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#### Abstract

The composition of electronic levels as well as optical transitions associated with $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes have been studied through $\mathrm{MS}-\mathrm{X} \alpha$ and $\operatorname{SCCEH}$ calculations performed as a function of equatorial ( $R_{\mathrm{eq}}$ ) and axial ( $R_{2 x}$ ) metal-ligand distances. The scheme and composition of levels for $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ is rather different from that for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ and other more ionic systems. The first transition for $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ (observed at $12500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ) is assigned to a jump involving the $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 g}$ orbital which is mainly built (about 70\%) from 3 p orbitals of axial chlorine atoms. Aside from explaining reasonably the five optical bands experimentally observed for $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$, the present work indicates that the first allowed charge-transfer transition of $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ would lie in the ultraviolet region and confirms that the unpaired electron in $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ spends a little more time on equatorial ligands than on the central ion. All these results are consistent with a high value $(\chi=2.8)$ for the optical electronegativity of $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$. The dependence of electronic transitions (and also of unpaired spin densities $f_{\sigma}$ and $f_{s}$ ) on $R_{\text {eq }}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ is found to be rather similar for both $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes. The relation between such a dependence and the band widths of optical transitions is outlined.


## 1. Introduction

Theoretical work devoted to $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ complexes is rather scarce [1-3], a situation which is markedly different from that for $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ complexes. For instance, a good number of theoretical studies on the electronic structure of simple $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ complexes involving halides as ligands have been performed [4-13] while no calculations on $\mathrm{AgX}_{6}^{4-}$ ( $\mathrm{X}=$ =halide) complexes (displaying a $\mathrm{D}_{4 \mathrm{~h}}$ 'elongated' octahedral geometry) have been reported up to now. Experimentally such complexes are formed through x-irradiation of ionic lattices (such as NaF and KCl ) previously doped with the stable $\mathrm{Ag}^{+}$cation [14-22].

The interest in calculating the electronic structure of a complex such as $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ lies in the conclusions reached from the analysis of its optical and EPR data [23]. In fact it was pointed out that the unpaired electron of $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$, although lying in the antibonding $\mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}^{*}\left(\sim x^{2}-y^{2}\right)$ level, should spend at least the same time on ligands as on the silver ion. Furthermore, it was suggested [23] that the optical electronegativity would be equal to $\chi=2.8$ for $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ and thus it would be the same as for $\mathrm{Br}^{-}[24]$. From this the experimental $[g]$ tensor associated with tetragonal $\mathrm{AgBr}_{6}^{4-}$ units exhibits a surprising almost isotropic behaviour ( $g_{\|}=2.072(3)$; $g_{\perp}=2.067(3)$ for $\mathrm{CdBr}_{2}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}[25]$ ) which has been explained on the assumption again of a high localization of the unpaired electron on the four equatorial ligands and taking into account the key role played by charge-transfer excitations in the [g] tensor of non-ionic $\mathrm{MX}_{n}$ ( $\mathrm{M} \equiv$ transition-metal ion) complexes [23].

As regards optical excitations on $\mathrm{AgX}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes ( $\mathrm{X} \equiv \mathrm{F}$ or Cl ) the available experimental information is relatively scarce although data have been reported for $\mathrm{AgBF}_{6}$
compounds ( $\mathrm{B} \equiv \mathrm{Sn}, \mathrm{Zr}$ or Ti ) $[26,27]$ as well as for $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}[14,16,19]$. In the latter case, five different bands peaked at $12500,15900,17800,21700$ and $29600 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ have been observed, suggesting that the gap $G$ between the highest crystal-field-like transitions and the smallest charge-transfer transition would certainly be smaller than for $\mathrm{CuCl}_{6}^{4-}$. In this case the highest crystal-field transitions $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}^{*} \rightarrow \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}^{*}$ between the mainly d levels $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}^{*}(\sim x z, y z)$ and $\mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}^{*}$ lies at $10970 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}[28,29]$ while the lowest charge-transfer transition $\mathrm{e}_{u}(\pi+\sigma, \mathrm{eq}) \rightarrow \mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}^{*}$ is located at $25510 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, so $G=14540 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ [30].

When all these facts are borne in mind, carrying out a theoretical investigation upon the electronic structure of $\mathrm{AgX}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes ( $\mathrm{X} \equiv$ halide) becomes an attractive and necessary task. Here the results of theoretical calculations made on $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes are reported. Aside from exploring the charge distribution associated with the unpaired electron the present work is especially devoted to understanding the optical transitions displayed by both systems. To achieve this goal, two different methods are used throughout this work: the multiple-scattering-X $\alpha$ (MS-X $\alpha$ ) method together with the self-consistent charge extended Hückel (SCCEH) procedure. Both have previously led to a reasonable understanding of experimental optical transitions of transition-metal complexes and in particular of chargetransfer excitations of $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ complexes [30].

Such transitions are difficult to calculate properly through ab initio methods which use a moderate quality basis. In fact they underestimate the energy of valence $n_{L} \mathrm{p}$ levels of free $X^{-}$ion which can give rise to negative values of the electronic affinity of $X$ [31] as well as place the mainly $n_{L} p$ ligand levels above the mainly $d$ levels in the case of ionic complexes. A recent example of this problem can be found in [32]. Such an important drawback is, however, circumvented in the semiempirical SCCEH method (where the energies of free ions are taken from experiment) and also in the density functional MS-X $\alpha$ procedure when used in conjunction with the Norman [33] criterion as shown by previous results on $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{Ni}^{+}$complexes $[8,11,30]$.

