW VOLUME 136. NUMBER 5A 30 NOVEMBER 1964

# Electron Spin Resonance of Concentrated Copper Phthalocyanine Crystals

JACQUES M. ASSOUR AND SOL E. HARRISON *RCA Laboratories, Princeton, New Jersey*  (Received 23 June 1964)

An electron-spin-resonance study of pure copper phthalocyanine single crystal reveals a highly anisotropic environment. There are strong exchange and dipolar interactions between equivalent sites. However, the exchange interactions between the two nonequivalent sites are small enough to permit detection and separation of the two individual resonances. Values of *g* and the linewidth have been measured as a function of angle in the three crystallographic planes. The variation of  $\Delta H$  is discussed in terms of the exchange narrowing, exchange broadening, dipolar broadening, and hyperfine interaction.

# **I. INTRODUCTION**

E LECTRON-spin-resonance (ESR) measurements on single crystals of copper phthalocyanine magnetically diluted in metal-free phthalocyanine have been reported previously.<sup>1</sup> ESR spectra of Cu<sup>2+</sup> ion in a dilute crystal, in which the interactions between neighboring ions are negligible, consists of four copper hyperfine lines. Each of the copper lines is further split into nine lines by the nitrogen nuclear interaction.<sup>1</sup> In this paper we report measurements on undiluted copper phthalocyanine crystals, which were found to have extremely anisotropic magnetic properties.

In the copper complex the spin-lattice relaxation time is long compared with the spin-spin relaxation time. Therefore, we find no temperature dependence of the linewidth in our analysis, and consequently we concern ourselves solely with the ion-ion interactions and ignore the spin-lattice interaction. In concentrated paramagnetic crystals, the magnetic interactions between neighboring ions cause considerable overlapping of the hyperfine lines, and only one broad resonance line is usually found. The breadth of the resonance line depends on the relative magnitude of the spin-spin dipolar interaction, exchange narrowing between equivalent ions, and exchange broadening between nonequivalent ions. Although the physical nature of these interactions is understood, complete theoretical and quantitative treatment is lacking at present. Nevertheless, it is of interest to study these interactions by investigating the angular dependence of the ESR spectra and comparing it with computed theoretical curves.<sup>2-4</sup>

#### **II. CRYSTALLOGRAPHY**

The phthalocyanine compounds form a monoclinic series, in which the crystallographic axes *a, b,* and *c* are closely related by the ratio 4:1:3. The *b* axis is normal to the *ac* plane, and the *a* axis makes an angle of 120°36' with the *c* axis in the copper crystal. Robertson<sup>5</sup> has determined the crystal dimensions of the copper phthalocyanine by x-ray measurements. The cell dimensions of the monoclinic crystal are  $a = 19.6 \text{ Å}$ , *b* = 4.79 Å, and  $c = 14.6$  Å, and  $\beta = 120^{\circ}36'$ . The unit cell contains two molecules with parameters (0,0,0) and  $(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2},0)$ . One molecule is translated into the second by a screw rotation of 180° about the *b* axis. The two mole-

<sup>1</sup> S. E. Harrison and J. M. Assour, J. Chem. Phys. **40,** 365 (1964).

<sup>2</sup> D. M. S. Bagguley and J. H. E. Griffiths, Proc. Roy. Soc. (London) **201,** 366 (1950).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> H. Kamagai, K. Ôno, I. Hayashi, H. Abe, and J. Shimada, J. Phys. Soc. (Japan) 9, 369 (1954).<br>1. Phys. Soc. (Japan) 9, 369 (1954).<br>5. Soc. (London) A198, 406 (1949).<br>5. Phys. C. (London) A198, 406 (1949).<br><sup>1</sup>. J. M. Rob



