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## §1. Materials and Instrumentation

All synthetic procedures were carried out under an argon atmosphere using standard Schlenk technique. Cul ( $\geq 99 \%$, Sigma), $\left[\mathrm{Cu}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)_{4}\right] \mathrm{BF}_{4}$ ( $\geq 99 \%$, Acros), $n$-BuLi ( 2.5 M in hexanes, Sigma), 2-bromopyridine ( $\geq 99 \%$, Acros), silica gel 60 (Macherey-Nagel, $60 \AA$ pore size, $230-400$ mesh) were used as purchased. CuCl ( $\geq 99 \%$, Sigma) was additionally purified prior to use by subsequent washing with $\mathrm{HCl}_{\text {aq }}$, water and acetone, followed by drying under vacuum. CuBr was freshly synthesized by treatment of $\mathrm{CuBr}_{2}$ with Cu powder in MeCN solution. Dichlorophenylarsine ( $\mathrm{PhAsCl}_{2}$ ) was prepared according to literature procedure. ${ }^{[1]}$
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectra were recorded using a Bruker AV-500 spectrometer at 500.13 and 125.77 MHz respectively. Chemical shifts were reported in $\delta(\mathrm{ppm})$ relative to $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$.

FT-IR spectra were registered in KBr pellets on a Bruker Vertex 80 spectrometer at ambient temperature.

CHN microanalyses were performed on a MICRO cube analyzer.
Thermogravimetric analyses (TGA/c-DTA/DTG) were carried out in a closed $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ pan under argon flow at $10^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{min}^{-1}$ heating rate using a NETZSCH STA 449 F1 Jupiter STA.

Powder X-ray diffraction (PXRD) patterns were recorded on a Shimadzu XRD-7000 diffractometer (Cu$K \alpha$ radiation, $\mathrm{Ni}-$ filter, $3-35^{\circ} 2 \vartheta$ range, $0.03^{\circ} 2 \vartheta$ step, 5 s per point).

Steady state emission and excitation spectra were recorded on a Fluorolog 3 spectrometer (Horiba Jobin Yvon) equipped with a cooled PC177CE-010 photon detection module and an R2658 photomultiplier. The emission decays were recorded on the same instrument. The absolute PLQYs were determined at 300 K using a Fluorolog 3 Quanta-phi integrating sphere. The PLQYs at 77 K were obtained relative to those of the same samples at 300 K . Independently, the relative PLQYs were calibrated using the absolute PLQY values measured at 77 K . Temperature-dependent excitation and emission spectra as well as emission decays were recorded using an Optistat DN optical cryostat (Oxford Instruments) integrated with above spectrometer.

## §2. Synthetic procedures and characterization data

Bis(2-pyridyl)phenylarsine (AsPy ${ }_{2} \mathrm{Ph}$ )
Caution! These operations, which involve toxic phenyldichloroarsine ( $\mathrm{PhAsCl}_{2}$ ), must be conducted in an efficient hood!
n-BuLi ( 2.5 M in hexanes, $5.2 \mathrm{~mL}, 13 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added dropwise to a solution of 2-bromopyridine ( 2.05 g , $13 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF ( 30 mL ) at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, and the mixture was stirred at the same temperature for 1 h . To a resulting solution, $\mathrm{PhAsCl}_{2}(1.45 \mathrm{~g}, 6.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ in THF $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added dropwise at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min , and the mixture was warmed to ambient temperature and reached overnight. The reaction mixture was then quenched with water ( 20 mL ) and extracted with $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(3 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL})$. The organic phases were dried over $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}$, and concentrated under reduced pressure. The residue obtained was purified through silica column chromatography (hexane:EtOAc, $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}=1: 1$ ) to give pure product ( $0.378 \mathrm{~g}, 19 \%$ ) as a pale solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500.13 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, \mathrm{ppm}$ ), $\delta: 8.73$ (ddd, $J=4.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6}$ in Py), $7.58(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=$ $1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{4}$ in Py ), $7.52-7.49\left(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right.$ in Py$), 7.40-7.35(\mathrm{~m}, 3 \mathrm{H}, m-\mathrm{H}$ and $p-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph$), 7.32(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, J$ $=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, o-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph), 7.22 (ddd, $J=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=4.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{3}$ in Py). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{NMR}\left(125.77 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right.$, ppm) $\delta: 166.6,150.4,139.1,135.8,134.4,133.9,128.8,122.5$. Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{AsN}_{2}$ (308.21): C, 62.3; H, 4.3; N, 9.1. Found: C, 62.2; H, 4.2; N, 9.0.