As previously discussed, the optical and EPR parameters of isolated tetragonal $\mathrm{d}^{9}$ complexes depend upon the equatorial ( $R_{\text {eq }}$ ) and axial ( $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ ) metal-ligand distances. The actual values of $R_{\mathrm{eq}}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ depending on the host lattice are not easy to determine especially for the present $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ complexes as the $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ cation is involved in only a few inorganic compounds. Therefore, in order to overcome this significant problem, it has been necessary to perform calculations as a function of $R_{\mathrm{eq}}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ around some initial values $R_{\mathrm{eq}}^{0}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}^{0}$ estimated from data for $\mathrm{AgF}_{2}$ [34] as well as for compounds involving $\mathrm{CuCl}_{6}^{4-}$ units [35, 36].

## 2. Theoretical details

Calculations have been performed with two methods on the basis of very different approximations but the results obtained are rather similar.

A standard version of the MS- $\mathrm{X} \alpha$ method has been used. The exchange parameters $\alpha$ for the different atoms were taken from the compilation of Schwarz [37,38]. Sphere radii were chosen according to the Norman [33] procedure, allowing the atomic spheres to overlap and determining the absolute values of the radii by the condition that the virial ratio $-2\langle T\rangle /\langle V\rangle$ is as close as possible to 1 . A Watson sphere coincident with the outer-sphere radius and carrying a charge of +2 was used to simulate the crystal field. Partial waves up to $l=3,2$ and 1 have been included in the multiple-scattering expansion for outer-sphere, silver and halide regions, respectively. Optical transition energies were determined using the Slater transition state procedure.

The calculations were performed at a non-relativistic spin-restricted level on a VAX 8350 computer with computation times of about 30 s per iteration and about 40 iterations required for convergence. We have also performed calculations in a spin-unrestricted level, so as to include quasi-relativistic corrections [39] and to increase the number of partial waves, but we find no change in the level ordering and an almost negligible variation in the charge distributions and the energies of the optical transitions.

The charge distributions shown in this work were calculated using the method of Karplus and co-workers $[40,41]$ for partitioning of the inter- and outer-sphere charges. The LCAO parameters of the antibonding $b_{1 g}^{*}\left(\sim x^{2}-y^{2}\right)$ orbital used in the calculation of the parameters of unpaired spin density on ligands $f_{\mathrm{s}}$ and $f_{\sigma}$ were obtained from these redistributed charges with a small Mulliken-like correction.

Writing the $b_{1 g}^{*}$ wavefunction in LCAO form as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|b_{1 \mathrm{~g}}^{*}\right\rangle=N\left[\left|d\left(x^{2}-y^{2}\right)\right\rangle-\lambda_{\mathrm{p} \sigma}\left|\chi_{\mathrm{p} \sigma}\right\rangle-\lambda_{\mathrm{s}}\left|\chi_{\mathrm{s}}\right\rangle\right] \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left|\chi_{\mathrm{p} \sigma}\right\rangle$ and $\left|\chi_{s}\right\rangle$ are suitable normalized LCAOS involving valence $n_{L} \mathrm{p}$ and $n_{L} \mathrm{~s}$ orbitals of ligands, the parameters $f_{s}$ and $f_{\sigma}$ are defined for the present case as

$$
\begin{align*}
& f_{\mathrm{s}}=\frac{1}{4}\left(N \lambda_{\mathrm{s}}\right)^{2} \\
& f_{\sigma}=\frac{1}{4}\left(N \lambda_{\mathrm{p} \sigma}\right)^{2} . \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

The SCCEH calculations have been carried out following the procedure developed by Ammeter et al [42]. In this model the diagonal elements of the one-electron Hamiltonian are taken from the so-called VSIEs depending upon the atomic charges and derived from experimental data on different free ions [43]. The dependence of VSIEs with the charge for a given atomic configuration is assumed [43] to be quadratic (VSIE $(q)=A q^{2}+B q+C$ ). The three vSIE coefficients used for fluorine and chlorine in this work are the same as those used in previous calculations of optical and EPR properties of $\mathrm{MX}_{n}$ complexes ( $\mathrm{M} \equiv \mathrm{Ni}^{+}, \mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ or $\mathrm{Mn}^{2+} ; \mathrm{X} \equiv \mathrm{F}$ or $\left.\mathrm{Cl} ; n=4,6,8\right)[30,44]$. As regards the corresponding parameters for the nine configurations of silver employed in this work ( $\mathrm{d}^{n}, \mathrm{~d}^{n-1} \mathrm{~s}, \mathrm{~d}^{n-1} \mathrm{p}$ for the 4 d orbital and so on), they have been taken from the work by Munita and Letelier [45].

As the first excitations mainly depend upon the interaction between 4 d orbitals of silver and $n_{L} \mathrm{p}$ and $n_{I} s$ valence orbitals of the corresponding halide, we have used Clementi-Roetti [46] wavefunctions to describe such orbitals and to calculate the overlap integrals involved. The radial part of the 5 s and 5 p orbitals of silver is simply described by a single exponential function with an exponent equal to 2.2775 in both cases.

