

## Visible Absorption Spectra of Substituted Ferricenium Cations

By R. PRINS

[Koninklijke/Shell-Laboratorium Amsterdam, (Shell Research N.V.) Netherlands]

*Summary* The magnitude of the extinction coefficient and the shift on substitution show that the band at  $16,200\text{ cm}^{-1}$  in the absorption spectrum of  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2^+$ , which formerly was attributed to a  $3d-3d$  ligand-field transition, is due to a ligand-to-metal  $e_{1u} \rightarrow e_{2g}$  charge-transfer transition.

there is a band at  $16,200\text{ cm}^{-1}$ . Levy and Orgel<sup>1</sup> and Scott and Becker<sup>2</sup> attributed this band to the  ${}^2E_{2g} \rightarrow {}^2A_{1g}$  transition, in which an electron is promoted from the  $a_{1g}(3d)$  to the  $e_{2g}(3d)$  orbital. This assignment to a parity-forbidden  $3d-3d$  transition is, however, questionable. The extinction coefficient of this band ( $\epsilon$  420) is one order of magnitude larger than extinction coefficients of  $3d-3d$  bands in the absorption spectra of dibenzenechromium

---

In the visible absorption spectrum of the ferricenium cation

cation ( $\epsilon$  10),<sup>1-3</sup> vanadocene, nickelocene, and ferrocene ( $10 < \epsilon < 50$ ),<sup>4</sup> and a similar assignment for the 16,200  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  band therefore seems improbable.

Our absorption measurements on substituted ferricenium cations support a different assignment. Substitution with methyl groups gives a red-shift of 700  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ , while the acetyl group gives a blue-shift of 2700  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  (*cf.* Table). These shifts are much larger than those observed for the  $3d-3d$  bands of substituted ferrocenes<sup>5</sup> and indicate that at least one of the orbitals involved in the 16,200  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  transition is a ligand orbital. Since in other metallocenes no band around 16,000  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  is observed,<sup>4</sup> a ligand-to-ligand transition can be ruled out as a possible explanation and we conclude that the 16,200  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  band is a charge-transfer band. Furthermore, the observation that the electron-donating methyl groups give a red-shift and the electron-withdrawing acetyl group gives a blue-shift shows that the band is due to a ligand-to-metal charge-transfer transition. Comparison with an MO calculation on ferrocene<sup>6</sup> indicates that the transition most probably is the symmetry-allowed  ${}^2E_{2g} \rightarrow {}^2E_{1u}$  transition, in which an electron is promoted from the filled  $e_{1u}$  ligand orbital to the partly filled<sup>7</sup>  $e_{2g}$  iron orbital.

Additional evidence in favour of this assignment comes from photoelectron measurements by Turner.<sup>8</sup> In the photoelectron spectrum of ferrocene there are peaks at 6.85, 7.2, 8.8, and 9.3 eV, and several others at higher energies. The lower two ionization potentials are due to removal of electrons from the  $e_{2g}$  and  $a_{1g}$  iron  $3d$ -orbitals.<sup>8</sup> The next two IP's are somewhat larger than the lowest one (8.7 eV) of the  $\text{C}_5\text{H}_5$  radical<sup>9</sup> and may therefore be attributed to ionization from the  $e_{1u}$  and  $e_{1g}$  ligand  $\pi$ -orbitals. Subtraction of the first from the third and fourth IP's of  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2$  gives energy differences of 1.95 and 2.45 eV, that is 15,700 and 19,800  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ . These values should be close to the excitation energies of the  ${}^2E_{2g} \rightarrow {}^2E_{1u}$ ,  ${}^2E_{1g}$  bands in

the absorption spectrum of  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2^+$ . No real coincidence is expected, because all energies refer to vertical transitions and the dimensional changes differ when going from  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2$  to  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2^+$ . Since in the absorption spectrum of  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2^+$  there is a moderately strong band at 16,200  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  and a weak band near 19,000  $\text{cm}^{-1}$ , we attribute the former to the symmetry-allowed  ${}^2E_{2g} \rightarrow {}^2E_{1u}$  transition and the latter to the forbidden  ${}^2E_{2g} \rightarrow {}^2E_{1g}$  transition.

The photoelectron results not only confirm the  ${}^2E_{2g} \rightarrow {}^2E_{1u}$  assignment of the visible absorption band, but also give information on the order of the  $a_{1g}$  and  $e_{2g}$  iron  $3d$ -orbitals. Subtraction of the first from the second IP gives an energy difference of 0.35 eV ( $=2800 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ ) between the  ${}^2A_{1g}$  and  ${}^2E_{2g}$  states of  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2^+$ . A ligand-field analysis of this value in terms of one- and two-electron integrals<sup>1,2</sup> shows that the  $a_{1g}$  level is 7200  $\text{cm}^{-1}$  above the  $e_{2g}$  level. This means that ionization of  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2$  to  $\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2^+$  in its ground state takes place by ejection of an electron from an orbital ( $e_{2g}$ ) which is not the highest filled orbital. The reason for this paradoxical situation is that two-electron integrals favour the  ${}^2E_{2g}$  configuration relative to the  ${}^2A_{1g}$  configuration.<sup>1,2</sup>

The present as well as former<sup>4</sup> results demonstrate that the order and character of the highest filled and lowest empty orbitals in ferrocene are:

$$e_{1g}(\pi\text{-Cp}) < e_{1u}(\pi\text{-Cp}) < e_{2g}(3d) < a_{1g}(3d) < e^*_{1g}(3d).$$

*Position and extinction coefficients of the visible absorption bands*

Compound	$\sigma$ , $\text{cm}^{-1}$	$\epsilon$ , $\text{l.mole}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$
$\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CH}_3)_2^+$	15,500	290
$\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)_2^+$	16,200	420
$\text{Fe}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{C}_5\text{H}_4\text{-COCH}_3)^+$	18,900	920

(Received, January 8th, 1970; Com. 029.)

<sup>1</sup> D. A. Levy and L. E. Orgel, *Mol. Phys.*, 1961, **4**, 93.

<sup>2</sup> D. R. Scott and R. S. Becker, *J. Phys. Chem.*, 1965, **69**, 3207.

<sup>3</sup> S. Yamada, H. Yamazaki, H. Nishikawa, and R. Tsuchida, *Bull. Chem. Soc. Japan*, 1960, **33**, 481.

<sup>4</sup> R. Prins and J. D. W. van Voorst, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 1968, **49**, 4665.

<sup>5</sup> T. H. Barr and W. E. Watts, *J. Organometallic Chem.*, 1968, **15**, 177.

<sup>6</sup> J. H. Schachtschneider, R. Prins, and P. Ros, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 1967, **1**, 462.

<sup>7</sup> R. Prins and F. J. Reinders, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1969, **91**, 4929.

<sup>8</sup> D. W. Turner, in "Physical Methods in Advanced Inorganic Chemistry," ed. H. A. O. Hill and P. Day, Interscience, New York, 1968, p. 102.

<sup>9</sup> A. G. Harrison, L. R. Honnen, H. J. Dauben, and F. R. Lossing, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 1960, **82**, 5593.