The mixture of $\mathrm{CuCl}(12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}(37 \mathrm{mg}, 0.12 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred at room temperature for 30 min . The formed precipitate was centrifuged and dried in vacuum. White powder. Yield: $88 \mathrm{mg}(90 \%) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500.13 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, \mathrm{ppm}$ ), $\delta: 9.10\left(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=5.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6}\right.$ in Py), $8.38\left(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right.$ in Py$)$, $7.69-7.63(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, m-\mathrm{H}$ and $p-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph$), 7.47\left(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right.$ in Py), $7.17(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{o}-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph$), 7.12$ (d, $J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{3}$ in Py). FT-IR (KBr, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): $415(\mathrm{~m}), 457(\mathrm{w}), 478(\mathrm{~m}), 492(\mathrm{~m}), 615(\mathrm{w}), 635(\mathrm{w}), 671(\mathrm{w})$, 702 (m), 758 (s), 770 (s), 988 (w), 1007 (m), 1024 (w), 1047 (w), 1082 (m), 1123 (w), 1157 (w), 1188 (w), 1233 (vw), 1275 ( w ), 1281 ( w ), 1420 ( s$), 1449$ ( vs ), 1481 ( w$), 1537$ ( vw ), 1558 (m), 1578 (s), 1639 ( w$), 1919$ ( vw ), 2021 (vw), 2959 (w), 3032 (m), 3053 (m), 3073 (w), 3117 (vw). Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ (814.42): C, 47.2; H, 3.2; N, 6.9. Found: C, 47.1; H, 3.1; N, 6.8.

## $\left[\mathrm{Cu}_{2}\left(\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$ (2)

The mixture of $\mathrm{CuBr}(12 \mathrm{mg}, 0.083 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}(26 \mathrm{mg}, 0.084 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred at room temperature for 30 min . The formed precipitate was centrifuged and dried in vacuum. White powder. Yield: $69 \mathrm{mg}(92 \%) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500.13 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, \mathrm{ppm}$ ), $\delta: 9.17$ (d, $J=5.2 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6}$ in Py ), $8.40\left(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right.$ in Py), 7.69-7.63 (m, 6H, m-H and $p-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph$), 7.46\left(\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{J}=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right.$ in Py), $7.16(\mathrm{t}, J=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, o-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph$)$, 7.10 (d, J=7.9 Hz, 4H, H3 in Py). FT-IR (KBr, cm ${ }^{-1}$ ): $415(\mathrm{~m}), 457(\mathrm{w}), 476(\mathrm{~m}), 490(\mathrm{~s}), 617(\mathrm{w}), 635(\mathrm{w}), 669$ (w), 700 (m), 733 (m), 754 (s), 768 (s), 968 (vw), 988 (w), 1005 (m), 1024 (w), 1047 (w), 1080 (m), 1121 (w), 1155 (w), 1188 ( w ), 1231 (vw), 1275 ( w ), 1281 ( w ), 1420 ( s$), 1449$ (vs), 1479 (w), 1558 (m), 1578 (s), 1639 (w), 1917 (vw), 2016 (vw), 2957 (w), 3032 (m), 3051 (w), 3073 (w). Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ (903.32): C, 42.5; H, 2.9; N, 6.2. Found: C, 42.5; H, 3.0; N, 6.3.