## 3. Discussion

Tables 1 and 2 depict the highest occupied electronic levels of $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ calculated for $R_{\text {eq }}=2.10 \AA$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}=2.50 \AA$ using the SCCEH and MS-X $\alpha$ methods, respectively. The main features obtained through both calculations are similar and can be summarized as follows.
(1) The unpaired electron lies in the antibonding $3 b_{l g}$ which is mainly built from the $4 \mathrm{~d}\left(x^{2}-y^{2}\right)$ wavefunction of silver. The MS-X $\alpha$ value $f_{\sigma}=11.5 \%$ is higher than those derived for the analogous $\mathrm{CuF}_{6}^{4-}\left(f_{\sigma}=5.3 \%\right)$ [47] and $\mathrm{NiF}_{6}^{5-}\left(f_{\sigma}=2.2 \%\right)$ [30] complexes involving the 3 d ions $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{Ni}^{+}$, respectively. A similar situation is obtained

Table 1. Relative energies and charge distributions for the highest valence orbitals of the complex $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ obtained in a MS-X $\alpha$ calculation with $R_{\text {eq }}=2.10 \AA$ and $R_{\text {ax }}=2.50 \AA$.

| Orbital | Energy (eV) | Charge distribution (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ag |  |  | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {eq }}$ |  | $\mathrm{F}_{\text {ax }}$ |  |
|  |  | $5 s$ | 5p | 4d | 2 s | 2 p | $2 s$ | 2 p |
| $3 \mathrm{~b}_{18}$ | 0 | - | - | 59.8 | 3.2 | 37.0 | - | - |
| $5 a_{18}$ | -0.990 | 1.2 | - | 55.0 | 0.3 | 10.2 | 1.3 | 32.0 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -1.853 | - | - | 76.4 | - | 23.6 | - | - |
| $3 e_{g}$ | -2.034 | - | - | 73.3 | - | 16.8 | - | 9.9 |
| $3 a_{24}$ | -2.712 | - | 2.0 | - | - | 7.2 | 0.0 | 90.8 |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{E}}$ | -2.715 | - | - | 2.4 | - | 14.1 | - | 83.5 |
| $4{ }_{4}$ | -2.752 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.1 | 1.6 | - | 98.3 |
| $1 \mathrm{a}_{28}$ | -3.388 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $4 \mathrm{alg}_{18}$ | -3.593 | 5.2 | - | 24.1 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 66.8 |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{0}$ | -3.599 | - | 1.8 | - | - | 98.2 | - | 0.0 |
| $1 \mathrm{l}_{24}$ | -3.670 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{u}}$ | -4.082 | - | 3.2 | - | - | 89.2 | 0.2 | 7.4 |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{4}$ | -4.259 | - | 7.9 | - | - | 90.9 | - | 1.2 |
| $1 \mathrm{e}_{8}$ | -4.410 | - | - | 25.7 | - | 68.3 | - | 6.0 |
| $1 b_{2 g}$ | -4.877 | - | - | 26.2 | - | 73.8 | - | - |
| $3 \mathbf{a l g}_{8}$ | -5.334 | 8.3 | - | 19.9 | 0.8 | 70.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -5.622 | - | - | 39.4 | 0.6 | 60.0 | - | - |

Table 2. The same as for table 1 for a SCCEH calculation.

| Orbital | Energy (eV) | Charge distribution (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ag |  |  | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{eq}}$ |  | $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{ax}}$ |  |
|  |  | 5s | 5p | 4d | 2 s | 2p | 2 s | 2p |
| $3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | 0 | - | - | 77.3 | 1.0 | 21.6 | - | - |
| $5 \mathrm{a}_{18}$ | -1.061 | 1.0 | - | 74.2 | 0.2 | 7.7 | 0.2 | 16.8 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -1.548 | - | - | 78.7 | - | 21.3 | - | - |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | -1.808 | - | - | 79.7 | - | 13.0 | - | 7.3 |
| $4 \mathrm{e}_{\text {u }}$ | -3.436 | - | 0.0 | - | - | 0.0 | - | 100.0 |
| $3 \mathrm{a}_{20}$ | -3.447 | - | 0.5 | - | - | 0.1 | - | 99.4 |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | -3.522 | - | - | 3.9 | - | 5.0 | - | 91.1 |
| $4 \mathrm{alg}_{18}$ | -3.782 | 1.5 | - | 9.7 | 0.0 | 9.1 | 0.0 | 79.7 |
| ${ }^{1} \mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ | $-4.365$ | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $3 e_{\square}$ | -4.381 | - | 0.2 | - | - | 99.8 | - | 0.0 |
| $1 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{u}}$ | -4.405 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{u}}$ | -4.429 | - | 0.2 | - | - | 99.7 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{4}$ | -4.479 | - | 1.1 | - | 0.0 | 98.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| ${ }_{19}{ }_{\text {g }}$ | -4.793 | - | - | 16.4 | - | 82.0 | - | 1.7 |
| $3 a_{15}$ | -4.907 | 0.9 | - | 14.9 | 0.1 | 80.8 | 0.0 | 3.3 |
| ${ }^{1 b_{2 g}}$ | $-5.066$ | - | - | 21.3 | - | 78.7 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | $-5.197$ | - | - | 21.5 | 0.2 | 78.3 | - | - |

