

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/232753048>

Effect of the Silyl Substitution on Structure and Vibrational Spectra of Hydrogen-Bonded Networks in Dimers, Cyclic Trimers, and Tetramers

ARTICLE in THE JOURNAL OF PHYSICAL CHEMISTRY A · NOVEMBER 2002

Impact Factor: 2.69 · DOI: 10.1021/jp0217233

CITATIONS

21

READS

8

3 AUTHORS:



Igor S. Ignatyev

Saint Petersburg State University

69 PUBLICATIONS 737 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Francisco Partal Ureña

Universidad de Jaén

42 PUBLICATIONS 464 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



J. J. López González

Universidad de Jaén

134 PUBLICATIONS 1,136 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Effect of the Silyl Substitution on Structure and Vibrational Spectra of Hydrogen-Bonded Networks in Dimers, Cyclic Trimers, and Tetramers

Igor S. Ignatyev,^{*,†} F. Partal, and J. J. López González

Departamento de Química Física y Analítica, Facultad de Ciencias Experimentales, Universidad de Jaén, Campus Universitario de "Las Lagunillas", Edif. B-3,E-23071 Jaén, Spain

Received: July 24, 2002; In Final Form: September 30, 2002

Geometries of the hydrogen bond clusters (ROH)_n ($n = 1-4$, R = H, CH₃, and SiH₃) are optimized at the B3LYP/DZP+diff level of theory. The reliability of the theoretical method employed for the description of the electronic structure of the hydrogen-bonded network is assessed by a comparison of the predicted geometry parameters and the BSSE corrected association energies with the existing experimental parameters and the higher level theoretical estimates for a water dimer and methanol oligomers. Cyclic structures with S_4 symmetry, similar in the hydrogen-bond arrangement to that of the water tetramer, were found as minima at the potential energy surface of methanol and silanol tetramers. The cyclic silanol trimer has the C_{3h} symmetry, in contrast to water and methanol trimers which are characterized by the nonplanar asymmetric structures. The O–O atomic separations decrease and association energies per monomer increase with n and in going from H to SiH₃. The silanol tetramer has the highest association energy per monomer among the analyzed systems. This finding is in keeping with the dominance of tetrameric cyclic structures in the experimentally studied crystal structures of silanols. Vibrational frequency shifts with n in the water–methanol–silanol systems are discussed and frequencies for methanol and silanol trimers and tetramers are predicted from the ab initio force fields scaled with factors refined to fit experimental vibrational frequencies of monomers and a water dimer. The main feature of the frequency change with n , along with the lowering of the OH stretch, is the upward shift of the OH bend, which is exceptionally high in silanols.

Introduction

The formation of inorganic networks containing SiO bonds has gained much attention in the past years, because this process is widely used for the fabrication of inorganic materials (ceramics, glasses, fine monodisperse powders, films, and fibers) with desired shape and properties. The precursors of this process (known as a sol–gel process) are halo- and alkoxysilanes which undergo hydrolysis (as a first step) with the subsequent condensation of silanols and formation of monolithic inorganic gels at low temperatures.¹ Thus, silanols are important intermediates in this process of high practical importance, and the knowledge of their structure and vibrational spectra may give a further insight into the interpretation of experimental results on sol–gel processes.

However, the experimental study of silanols is hindered by their instability toward condensation. The simplest silanol H₃–SiOH was not isolated and characterized experimentally, but theoretical predictions of its structure and the vibrational spectrum exist.^{2–11} The steric hindrance produced by the bulkier substituents at silicon prevents the rapid condensation and allows structural characterization of the silanol structure in the solid state by X-ray diffraction. With one exception of the specific substituent,¹² silanol molecules in condensed phases exhibit different motifs of hydrogen bonded associates and frameworks as shown by the X-ray and vibrational spectroscopy studies.¹³ Within the scope of the reported silanol oligomer structures,

