

Microscopic theory for the glass transition in a system without static correlations

R. SCHILLING¹ and G. SZAMEL^{1,2}

¹ *Institut für Physik, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, D-55099 Mainz, Staudinger Weg 7, Germany*

² *Department of Chemistry, Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, CO 80523, USA*

PACS. 61.20. Lc –

PACS. 61.43. Fs –

PACS. 64.70. Pf –

Abstract. – We study the orientational dynamics of infinitely thin hard rods of length L , with the centers-of-mass fixed on a simple cubic lattice with lattice constant a . We approximate the influence of the surrounding rods onto dynamics of a pair of rods by introducing an effective rotational diffusion constant $D(l)$, $l = L/a$. We get $D(l) \propto [1 - v(l)]$, where $v(l)$ is given through an integral of a time-dependent torque-torque correlator of an isolated pair of rods. A glass transition occurs at l_c , if $v(l_c) = 1$. We present a variational and a numerically exact evaluation of $v(l)$. Close to l_c the diffusion constant decreases as $D(l) \propto (l_c - l)^\gamma$, with $\gamma = 1$. Our approach predicts a glass transition in the absence of any static correlations, in contrast to present form of mode coupling theory.

When a system of interacting species is cooled sufficiently fast it will typically undergo a glass transition. In the last two decades there has been a significant progress in microscopic understanding of this transition. The first approach is the so-called mode coupling theory (MCT) [1, 2], first suggested and mainly worked out by Götze and coworkers. For reviews see Refs. [3, 4, 5]. MCT yields a closed set of equations for time-dependent correlators. This set involves as an input *static* correlators which depend only on thermodynamic variables like temperature T , density n , etc. With decreasing T (or increasing n) local ordering described by peaks of the static correlators grows. When the peaks' magnitude becomes large enough MCT predicts an ergodicity breaking transition at a critical temperature T_c (or density n_c). This *dynamic* transition is interpreted as an ideal glass transition.

A different approach has recently been proposed by Mézard and Parisi [6, 7]. Inspired by the replica theory for spin glasses they developed a microscopic replica theory for structural glasses. This theory predicts a *static* glass transition at a temperature T_f which is lower than T_c . One of its characteristic features of this transition is the vanishing of the configurational entropy at T_f . The physical picture behind that replica theory was suggested earlier by Singh *et al.* [8].

Despite providing new valuable insights, these microscopic theories can *not* be complete, because there exists a *purely dynamical* mechanism which leads to a glass transition which is *not* based on the existence of any *static* correlations. As an example, let us consider a simple

cubic lattice with N lattice sites and lattice constant a with hard rods of length L and diameter d with their centers fixed on the lattice sites (Fig. 1). This model system was first introduced by Rubinstein and Obukhov [9]. It can be used to describe orientational glasses [10, 11] ⁽¹⁾. The increase of the reduced rod length $l = L/a$ leads to an increase of the *steric hindrance*, which may lead to a glass transition. Now suppose that the thickness d goes to zero, for fixed a and L . For $d = 0$ all static orientational correlations vanish and there is no static phase transition. Nevertheless, the simulational studies by Renner *et al.* [13] for a fcc lattice and Obukhov *et al.* [14] clearly demonstrate the existence of a (dynamical) glass transition at a critical length $l_c = L_c/a$. In addition, it is particularly interesting that the time-dependent orientational correlators studied in Ref. [13] exhibit a two-step relaxation process similar to that observed for supercooled liquids and predicted by MCT [3, 4, 5]. However, as Renner *et al.* [13] stressed the MCT in its present form fails to describe this dynamical transition. The reason is obvious: the vertices which enter into the MCT equations vanish ⁽²⁾. Thus, *present* formulation of MCT as well as the replica theory [6, 7] cannot explain the numerical findings of Ref. [13, 14], due to the complete trivial statics for $d = 0$.

This discussion demonstrates the necessity to derive a microscopic theory which is capable to describe a purely dynamical glass transition for systems with completely trivial statics. To achieve this for the infinitely thin hard rods on a cubic lattice is the goal of the present contribution. Details and additional features of our approach will be given elsewhere [16].