through SCCEH where the $f_{\sigma}$-values are $7.3 \%, 4.0 \%$ and $2.0 \%$ for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$, $\mathrm{CuF}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{NiF}_{6}^{5-}$, respectively. This already supports a higher optical electronegativity $\chi$ for $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ than for $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$. The analysis of the experimental EPR parameters reported for $\mathrm{NaF}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}[21]$ within the framework given in [48] leads to a value $f_{\sigma}=8.3 \%$ and thus the present MS-X $\alpha$ and SCCEH values are close to it.
(2) As the occupied $5 a_{1 g}, 2 b_{2 g}$ and $3 e_{g}$ levels are the closest to $3 b_{1 g}$, they are also mainly built from the 4 d level of $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$. Thus the picture of first excitations is qualitatively similar to that of a crystal-field description.
(3) Below the preceding levels, those labelled as $4 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}, 3 \mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{u}}, 2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ and $4 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ mainly built from $2 p\left(F_{a x}^{-}\right)$levels of axial ligands are located. A gap appears between both sets of levels. The value of such a gap is smaller in the MS-X $\alpha$ calculation (equal to about 0.7 eV ) than in the SCCEH calculation (equal to about 1.5 eV ).
(4) The electronic levels mainly made from equatorial $2 p\left(\mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{eq}}^{-}\right)$wavefunctions are separated by about 1.6 eV from the mainly axial levels in both calculations. Qualitatively this separation follows from the different electrostatic potential seen by an electron located in equatorial or axial ligands [30]. As in the present case the axial ligands lie farther from silver than do the equatorial ligands, the $2 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{ax}}^{-}\right)$levels are raised with respect to $2 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{eq}}^{-}\right)$ levels.

The information given in tables 1 and 2 is thus basically similar to that for elongated complexes such as $\mathrm{NiF}_{6}^{5-}$ and $\mathrm{CuF}_{6}^{4-}$ although the covalence is higher for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$.

Table 3. Relative energies and charge distributions for the highest valence orbitals of the complex $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ obtained in a MS-X $\alpha$ calculation with $R_{\mathrm{eq}}=2.45 \AA$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}=3.10 \AA$.

| Orbital | Energy (eV) | Charge distribution (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ag |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}_{\text {eq }}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}_{\mathrm{ax}}$ |  |
|  |  | 5s | 5p | 4d | 3 s | 3p | 3 s | 3p |
| $3 b_{1 g}$ | 0 | - | - | 44.5 | 3.1 | 52.4 | - | - |
| $5 \mathrm{atg}_{\mathrm{tg}}$ | -0.999 | 0.80 | - | 21.9 | 0.2 | 9.4 | 0.6 | 67.1 |
| $33_{24}$ | -1.503 | - | 1.0 | - | - | 11.0 | 0.1 | 87.9 |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | -1.519 | - | - | 0.1 | - | 11.6 | - | 88.3 |
| $4{ }_{4}$ | -1.622 | - | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 1.5 | - | 98.3 |
| $\mathrm{la}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -1.909 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | -2.062 | - | - | 33.8 | - | 57.5 | - | 8.7 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -2.074 | - | - | 48.4 | - | 51.6 | - | - |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$ | -2.240 | - | 2.2 | - | 0.2 | 97.6 | - | 0.0 |
| $1 \mathrm{~b}_{20}$ | -2.360 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{a}_{24}$ | -2.958 | 8.8 | 3.0 | - | - | 84.3 | 0.7 | 12.0 |
| $4 \mathrm{al}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | -2.958 | - | - | 44.0 | 0.1 | 13.0 | 0.8 | 33.5 |
| $2 e_{0}$ | -3.250 | - | 9.0 | - | 0.3 | 89.5 | - | 1.2 |
| $1 \mathrm{le}_{8}$ | -3.743 | - | - | 65.2 | - | 31.9 | - | 2.9 |
| $\mathrm{lb}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -4.155 | - | - | 51.3 | - | 48.7 | - | - |
| $3 \mathrm{atg}_{\underline{g}}$ | -4.705 | 8.7 | - | 31.0 | 1.8 | 58.5 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -4.923 | - | - | 54.2 | 1.1 | 44.7 | - | - |

Nevertheless the preceding disposal and composition of levels is significantly changed when we look at the corresponding results for $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ collected in tables 3 and 4 and whose more conspicuous features are the following.
(1) Although the unpaired electron also lies on the antibonding $3 b_{1 g}$ orbital, this orbital cannot be considered a mainly 4 d orbital as the electronic population lying on equatorial ligands is a little higher than that on silver ion. The $f_{\sigma}$ values derived from MS-X $\alpha$ and SCCEH calculations are $15.5 \%$ and $15.3 \%$, respectively, to be compared with the value $f_{\sigma}=17.7 \%$ obtained from the analysis of experimental EPR data [23].