## $\left[\mathrm{Cu}_{2}\left(\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}\right)_{2} 2_{2}\right]$ (3)

The mixture of Cul ( $25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.131 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and $\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}(40 \mathrm{mg}, 0.13 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred at room temperature for 30 min . The formed precipitate was centrifuged and dried in vacuum. White powder. Yield: $105 \mathrm{mg}(81 \%) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $500.13 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, \mathrm{ppm}$ ), $\delta: 9.24$ ( $\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{J}=5.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{6}$ in Py$), 8.37\left(\mathrm{~s}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{4}\right.$ in Py), $7.69-7.60(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}, m-\mathrm{H}$ and $p-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph$), 7.45\left(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{5}\right.$ in Py ), 7.15 (ddd, $J=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=5.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, o-\mathrm{H}$ in Ph), $7.08\left(\mathrm{dt}, J=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, J=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{H}^{3}\right.$ in Py). FT-IR (KBr, cm ${ }^{-1}$ ): 417 (w), 461 (w), 476 (m), 486 (s), 617 ( vw), 637 (w), 669 (vw), 700 (m), 745 (vs), 758 (vs), 781 (m), 964 (vw), 988 (w), 1007 (m), 1024 (w), 1049 (m), 1078 (m), 1117 (w), 1159 (m), 1186 (w), 1231 ( w$), 1269$ (w), 1315 (w), 1410 (s), 1420 (s), 1437 (s), 1449 (vs), 1483 (w), 1558 (s), 1578 (s), 1975 (vw), 3015 (w), 3048 (m). Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{I}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ (997.32): C, 38.5; H, 2.6; N, 5.6. Found: C, 38.3; H, 2.6; N, 5.5.
$\left[\mathrm{Cu}_{2}\left(\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}\right)_{2}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)_{2}\right]\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)_{2}(4)$
The mixture of $\left[\mathrm{Cu}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}\right)_{4}\right] \mathrm{BF}_{4}(25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.079 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}(25 \mathrm{mg}, 0.081 \mathrm{mmol})$ in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}(1 \mathrm{~mL})$ was stirred at room temperature for 10 min , to the resulting solution, diethyl ether ( 1 mL ) was then added and the precipitate formed was centrifuged and dried in vacuum. White powder. Yield: $70 \mathrm{mg}(89 \%)$. FT-IR (KBr, $\mathrm{cm}^{-1}$ ): 415 (w), 455 (w), 476 (w), 486 (m), 523 (w), 637 (vw), 696 (m), 746 (s), 762 (s), 770 (s), 897 (w), 972 (w), 999 (m), 1011 (s), 1040 (vs), 1059 (vs), 1157 (m), 1186 (w), 1233 (vw), 1288 ( w$), 1308$ (w), 1371 (w), 1423 (s), 1439 (m), 1454 (s), 1483 (w), 1560 (m), 1580 (m), 1979 (vw), 2272 (w), 2307 (w), 2947 (w), 3055 (w), 3096 (w). Calcd. for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{6} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{8}$ (999.22): C, 43.3; H, 3.2; $\mathrm{N}, 8.4$. Found: C, 43.2; H, 3.2; N, 8.4.

## §3. Single crystal X-ray crystallography

Single crystals of 1-3 were grown by diffusion of $\mathrm{Et}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ vapor into $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ (for $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{3}$ ) or $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ (for $\mathbf{1}$ ) solutions, respectively, overnight. Crystals of 4 were grown by slow evaporation of a $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{CN}$ solution overnight.

X-ray data and refinement details are summarized in Table S1. The data were collected on a Bruker Kappa Apex II CCD diffractometer using $\phi, \omega$-scans of narrow $\left(0.5^{\circ}\right)$ frames with MoKa radiation $(\lambda=0.71073$ $\AA$ A) and a graphite monochromator. The structures were solved by direct methods SHELXL97 and refined by a full matrix least-squares anisotropic-isotropic (for H atoms) procedure using SHELXL-2014/7 programs set. ${ }^{[1]}$ Absorption corrections were applied using the empirical multiscan method with the SADABS program. ${ }^{[2]}$ The positions of the hydrogen atoms were calculated with the riding model. Note that the crystals of 3 are prone to twinning. Therefore, the collected data for 3 were refined to take into account twinning. The refinement showed the contribution of the main twin is $0.8277(14)$, the second one is $0.1723(14)$.

Table S1. X-Ray crystallographic data for 1-4.