the predominant pattern of the hydrogen bonded aggregates of monofunctional silanols is that of the tetrameric cycles. Crystal structures containing tetramers include *t*-Bu₂FSiOH,¹⁴ *t*-Bu₂–HSiOH,¹⁵ and Ph₃SiOH.¹⁶ However, sterical hindrance of substituents in the more crowded silanols prevents formation of tetramers, and, as a result, the dimers are formed.^{17–18} Because vibrational spectroscopy is a regular tool for the monitoring of sol–gel processes, the knowledge of vibrational spectra of individual silanols and the frequency changes in the process of their condensation may be very helpful for the experimental research. However, to the best of our knowledge, experimental vibrational spectra are known only for a few silanols; the most complete experimental spectral data exist for trimethylsilanol.^{19–22}

In contrast to the absence of both experimental and theoretical data on silanol oligomers, there exist numerous studies of water dimers, trimers, and tetramers.^{23–74} Studies of the methanol clusters are less abundant, but these species received considerable attention in recent years.^{75–94} To the best of our knowledge, there are only two works on silanol dimers.^{8,75} Because silanols are stronger acids than the corresponding carbinols and their basicity does not differ significantly from carbinols,^{95–98} one may expect stronger hydrogen bonding in silanol oligomers. However, no quantitative estimates of this difference for silanol clusters higher than dimers were reported.

Theoretical Methods

State-of-the-art quantum chemical methods applied extensively for water clusters are too computationally demanding to be used for methanol and especially silanol clusters. DFT

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: ignatyev@ujaen.es. Fax: (34) 953 012 141.

[†] Permanent address: Department of Chemistry, Radiochemistry Laboratory, St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia.

methods provide a reasonable compromise between the accuracy of calculations and computational costs. Extensive application of DFT methods to numerous chemical problems including hydrogen bonding has shown that hybrid DFT methods, especially B3LYP, perform well in the prediction of the properties of hydrogen bonded systems.^{46–54} The computational method employed in this work was the hybrid DFT method combining Becke's three parameter exchange functional⁹⁹ with the LYP correlation functional¹⁰⁰ (B3LYP) as implemented in the Gaussian 98 program.¹⁰¹ The basis set was constructed from the double- ζ set of Huzinaga et al.,¹⁰² namely, Si (11s7p/6s4p), C, O (9s5p/4s2p) H (4s/2s). This basis set was augmented with one set of d polarization functions with [$\alpha_d(\text{Si}) = 0.5$, $\alpha_d(\text{C}) = 0.75$, $\alpha_d(\text{O}) = 0.85$] and p polarization functions at H [$\alpha_p(\text{H}) = 0.75$], as well as one set of diffuse functions for H, C, and O [$\alpha_s(\text{H}) = 0.048273$, $\alpha_p(\text{C}) = 0.034$, and $\alpha_p(\text{O}) = 0.059$]. This basis set is designated as DZP+diff.

The "tight" option as a criterion for optimization was used in Gaussian, and in some cases, in which the low accuracy of the default integration grid prevented the B3LYP optimization convergence and/or calculated vibrational frequencies were very low (below 10 cm^{-1}), the larger integration grid of 99 radial shells and 434 angular points in each shell (99434) was used. All structures were fully optimized and vibrational frequencies were evaluated for all stationary points. Basis set superposition error corrections for trimers and tetramers are estimated as proposed by Nielsen et al.³⁵ Scaling of the ab initio force fields in natural internal coordinates was performed as this procedure is implemented in the MOLVIB program.¹⁰³

