if the appropriate force constants from the valence force field for methanol reported by Margottin-Maclou<sup>11</sup> are transferred, then the qualitative results of our calculations are retained. Finally, the conformational dependence of R provides a ready explanation for the observed discrepancy of 20 cm<sup>-1</sup> between the CD and absorption maxima, namely, that the CD band is a population weighted sum of conformer contributions.

The calculations for II were done twice with two different force fields. For both fields the diagonal force constants for the *tert*-butyl groups were transferred from the alkane force field of Schachtschneider and Snyder<sup>12</sup> (S–S). However, the diagonal and offdiagonal force constants for the CHDCl end of the molecule were taken in the first instance from the alkyl chloride field of  $(S-S)^{13}$  and in the second instance from the ethyl chloride field of Dempster and Zerbi<sup>14</sup> (D–Z). The resultant two fields will be denoted, respectively, as the (S-S)-(S-S) field and the (S-S)-(D-Z) field.

As shown in Table II, the two fields give somewhat

Table II.Rotational and Dipole Strengths for(R)-(-)-Neopentyl-I-d-Chloride

	Force field	ν̄ (cm <sup>-1</sup> )	R (esu cm) <sup>2</sup>	D (esu cm) <sup>2</sup>
Obsd Calcd	(S-S)-(S-S) (S-S)-(D-Z)	2204 2202 2204	$\begin{array}{r} -2 \times 10^{-45} \\ -4.0 \times 10^{-46} \\ -1.0 \times 10^{-45} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.0 \times 10^{-39} \\ 1.2 \times 10^{-39} \\ 1.2 \times 10^{-39} \\ 1.2 \times 10^{-39} \end{array}$

different results, with the (S-S)-(D-Z) field predicting an R value more nearly in accord with experiment. This, despite the fact that the two fields predict frequencies for the C\*-D stretching mode that differ by only 2 cm<sup>-1</sup>. The superiority of the (D–Z) ethyl chloride field for the present purposes is probably related to the fact that it was fit to several *deuterated* isomers of ethyl chloride, while the (S-S) alkyl chloride field was fit to a series of undeuterated n-alkyl chlorides. However, the important inferences to be drawn are: (1) the sensitivity of the calculated R values to the precise choice of force constants when dealing with relatively small rotational strengths (cf. the R values for I and II) and (2) the potential utility of vibrational optical activity data as additional criteria in the selection and determination of vibrational force constants.

Some further conclusions can be tentatively drawn from the above results. First, within limits, the point charge model can probably be used in a semiempirical way to make reasonable estimates of vibrational electric dipole transition moments. However, as the calculated R values are low, by an order of magnitude in the case of I, it seems that the model may fail as regards magnetic dipole transition moments. This is in accord with the discussion of Schellman,<sup>2</sup> who anticipated possible underestimation of magnetic dipole transition moments by the point charge model.

Acknowledgment. We wish to thank the University of Minnesota Computer Center for a generous grant of computer time, the National Science Foundation for its

(12) J. H. Schachtschneider and R. G. Snyder, Spectrochim. Acta, 19, 117 (1963).

(13) R. G. Snyder and J. H. Schachtschneider, J. Mol. Spectrosc., 30, 290 (1965).

(14) A. B. Dempster and G. Zerbi, J. Mol. Spectrosc., 39, 1 (1971).



Figure 1. Molecular geometries and atomic charges (units of  $e = 4.80 \times 10^{-10}$  esu).

support *via* Grants GP-8566 and GP-27448, and the National Institutes of Health for a Research Career Development Award to G. H.

Thomas R. Faulkner, Albert Moscowitz\* Department of Chemistry, University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

G. Holzwarth, Edward C. Hsu

Departments of Biophysics and Chemistry, University of Chicago Chicago, Illinois 60637

> Harry S. Mosher Department of Chemistry, Stanford University Stanford, California 94305 Received September 18, 1973

## MINDO/3 Study of the Electronic States of Methylene<sup>1</sup>

## Sir:

While the ground state of methylene is  $known^2$  to be a triplet, the separation of this from the lowest singlet has been a matter of controversy. Earlier calculations<sup>2-9</sup> had led to values in the range 25-40 kcal/mol, in agreement with an admittedly uncertain estimate (38 kcal/mol) from electron impact work.<sup>10</sup> On the

(1) This work was supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research through Contract F44620-71-C-0119 and the Robert A. Welch Foundation through Grant No. F-126.