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crystal data | 2090739 | 2090738 | 2090737 | 2095153 |
| Chemical formula | $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{l}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{As}_{2} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{6} \cdot 2\left(\mathrm{BF}_{4}\right)$ |
| $M_{r}$ | 814.39 | 903.3 | 997.29 | 999.21 |
| Crystal system, space group | Monoclinic, $P 2{ }_{1} / n$ | Monoclinic, $P 2{ }_{1} / n$ | Triclinic, P1 | Monoclinic, $P 2{ }_{1} / n$ |
| Temperature ( K ) | 299 | 296 | 296 | 296 |
| $a, b, c$ (Å) | $\begin{gathered} 9.2247(19), \\ 9.2436(18), \\ 18.964(4) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.220(3), \\ 11.284(4), \\ 16.043(5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 9.0573(11), \\ 9.1282(10), \\ 20.279(3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.9008(12), \\ 9.7467(16), \\ 22.795(4) \end{gathered}$ |
| $\beta\left({ }^{\circ}\right)$ | 99.668(9) | 96.547(13) | 87.224(5) | 91.882(5) |
| $V\left(\AA^{3}\right)$ | 1594.0(6) | 1658.1(9) | 1669.6(4) | 1976.5(5) |
| Z | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| $\mu\left(\mathrm{mm}^{-1}\right)$ | 3.59 | 5.70 | 5.12 | 2.81 |
| Crystal size (mm) | $0.10 \times 0.10 \times 0.02$ | $0.30 \times 0.05 \times 0.01$ | $0.12 \times 0.10 \times 0.08$ | $0.40 \times 0.30 \times 0.15$ |
| $T_{\text {min }}, T_{\text {max }}$ | $0.761,0.928$ | $0.719,0.928$ | $0.695,0.928$ | $0.531,0.745$ |
| No. of measured, independent and observed [I>2 $2(I)$ ] reflections | 16399, 2806, 1718 | 17017, 3806, 3101 | 15424, 5853, 4423 | 21894, 3401, 2305 |
| $R_{\text {int }}$ | 0.106 | 0.059 | 0.061 | 0.089 |
| $(\sin \theta / \lambda)_{\text {max }}\left(\AA^{-1}\right)$ | 0.596 | 0.651 | 0.595 | 0.598 |
| $\begin{aligned} & R\left[F^{2}>2 \sigma\left(F^{2}\right)\right], \\ & w R\left(F^{2}\right), S \end{aligned}$ | 0.084, 0.200, 1.12 | 0.034, 0.089, 1.07 | 0.043, 0.124, 0.72 | 0.047, 0.114, 1.02 |
| No. of reflections | 2806 | 3806 | 5853 | 3401 |
| No. of parameters | 190 | 190 | 380 | 282 |
| $\Delta \rho_{\text {max }}, \Delta \rho_{\text {min }}\left(\mathrm{e} \AA^{-3}\right)$ | 1.05, -0.79 | 0.48, -0.56 | 1.48, -0.95 | 0.44, -0.43 |

§4. Powder X-ray diffraction data


Figure S1. Experimental and simulated PXRD patterns of 1.


Figure S2. Experimental and simulated PXRD patterns of $\mathbf{2}$.


Figure S3. Experimental and simulated PXRD patterns of 3.


Figure S4. Experimental and simulated PXRD patterns of 4.
§5. NMR spectra of bis(2-pyridyl)phenylarsine and complexes 1-4


Figure S5. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of bis(2-pyridyl)phenylarsine ( $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ).


Figure S6. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR spectrum of bis(2-pyridyl)phenylarsine $\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.


Figure S7. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of $\mathbf{1}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.


Figure S8. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of $2\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.


Figure S9. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum of $\mathbf{3}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}, 25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$.
§6. FT-IR spectra


Figure S10. FT-IR spectra for the complexes 1-4 in the $500-3250 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ region.


Figure S11. FT-IR spectra for the complexes 1-4 in the fingerprint region.

## §7. TGA\&DTG curves



Figure S12. TGA\&DTG curves for 1-4.