cules per unit cell are similar in the *ac* plane, while in the *ab* and *be* planes they are dissimilar. This property will be considered later. The molecule is square planar and it is often convenient to characterize it by a set of three Cartesian axes *L, M,* and *N.* The perpendicular to the plane of the molecule, designated as *N,* and the other two axes in the molecular plane, designated as *L*  and *M,* are shown in Fig. 1. The axes of symmetry of the two molecules in the unit cell are almost at right angles ( $\angle N_1N_2 = 88.4^{\circ}$ ). The two molecular symmetry axes  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  in the unit cell are equally inclined to the *ac* plane by an angle  $\delta = 45.8^{\circ}$ . The orientation of the principal susceptibility  $axes^4 K_1$ ,  $K_2$ , and  $K_3$  can be elucidated with reference to the molecular and crystal axes. The axes  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  lie in the *ac* plane containing  $K_1$ ,  $N_1$ , and  $N_2$ . The third axis  $K_3$  lies along the *b* axis as shown in Fig. 2. *K2* is in the plane of the molecule and affords an easily accessible direction for the determination of g.

The crystal grows in the shape of a long flat needle with typical dimensions of  $1.0\times0.1\times0.01$  cm. The longest dimension is along the *b* axis and the largest flat face corresponds to the *ab* plane. The angles between the crystal axes and the molecular symmetry axis *N* are:  $\alpha(a,N) = 131.4^{\circ}, \beta(b,N) = 44.2^{\circ}, \text{ and } \gamma(c^*,N)$  $= 77.3^{\circ}$ , where the  $c^*$  axis forms an orthogonal set of axes with *a* and *b.* The angles that the copper complex makes with the crystal axes are such that the relationship between the applied magnetic field *H* and the magnetic axes of the molecule is quite complex for the easily accessible orientations utilizing the natural crystal habit. Since the angle  $\theta$  between  $H$  and  $N$  is not directly accessible in our ESR measurements, we have selected an angle  $\epsilon$  which represents the angle between *H* and one of the crystal axes in the plane of rotation. The relationships between  $\theta$  and  $\epsilon$  when *H* is rotated in the *ab, be,* and *ca* planes, respectively, are given by

$$
\cos\theta_{ab} = \cos\alpha \cos\epsilon - \cos\beta \sin\epsilon, \quad \epsilon = \angle H, \, a;
$$
  
\n
$$
\cos\theta_{bc} = \cos\beta \cos\epsilon - \cos\gamma \sin\epsilon, \quad \epsilon = \angle H, \, b;
$$
  
\n
$$
\cos\theta_{ca} = \cos\gamma \cos\epsilon - \cos\alpha \sin\epsilon, \quad \epsilon = \angle H, \, c.
$$
 (1)

It is easily seen that  $\theta$  never reaches the zero value (N)

parallel to  $H$ ) in any of the three easily accessible planes.

### **III. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

The crystals were grown by a sublimation method similar to that first used by Linstead.<sup>6</sup> Crystals with well defined faces were mounted on sample holders made of Plexiglas. The microwave equipment used was a Varian spectrometer. The magnetic-field modulation was 100 kc/sec, while the microwave frequency was 9500 Mc/sec. The magnetic field was determined by a Harvey-Wells nuclear-magnetic-resonance gaussmeter used in conjunction with a Hewlett-Packard 524 D counter. In all measurements reported here, the derivative of the absorption was recorded at room temperature and the linewidth was taken between two points of extrema. The ESR spectra were determined for each plane over a region of 180° in steps of 10° each.

The spectra recorded in the *ac* plane consisted of one resonance line, since both ions are similar in this plane. Anisotropic values for  $g$  and the linewidth  $\Delta H$  as a function of  $\epsilon$  are shown in Figs. 3 and 4. The maximum value of  $g=2.166\pm0.003$  occurred at  $\theta=45^{\circ}$ . At this maximum value one determines the position of the susceptibility axis  $K_1$ , which makes an angle of  $\approx 101^\circ$ with the *c* axis. The minimum value  $g = 2.050 + 0.003$ occurred at  $\theta = 90^{\circ}$  which is the position of the second axis  $K_2$ . This minimum value of  $g$  is identical to the value of  $g_1$  obtained for the dilute crystal.<sup>1</sup> From the polar plot shown in Fig. 4  $\Delta H_{\text{max}} = 333 \pm 5$  G at  $\theta = 45^{\circ}$ and  $\Delta H_{\text{min}}$  = 147 $\pm$ 5 G at  $\theta$  = 90°.