Table 4. The same as table 3, in a sccer calculation.

| Orbital | Energy (eV) | Charge distribution (\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ag |  |  | $\mathrm{Cl}_{\text {eq }}$ |  | $\mathrm{Cl}_{2 \mathrm{ax}}$ |  |
|  |  | 55 | 5p | 4 d | 3 s | 3p | 3s | 3p |
| $3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{tg}}$ | 0 | - | - | 49.2 | 1.7 | 49.2 | - | - |
| $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -1.165 | 0.4 | - | 23.2 | 0.1 | 4.8 | 0.1 | 71.6 |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | -1.716 | - | - | 3.5 | - | 0.1 | - | 96.5 |
| $3 a_{24}$ | -1.739 | - | 0.8 | - | - | 4.1 | - | 95.1 |
| $4 \mathrm{e}_{\text {u }}$ | -1.765 | - | 0.0 | - | 0.0 | 0.5 | - | 99.5 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -2.160 | - | - | 65.0 | - | 35.0 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{\text {g }}$ | -2.285 | - | - | 51.1 | - | 47.4 | - | 1.5 |
| ${ }_{102}{ }_{8}$ | -2.623 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{0}$ | -2.830 | - | 1.7 | - | 0.1 | 98.0 | - | 0.3 |
| $4^{4} \mathrm{l}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | -3.021 | 3.9 | - | 52.2 | 0.0 | 15.7 | 0.2 | 28.1 |
| $1 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{u}}$ | -3.120 | - | - | - | - | 100.0 | - | - |
| $2 \mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{u}}$ | -3.466 | - | 1.0 | - | - | 95.2 | 0.1 | 3.7 |
| $2 e_{0}$ | -3.733 | - | 2.6 | - | 0.2 | 96.9 | - | 0.2 |
| $1 e_{g}$ | -4.038 | - | - | 45.4 | - | 52.6 | - | 2.0 |
| $3 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | -4.343 | 2.5 | - | 23.5 | 0.7 | 73.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{15}$ | -4.418 | - | - | 49.1 | 0.3 | 50.6 | - | - |
| $1 b_{2 g}$ | -4.598 | - | - | 35.0 | - | 65.0 | - | - |

(2) At variance with what is found for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ the four levels $5 a_{1 g}, 3 a_{2 u}, 3 e_{g}$ and $4 e_{u}$ lying immediately below $3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ are mainly built from $3 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\mathrm{ax}}^{-}\right)$wavefunctions. Only in the case of $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ is there an important amount (about $25 \%$ ) of the $4 d\left(3 z^{2}-r^{2}\right)$ wavefunction. Thus the present picture for the first excited states of $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ cannot be accounted for even qualitatively on the grounds of a crystal-field description.
(3) The $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}\left(2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}\right)$ and $1 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ ( $1 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ ) levels exhibit strong hybridization between 4 d and $3 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\mathrm{eq}}^{-}\right)$wavefunctions. Ms-X $\alpha$ calculations give a little more of the $3 \mathrm{p}_{\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\text {eq }}^{-}\right)}$) character to $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ and $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ than reached through SCCEH calculations.
(4) Both types of calculation indicate that $4 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ is now mainly a 4 d level, although lying about 3 eV below $3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$. Such a level is located between levels such as $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$ and $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$ formed essentially from $3 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\mathrm{eq}}^{-}\right)$atomic orbitals.

We have verified that neither the order of levels nor their composition is altered by changing $R_{\mathrm{eq}}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ in our calculations. An increase in $R_{\mathrm{eq}}$ or $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ tends, however, to decrease the separation between every one-electron level and $3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$.

Bearing in mind the results displayed in tables 3 and 4, let us discuss the microscopic origin of the five optical absorption bands found in $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}[14,16,19]$. The most intense bands have their maxima at $21700 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ (here called $\delta_{1}$ ) and $29600 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ (called $\delta_{2}$ ), respectively, while those peaked at $12500 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\left(\Delta_{1}\right), 15900 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\left(\Delta_{2}\right)$ and $17800 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ $\left(\Delta_{3}\right)$ have oscillator strengths $f_{\text {os }}$ lying between $1 / 200$ and $1 / 30$ of the value corresponding to $\delta_{1}$. As regards the ratio $f_{\text {os }}\left(\delta_{2}\right) / f_{o s}\left(\delta_{1}\right)$, it has been reported to be equal to 1.9 [14].

The present calculations of electronic transitions (table 5) support the fact that $\delta_{1}$ and $\delta_{2}$ can be assigned to charge-transfer transitions arising from $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\pi+\sigma)$ and $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\sigma+\pi)$ equatorial levels. Aside from reasonable agreement between the experimental and calculated transition energies such an assignment is supported by the following facts.
(a) Experimentally $[14,16,19]$ the polarization of the two transitions $\delta_{1}$ and $\delta_{2}$ corresponds to the electric vector lying in the equatorial plane of the $\mathrm{D}_{4 \mathrm{~h}} \mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ unit.

Table 5. Energies of the five optical transitions studied in this work for $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$, obtained in the sccer and ms-X $\alpha$ calculations for $R_{\text {eq }}=2.45 \AA$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}=3.10 \AA$. The experimental values correspond to the $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ system.

|  |  | Energy $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| Transition | Symbol | SCCEH | Ms-X $\alpha$ | Experimental |
| $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 g} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{g}}$ | $\Delta_{3}$ | 9404 | 10600 | 12500 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 g} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{lg}}$ | $\Delta_{1}$ | 17425 | 16780 | 15900 |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{lg}}$ | $\Delta_{2}$ | 18430 | 16700 | 17800 |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\pi+\sigma) \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{lg}}$ | $\delta_{1}$ | 22827 | 22370 | 21700 |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\sigma+\pi) \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{Eg}}$ | $\delta_{2}$ | 30111 | 29800 | 29600 |