Let us consider the time-dependent 1-rod density $\rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega; t)$ for a tagged rod at lattice site n_1 with orientation $\Omega = (\Theta, \phi)$ and

$$\rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega; 0) = \delta(\Omega|\Omega') \quad (1)$$

as initial condition, where $\delta(\Omega|\Omega') = \sin \Theta \delta(\Theta - \Theta') \delta(\phi - \phi')$. If $l < 1$ the rods cannot touch and the tagged rod will perform a free *rotational* motion. However, for $l > 1$ steric hindrance exists and the tagged rod's motion becomes influenced by its nearest, next-nearest, etc. neighbours. These interactions will influence the rotational motion of the rod at site n_1 . With increasing l rotational diffusion constants will decrease and finally may become zero at a critical length l_c .

The time derivative of $\rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega; t)$ is related to the 1-rod current density $\mathbf{j}_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega; t)$ by the continuity equation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega; t) + \nabla_{\Omega} \cdot \mathbf{j}_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega; t) = 0. \quad (2)$$

We define a generalized rotational diffusion tensor, $D(\Omega, \Omega'; t)$, by:

$$\mathbf{j}_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega; t) = - \int_0^t dt' \int d\Omega' D(\Omega, \Omega'; t - t') \cdot \nabla_{\Omega'} \rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega'; t'). \quad (3)$$

In the following we derive a closed equation for the diffusion tensor D which will allow to investigate its l -dependence. To derive this equation we use Smoluchowski (Brownian) dynamics (glass transition should not depend on the microscopic dynamics [17, 18]). We start from the so-called generalized Smoluchowski equation for the N -rod probability density

⁽¹⁾We stress that this type of model is quite different to the mixed crystals studies by Michel [12] where the glass transition occurs due to *quenched disorder*

⁽²⁾There exist non-generic model systems for which the vertices do not vanish although there are no static correlations [15].

$P_N(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N; t)$:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} P_N(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N; t) = D_0 \sum_{n=1}^N \nabla_n \cdot [\nabla_n - \mathbf{T}_n(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N)] P_N(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N; t) \quad (4)$$

where D_0 is the *bare* rotational diffusion constant, $\nabla_{n_1} \equiv \nabla_{\Omega_n}$, and

$$\mathbf{T}_n(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_N) = \sum_{j \neq n} \mathbf{T}_{jn}(\Omega_j, \Omega_n) \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathbf{T}_{ij}(\Omega_i, \Omega_j) = s_{ij}(\mathbf{u}_i \times \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ij}^\perp) \delta(r_{ij}^\perp - 0^+) \Theta\left(\frac{L}{2} - |s_{ij}|\right) \Theta\left(\frac{L}{2} - |s_{ji}|\right) \quad (6)$$

describes the singular torque when two rods at sites i and j with vector distance \mathbf{r}_{ij} touch each other [19] ⁽³⁾. \mathbf{r}_{ij}^\perp is the component of \mathbf{r}_{ij} perpendicular to the plane defined by the unit vectors along the rods, \mathbf{u}_i and \mathbf{u}_j , $r_{ij}^\perp = |\mathbf{r}_{ij}^\perp|$ and $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{ij}^\perp = \mathbf{r}_{ij}^\perp / r_{ij}^\perp$. s_{ij} and s_{ji} (which depend on Ω_i, Ω_j) is the distance of the contact point to the center of rod i and rod j , respectively (cf. Fig. 2). $\delta(x - 0^+)$ stands for $\lim_{d \rightarrow 0^+} \delta(x - d)$. The reader should note that \mathbf{r}_{ij} is t -independent and is equal to the lattice vector $\mathbf{R}_{ij} = \mathbf{R}_i - \mathbf{R}_j$, in contrast to a *fluid* of hard rods (needles).

A generalized Smoluchowski equation similar to Eq. (4) had been used to describe a *fluid* of infinitely thin rods with randomly frozen orientations [20, 21]. In this case there is no glass transition if the longitudinal component of the bare translational diffusion tensor is positive.

From Eq. (4) one can derive a hierarchy of equations of motion for the reduced j -rod densities $\rho_{n_1 \dots n_j}^{(j)}(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_j; t)$ [22]. For instance, for $j = 1$ one gets:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega_1; t) = D_0 \nabla_{n_1} \cdot \left[\nabla_{n_1} \rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega_1; t) - \sum_{n_2} \int d\Omega_2 \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t) \right]. \quad (7)$$

The first term on the r.h.s. describes the free Brownian motion. The second term describes the influence of a rod at site n_2 on the tagged rod. It involves the 2-rod density $\rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t)$. To proceed it is convenient to introduce the *fluctuations*:

$$\delta \rho_{n_1 \dots n_j}^{(j)}(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_j; t) = \rho_{n_1 \dots n_j}^{(j)}(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_j; t) - \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{j-1}} g_{n_1 \dots n_j}^{(j)}(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_j) \rho_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega_1; t) \quad (8)$$

where $g_{n_1 \dots n_j}^{(j)}(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_j)$ is the equilibrium j -rod distribution function. Note that the equilibrium distribution functions are equal to one almost everywhere.