In the *ab* plane, where the two ions per unit cell are dissimilar, just one resonance was originally found. However, upon amplification of the signal, a weak



**K,K8 PLANE IS NORMAL TO AC PLANE** 



6 R. P. Linstead, P. A. Barrett, and C. E. Dent, J. Chem. Soc. **1936, 1719** (1936).



FIG. 3. Plot of *g* versus e in *ac* plane.

additional resonance also made its appearance, which corresponded to the second ion. This is shown in Fig. 5 for  $\epsilon = 45^{\circ}$  ( $\theta = 167.5^{\circ}$  and 87.7°). The two resonances are not always observed because the separation of the two signals occurs only if the *g* values are sufficiently different that the signals do not overlap. Also, as shown in Fig. 5, the intensity of the signal depends on the value of  $\theta$  (see Sec. IV).

The linewidth  $\Delta H$  and the *g* values in the *ab* and *bc* planes are highly anisotropic. Figures 6 and 7 show these variations for the *be* plane. Results for the *ab*  plane are shown in Fig. 8.

# **IV. DISCUSSION**

# **A. Variation of** *g*

The values of *gn* and *gx* had been previously determined from the ESR spectra of dilute crystals<sup>1</sup> and these are  $g_{11} = 2.1797 \pm 0.0002$  and  $g_{1} = 2.050 \pm 0.0002$ . For all





three planes, values of  $g(\theta)$  were calculated for each ion using the relation

$$
e^2 = g_{11}^2 \cos^2 \theta + g_1^2 \sin^2 \theta. \tag{2}
$$

The experimental results were fitted to theoretical curves as shown in Figs. 3, 7, and 8. In the *ac* plane, the theoretical and experimental values are in good agreement. In the  $ab$  plane the two theoretical curves  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  for each ion intersect at  $\theta = 49^\circ$  and at  $\theta = 131^\circ$ , which corresponds to the position of the third susceptibility axis  $K_3$ . The experimental values for  $g$  are found to



FIG. 5. ESR of copper phthalocyanine crystal in *ab* plane,<br>  $\hat{\times}$  (*H*,*a*) = 45°.

agree with the theoretical values in the lower portions of the curves  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , i.e.,  $\theta$  close to 90°. As the angle between *H* and *a* axis is varied from  $\epsilon = 0^{\circ}$  to  $\epsilon = 90^{\circ}$ , the magnetic-resonance transitions of ion No. 2 are predominant and values of  $g_2$  are recorded. From  $\epsilon = 90^\circ$ to  $\epsilon = 180^{\circ}$ , the resonance transitions of ion No. 1 become stronger and values of *gi* are obtained. When the resonance fields of the two ions are well separated (Fig. 5), we obtain experimental values of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ which are in good agreement with the predicted theoretical values.

In the *be* plane, the dissimilarity of the two ions also most clearly manifests itself. In this plane, several  $=$ 

experimental values of *g* were found to be lower than the theoretical values. The causes of these differences are rather obscure. However, these small discrepancies have no effect on our conclusions.