(b) In other $\mathrm{D}_{4 \mathrm{~h}}$ systems involving $\mathrm{d}^{9}$ ions (such as $\mathrm{CdCl}_{2}: \mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ or $(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{mpH})_{2} \mathrm{CuCl}_{4}$ ) the charge-transfer spectrum is essentially composed of two bands assigned to electron jumps from $3 \mathrm{e}_{u}(\pi+\sigma)$ and $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\sigma+\pi)$ levels made from equatorial $3 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{Cl}^{-}\right)$levels $[7,11,30]$.
(c) Preliminary calculations of oscillator strengths following the procedure by [49] give $f_{\text {os }}\left(\delta_{2}\right) / f_{\text {os }}\left(\delta_{1}\right)$ close to the experimental value [14]. On the other hand, to support the present assignment, we have also calculated the oscillator strength of the $4 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ transition (simply called $\delta_{3}$ ) which involves the highest $\mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$-type orbital. The results give $f_{\mathrm{os}}\left(\delta_{3}\right) / f_{\mathrm{os}}\left(\delta_{2}\right) \leqslant 10^{-3}$. It has been pointed out [7] that, among the allowed $\mathrm{c} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ charge-transfer transitions of $d^{9}$ complexes, those where the $c$ level involves $\sigma$ wavefunctions of equatorial ligands are much more intense than the others. This idea can explain the very small value of $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{os}}\left(\delta_{3}\right)$ as $4 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$ is built almost only from $3 p\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\mathrm{ax}}^{-}\right)$atomic levels. Furthermore up to now no experimental evidence of charge-transfer transitions involving jumps from $3 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{Cl}_{\mathrm{ax}}^{-}\right)$levels has been reported for $\mathrm{CuCl}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{CuCl}_{4}^{2-}$ complexes.

As regards the weak optical absorption bands they are assigned to electronic jumps from the even levels $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}, 2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ and $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$ to $3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ (table 5). Although the agreement between experimental and calculated transitions is reasonable, additional experiments would be necessary to confirm that all the three weak bands observed for $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ exhibit an oscillator strength which is temperature dependent. Because of this the assignment of one of these transitions to $4 e_{u} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ cannot be fully ruled out although it seems less probable.

Therefore, from the present analysis, $\Delta_{3}$ should be ascribed to an electron jump from the $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ level which, although mainly only made from the axial $3 \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{Cl}^{-}\right)$level, involves a significant amount (about $25 \%$ ) of the $4 \mathrm{~d}\left(3 z^{2}-r^{2}\right)$ wavefunction, however. By contrast the transition from the mainly 4 d level $4 \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{lg}}$ could be masked by the two intense charge-transfer transitions $\delta_{1}$ and $\delta_{2}$ as $4 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ Iies between $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$ and $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$ in both types of calculation (tables 3 and 4).

Table 6. Energies of the five optical transitions studied in this work for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$, obtained in the sCcer and ms-X $\alpha$ calculations for $R_{\text {eq }}=2.10 \AA$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}=2.50 \AA$.

|  |  | Energy $\left(\mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Transition | Symbol | SCCEH | $\mathrm{MS}-\mathrm{X} \alpha$ |
| $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{Ig}}$ | $\Delta_{3}$ | 8555 | 9100 |
| $2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | $\Delta_{1}$ | 12486 | 15220 |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}} \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | $\Delta_{2}$ | 14579 | 16730 |
| $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\pi+\sigma) \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ | $\delta_{\mathrm{I}}$ | 35334 | 36310 |
| $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\sigma+\pi) \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{\mathrm{lg}}$ | $\delta_{2}$ | 36127 | 40990 |

Let us briefly comment on the results for the optical transitions of $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ which are collected in table 6. The calculated crystal-field-like transitions $\Delta_{3}, \Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{2}$ can explain reasonably well the optical spectrum displayed by $\mathrm{AgBF}_{6}(\mathrm{~B} \equiv \mathrm{Sn}$, Ti or Zr ) compounds [26,27]. Taking $\mathrm{AgSnF}_{6}$ as a guide, three bands peaked at 8300,11900 and $15400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ have been found experimentally. From our calculations, such transitions can reasonably be assigned to jumps arising from the mainly 4 d levels $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}, 2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}$ and $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{g}}$.

An interesting result gathered in table 6 concerns the position of charge-transfer transitions $\delta_{1}$ and $\delta_{2}$. As fluorine exhibits the highest optical electronegativity of the halides, $\mathrm{MF}_{6}$ complexes ( $\mathrm{M} \equiv 3 \mathrm{~d}$ ion) have their allowed charge-transfer transitions in the vacuumultraviolet region. As an example the first charge-transfer band of $\mathrm{CrF}_{6}^{3-}$ has been observed to lie at around $65000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ in the excitation spectrum of $\mathrm{Na}_{3} \mathrm{In}_{2} \mathrm{Li}_{3} \mathrm{~F}_{12}: \mathrm{Cr}^{3+}$ [50] measured using synchrotron radiation. For $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ both types of calculation indicate, however, that the first charge-transfer transition $3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}(\pi+\sigma) \rightarrow 3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ would lie in the visible-ultraviolet region. This conclusion although a little surprising is not incompatible with the empirical equation obtained by Jørgensen [24] for the frequency $\nu_{1}$ of the first charge-transfer transition and the value $\chi\left(\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}\right)=2.8$ proposed for $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}[24]$. In fact writing for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{1}=K\left[\chi\left(\mathrm{~F}^{-}\right)-\chi\left(\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}\right)\right]+10 D q \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $K=30000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}, \chi\left(\left(\mathrm{~F}^{-}\right)=3.9\right.$ and taking $10 D q=12000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ it is found that $\nu_{1}=45000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. So, this value, although being $25 \%$ higher than those reported in table 6, places again the first charge-transfer transition of $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ in the visible-ultraviolet range. It is worth noting that charge-transfer transitions are rather sensitive to changes in $R_{\text {eq }}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ as has been demonstrated experimentally [51] and theoretically [11,30,52] for several $\mathrm{Cu}^{2+}$ complexes. Despite this, even if calculations are performed for $R_{\text {eq }}=2.0 \AA$ the first charge-transfer transition is found to lie at about $44000 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. More details on the dependence of the optical transitions on $R_{e q}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ are given later. Recently EPR and optical data on $\mathrm{NaF}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ [21] have been reported. Unfortunately, in the ultraviolet region of the optical spectrum the presence of bands due to $\mathrm{Ag}^{+}$as well as to other colour centres formed under $x$-irradiation have prevented clear identification of optical bands due to $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$.