(2) The final proof was provided by esr studies: E. Wasserman, V. J. Kuck, R. S. Hutton, and W. A. Yager, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 92, 7491 (1970); R. A. Bernheim, H. W. Bernard, P. S. Wang, L. S. Wood, and P. S. Skell, J. Chem. Phys., 53, 1280 (1970).

(3) J. F. Harrison and L. C. Allen, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 91, 807 (1969).

(4) C. F. Bender and H. F. Schaeffer, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 92, 4984 (1970).

(5) W. A. Lathan, W. J. Hehre, and J. A. Pople, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 93, 808 (1971); W. A. Lathan, W. J. Hehre, L. A. Curtiss, and J. A. Pople, *ibid.*, 93, 6377 (1971).

(6) J. F. Harrison, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 93, 4112 (1971).

(7) J. E. Del Bene, Chem. Phys. Lett., 9, 68 (1971).

(8) S. V. O'Neil, H. F. Schaefer, and C. F. Bender, J. Chem. Phys., 55, 162 (1971).

(9) N. Bodor, M. J. S. Dewar, and J. S. Wasson, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 94, 9095 (1972).

(10) F. Field and J. A. Franklin, "Electron Impact Phenomena," Academic Press, New York, N. Y., 1957, p 117.

<sup>(11)</sup> M. Margottin-Maclou, J. Phys. Radium, 20, 634 (1960).

State	Property	Experiment	MINDO/3	MINDO/2ª	Ab initio SCF	"Best" correlated ab initio SCF <sup>b</sup>
S <sub>0</sub>	$\Delta H_{\rm f}^{c}$	101 <sup>d</sup>	100.2	95.8	<u></u>	
	<i>г</i> св, Å	1.12"	1.12	1.0971	1.100,° 1.133 <sup>h</sup>	1.125
	HCH angle, deg	103.2*	100.2	107	105.4, <sup>g</sup> 104.4, <sup>h</sup> 108, <sup>i</sup> 105, <sup>i</sup> 100, <sup>k</sup> 105 <sup>i</sup>	101.0
T <sub>1</sub>	$\Delta H_{\mathbf{f}}^{c}$	$93.9 \pm 0.7,^{m}$ $91.9 \pm 1,^{n}$ $<95.5^{\circ}$	91.5	67.5		
	r <sub>сн</sub> , Å	1.078 <sup>p</sup>	1.078	1.062	$1.069^{g}$ $1.095^{h}$ $1.096^{q}$	
	HCH angle, deg	136 <sup>p</sup> , <sup>r</sup>	134.1	142	132, ° 133.3, <sup>h</sup> 138, <sup>i</sup> 132.5, <sup>i</sup> 130, <sup>k</sup> 135 <sup>i</sup>	134
$S_1$	$\Delta H_{\rm f}{}^c$		125.0	<b>97</b> .0		
	rcn, Å	$1.05^{p}$	1.078	1.0501	1.092 <sup>h</sup>	
	HCH angle, deg	$140 \pm 15^{p}$	141.7	180	143.8, <sup>h</sup> 148, <sup>i</sup> 180, <sup>j</sup> 135 <sup>i</sup>	
<b>S</b> <sub>0</sub> , <b>T</b> <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>0</sub> -T <sub>1</sub> <sup>s</sup>	8,t 9 <sup>d</sup>	8.7	28.3	37, <sup>g</sup> 22, <sup>h</sup> 33, <sup>i</sup> 25, <sup>j</sup> 20.3, <sup>k</sup> 11.5 <sup>l</sup>	$11.0 \pm 2$