## §8. Photophysical details

To evaluate singlet-triplet splitting $\left({ }^{\Delta E_{S T}}\right.$ ) for complexes 1-3, the experimental $\tau_{\text {obs }}(T)$ dependences (Fig. 4d in main document) were fitted using Boltzmann type equation (Eq. S1) proposed for TADF model: ${ }^{[4]}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{o b s}(T)=\left(3+\exp \left(-\frac{\Delta E_{S T}}{k_{B} T}\right)\right) /\left(\frac{3}{\tau_{T}}+\frac{1}{\tau_{S}} \exp \left(-\frac{\Delta E_{S T}}{k_{B} T}\right)\right) \tag{Eq.S1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tau_{S}$ and $\tau_{T}$ are the lifetimes of the $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ excited states, respectively, and $k_{B}$ is the Boltzmann constant. The resulting $\Delta E_{S T}$ values are outlined in Table 1 of the main document.


Figure S13. Emission (a) and excitation (b) spectra of 4 at 300 and 77 K . Emission spectra were recorded at $\lambda_{\mathrm{ex}}=350 \mathrm{~nm}$.


Figure S14. Temperature dependent excitation spectra of $1\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{em}}=530 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$.


Figure S15. Temperature dependent excitation spectra of $\mathbf{2}\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{em}}=520 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$.


Figure S16. Temperature dependent excitation spectra of $3\left(\lambda_{\mathrm{em}}=500 \mathrm{~nm}\right)$.

## §9. Computational details

The DFT calculations were performed using the ADF2019 ${ }^{[5]}$ suite with all-electron TZ2P basis set, ${ }^{[6]}$ B3LYP density functional, ${ }^{[7]}$ Grimme D3BJ dispersion correction, ${ }^{[8]}$ and ZORA for scalar relativistic effects. ${ }^{[9]}$ Electronic excitation energies are found with Davidson's procedure for close-shell systems in a spinrestricted TDDFT calculations with scalar ZORA and no frozen core. ${ }^{[10]}$


HOMO-1 ( -5.499 eV )


Номо
( -5.467 eV )


LUMO ( -1.932 eV )

Figure S17. Frontier orbitals (isovalue of 0.03) in the ground state of $\left[\mathrm{Cu}_{2}\left(\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]$ (2) computed at the B3LYP/ma-ZORA-TZ2P level of theory.


Figure S18. Frontier orbitals (isovalue of 0.03) in the ground state of $\left[\mathrm{Cu}_{2}\left(\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}\right)_{2} 1_{2}\right]$ (3) computed at the B3LYP/ma-ZORA-TZ2P level of theory.


Figure S19. Single-occupied orbitals (isovalue of 0.03 ) in the $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ state of $\left[\mathrm{Cu}_{2}\left(\mathrm{Py}_{2} \mathrm{AsPh}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right]$ (1) computed at the B3LYP/ma-ZORA-TZ2P level of theory.

Table S2. Lowest singlet-singlet transitions ( $f>0.001$ ) in $\mathbf{1}$ calculated at TD-B3LYP-TZ2P level (gas).

| $\lambda, \mathrm{nm}$ | $f$ | Transitions (main contributions) | Character |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 451 | 0.003 | HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO (61.4\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (23.5\%) | $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X})$ LCT |
| 427 | 0.0014 | HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (67.2\%) | $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X})$ LCT |
| 426 | 0.0511 | HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (58.0\%) <br> HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO (22.0\%) | (M+X)LCT |
| 418 | 0.0093 | HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (42.5\%) <br> HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (17.4\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (11.1\%) | (M+X)LCT |
| 404 | 0.0173 | HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (38.4\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1(37.9\%) <br> HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (13.7\%) | (M+X)LCT |
| 402 | 0.0119 | HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (29.1\%) <br> HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO (22.7\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (20.4\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (16.4\%) | (M+X)LCT |
| 389 | 0.0031 | HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (32.8\%) <br> HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO (25.6\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (25.6\%) | (M+X)LCT |
| 386 | 0.0075 | HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (31.6\%) <br> HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO (30.7\%) <br> HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (13.0\%) | (M+X)LCT |
| 383 | 0.0139 | HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO(55.7\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (20.6\%) | (M+X)LCT |


|  |  | HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (14.0\%) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 381 | 0.0095 | HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (47.5\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (23.3\%) <br> HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (10.2\%) | $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X})$ LCT |
| 370 | 0.0016 | HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (78.3\%) | $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X})$ LCT |
| 368 | 0.0016 | HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+2 (44.7\%) <br> HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (24.3\%) <br> HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+2 (13.0\%) | $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X})$ LCT |
| 367 | 0.0083 | HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 (60.5\%) <br> HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+2 (18.8\%) <br> HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO (7.1\%) | (M+X)LCT |