A study of the dependence of optical and EPR parameters on metal-ligand distances has been shown to be of great interest as the variations in such distances (of the order of $10^{-3} \AA$ ) can be detected through the corresponding changes in spectroscopic parameters [30]. Furthermore in the case of optical spectra such a dependence determines the HuangRhys factors associated with the $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{Ig}}$ vibration modes of the complex [44].

Writing the $R$-dependence of a given quantity $Q$ in the vicinity of $R_{\mathrm{eq}}^{0}$ and $R_{\mathrm{ax}}^{0}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q=Q_{0} R_{\mathrm{eq}}^{-n_{\mathrm{eq}}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

the exponents $n_{\text {eq }}$ can be derived from molecular orbital calculations performed at different $R_{\text {eq }}$-values. A similar law to (4) but replacing $R_{\text {eq }}$ and $n_{\text {eq }}$ by $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ and $n_{\mathrm{ax}}$ is used to describe the changes induced by variations in $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ in the neighbourhood of $R_{\mathrm{ax}}^{0}$.

The $n_{\text {eq }}$ and $n_{\mathrm{ax}}$-values corresponding to optical transitions and also to $f_{\sigma}$ and $f_{\mathrm{s}}$ parameters for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes are collected in table 7. Let us firstly discuss the most relevant results obtained on the more ionic $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ complex which are the following.
(1) The two crystal-field transitions $\Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{2}$ as well as the two charge-transfer transitions $\delta_{1}$ and $\delta_{2}$ are much more sensitive to changes in $R_{\mathrm{eq}}$ than to changes in $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$

Table 7. Exponents $n_{\mathrm{eq}}$ and $n_{\mathrm{ax}}$ corresponding to optical transitions and $f_{\mathrm{s}}$ and $f_{\sigma}$ parameters of $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes obtained by Ms-X $\alpha$ and sccer calculations.

| System |  | Calculation method | Value of exponent $n$ for the following |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\Delta_{3}$ | $\Delta_{1}$ | $\Delta_{2}$ | $\delta_{1}$ | $\delta_{2}$ | $f_{\text {s }}$ | $f_{\sigma}$ |
| $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ | $n_{\text {eq }}$ | ms-X $\alpha$ | 8.29 | 4.22 | 4.60 | 3.05 | 3.25 | 7.99 | 0.18 |
|  | $n_{\text {eq }}$ | SCCEH | 10.0 | 4.5 | 5.1 | 4.97 | 4.96 | 8.4 | -2.6 |
|  | $n_{\text {ax }}$ | ms-X $\alpha$ \% | -3.60 | -0.13 | -0.28 | 1.78 | 0.49 | 0.64 | -0.41 |
|  | $n_{\text {ax }}$ | SCCEH | -3.4 | 0.5 | 0.02 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.4 | -1.0 |
| $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ | $n_{\text {cq }}$ | ms-X $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ | 9.94 | 4.43 | 4.88 | 4.96 | 4.79 | 7.01 | -1.85 |
|  | $n_{\text {eq }}$ | SCCEH | 18.0 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 10.7 | -0.4 |
|  | $n_{\text {ax }}$ | Ms-X $\alpha$ | -3.25 | 0.05 | 0.20 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.38 | $-0.30$ |
|  | $n_{\text {ax }}$ | sccer | -2.9 | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 0.7 | -0.7 |