<sup>a</sup> See ref 9. <sup>b</sup> See ref 15. <sup>c</sup> Heat of formation (kcal/mol). <sup>d</sup> W. L. Hase, R. J. Phillips, and J. W. Simons, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **12**, 161 (1971). <sup>e</sup> G. Herzberg, *Proc. Roy. Soc., Ser. A*, **262**, 291 (1961). <sup>f</sup> Corrected value; see ref 9. <sup>g</sup> See ref 5. <sup>h</sup> See ref 8. <sup>i</sup> See ref 3. <sup>i</sup> See ref 6. <sup>k</sup> See ref 13. <sup>l</sup> See ref 14. <sup>m</sup> V. H. Dibeler, M. Krauss, R. M. Reese, and F. N. Harllee, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **42**, 3791 (1965). <sup>n</sup> W. A. Chupka and C. Lifshitz, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **48**, 1109 (1968). <sup>o</sup> W. A. Chupka, J. Berkowitz, and K. M. A. Refaey, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **50**, 1938 (1969). <sup>p</sup> G. Herzberg and J. W. C. Johns, *J. Chem. Phys.*, **54**, 2276 (1971); *Proc. Roy. Soc., Ser. A*, **295**, 107 (1966); G. Herzberg, "Electronic Spectra and Electronic Structure of Polyatomic Molecules," Van Nostrand, Princeton, N. J., 1966, pp 491, 584. <sup>g</sup> See ref 4. <sup>r</sup> See ref 2. <sup>s</sup> Singlet-triplet separation (kcal/mol). <sup>t</sup> H. M. Frey, *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.*, 1024 (1972).



Figure 1. Plot of calculated (MINDO/3) heat of formation  $(\Delta H_t)$ vs. HCH bond angle for the S<sub>0</sub> (O), S<sub>1</sub> ( $\Delta$ ), and T<sub>1</sub> ( $\Box$ ) states of CH<sub>2</sub>. Values ( $\bullet$ ) are also given for S<sub>1</sub> including CI with the lowest doubly excited configuration.

other hand recent photochemical studies have implied a very small singlet-triplet separation  $(1-2^{11} \text{ and } 2.5^{12} \text{ kcal/mol})$  and three very recent and very detailed *ab initio* SCF calculations<sup>13-15</sup> have led to intermediate

(11) R. W. Carr, T. W. Eder, and M. G. Topor, J. Chem. Phys., 53, 4716 (1970).

(12) M. L. Halberstadt and J. R. McNesby, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 89, 3417 (1967).

(13) S. Y. Chu, A. K. Q. Siu, and E. F. Hayes, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 94, 2969 (1972).

values (20,<sup>13</sup> 11.5,<sup>14</sup> and 11.0  $\pm$  2<sup>15</sup> kcal/mol). Recent experimental work has given estimates of the heats of formation of singlet and triplet methylene (Table I) which lead to a singlet-triplet separation (8-9 kcal/mol) in reasonable agreement with the results of the latest<sup>14,15</sup> and apparently most reliable of the *ab initio* calculations.

An improved version of the MINDO method (MINDO/3<sup>16,17</sup>) has now been developed in these laboratories. This appears to avoid the systematic errors present in MINDO/2. We have used this to study methylene, partly to check to the ability of MINDO/3 to deal with an unusual singlet species (*i.e.*, carbene) and partly to see if it would give a better estimate of the energy of the triplet than MINDO/2.<sup>9</sup> Calculations for the triplet were carried out as before by the "half-electron" method.<sup>21,22</sup>

The MINDO/3 results are compared with experiment and with the results of *ab initio* calculations in Table I. It will be seen that they agree well with experiment and with the results of the most recent and most detailed<sup>15</sup> *ab initio* calculation.

Figure 1 shows MINDO/3 estimates of the variation in the energies of the various states of  $CH_2$  with the bond angle. The results agree qualitatively with those from *ab initio* calculations; MINDO/3 naturally (*cf.* 

(14) P. J. Hay, W. J. Hunt, and W. A. Goddard III, Chem. Phys. Lett., 13, 30 (1972).

(15) C. F. Bender, H. F. Schaefer, D. R. Franceschetti, and L. C. Allen, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 94, 6888 (1972).