Table S3. Lowest singlet-singlet transitions ( $f>0.0001$ ) in $\mathbf{2}$ calculated at TD-B3LYP-TZ2P level (gas).

| $\lambda, \mathrm{nm}$ | $f$ | Transitions (main contributions) | Character |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 445 | 0.0013 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 82.9\% HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \\ & 9.8 \% \text { HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 427 | 0.0438 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75.0\% HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \\ & \text { 11.5\% HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 388 | 0.0073 | 34.5\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 <br> 31.4\% HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> 16.1\% HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO | (M+X)LCT |
| 419 | 0.0008 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 53.7\% HOMO-2 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \\ & \text { 27.7\% HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 411 | 0.0299 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 76.1\% HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \\ & \text { 16.0\% HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 405 | 0.0021 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 68.5 \% \text { HOMO-2 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \\ & \text { 21.8\% HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 391 | 0.0062 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 56.5 \% \text { HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \\ & \text { 16.9\% HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \\ & \text { 16.7\% HOMO-2 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 387 | 0.0056 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69.8\% HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \\ & \text { 16.2\% HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 384 | 0.0021 | 77.4\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 <br> 8.1\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO | (M+X)LCT |
| 382 | 0.0111 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { 74.1\% HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \\ \text { 7.3\% HOMO-2 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \end{array}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 372 | 0.0004 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 86.2\% HOMO-2 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO } \\ & 9.4 \% \text { HOMO-2 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 366 | 0.0077 | 90.5\% HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 | (M+X)LCT |
| 365 | 0.0014 | 76.7\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+2 | (M+X)LCT |

Table S4. Lowest singlet-singlet transitions ( $f>0.0001$ ) in $\mathbf{3}$ calculated at TD-B3LYP-TZ2P level (gas).

| $\lambda, \mathrm{nm}$ | $f$ | Transitions (main contributions) | Character |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 500 | 0.0017 | $73.3 \%$ HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> $9.7 \%$ HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO | $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X})$ LCT |
| 491 | 0.0189 | $80.0 \%$ HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO | $(\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X})$ LCT |


|  |  | 10.9\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 463 | 0.011 | $77.7 \%$ HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> 7.0\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 | (M+X)LCT |
| 458 | 0.0061 | 39.4\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> 19.7\% HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 <br> 11.3\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO | (M+X)LCT |
| 454 | 0.0045 | 35.3\% HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> 27.1\% HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 <br> 16.3\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 | (M+X)LCT |
| 445 | 0.0112 | 44.1\% HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> 37.0\% HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 | (M+X)LCT |
| 439 | 0.0024 | 65.6\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> 14.0\% HOMO-1 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 | (M+X)LCT |
| 427 | 0.0127 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 57.2\% HOMO-2 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \\ & \text { 23.9\% HOMO } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 422 | 0.0062 | $56.3 \%$ HOMO $\rightarrow$ LUMO +1 <br> 17.7\% HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 <br> $10.7 \%$ HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO | (M+X)LCT |
| 415 | 0.0004 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 75.0\% HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \\ & \text { 15.5\% HOMO-1 } \rightarrow \text { LUMO+1 } \end{aligned}$ | (M+X)LCT |
| 410 | 0.0096 | 75.3\% HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO <br> 14.9\% HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 | ( $\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{X}$ ) LCT |
| 402 | 0.0049 | 84.5\% HOMO-3 $\rightarrow$ LUMO | (M+X)LCT |
| 389 | 0.0127 | 88.9\% HOMO-2 $\rightarrow$ LUMO+1 | (M+X)LCT |
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