### **B. Variation of Linewidth**

In copper phthalocyanine crystals the two predominant types of interaction between the Cu<sup>2+</sup> tons which influence the resonance linewidth are the dipoledipole and the exchange interaction. These two interactions were fully discussed by Van Vleck<sup>7</sup> and Bleaney



FIG. 6. Experimental and theoretical linewidth in *be* plane.

and Stevens.<sup>8</sup> Van Vleck<sup>7</sup> has shown that the mean square width of a line for the case of free spins, assuming dipole-dipole interaction only, is given by

$$
H_{\rm av}^2 = \frac{3}{4}s(s+1)g^4\beta^4 \sum_k (1-3\cos^2\phi_{jk})^2 r_{jk}^{-6}
$$
  
 
$$
+\frac{1}{3}s'(s'+1)g^2g'^2\beta^4 \sum_{k'} (1-3\cos^2\phi_{jk'})^2 r_{jk}^{-6}, \quad (3)
$$

where ions of type  $j$ , spin  $s$ , and factor  $g$  are in resonance and the dissimilar ions are of type  $k'(s', g')$ ;  $\phi_{ik}$  denotes the angle between the applied magnetic field and the line joining the two ions;  $\beta$  is the Bohr magneton; and  $r_{jk}$  is the distance between two dipoles. Since in the *ac* plane the two magnetic ions are similar,



the second term in Eq. (3) vanishes. In all calculations only second-neighbor interactions were considered. Ions at distances greater than 12.14 A were neglected. The position and distance of neighbors relative to the ion at (0,0,0) in the *ac* plane is given in Table I. The values for the dipolar linewidth were calculated every 5° and are plotted in Fig. 4. Note that in this plane, ions *a* and *b* of Table I are independent of the angle  $\phi_{jk}$  and con-

TABLE I. Position and distance of neighbors relative to the ion at (0,0,0) in the *ac* plane.

	No. of similar ions	Position	Distance $(A)$	
а с		$(0,\pm 1,0)$ $\pm \frac{1}{2}, \pm 1\frac{1}{2}, 0$	4.79 9.58 10.08 12.14	

tribute a constant term to the linewidth as *H* is rotated in the plane. Since these ions have the shorter distances to the central ion, the contribution of this resulting constant term will be predominant. The theoretical curve is shown to vary slightly around a base line of magnitude  $\sim$  200 G.

In the *ab* and *be* planes the two ions are dissimilar, with both spins *s* and *s'* of Eq. (3) equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$ . In these planes an angular dependence exists between all neighboring ions and the magnetic field, and as expected, the



FIG. 8. Plot of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  versus  $\epsilon$  in *ab* plane.

<sup>7</sup> J. H. Van Vleck, Phys. Rev. 74, 1168 (1948).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> B. Bleaney and K. W. H. Stevens, Rept. Progr. Phys. 16, 108 (1953).

linewidth varies considerably, as shown, for example, in Fig. 6.

Exchange interactions in concentrated paramagnetic crystals have a far more complex nature than the dipolar interaction. Basically, there are two kinds of exchange interaction which contribute to the resonance linewidth. The first kind is an isotropic interaction which depends only on the relative orientation of the spins provided the spin-orbit interaction is neglected. This interaction can be reduced to a scalar product given by

$$
\mathcal{K}_{\text{ex}} = -2J_{ij}(\mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j) \tag{4}
$$

summed over all nearest neighbors. The second kind is an anisotropic exchange interaction and is given by

$$
3C_{\rm ex}' = \sum_{i>j} c_{ij}(r_{ij}) \left[ \left( \mathbf{S}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{S}_{j} \right) - 3 \left( \mathbf{S}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij} \right) \left( \mathbf{S}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{ij} \right) / r_{ij}^{2} \right]. \tag{5}
$$