(16) R. C. Bingham, M. J. S. Dewar, and D. H. Lo, to be submitted for publication.

(17) MINDO/3 follows the original version<sup>18,19</sup> of MINDO/2, with two exceptions. First, the one-center integrals are estimated by Oleari's method; see Dewar and Lo.<sup>20</sup> Secondly, the Slater exponents for valence shell AOs are treated as parameters, different values being used for 2s and 2p AOs. These exponents appear only in the calculation of overlap integrals, used in the Mulliken approximation for the one-electron resonance integrals.<sup>18,19</sup>

(18) M. J. S. Dewar and E. Haselbach, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 92, 590 (1970).

(19) N. Bodor, M. J. S. Dewar, A. Harget, and E. Haselbach, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 92, 3854 (1970).
(20) M. J. S. Dewar and D. H. Lo, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 94, 5296

(20) M. J. S. Dewar and D. H. Lo, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., *J.*, 5256
 (1972).
 (21) M. J. S. Dewar, J. A. Hashmall, and C. G. Venier, *J. Amer.*

Chem. Soc., **90**, 1953 (1968). (22) M. J. S. Dewar and N. Trinajstic, J. Chem. Soc. A, 1220 (1971). ref 9) fails to reproduce the degeneracy of the  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  states in linear CH<sub>2</sub>. This difficulty can be removed by including CI with the lowest doubly excited configuration as is shown by the corresponding plot in the figure. Inclusion of such CI lowers the energy of normal molecules (*e.g.*, the  $S_0$  state of CH<sub>2</sub>, at equilibrium) by  $\sim 3$  kcal/mol. Since MINDO/3 is parametrized for single-determinant wave functions, CI should not be included except in cases when the HOMO and LUMO are degenerate or nearly degenerate. The  $S_0$ -T<sub>1</sub> separation should therefore be found from the single-determinant values, as in Table I.

We have also used MINDO/3 to study the  ${}^{3}\Sigma$  and  ${}^{1}\Delta$  states of O<sub>2</sub>. The results are compared with experiment in Table II. Here again the agreement is good for both states.

Table II. Calculated and Observed Properties of  ${}^{3}\Sigma$  and  ${}^{1}\Delta$  O<sub>2</sub>

	$\Delta H_{\rm f}$ , kcal/mol		Bond length, Å	
State	Calcd	Obsd	Calcd	Obsd
3Σ	-3.9	0	1.206	1.207°
$^{1}\Delta$	22.8	22.6ª	1.206	1.216ª

<sup>a</sup> G. Herzberg, "Molecular Spectra and Molecular Structure. I. Spectra of Diatomic Molecules," Van Nostrand, New York, N. Y., 1965.

These results suggest that the superiority of MINDO/3 over MINDO/2 may extend to triplet states and so provide a simple and convenient way to calculate their properties.

Michael J. S. Dewar,\* Robert C. Haddon, Paul K. Weiner Department of Chemistry, The University of Texas at Austin Austin, Texas 78712 Received July 2, 1973

## $\label{eq:MINDO/3} MINDO/3 \ Study \ of \ the \ Multiplicity \ of \ Cyclopentadienate \ Cations^1$

Sir:

We recently reported<sup>2</sup> MINDO/3<sup>3,4</sup> calculations for various possible geometries of the  $(CH)_{5}^{+}$  cation (1). The singlet state of lowest energy was found to be a distorted nonplanar form (2) of the cyclopentadienate cation. The MINDO/3 method has now been extended to triplet states, using the "half-electron" approximation,<sup>7</sup> and has been shown to give good results for the electronic states of methylene.<sup>6</sup> We have therefore carried out calculations for the triplet state of 1 and for the singlet and triplet states of the pentachloro derivative (3), (CCl)<sub>5</sub><sup>+</sup>, of 1.

(1) This work was supported by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research through Contract F44620-71-C-0119 and by the Robert A. Welch Foundation through Grant F-126.

(2) M. J. S. Dewar and R. C. Haddon, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 95, 5836 (1973).