Results and Discussion

A. Dimers. The water dimer is one of the most studied hydrogen bonded systems, both theoretically and experimentally. The available experimental data, i.e., the oxygen–oxygen intermolecular distance and the binding energy, allowed theoretical chemists to check the performance of different methods in the reproducibility of the properties of the hydrogen bonded systems. The most accurate CCSD(T) estimates of $r_{\text{O} \cdots \text{O}}$ are 2.895 Å with the aug-cc-pVTZ basis set³³ and 2.909 Å with the TZ2P(d,f)+diff set.⁴⁰ These results are still significantly lower than the generally accepted $r_{\text{O} \cdots \text{O}}$ value of 2.952 Å derived from the experimental r_0 values of Odutola and Dyke⁶⁰ and corrected for the anharmonicity effects by van Duijneveldt-van de Rijdt and van Duijneveldt.²⁶ This systematic underestimation of the O–O separations by the most accurate methods is substantially diminished at the methods which use the BSSE corrected geometry optimization procedure (2.925³⁴ and 2.917 Å³⁶). However, in a recent work by Mas et al.,⁶² a new experimental/theoretically corrected value of 2.910 Å was recommended. This value is in excellent agreement with theoretical predictions of Tschumper et al.⁴⁰ but makes BSSE corrected results somewhat overestimated. Other methods (mostly different versions of MP2) predict the $r_{\text{O} \cdots \text{O}}$ value in the 2.891–2.953 Å range (see Table 1 of ref 38). Our B3LYP result (2.891 Å) is close to the MP2 predictions with similar basis sets and lies at the lower boundary of this range.

The experimental estimate of the binding enthalpy at 373 K (ΔH_T) is 3.6 ± 0.5 kcal/mol⁵⁹ that corresponds to the ΔE_e value of 5.4 kcal/mol. The best theoretical prediction of this value is 5.0 kcal/mol.³⁸ Our B3LYP estimate of the ΔE_e value (5.7 kcal/mol) after corrections for the basis set superpositions error (BSSE) with the counterpoise method¹⁰⁴ is in excellent agreement with experiment (Table 1). However, this agreement between experimental binding energies and those predicted by

TABLE 1: Association Energies and BSSE Corrections (kcal/mol) of Water, Methanol, and Silanol Oligomers Estimated at the B3LYP/DZP+diff Level of Theory ($\Delta E_0 = \Delta E_e + \Delta \text{ZPVE}$, $\Delta H_{298} = \Delta E_e + \Delta \text{THERM}$)

oligomers	ΔE_e	ΔE_0	ΔH_{298}	BSSE corr.	$\Delta H_{298}^{\text{corr}}$	ΔH_{298} (exp)	$-\Delta H_{298}^{\text{corr}}/n^d$
(H ₂ O) ₂	−5.7	−3.5	−4.0	0.2	−3.8	−3.6 ^b	1.9
(H ₂ O) ₃	−17.3	−11.6	−13.5	1.6	−11.9		4.0
(H ₂ O) ₄	−31.4	−22.7	−25.7	2.6	−23.1		5.8
(CH ₃ OH) ₂	−5.8	−4.4	−4.1	0.5	−3.6	−3.2 ^c	1.8
(CH ₃ OH) ₃	−17.1	−13.5	−13.6	1.4	−12.2	−12.5 ^d	4.1
(CH ₃ OH) ₄	−30.9	−25.5	−25.7	2.7	−23.0	−24.2 ^c	5.8
(SiH ₃ OH) ₂	−6.0	−4.6	−4.4	0.4	−4.0		2.0
(SiH ₃ OH) ₃	−18.3	−15.1	−15.0	1.5	−13.5		4.5
(SiH ₃ OH) ₄	−31.9	−26.8	−26.	3.0	−23.8		6.0

^a The BSSE corrected binding enthalpy per monomer. ^b Reference 59. ^c Reference 106. ^d Reference 105.




Figure 1. Equilibrium B3LYP/DZP+diff structures of global minima for water, methanol, and silanol dimers.

B3LYP with the double- ζ quality basis sets may be fortuitous, because, as was noticed by González et al.,⁴⁶ the increase in the quality of the basis set from 6-31+G(d,p) to 6-311+G(3df,2p) results in larger deviations. Nevertheless, the comparison of our B3LYP results for the hydrogen bonded water dimer with experimental thermochemical parameters and those obtained by the more accurate methods, ascertains that B3LYP/DZP+diff gives satisfactory results in the description of hydrogen bonded systems at much lower costs than those of MO correlated methods.