Because of the complexities involved, we shall only consider the isotropic exchange interaction. If the ions precess about the same axis, i.e., they are equivalent, there is exchange narrowing and the line diminishes in width. If the ions are nonequivalent, then the resultant contribution to the mean square width is proportional to  $J^2(\sin \frac{\mathcal{S}}{2})^4$ , when the ions have the same precessional frequencies, and proportional to  $J^2(\cos \theta)^2$  when they have different precessional frequencies<sup>9</sup>;  $\&$  is the angle between the axes of precession. For dissimilar ions, the absorption line depends on whether the exchange frequency is greater or less than the difference in precessional frequencies. For weak exchange, the spectrum of the two dissimilar ions in the unit cell consists of two distinct resolved lines having different *g* values (Fig. 5). As the exchange increases, the lines broaden and 'eventually overlap. For  $J > (g_1 - g_2)\beta H$ , the lines coalesce into one line at  $h\nu = \frac{1}{2}(g_1 + g_2)\beta H$ , where  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ are the *g* factors of the dissimilar ions. This effect has been observed in copper sulfate.<sup>2,10,11</sup>

A third contribution to the variation of *AH* with angle is the variation of the hyperfine structure with  $\theta$ . The width of the spectrum of the isolated molecule is given approximately by  $3(A^2g_{11}^2\cos^2\theta + B^2g_1^2\sin^2\theta)^{1/2}/g$ , where *A* and *B* are the copper hyperfine structure constants. This factor ranges from 600 to about 60 G and is plotted for the *ac* plane for further reference in Fig. 4. In addition, we have noted that the superhyperfine structure of the four nitrogen ligands splits each of the copper lines into nine components with an average nitrogen splitting of about 16 G. So the width of the spectrum of the isolated molecule extends from about 200 to 800 G.<sup>1</sup> To obtain a relative magnitude of these exchange interactions, we compare the calculated contribution to broadening with the experimental linewidth.

#### **V. COMPARISON WITH EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

Before we compare the experimental and theoretical results, some assumptions must be made concerning the line shape. For concentrated crystals, the shape of the resonance line is found to resemble a Gaussian distribution. The width of the line at the half-power point is then given by

$$
\Delta H_{1/2} = 1.18 \, (\Delta H^2)_{\rm av}^{1/2}.\tag{6}
$$

In our experiments the linewidth  $\Delta H$  of the derivative of the absorption is recorded. The relation between *AH*  and  $\Delta H_{1/2}$  is given by

$$
\Delta H = 0.852\Delta H_{1/2},\tag{7}
$$

again assuming a Gaussian distribution. Combining Eqs.  $(5)$  and  $(6)$  we obtain

$$
\Delta H \approx (\Delta H^2)_{\rm av}^{1/2}.\tag{8}
$$

We first compare the sum of the half-width due to the hyperfine structure  $(\Delta H_P)$  and the dipolar broadening  $(\Delta H_D)$  with the experimental half-width  $(\Delta H_E)$ . Then, qualitative evidence of exchange interaction will be examined.

The calculated anisotropy due to dipolar broadening in the  $ac$  plane differs markedly from the value of  $\Delta H_E$ as shown in Fig. 4. The values of  $\Delta H_E$  plotted in the  $ac$ plane closely follow the variation of  $\Delta H_P$  (Fig. 4), so that the width of the hyperfine structure as a function of  $\theta$  is prominent in determining  $\Delta H_E$  in this plane. At  $\theta = 90^{\circ}$ , i.e., along the susceptibility axis  $K_2$ , we obtain a minimum value for  $\Delta H_E$ . This value of  $\theta$  corresponds to a minimum value of  $\Delta H_P$ . Similarly the maximum value for  $\Delta H_E$  occurs at a minimum value for  $\theta \approx 46^\circ$  in the *ac* plane, i.e., a maximum value for  $\Delta H_P$ . Exchange narrowing is clearly in evidence in the *ac* plane since the values of  $\Delta H_E$  fall approximately 50 G below  $\Delta H_D$ even without considering *AHP.* Note that the maximum value of  $\Delta H_E$ = 330 G at  $\theta$ = 47° (i.e., along the  $K_1$  axis) is less than what one might expect from a consideration of  $\Delta H_D$  and  $\Delta H_P$  ( $\theta = 46^\circ$ ) ~ 560 G. Thus, in the *ac* plane the angular variation of  $\Delta H_E$  follows the form of  $\Delta H_P$ , but it is strongly diminished by exchange narrowing.

