

Ab initio CI Study of the Ground and Excited States of CuF₂ and CuCl₂

Tae-Kyu Ha

Laboratory of Physical Chemistry, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, Switzerland

and Minh Tho Nguyen

Department of Chemistry, University of Leuven, B-3030 Heverlee, Belgium

Z. Naturforsch. **39a**, 175–178 (1984); received December 13, 1983

Ab initio configuration interaction (CI) calculations of the ground, electronically excited and the ionized states (cations) are reported for CuF₂ and CuCl₂. The calculated results are compared with available experimental values of the UV spectrum of CuCl₂ and the ionization potentials obtained from the photoelectron spectrum of CuF₂.

1. Introduction

The linear copper halides, CuF₂ and CuCl₂ are of interest since these molecules represent the simplest copper (II) complexes whose electronic properties and stereochemistry have been reviewed extensively [1]. While it is established from various experimental and theoretical studies that the ground state of both CuF₂ and CuCl₂ is a $^2\Sigma_g^+$ state, the relative ordering of the lower lying electronically excited states and the interpretation of the UV and photoelectron spectra are of some controversy [2–5]. For CuF₂, the photoelectron spectra have recently been reported, but again the interpretation of nine peaks observed in the ionization energy region between 11.0 and 21.0 eV has not been satisfactory in a previous study [6]. In view of these discrepancies in previous experimental and also in theoretical studies which are mostly ab initio SCF calculations without or with a very limited configuration interaction (CI), we have performed an extensive CI calculation for the ground and electronically excited states of CuF₂ and CuCl₂ in order to clarify the existing controversy.

2. Calculation

Ab initio SCF calculations which precede the CI study employed the gaussian type orbital basis sets

of Basch et al. [7], which correspond to a single zeta quality for the core orbital and to a double zeta quality for the valence shell orbitals of Cu. For fluorine we employed Huzinaga's (9s, 5p) set [8] contracted to a double zeta (4s, 2p) according to Dunning's scheme [9], and for chlorine the Dunning's (12s, 9p/6s, 5p) contraction [10] of Veillard's gaussian basis set [11] has been employed. The spin-restricted open-shell SCF calculation has first been carried out for five states of interest for CuF₂ and CuCl₂ [12]: $^2\Sigma_g^+$, $^2\Sigma_u^+$, $^2\Pi_u$, $^2\Pi_g$ and $^2\Delta_g$. The ground state ($^2\Sigma_g^+$) of CuF₂ and CuCl₂ exhibited the following configurations, respectively:

$$(6\sigma_g)^2(1\delta_g)^4(7\sigma_g)^1(2\pi_g)^4(5\sigma_u)^2(3\pi_u)^4 \text{ for CuF}_2$$

and

$$(8\sigma_g)^2(1\delta_g)^4(9\sigma_g)^1(7\sigma_u)^2(4\pi_u)^4(3\pi_g)^4 \text{ for CuCl}_2.$$

The corresponding configurations of electronically excited states have also been generated separately by SCF calculations, and these have been employed as reference configurations for the following CI calculations of electronic states for each molecule.

The geometrical parameters of linear CuF₂ and CuCl₂ are $r(\text{Cu}-\text{F}) = 1.759 \text{ \AA}$ [13] and $r(\text{Cu}-\text{Cl}) = 2.020 \text{ \AA}$ [14], which are theoretically optimized values in previous studies.

In addition to the excited doublet states mentioned above, the cationic states which result from the ionization of CuF₂ and CuCl₂ have also been calculated by the open-shell SCF method. These ionized states are either singlet or triplet states of $^{1,3}\Sigma_g^+$, $^{1,3}\Sigma_u^+$, $^{1,3}\Pi_u$, $^{1,3}\Pi_g$ and $^{1,3}\Delta_g$.

Reprint requests to PD Dr. T.-K. Ha, Laboratory of Physical Chemistry, Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Universitätsstrasse 22, 8092 Zürich, Schweiz.

0340-4811 / 84 / 0200-0175 \$ 01.3 0/0. – Please order a reprint rather than making your own copy.