The water dimer, which is formed by hydrogen bonding between the hydrogen atom of the proton donor molecule and the oxygen atom of the proton acceptor, belongs to the point group C_s . Similar arrangements of atoms were found as energy minima for methanol^{8,75–77} and silanol^{8,75} dimers (Figure 1). However, the structure of the silanol dimer differs from the analogous dimers by the mutual orientation of the hydrogen bound molecules (Figure 1). This difference manifests itself in the change of the equilibrium XOOX torsion angle: in water and methanol (X = H and C), dihedral angles are nearly equal




Figure 2. Equilibrium B3LYP/DZP+diff structures of global minima for water, methanol, and silanol trimers.

and close to 120° (119.8 and 120.9°), whereas in silanol, this dihedral angle becomes close to 90° (96.8°).

B. Trimers. Although the water trimer is not so well-characterized by experimental methods as the water dimer, there exist experimental^{58,66} and quantum-chemical studies of the water trimer.^{27–31,35,44–45} It was found that the global minimum corresponds to the cyclic structure with the nearly planar arrangement of the hydrogen-bond network and three exocyclic OH bonds, two of which are above this plane and one is below. Similar structure was obtained in this work (Figure 2). The structure possesses C_1 symmetry; however, two O—O distances are nearly equal, whereas the third O—O separation (between oxygens with exocyclic hydrogens above the plain) is substantially longer.

The analysis of the vibration–rotation tunneling spectroscopy data on the $(D_2O)_n$ clusters⁵⁸ confirmed the cyclic structure of the water trimer and refined O—O separations. Values of 2.97 and 2.94 Å were obtained in this study. However, these values are not very accurate, because of the lack in the experimental data, some constraints should be used for their derivation. The more rigorous treatment yielded the 2.84 Å value.⁶⁶ The CCSD/aug-cc-pVDZ equilibrium distances of Nielsen et al.³⁵ (2.835 , 2.837 , and 2.839 Å) are close to this estimate, whereas CCSD/

DZP+diff separations of Fowler and Schaefer³⁵ (2.850 , 2.860 , and 2.909 Å) are slightly longer. Our B3LYP/DZP+diff prediction (2.760 , 2.762 , and 2.769 Å) underestimates O—O separations.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no experimental value for the binding energy of the water trimer. The best theoretical estimate of this value is that of Nielsen et al.³⁵ The infinite basis set extrapolation of the frozen core MP2 results with taking into account the BSSE, core correlation, and higher order correlation effects gave the value of 15.9 ± 0.2 kcal/mol. Our BSSE corrected ΔE_e value, that is, 15.7 kcal/mol (ΔE_e + BSSE corr. of Table 1), is in a good agreement with this estimate.

The cyclic structure was also found to be the global minimum at the potential energy surface of the methanol trimer.^{77–80} Similar to the water analogue, it has no symmetry and the hydrogen bonded ring is characterized by the two nearly equal short O...H separations and the one which is longer. The geometry optimized in our work (Figure 2) slightly differs from other B3LYP studies, in which 6-311+G(d,p)⁷⁷ and 6-31+G(d)⁷⁸ were employed. Our geometry is characterized by shorter O...H and O—O separations. This differences may be due to the presence of diffuse functions on hydrogens in our set.

Association enthalpy of the methanol trimer was estimated by M6, Yáñez, and Elguero⁷⁷ as a single point calculation with a larger basis set augmented with diffuse functions on H [6-311++G(3d,2p)] to be 9.2 kcal/mol. It is substantially lower than the experimental estimate of 12.5 kcal/mol.¹⁰⁵ Our ΔH_{298} value is closer to experiment (Table 1). The difference between our results and those of M6 et al.⁷⁷ may stem from the underestimation of the strength of the hydrogen bond in the 6-311+G(d,p) set at which the geometry was optimized in the latter study.