In Fig. 6, where we have compared  $\Delta H_E$  with  $\Delta H_D$ in the *be* plane, the sharp minimum in the experimental curve corresponds to the vanishing of the term  $(\cos^2\phi - \frac{1}{3})$ for the most prominent contribution of Eq. (3) for dipolar broadening. The minimum value for  $\Delta H_P$  occurs at  $\epsilon = 72^{\circ}$  (or  $\theta = 90^{\circ}$ ). Unlike the *ac* plane, in the *bc* plane the  $\Delta H_E$  curve does not seem to strongly reflect the anisotropy of  $\Delta H_P$  in the experimental half-width. When  $H||b$  (or  $K_3$  axis)  $\Delta H_E$  is  $\sim 100$  G greater than  $\Delta H_D$ . This is probably due to the fact that in this direction *AHP* assumes its largest value in the *be* plane. The symmetry about  $\epsilon = 90^{\circ}$  shown in Fig. 6 (i.e., compare the difference between Figs. 4 and 6) results from the fact that in the *be* plane the two ions are not equivalent

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> M. H. L. Pryce and K. W. H. Stevens, Proc. Phys. Soc. (London) 63, 36 (1950).<br><sup>10</sup> M. H. L. Pryce, Nature 162, 539 (1948).<br><sup>11</sup> K. Yoshida, Progr. Theoret. Phys. (Kyoto) 5, 1047 (1950).

and experimentally one sees for the most part only the ion which has the narrowest and strongest resonance line. Therefore, from  $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 90^{\circ}$  we are observing the resonance of one molecule and from  $90^{\circ} \leq \epsilon \leq 180^{\circ}$  the second is being recorded. Consequently, we have not recorded a maximum for  $\Delta H_E$  in this plane.

In the *ab* plane the minima in  $\Delta H_E$  are determined primarily by  $\Delta H_P$  and shifted somewhat (about 5°) toward the calculated minima of  $\Delta H_D$ .

Thus, the general features of the variation of  $\Delta H_E$ as a function of direction in the three planes may be summarized in the following way. In the  $ac$  plane  $\Delta H_E$ follows the variation of *AHp,* in the *be* plane that of  $\Delta H_D$ , and in the *ab* plane it is influenced by both  $\Delta H_P$ and  $\Delta H_D$ *.* 

By noting that  $\Delta H_E$  consistently falls well below the amount  $(\Delta H_P^2 + \Delta H_D^2)^{1/2}$ , it is apparent that there is exchange narrowing in all three planes. This is due to the interaction between nearest-neighbor identical ions. If one calculates the difference between  $(\Delta H_D^2 + \Delta H_P^2)^{1/2}$ and  $\Delta H_E$ , the apparent exchange narrowing is highly anisotropic. The anisotropic exchange interaction is due to the spin-orbit interaction. The spins sense the departure of the wave functions from spherical symmetry through the agency of the spin-orbit coupling.<sup>12</sup> We note that in the *ac* plane, where the two ions per unit cell are resonating at the same frequency but about different axes,  $\Delta H_E$  never falls below 150 G. This is due to the fact that there are exchange broadening contributions such that  $\Delta H_{\text{ex}} \sim \sin^2(\mathcal{E}/2)$ , where  $\mathcal{E} = 88.4^{\circ}$ . In the other two planes, where the two ions do not resonate at the same frequency, the additional width from exchange broadening is  $\Delta H_{\text{ex}} \sim \cos^2 \mathcal{E}$ , i.e., the exchange broadening should be negligible by comparison. Accordingly, in the *ab* and *be* planes our minimum values of  $\Delta H_E$  are approximately 20 and 35 G, respectively.