Dieses Werk wurde im Jahr 2013 vom Verlag Zeitschrift für Naturforschung in Zusammenarbeit mit der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft zur Förderung der Wissenschaften e.V. digitalisiert und unter folgender Lizenz veröffentlicht: Creative Commons Namensnennung-Keine Bearbeitung 3.0 Deutschland Lizenz.

Zum 01.01.2015 ist eine Anpassung der Lizenzbedingungen (Entfall der Creative Commons Lizenzbedingung „Keine Bearbeitung“) beabsichtigt, um eine Nachnutzung auch im Rahmen zukünftiger wissenschaftlicher Nutzungsformen zu ermöglichen.

This work has been digitalized and published in 2013 by Verlag Zeitschrift für Naturforschung in cooperation with the Max Planck Society for the Advancement of Science under a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs 3.0 Germany License.

On 01.01.2015 it is planned to change the License Conditions (the removal of the Creative Commons License condition "no derivative works"). This is to allow reuse in the area of future scientific usage.

Table 1. Energies of the CI wavefunctions of the ground and excited states of CuF₂ and CuCl₂^a.

Electronic states and reference configurations	E (CI) ^b	ΔE (CI–SCF)	ΔE_p (kept) ^c	ΔE_p (not kept) ^c
CuF₂				
$^2\Sigma_g^+ \dots (7 \sigma_g)^1$	–0.63150 (1971)	–0.38694	–0.53037	–0.01446
$^2\Sigma_u^+ \dots (5 \sigma_u)^1$	–0.44306 (2299)	–0.43337	–0.65637	–0.01448
$^2\Pi_u \dots (3 \pi_u)^1$	–0.44669 (2305)	–0.43663	–0.66347	–0.01457
$^2\Pi_g \dots (2 \pi_g)^1$	–0.60917 (2420)	–0.38591	–0.52950	–0.01659
$^2A_g \dots (1 \delta_g)^1$	–0.58428 (2159)	–0.38378	–0.52673	–0.01409
CuCl₂				
$^2\Sigma_g^+ \dots (9 \sigma_g)^1$	–0.48285 (1360)	–0.23801	–0.31557	–0.00751
$^2\Sigma_u^+ \dots (7 \sigma_u)^1$	–0.39660 (2021)	–0.28431	–0.39864	–0.00919
$^2\Pi_u \dots (4 \pi_u)^1$	–0.40331 (2029)	–0.28609	–0.40459	–0.00876
$^2\Pi_g \dots (3 \pi_g)^1$	–0.47500 (2064)	–0.23714	–0.32371	–0.00994
$^2A_g \dots (1 \delta_g)^1$	–0.46456 (1701)	–0.23844	–0.31131	–0.00903

^a Atomic units. References CI energy: –1836.0 a.u. (CuF₂) and –2556.0 a.u. (CuCl₂).^b Values in parentheses are the dimension of the CI wavefunctions.^c Energy portions retained or discarded (see text for a detail).

A CI calculation has been carried out for each state of interest using the above mentioned reference configurations. As orbitals of variable occupancy in the CI calculation, we adopted 32 and 31 valence orbitals for CuF₂ and CuCl₂, respectively. The 7 or 16 lowest lying orbitals are assumed to form a frozen core and were kept fixed. All configurations derived from single and double excitations from each reference configuration which lie within an energy threshold of 10^{-5} a.u. were included in the CI calculation. Within the truncation of the MO bases and the perturbation threshold, the dimension of the CI wavefunction was 1971 for CuF₂ and 1360 for CuCl₂ in their $^2\Sigma_g^+$ ground state.

The energies of the CI wavefunction and the energy decreases with respect to the SCF energies of the reference configurations are summarized in Table 1. The ΔE_p values refer to portions of energy retained (ΔE_p (kept)) or discarded (ΔE_p (not kept)) by the second-order perturbation theory with the energy threshold of 10^{-5} a.u. It may be noted that the ΔE_p (not kept) value is only less than 3% of the ΔE_p (kept) value in all states considered in this study.

3. Results and Discussion

In Table 2 the calculated excitation energies and oscillator strengths obtained from the CI calcula-

Table 2. A summary of the calculated excited energies and oscillator strengths (f) of CuF₂ and CuCl₂^a.