Using Eq. (8) one obtains a hierarchy of equations for $\delta \rho^{(j)}$. The lowest level of this hierarchy is still given by Eq. (7) where one is allowed to replace $\rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}$ by $\delta \rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}$, because $\sum_{n_2} \int d\Omega_2 \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) g_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = 0$. At the second level one gets [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \delta \rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t) = & -\frac{1}{4\pi} (\nabla_{n_1} g_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)) \cdot \mathbf{j}_{n_1}^{(1)}(\Omega_1; t) + \\ & D_0 \{ \nabla_{n_1} \cdot [\nabla_{n_1} - \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)] + (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \} \delta \rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t) + A_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

⁽³⁾Since ∇_{u_n} is used in Ref. [19] instead of ∇_{Ω_n} their expression for \mathbf{T}_{ij} differs slightly from ours.

where

$$A_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t) = D_0 \nabla_{n_1} \cdot \left[g_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \sum_{n_3} \frac{1}{4\pi} \int d\Omega_3 \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_3}(\Omega_1, \Omega_3) \delta \rho_{n_1 n_3}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_3; t) \right] \\ - D_0 \sum_{\nu=1}^2 \nabla_{n_\nu} \cdot \sum_{n_3} \int d\Omega_3 \mathbf{T}_{n_\nu n_3}(\Omega_\nu, \Omega_3) \delta \rho_{n_1 n_2 n_3}^{(3)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3; t). \quad (10)$$

$A_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}$ describes the influence of a third rod at n_3 on the rods at n_1 and n_2 . Here we follow Refs. [20, 21] and approximate this influence by introducing an effective diffusion tensor \mathbf{D}^{eff} . Specifically, in Eq. (9) we replace D_0 by the effective diffusion tensor and we neglect $A_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}$:

$$\{D_0 \nabla_{n_1} \cdot [\nabla_{n_1} - \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)] + (1 \leftrightarrow 2)\} \delta \rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t) \rightarrow \quad (11)$$

$$\left\{ \nabla_{n_1} \cdot \int_0^t dt' \int d\Omega'_1 \mathbf{D}^{\text{eff}}(\Omega_1, \Omega'_1; t - t') \cdot [\nabla_{n'_1} - \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega'_1, \Omega_2)] + (1 \leftrightarrow 2) \right\} \delta \rho_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega'_1, \Omega_2; t') \\ A_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t) \approx 0. \quad (12)$$

In order to get a self consistent equation we then set in Eq. (11) $\mathbf{D}^{\text{eff}} \equiv \mathbf{D}$. This approximation leads to a closed set of equations, given by Eqs. (3), (9), (11) and (12). Taking Laplace transforms of these equations one finally gets a self consistent equation for the diffusion tensor $\mathbf{D}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{D}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; z)$, where the latter is the Laplace transform of $\mathbf{D}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2; t)$ [16]. For *technical* convenience we perform here an additional approximation:

$$D^{\alpha\beta}(\Omega_1, \Omega'_1) \approx D(l) \delta^{\alpha\beta} \delta(\Omega_1 | \Omega'_1). \quad (13)$$

Substitution of Eq. (13) into the self consistent equation for \mathbf{D} yields [16]:

$$D(l) = D_0 [1 - v(l)] \quad (14)$$

with the l -dependent coupling function

$$v(l) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{n_2} \int_0^\infty dt \langle \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \cdot e^{\mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger} t} \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \rangle \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger}$ is an adjoint Smoluchowski operator for an *isolated* pair of rods

$$\mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger} = [\nabla_{n_1} + \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)] \cdot \nabla_{n_1} + [\nabla_{n_2} + \mathbf{T}_{n_2 n_1}(\Omega_2, \Omega_1)] \cdot \nabla_{n_2}. \quad (16)$$

The time-dependent torque-torque correlator on the r.h.s. of Eq. (15) is defined by:

$$\langle \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \cdot e^{\mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger} t} \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \rangle \\ = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \int d\Omega_1 \int d\Omega_2 g_{n_1 n_2}^{(2)}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \cdot e^{\mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger} t} \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2). \quad (17)$$

Due to the lattice translation invariance $v(l)$ does not depend on n_1 . Moreover, $v(l) \geq 0$, where the equality sign holds only for $l \leq 1$ and $v(l) \sim l^3$ for $l \gg 1$.