### A. Magnitude of *J*

From the resonance data (Fig. 5) it is apparent that the exchange integral  $J$  for nonequivalent ions is smaller than the microwave quantum  $(\frac{1}{3}$  cm<sup>-1</sup>). A rough estimate of  $J$  can be obtained from the resonance data in Fig. 5. For the case of weak exchange coupling, two resonance peaks should be observed according to the relations

$$
h\nu_1 = g_1 \beta H ,
$$
  
\n
$$
h\nu_2 = g_2 \beta H ,
$$
\n(9)

where  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are the *g* values of the two nonequivalent ions. The difference in Zeeman energies of these ions is

 $\Delta W_z = (\Delta g)\beta H$ , where  $\Delta g = g_1 - g_2$ . Since the separation between the resonance lines is observed, as a first approximation we let  $2J \approx \Delta W_{Z}$ . In our experiments the frequency *v* is kept constant while the magnetic field is varied. Therefore,  $2J \approx \Delta g h \nu/g_m$ , where  $g_m = 2.118$  is the mean value of  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , and  $\nu = 9500.5$  Mc/sec. An approximate value for  $J\sim 9.8\times 10^{-3}$  cm<sup>-1</sup> is obtained.

For the case of exchange interaction between *equivalent* ions which are only 4.72 A apart, an approximate value of  $J'$  can be calculated from the susceptibility measurements of copper phthalocyanine made by Klemm and Klemm<sup>13</sup> and Ray and Sen.<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately, the temperature range in the two experiments is not clearly specified in the literature. Nevertheless, based on their experimental results, an approximate value for the paramagnetic Curie temperature *6*   $= -12.8$ °K is obtained. The relation between the exchange integral and the Curie point<sup>15</sup> is given by

$$
3K\theta = 2J'ZS(S+1),\tag{10}
$$

where  $S = \frac{1}{2}$  for CuII and Z, the number of nearest neighbors is equal to  $2$ ;  $J' \sim 10$  cm<sup>-1</sup>.

The exchange constant of 10  $cm^{-1}$  is a significant interaction from the point of view of conductivity of phthalocyanines.<sup>16</sup> In metal-free phthalocyanine the width of the conduction band was estimated to be less than 100-150 cm<sup>-1.17</sup> According to Fröhlich and Sewell,<sup>18</sup> the mobility is roughly proportional to the square of the bandwidth in a narrow-band semiconductor. As a consequence of this relation, any broadening of the bands by the magnetic interaction between the equivalent ions along the *b* axis will give rise to a higher mobility. In copper phthalocyanine the mobility of the electronic carriers<sup>19</sup> has been shown to be  $10^2$ times as large as in metal-free phthalocyanine.<sup>20</sup> Thus, the conduction bands will undoubtedly be broader in the copper phthalocyanine derivative. Nevertheless, it is anticipated that even in the compounds that have the wider energy band, this exchange interaction may affect the mobility of the carriers through the alteration of the shape of the bands, especially at the edges.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> L. Klemm and W. Klemm, J. Prakt. Chem. 143, 82 (1935).<br><sup>14</sup> P. Ray and D. N. Sen, J. Indian Chem. Soc. 25, 473 (1948).<br><sup>15</sup> J. H. Van Vleck, *Electric and Magnetic Susceptibilities*<br>(Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1932).<br><sup></sup>
- Phys. 34, 2278 (1963). 17 G. H. Heilmeier and G. Warfield, J. Chem. Phys. 38, 897
- (1963). 18 H. Frohlich and G. L. Sewell, Proc. Phys. Soc. (London) 74,
- 643 (1959). 19 G. H. Heilmeier and S. E. Harrison, Phys. Rev. 132, 2010 (1963).
- 20 G. H. Heilmeier, G. Warfield, and S. E. Harrison, Phys. Rev. Letters 8, 309 (1962).

<sup>12</sup> J. H. Van Vleck, Phys. Rev. 52, 1178 (1937).