Electronic states	ΔE (CI)		f^b
	eV	cm ⁻¹	

CuF₂			
$^2\Sigma_g^+$ (ground state)			
$^2\Sigma_u^+$	5.13	41 377	0.161 (x)
$^2\Pi_u^+$	5.03	40 571	0.038 (y, z)
$^2\Pi_g$	0.61	4 920	0.0
2A_g	1.28	10 324	0.0

CuCl₂			
$^2\Sigma_g^+$ (ground state)			
$^2\Sigma_u^+$	2.35	18 955	0.281 (x)
$^2\Pi_u$	2.16	17 422	0.001 (y, z)
$^2\Pi_g$	0.21	1 694	0.0
2A_g	0.50	4 033	0.0

^a The molecule lies in the x-axis.^b The oscillator strengths have been calculated by $f = \frac{2}{3} |t|^2 \Delta E$, where t and ΔE are the transition moment and transition energy.

tions are summarized. The first excited state in both molecules is shown as a $^2\Pi_g$ state which lies 0.61 eV and 0.21 eV above the $^2\Sigma_g^+$ ground state of CuF₂ and CuCl₂, respectively. The relative ordering of the electronic states in both molecules turned out to be the same with $^2\Sigma_g^+ < ^2\Pi_g < ^2A_g < ^2\Pi_u < ^2\Sigma_u^+$. This same ordering of states has also been recently

reported by de Mello et al. [15], who summarized other previous ab initio and semiempirical MO studies in addition to their own calculations. The first two transitions, ${}^2\Pi_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and ${}^2\Delta_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ with excitation energies 4920 cm⁻¹ and 10 324 cm⁻¹ in CuF₂ are dipole forbidden. On the other hand, the dipole allowed transitions, ${}^2\Pi_u \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and ${}^2\Sigma_u^+ \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ with calculated transition energies 40 571 and 41 377 cm⁻¹ carry appreciable amounts of oscillator strength (*f*) of 0.038 (*y*) and 0.161 (*y*). Comparing these results with previous ab initio SCF and semiempirical MO studies [15], [16], the two dipole allowed transitions ${}^2\Pi_u \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and ${}^2\Sigma_u^+ \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ have significantly higher transition energies (> 52 000 cm⁻¹) in all levels of calculations in the previous study, even though the energy differences between the ${}^2\Pi_u$ and ${}^2\Sigma_u^+$ states seem to agree with each other. The energy difference between these two states amounts to less than 1000 cm⁻¹. There are no experimental UV spectra in the gas phase available as yet to compare with these calculated values.

The first two excitations in CuCl₂ are similarly the ${}^2\Pi_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and ${}^2\Delta_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transitions with excitation energies of 1694 and 4033 cm⁻¹, which are dipole forbidden. The dipole allowed transitions ${}^2\Pi_u \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and ${}^2\Sigma_u^+ \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ with transition energies of 17 422 and 18 955 cm⁻¹ carry *f* values of 0.001 (*y*) and 0.281 (*x*), respectively. Unlike for CuF₂, the optical spectra of the gas phase CuCl₂ have been reported previously [3]. The UV spectrum is characterized by two absorption bands with maxima at 9000 cm⁻¹ and 19 000 cm⁻¹. As to the assignments of these UV bands, there has been some controversy in the literature. Hougen et al. [2] and Smith [14] proposed that both bands are due to the ${}^2\Pi_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ (9000 cm⁻¹) and ${}^2\Delta_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ (19 000 cm⁻¹). DeKock and Gruen [3] and Lever and Hollebone [5] proposed, however, that the 9000 cm⁻¹ band should be due to ${}^2\Delta_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and the ${}^2\Pi_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transition would lie below 5000 cm⁻¹. Garner et al. [16] proposed that the 19 000 cm⁻¹ band was due to the ${}^2\Pi_u \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transition and the 9000 cm⁻¹ band corresponds to the ${}^2\Delta_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transition. Finally, de Mello et al. [15] recently proposed that the band observed at 19 000 cm⁻¹ may be assigned to the ${}^2\Pi_u \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and ${}^2\Sigma_u^+ \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transitions and that the band observed at 9000 cm⁻¹ is due to a combination of ${}^2\Pi_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and ${}^2\Delta_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transitions.