(3) MINDO/3<sup>4</sup> is an improved version of the MINDO/2 semiempirical SCF treatment.<sup>6</sup> For a brief summary of the changes, see Dewar, Haddon, and Weiner.<sup>6</sup>

(4) R. C. Bingham, M. J. S. Dewar, and D. H. Lo, to be published.

(5) M. J. S. Dewar and E. Haselbach, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 92, 590 (1970); N. Bodor, M. J. S. Dewar, A. Harget, and E. Haselbach, *ibid.*, 92, 3854 (1972).

(6) M. J. S. Dewar, R. C. Haddon, and P. K. Weiner, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 96, 253 (1974).

(7) M. J. S. Dewar, J. A. Hashmall, and C. G. Venier, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., **90**, 1953 (1968); M. J. S. Dewar and N. Trinajstic, J. Chem. Soc. D, 646 (1970). We find 4 to be more stable than 2 by 1.6 kcal/mol. This is in agreement with recent epr work<sup>8</sup> which has shown that the cyclopentadienate cation has a triplet ground state. As one would expect, 4 is predicted to have a symmetrical pentagonal structure with the indicated bond lengths (Å).

The lowest singlet state of 3 is predicted to be planar, unlike that (2) of 1. The ring does, however, undergo Jahn-Teller distortion to two isomers 5 and 6, the latter being the more stable by 0.4 kcal/mol. The predicted bond lengths, shown (A) in 5 and 6, conform in an entertaining way to the indicated "localized" structures. Thus the CC bond lengths in 5 are close to the values for single, double, and allylic CC bonds while those in 6 alternate analogously. Likewise the CCl bonds at the end of the "allylic" system in 5 are short, as would be expected for such bonds in the 1,3 positions of an allyl cation, while the CCl bond adjacent to the "localized" positive charge in 6 is still shorter. The fact that the CCl bond at the "2-allylic" position in 5 is long can also be understood on this basis since the SCF method predicts a high electron density at the 2 position of an allyl cation.

The lowest energy state of 3 is again predicted to be a triplet (7), this lying 1.6 kcal/mol below 6. Breslow,



Hill, and Wasserman<sup>9</sup> showed that the pentachlorocyclopentadienate cation almost certainly has a triplet ground state.

The prediction that the singlet and triplet states of these ions are very close together in energy also seems likely to be correct, given that in the case of the pentaphenylcyclopentadienate cation the singlet is lower than the triplet by 0.5 kcal/mol.<sup>10</sup>

We have also calculated the zero field splitting parameter  $D^{11,12}$  for 4 and 7. In the ZDO approximation (such as INDO) and neglecting spin-orbit interactions

$$D = \sum_{i} \sum_{k} \{a_{\mu i}^{2} a_{\nu k}^{2} - a_{\mu i} a_{\nu i} a_{\mu k} a_{\mu k} \} \langle ii| (3g^{2} \beta_{e}^{2}/4) \times (r_{12}^{2} - 3z_{12}^{2}) r_{12}^{-5} | kk \rangle$$

where  $a_{\mu i}$  is the coefficient of the AO  $\phi_i$  in the MO  $\psi_{\mu}$ ,  $r_{12}$  is the distance between electron 1 occupying  $\psi_{\mu}$  and electron 2 occupying  $\psi_{\nu}$  and  $z_{12}$  the corresponding differ-

(11) E. Wasserman, L. C. Snyder, and W. A. Yager, J. Chem. Phys., 41, 1763 (1964).

(12) For symmetrical planar polygonal  $\pi$  systems such as 4 and 7 the parameter E vanishes.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>(8)</sup> M. Saunders, R. Berger, A. Jaffe, J. M. McBride, J. O'Neill, R. Breslow, J. M. Hoffman, Jr., C. Perchonock, E. Wasserman, R. S. Hutton, and V. J. Kuck, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 95, 3017 (1973).

<sup>(9)</sup> R. Breslow, R. Hill, and E. Wasserman, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 86, 5349 (1964).

<sup>(10)</sup> R. Breslow, H. W. Chang and W. A. Yager, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 85, 2033 (1963).