in accordance with the 'planar character' of orbitals such as $3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}, 2 \mathrm{~b}_{2 \mathrm{~g}}, 3 \mathrm{e}_{g}, 3 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$ and $2 \mathrm{e}_{\mathrm{u}}$. The $n_{\text {eq }}$ values found for $\Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{2}$ lie between 4 and 5.5 as was previously found for complexes such as $\mathrm{NiF}_{6}^{5-}, \mathrm{CuF}_{6}^{4-}, \mathrm{MnF}_{6}^{4-}$ or $\mathrm{CrF}_{6}^{3-}$ [44]. For $\mathrm{MnF}_{6}^{4-}$ a value $n_{\text {eq }}=4.7$ has been measured experimentally $[53,54]$.
(2) $\Delta_{3}$ exhibits a greater dependence on $R_{\text {eq }}$ than $\Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{2}$ do. As the Huang-Rhys factor $S\left(\mathrm{~A}_{1 g} ; \mathrm{eq}\right)$ associated with the $\mathrm{A}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}$ vibration mode of equatorial ligands is proportional to $n_{\text {eq }}^{2}$ [44], this factor alone would give rise to a band width for the $\Delta_{3}$ transition which is about twice that corresponding to $\Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{2}$. Although experimental band widths for $\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}$ and $\Delta_{3}$ transitions of $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ have not been reported, they have been measured, however, for $\mathrm{CuCl}_{6}^{4-}$ where the band width associated with $\Delta_{3}$ is reported to be about 1.8 of that corresponding to $\Delta_{2}[28,29]$.
(3) Also $\Delta_{3}$ is more sensitive to $R_{\mathrm{ax}}$ variations than $\Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{2}$ are. The negative value of $n_{\mathrm{ax}}$ is in accord with the increase in the separation between $5 \mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}\left(\sim 3 z^{2}-r^{2}\right)$ and $3 \mathrm{~b}_{1 \mathrm{~g}}\left(\sim x^{2}-y^{2}\right)$ levels upon the removal of the axial ligands.
(4) Although $f_{\sigma}$ is much higher than $f_{s}$ the latter parameter is, however, much more strongly dependent upon $R_{e q}$ than the former. The microscopic origin of this situation already found in $\mathrm{D}_{4 \mathrm{~h}}$ systems such as $\mathrm{NiF}_{6}^{5-}, \mathrm{NiF}_{4}^{3-}$ and $\mathrm{CuF}_{6}^{4-}$ and also in $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{h}}$ complexes such as $\mathrm{MnF}_{6}^{4-}$ is discussed in [30]. It allows one to detect $R_{\text {eq }}$ changes through the corresponding variations in the isotropic superhyperfine constant $A_{5}$. For $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$, taking as a first approximation $A_{\mathrm{s}} \propto f_{\mathrm{s}}$, a $\Delta A_{\mathrm{s}}$ of about 0.5 G is expected if $\Delta R_{\text {eq }}=1 \mathrm{pm}$ provided that $f_{\mathrm{s}} \propto R_{\mathrm{eq}}^{-7}$ and $A_{\mathrm{s}}$ is about 15 G as derived from the analysis of experimental data. When it is borne in mind that the differences between the experimental superhyperfine tensors of $\mathrm{LiCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ and $\mathrm{RbCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ determined through EPR [15] involve errors of $\pm 4 \mathrm{G}$, the detection of variations $\Delta R_{\mathrm{eq}} \simeq 1 \mathrm{pm}$ for $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ would require the use of the ENDOR technique.

When comparing exponents $n_{\mathrm{ax}}$ and $n_{\mathrm{eq}}$ for $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ and $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ complexes, table 7 reveals that they are very similar for both complexes in spite of the different compositions of their electronic levels. Therefore, in the case of $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ a change of 1 pm in $R_{\text {eq }}$ would produce variations in $\delta_{1}, \Delta_{1}$ and $\Delta_{3}$ all of which are close to $400 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. This situation would be different from that existing for other more ionic systems such as $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}, \mathrm{NiF}_{6}^{5-}$ or $\mathrm{MnF}_{6}^{4-}$. In these cases if we designate by $E$ the energy of a given transition, $\partial E / \partial R_{\text {eq }}$ is clearly higher for charge-transfer transitions $\delta_{1}$ or $\delta_{2}$ than for the crystal-field transitions $\Delta_{1}$ or $\Delta_{2}$. Taking as a guide the case of $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$, table 7 indicates that, if $R_{\mathrm{eq}}$ is changed by 1 pm , the corresponding changes for $\Delta_{1}$ and $\delta_{1}$ would be equal to about $250 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ and
$600 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$, respectively, because $\delta_{1} / \Delta_{1}$ is about 3. Experimental evidence for the different sensitivities of charge-transfer and crystal-field transitions to $R_{\text {eq }}$ changes in the case of complexes with low or moderate covalences has recently been reported [51].

## 4. Conclusions

In conclusion we believe that the present calculations help in a better understanding of optical transitions displayed by $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ as well as the crystal-field transitions of compounds involving $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ units.

In particular the position of charge-transfer transitions for $\mathrm{KCl}: \mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ is reasonably accounted for through both types of calculation such as was found previously for other $d^{9}$ systems $[7,8,11,30]$. The present work stresses the strong hybridization existing between $4 d$ levels of $\mathrm{Ag}^{2+}$ and $3 p$ levels of axial and equatorial chlorine atoms in the case of the very covalent $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$ unit. Because of this a description in terms of antibonding (bonding) levels as being mainly d (mainly p ligand) appears to meaningless for $\mathrm{AgCl}_{6}^{4-}$.

In the case of $\mathrm{AgBr}_{6}^{4-}$ it is expected that an unpaired electron still more delocalized appears on ligands ( $4 f_{\sigma}>70 \%$ ) in view of the smaller electronegativity of bromine. Calculations for this system are planned in the near future.

Because of the scarcity of optical data for system involving $\mathrm{AgX}_{6}^{4-}$ units $(\mathrm{X} \equiv \mathrm{F}$ or Cl ), more experimental data in different host lattices are required to check the conclusions reached in this work. In particular we think that the possible existence of intense chargetransfer transitions in the UV region for systems containing $\mathrm{AgF}_{6}^{4-}$ units certainly deserves further investigation.
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