There are no previous reports of the structure of the silanol trimers. Optimization of this structure in this work started from the geometry similar to that of the cyclic methanol trimer. However, the energy minimum found for the silanol trimer possesses the C_{3h} symmetry with three SiO bonds coplanar with the hydrogen-bond ring, in contrast to the asymmetric methanol analogue (Figure 2). The O—O interatomic separations in the planar hydrogen-bonded ring of silanols is considerably shorter than those of methanol (Table 2). The increase in the hydrogen bonding manifests itself also in the growth of the association energy from 12.2 kcal/mol for methanol to 13.5 kcal/mol for silanol (BSSE corrected ΔH_{298} values, Table 1).

C. Tetramers. All previous ab initio calculations of the water tetramer^{23–25,27–29,42,47} revealed the cyclic S_4 structure as a global minimum of the system. The structure of the global minimum for the methanol tetramer was found to have a cyclic S_4 structure, similar to the water tetramer (Figure 3).^{78,90} Though in both studies of the methanol tetramer the B3LYP method was used, O—O separations reported differ substantially. Hagemester et al.⁷⁸ employed the 6-31+G(d) basis set and obtained 2.737 Å for the equilibrium O—O distance, whereas the Vener and Sauer⁹⁰ optimized value with the modified DZP basis set (triple- ζ in the valence region of oxygen) is 2.674 Å. Our equilibrium value lies between these two, i.e., 2.702 Å (Table 2). The experimental estimate of the binding enthalpy of the gaseous tetrameric clusters of methanol, that is, 24.2 kcal/mol,¹⁰⁶ is close to our BSSE corrected ΔH_{298} value of 23.0 kcal/mol (Table 1).

The similar cyclic S_4 structure was found in this work as a minimum at the $(SiH_3OH)_4$ potential energy surface. The silanol tetramer is characterized by the further decrease of the O—O interatomic separations. This substantial increase not only in

TABLE 2: Equilibrium Geometry Parameters (Bond Lengths in Å; Bond Angles in Degrees) of Methanol and Silanol Clusters (XH₃OH)_n (X = C and Si, n = 1–4) Optimized at the B3LYP/DZP+diff Level of Theory