The coupling constant $v(l)$ can be calculated via a Brownian dynamics simulation of the isolated two-rod system or it can be estimated analytically. The former approach is straightforward. In the following we briefly discuss the latter. Eq. (15) can be rewritten as

$$v(l) = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{n_2} \langle \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \cdot (-\mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger})^{-1} \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \rangle. \quad (18)$$

We introduce a vector function $\mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger} \mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \quad . \quad (19)$$

If \mathbf{f} is a solution of Eq. (19), then $v(l)$ can be readily calculated: $v(l) = -\frac{1}{3} \sum_{n_2} \langle \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \cdot \mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \rangle$. $\mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$ can be determined from the variational equation of the following functional (for a similar discussion see Ref. [23]):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}[\{\mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)\}] \\ = \frac{1}{3} \langle \mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \cdot \mathcal{L}^{(2)\dagger} \mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \rangle - \frac{2}{3} \langle \mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \cdot \mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

$v(l)$ is the maximum value of \mathcal{F} and $v^{\text{var}}(l) \equiv \mathcal{F}[\{\mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}^{\text{var}}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)\}] \leq v(l)$ for all trial functions $\mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}^{\text{var}}$. We have used the following simple trial function

$$\mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}^{\text{var}}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \lambda \sin \Theta_1 \sin \Theta_2 \begin{pmatrix} \cos \Theta_1 \cos \phi_1 \\ \cos \Theta_1 \sin \phi_1 \\ -\sin \Theta_1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{\pi}{2} - (\phi_2 - \phi_1), & 0 < \phi_2 - \phi_1 < \pi \\ \frac{3\pi}{2} - (\phi_2 - \phi_1), & \pi < \phi_2 - \phi_1 < 2\pi \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

where λ is a variational parameter. Note that $\mathbf{f}_{n_1 n_2}^{\text{var}}$ is independent on n_1, n_2 and does not depend explicitly on l . For this simple trial function the l -dependence of $v^{\text{var}}(l)$ comes from that of $\mathbf{T}_{n_1 n_2}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)$.

In Fig. 3 we present $v(l)$ for a simple cubic lattice as obtained from Eq. (15) by a computer simulation of the isolated 2-rod system and from the variational approach. The glass transition is defined by $D(l_c) = 0$ which results in $v(l_c) = 1$. A finite value for $l_c > 1$ must exist because $v(l) \geq 0$ and $v(l) \sim l^3$ for $l \gg 1$. From Fig. 3 we get $l_c^{\text{num}} \cong 3.45$ and $l_c^{\text{var}} \cong 5.7$, respectively. For the fcc lattice we have found [16] $l_c^{\text{num}} \cong 2.2$ and $l_c^{\text{var}} \cong 3.96$ which reasonably fits $l_c^{\text{MD}} \cong 2.7$ ⁽⁴⁾ from the MD-simulation [13]. From this point of view our microscopic approach, including all approximations, leads to a satisfactory value for the critical length. Ref. [13] has also demonstrated that the rotational diffusion constant follows a power law $D(l) \sim (l_c - l)^\gamma$, close to l_c with exponent $\gamma^{\text{MD}} \cong 4.2$. Our approach yields a power law with $\gamma = 1$, which significantly deviates from the MD result. This discrepancy may be due to some uncertainties of the simulation ($\gamma^{\text{MD}} \cong 4.2$ is an unusually high value; for supercooled liquids γ is close to two) or it may originate from our approximations. With regard to the latter it should be noted that the simplest version of Edwards and Vilgis' description of the glass transition in a dense fluid of rods of finite thickness [24] predicts a power law decay of the self-diffusion coefficient with $\gamma = 1$. This result is changed in more complicated formulations of the theory. Whether our approach can be developed in an analogous way is left for the future study.