The proposals made by Garner et al. [16] and de Mello et al. [15] as to the assignment of the 19 000 cm⁻¹ band are qualitatively confirmed by the present CI calculation in that the ${}^2\Sigma_u^+$, ${}^2\Pi_u \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transitions are responsible for this band.

However, as shown in Table 2, the oscillator strength of the ${}^2\Sigma_u^+ \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transition (*f* = 0.281) is much larger than that of ${}^2\Pi_u \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ and therefore the ${}^2\Sigma_u^+ \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$ transition is believed to be essentially responsible for this band. As proposed by de Mello et al. [15], the lower lying 9000 cm⁻¹ band is confirmed as the combination of the two transitions, ${}^2\Pi_g$, ${}^2\Delta_g \leftarrow {}^2\Sigma_g^+$. These dipole forbidden transitions may become allowed through a slight deviation from the *D_{∞h}* symmetry.

The calculated ionization potentials of CuF₂ and CuCl₂ are summarized in Table 3. Among other things, it is shown that the energy gap of the resulting singlet and triplet cationic states of each symmetry is very small. While there is no experimental photoelectron spectrum (PES) available for

Table 3. Energies of the CI wavefunctions of the cationic states of CuF₂ and CuCl₂^a.

Electronic states	<i>E</i> (CI)	<i>E</i> (CI–SCF)	IP (CI) ^b
CuF₂⁺			
${}^1\Sigma_g^+$	–0.10097	–0.46688	14.44 (14.32)
${}^3\Sigma_u^+$	–0.07497	–0.39218	15.02 (14.74)
${}^1\Sigma_u^+$	–0.07854	–0.39091	15.05
${}^3\Pi_u$	–0.12782	–0.39959	13.71 (13.86)
${}^1\Pi_u$	–0.12324	–0.39840	13.83
${}^3\Pi_g$	–0.14067	–0.40126	13.36 (13.18)
${}^1\Pi_g$	–0.13792	–0.40066	13.43
${}^3\Delta_g$	–0.06975	–0.39282	15.29 (15.36)
${}^1\Delta_g$	–0.05885	–0.39049	15.58
CuCl₂⁺			
${}^3\Sigma_u^+$	–1.03413	–0.23662	12.48
${}^1\Sigma_u^+$	–1.03176	–0.23553	12.55
${}^3\Pi_u$	–1.05616	–0.25868	11.88
${}^1\Pi_u$	–1.05328	–0.25817	11.96
${}^3\Pi_g$	–1.07003	–0.26078	11.50
${}^1\Pi_g$	–1.06622	–0.26001	11.61
${}^3\Delta_g$	–0.96893	–0.24775	14.26

^a Atomic units. References CI energy: –1836.0 a.u. (CuF₂) and –2555.0 a.u. (CuCl₂).

^b Ionization potential obtained from the CI energies of the ground state (${}^2\Sigma_g^+$) and the cationic states of CuF₂ and CuCl₂ in eV. Values in parentheses are the experimental values of [6].

CuCl₂, the experimental PES values of Dyke et al. [6] for CuF₂ may be compared with our CI results. Experimentally, nine bands were observed in the I.P. range from 11.0 to 21.0 eV. The lowest IP of CuF₂ is calculated to be 13.36 and 13.43 eV for the $^3,1\Pi_g \leftarrow ^2\Sigma_g^+$ ionization, which is in excellent agreement with the experimental value of 13.18 eV. The first five bands observed in the experiment may be assigned as $^3,1\Pi_g$, $^3,1\Pi_u$, $^1\Sigma_g^+$, $^3,1\Sigma_u^+$ and $^3,1\Delta_g$. The calculated and experimental values are compared with each other in Table 3. Since the calculated singlet and triplet energy separations are too small, it is not possible to say whether the resulting cationic states are due to singlet or triplet states. As shown in Table 3, the ordering of the IP's for CuCl₂ turned out to be similar to that of CuF₂, the lowest PES band also being the $^3,1\Pi_g \leftarrow ^2\Sigma_g^+$ ionization with 11.50 eV.