<i>n</i>	parameters	X = C	X = Si	<i>n</i>	parameters	X = C	X = Si
1	<i>r</i> OH	0.967	0.966	1	ϕ XOH	108.8	119.5
	<i>r</i> XO	1.427	1.662		ϕ OXH(<i>g</i>) ^a	106.7	105.9
	<i>r</i> XH(<i>g</i>) ^a	1.095	1.476		ϕ OXH(<i>t</i>) ^b	112.2	111.6
	<i>r</i> XH(<i>t</i>) ^b	1.102	1.486		τ H(<i>t</i>) ^b –X–O–H	–61.5	–60.4
2	<i>r</i> O1–H1	0.968	0.968	2	ϕ O1–X1–H3	111.8	110.7
	<i>r</i> O2–H5	0.977	0.977		ϕ O1–X1–H4	106.7	105.1
	<i>r</i> O1–O2	2.864	2.834		τ H2–X1–O1–H1	–61.7	–60.1
	ϕ O1–H5–O2	177.8	176.8		τ H3–X1–O1–H1	61.2	60.6
	τ X1–O1–O2–X2	–120.9	–96.8		τ H4–X1–O1–H1	179.8	–179.6
	ϕ X1–O1–H1	109.1	118.6		<i>r</i> X2–H6	1.096	1.479
	ϕ X2–O2–H5	108.6	119.7		<i>r</i> X2–H7(H8)	1.103	1.489
	<i>r</i> X1–O1	1.434	1.678		ϕ O2–X2–H6	107.5	106.8
	<i>r</i> X2–O2	1.420	1.651		ϕ O2–X2–H7(H8)	112.4	112.2
	<i>r</i> X1–H2	1.099	1.483		τ H6–X2–O2–H5	179.5	179.4
	<i>r</i> X1–H3	1.100	1.482		τ H7–X2–O2–H5	60.7	59.8
	<i>r</i> X1–H4	1.094	1.475		τ H8–X2–O2–H5	–61.8	61.1
	ϕ O1–X1–H2	111.4	110.3				
3	<i>r</i> O1–H1(H3)	0.983	0.985	3	<i>r</i> X1(X2)–H4(H7)	1.095	1.478
	<i>r</i> O1–H2	0.984	0.985		<i>r</i> X1(X2)–H5(H9)	1.102	1.484
	<i>r</i> O1(O2)–O3	2.754	2.718		<i>r</i> X1(X2)–H6(H8)	1.101	1.484
	<i>r</i> O2–O3	2.765	2.718		ϕ O1(O2)–X1(X2)–H4(H7)	107.5	105.8
	ϕ O1–H1–O2	149.4	149.6		ϕ O1(O2)–X1(X2)–H5(H9)	111.4	111.3
	ϕ O2–H2–O3	151.7	149.6		ϕ O1(O2)–X1(X2)–H6(H8)	112.1	111.3
	ϕ O3–H3–O1	151.2	149.6		ϕ O1(O2)–X1(X2)–H4(H7)	107.5	105.8
	ϕ H1–O2–H2	88.8	90.4		ϕ O3–X3–H10	107.5	105.8
	ϕ H2–O3–H3	88.9	90.4		ϕ O3–X3–H11	111.9	111.3
	ϕ H3–O1–H1	89.8	90.4		ϕ O3–X3–H12	111.4	111.3
	τ H1–O1–O3–O2	–2.4	0.0		τ H4–X1–O1–H1	–178.2	–180.0
	τ H2–O2–O1–O3	1.2	0.0		τ H5–X1–O1–H1	63.2	60.6
	τ H3–O3–O2–O1	–1.4	0.0		τ H6–X1–O1–H1	–59.1	–60.6
	τ X1–O1–O2–O3	–52.0	0.0		τ H7–X2–O2–H2	–177.8	–180.0
	τ X2–O2–O3–O1	–49.8	0.0		τ H9–X2–O2–H2	63.6	60.6
	τ X3–O3–O1–O2	57.6	0.0		τ H8–X2–O2–H2	–58.5	–60.6
	<i>r</i> X1(X2)–O1(O2)	1.425	1.663		τ H10–X3–O3–H3	177.5	180.0
	<i>r</i> X3–O3	1.427	1.663		τ H11–X3–O3–H3	58.2	60.6
	<i>r</i> X1(X2)–H4(H6)	1.095	1.478		τ H12–X3–O3–H3	–63.9	–60.6
4	<i>r</i> OH	0.993	0.995	4	<i>r</i> XO	1.426	1.666
	ϕ OHO	167.8	167.0		ϕ XOH	109.4	119.6
	ϕ HOH	102.0	101.5		<i>r</i> XH(<i>g</i>) ^a	1.096	1.479
	τ HOOO	4.0	18.7		<i>r</i> XH(<i>t</i>) ^b	1.100	1.484
	τ XOOO	116.7	134.6		ϕ OXH(<i>g</i>) ^a	107.8	105.9
	<i>r</i> OO	2.702	2.678		ϕ OXH(<i>g</i>) ^a	111.6	111.2

^a The XH bond which is in the *gauche* position to the oxygen lone pairs. ^b Two XH bonds which are in the *trans* positions to the oxygen lone pairs.

the absolute stability but in the per monomer binding energy may be the reason of the dominance of the tetrameric pattern observed in the solid state. There are no experimental evidences of silanol trimers, whereas tetrameric structures were characterized by the single-crystal X-ray structure analysis to be the building blocks of the *t*-Bu₂HSiOH,¹⁴ Ph₃SiOH,¹⁵ and *t*-Bu₂-FSiOH¹⁶ crystal structures. The O–O interatomic distances found in two of these works (2.637–2.684¹⁵ and 2.701 Å¹⁴) agree well with our predicted value for the H₃SiOH tetramer (2.678 Å). The crystal structure of *t*-Bu₂FSiOH contains longer O–O separations (2.756 Å¹⁶), but elongation of these distances may be caused by the presence of fluorine as a substituent at Si, which is able to interact repulsively with the hydrogen bond ring oxygens.