To summarize, we have considered a system of hard rods fixed with their centers on a simple cubic lattice. We approximated the influence of a third rod on a pair of rods by introducing

⁽⁴⁾Obukhov *et al.* [14] considered a system of rods attached to the lattice sites of an sc lattice at one of their end points and obtained a slightly different value, $l_c \cong 4.5$.

an effective diffusion tensor and derived a closed set of equations for the 1- and 2-rod density. These equations lead to a self consistent equation for a rotational diffusion constant $D(l)$. In contrast to MCT it is *not* a static but a *dynamical* 2-particle correlator which determines the slowing down of the dynamics and finally the glass transition. Nevertheless, similar to the MCT, a cage effect exists in our model, too, but the cage is of *pure* dynamical nature. If l is large enough, the tagged rod will perform librations within this “*dynamical cage*” built by all the neighbouring rods, without existence of any static correlations. Note that this mechanism exists even for rods with *finite* d , as long as the static correlations are weak enough. With increasing d there will be a crossover to the “static” cage effect as described by MCT. Whether or not MCT can be extended such that this “dynamical” cage effect is included is, of course, a challenge for the future. In any case, the present model exhibits glassy behavior without possessing any static correlations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are grateful to M. Fuchs for helpful comments and to M. Ricker and D. Garanin for preparation of the figures. G. S. gratefully acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation through grant No. CHE 0111152 and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

REFERENCES

- [1] BENGTZELIUS U., GÖTZE W. and SJÖLANDER A., J. Phys. C **17**(1984) 5915.
- [2] DAS S. P. and MAZENKO G. F., Phys. Rev. A **34** (1986) 2265.
- [3] GÖTZE W., in *Liquids, Freezing and the Glass Transition, Les Houches 1989*, edited by J. P. HANSEN, D. LEVESQUE and J. ZINN-JUSTIN (North-Holland, Amsterdam) 1991, pp. 287-503.
- [4] SCHILLING R., in *Disorder Effects on Relaxational Processes*, edited by R. RICHERT and A. BLUMEN (Springer-Verlag, Berlin) 1994, pp. 193-231.
- [5] CUMMINS H. Z., J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, **11** (1999) A95.
- [6] MÉZARD M. and PARISI G., J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., **29** (1996) 6515.
- [7] MÉZARD M. and PARISI G., Phys. Rev. Lett., **82** (1999) 747.
- [8] SINGH Y., STOESSEL J. P. and WOLYNES P. G., Phys. Rev. Lett., **54** (1985) 1059.
- [9] RUBINSTEIN M. and OBUKHOV S. P., unpublished.
- [10] JIMÉNEZ-RUIZ M., CRIADO A., BERMEJO F. J., CUELLO G.J., TROUW F. R., FERNÁNDEZ-PÉREA R., LÖWEN H., CABRILLO C. and FISCHER H. E., Phys. Rev. Lett., **83** (1999) 2757.
- [11] AFFOUARD F. and DESCAMPS M., Phys. Rev. Lett., **87** (2001) 035501.
- [12] MICHEL K. H., Phys. Rev. Lett., **57** (1986) 2188.
- [13] RENNER C., LÖWEN H. and BARRAT J. L., Phys. Rev. E **52** (1995) 5091.
- [14] OBUKHOV S., KOBSEV D., PERCHAK D. and RUBINSTEIN M., J. Phys. I France, **7** (1997) 563.
- [15] BERGENHOLTZ J. and FUCHS M., Phys. Rev. E **59** (1999) 5706.
- [16] SCHILLING R. and SZAMEL G., unpublished
- [17] SZAMEL G. and LÖWEN H., Phys. Rev. A **44** (1991) 8215.
- [18] GLEIM T., KOB W., and BINDER K., Phys. Rev. Lett., **81** (1998) 4404.
- [19] CICHOCKI B., Z. Phys., **B66** (1987) 537.
- [20] SZAMEL G., Phys. Rev. Lett., **70** (1993) 3744.
- [21] SZAMEL G. and SCHWEIZER K., J. Chem. Phys., **100** (1994) 3127.
- [22] CICHOCKI B., Physica, **148A** (1988) 165.
- [23] DHONT J. K. G., VAN BRUGGEN P. B. and BRIELS W.J., Macromolecules, **32** (1999) 3809.
- [24] EDWARDS, S. F. and VILGIS, T., Physica Scripta T **13** (1986) 7.




Fig. 1 – Unit cell of the cubic lattice with hard rods of length L and diameter d with their centers at the lattice sites.




Fig. 2 – Illustration of the geometrical quantities defined in the text for two needles i and j .




Fig. 3 – $v(l)$ for a simple cubic lattice from the numerically exact (squares) and the variational calculation (solid line). l_c denotes the critical length for which $v(l_c) = 1$.