Some molecular properties for the ground state ($^2\Sigma_g^+$) of CuF₂ and CuCl₂ obtained from the CI wavefunctions are listed in Table 4. They include the second moment, the electric potential, electric field gradient and the spin densities for Cu, F and Cl. Of interest is the nuclear quadrupole coupling constant of ⁶³Cu in both molecules, since there are experimental values available [17]. The NQR frequencies of CuF₂ and CuCl₂ are reported to be 58.34 and 37.78 MHz, respectively. The calculated electric field gradients (*q*) at ⁶³Cu of −1.4816 and −1.0724 a.u. for CuF₂ and CuCl₂ are in good agree-

Table 4. Molecular properties for the ground state ($^2\Sigma_g^+$) of CuF₂ and CuCl₂.

	CuF ₂	CuCl ₂
$\langle r^{-2} \rangle^a$	−44.0791	−54.9992
$\langle 1/r^2 \rangle$	−19.6403	−37.3038
$\langle r^2 \rangle$	−83.3596	−139.5463
$\langle 1/r \rangle$ (Cu) ^b	−134.6673	−134.6374
$\langle 1/r \rangle$ (F, Cl)	−26.6262	−64.4176
$q3z^2 - r^2$ (Cu) ^c	−1.4816	−1.0724
$q3z^2 - r^2$ (F, Cl)	−0.6064	−0.8704
<i>q</i> (Cu) ^d	0.8704	0.9402
<i>q</i> (F, Cl)	0.0198	0.0060

^a Second moment in Buckingham units.

^b Electric potential at nucleus in a.u.

^c Electric field gradient in a.u.

^d Spin density in a.u.

ment with the NQR values. Also, the calculated eQ*q* value for ¹⁹F in CuF₂ of 20.3 MHz may be compared with a recent NQR value of 19.9 MHz [18]. The calculated spin density of Cu in CuCl₂ is slightly larger (0.9402 a.u.) than in CuF₂ (0.9704 a.u.), while the spin density of Cl in CuCl₂ (0.006 a.u.) is much smaller than that of F in CuF₂. It may thus be concluded that the unpaired electron in CuF₂ and CuCl₂ is localized almost totally in the copper atom, which is in agreement with previous EPR study of Kasai et al. [9].

- [1] B. J. Hathaway and D. E. Billing, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **5**, 143 (1970); D. W. Smith, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **21**, 93 (1976).
- [2] J. T. Hougen, G. E. Leroi, and T. C. James, *J. Chem. Phys.* **34**, 1670 (1961).
- [3] C. W. DeKock and D. M. Gruen, *J. Chem. Phys.* **44**, 4387 (1966).
- [4] D. W. Smith, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **5**, 231 (1971).
- [5] A. B. P. Lever and B. R. Hollebone, *Inorg. Chem.* **11**, 2183 (1972).
- [6] J. M. Dyke, N. K. Payad, G. D. Josland, and A. Morris, *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday II* **76**, 1672 (1980).
- [7] H. Basch, C. J. Hornback, and J. W. Moskowitz, *J. Chem. Phys.* **51**, 1311 (1969).
- [8] S. Huzinaga, *J. Chem. Phys.* **42**, 1293 (1965).
- [9] T. H. Dunning Jr., *J. Chem. Phys.* **53**, 2823 (1970).
- [10] T. H. Dunning Jr., *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **7**, 423 (1970).
- [11] A. Veillard, *Theor. Chim. Acta* **12**, 405 (1968).
- [12] E. R. Davidson and L. Z. Stenkamp, *Intern. J. Quantum Chem. Symp.* **10**, 21 (1976).
- [13] H. Basch, C. Hollister, and J. W. Moskowitz, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **4**, 79 (1969).
- [14] D. W. Smith, *Inorg. Chim. Acta* **22**, 107 (1977).
- [15] P. C. de Mello, M. Hehenberger, S. Larson, and M. Zerner, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.* **102**, 1278 (1980).
- [16] C. D. Garner, I. H. Hiller, and C. Wood, *Inorg. Chem.* **17**, 169 (1978).
- [17] T. J. Bastow, I. D. Campell, and H. J. Whitfield, *Solid State Comm.* **33**, 399 (1980).
- [18] H. Baefuss, G. Boehnlein, H. Hohenstein, W. Kreische, M. Meinhold, H. Niedrig, and K. Reuter, *J. Mol. Struct.* **58**, 503 (1980).
- [19] P. Kasai, E. P. Whipple, and W. Weltner, *J. Chem. Phys.* **44**, 2581 (1966).