D. Trends in Geometries and Binding Energies of Clusters (RHO)_n in Going from R = H to SiH₃. Cooperative effects in the cyclic hydrogen bonded clusters which manifest in a systematic contraction of the O–O separation with increasing cluster size are well-known.^{27–29,47,64–66} These effects may stem from the charge-transfer phenomena: in cyclic structures, each molecule is a donor and acceptor of charge transferring in

hydrogen bonding. This minimizes the destabilizing effect of the charge transfer to the antibonding orbitals of an acceptor. Other manifestations of these cooperative effects studied both theoretically and experimentally on water clusters include the increase of the binding energy per monomer with cluster size, the linearization of the hydrogen bond O···H–O angles, and the different arrangement of the exocyclic free OH bonds for odd and even *n*.^{27–29,64}

However, these effects are close to saturation in the cyclic tetramers. As shown by Lee et al.,²⁹ the growth of the water clusters beyond *n* = 4 leads to considerably smaller increments of the binding energy per water monomer. Moreover, among these clusters those with *n* divisible by four, i.e., with *n* = 8, 12, 16, etc., are the most stable. These structure with “magic” numbers are built from the nearly planar four-membered OH rings. There are also experimental evidences which indicate that the structure of the water hexamer is a cage rather than a ring.^{107,108} This “magic” character of the cyclic hydrogen bonded tetramers probably stems from the fact that the H···O–H angle strain in tetramers is minimal, whereas the energy gain, because of the complex formation, is close to saturation. The preference




Figure 3. Equilibrium B3LYP/DZP+diff structures of global minima for water, methanol, and silanol tetramers.

of tetrameric structures is supported by the fact that the only cyclic clusters detected experimentally in the methanol gas phase¹⁰⁵ and in the carbinol¹⁰⁶ and silanol^{14–16} crystals are cyclic tetramers.

All hydrogen bonded systems considered in this study exhibit the tendency of the hydrogen bond strengthening with the cluster size. Although the predicted contraction of the O–O distance in going from $n = 2$ to 4 decreases in the water–methanol–silanol series (0.181–0.162–0.156 Å), the silanol tetramer possesses the shortest O–O separation among the studied systems, which is by 0.032 Å shorter than in water and by 0.024 Å than in methanol.

The association energies of the clusters follow the geometrical tendencies, although they are more smooth. Thus, the per monomer $\Delta H_{298}^{\text{corr}}/n$ values are almost identical for water and methanol clusters with the same n but slightly increase for silanol. The more pronounced increase of $\Delta H_{298}^{\text{corr}}/n$ is predicted for the silanol trimer (Table 1). This effect may stem from the highly symmetric structure found for this species.

E. Vibrational Spectra. Vibrational spectroscopy provides one of the most important tools for the identification of the

hydrogen-bonded clusters. The systematic strengthening of the hydrogen bond with the cluster size manifests in a red shift of the hydrogen-bonded stretch frequencies. This effect for water clusters was numerously studied both experimentally and theoretically^{27–29,64–74} and less extensively for those of methanol.^{77–79,85,86,90–92} To the best of our knowledge, there are no studies of the vibrational frequency shifts in silanol clusters.

When comparing experimental and theoretically predicted frequencies of vibrations involving hydrogens, one should take into account that the main factor of their discrepancy is not the drawbacks of the quantum chemical approximation but rather the fact that theoretical frequencies are harmonic ones. Usually in the discussion of the spectral changes upon cluster formation, vibrational frequency shifts size are used to avoid this discrepancy. Because one of the aims of this work is the prediction of frequency changes in silanol clusters, we propose an alternative approach, i.e., the use of the force field scaling procedure.¹¹⁰ When cautiously used (the transfer of scale factors refined for fragments), this empiric procedure may have a predictive power.

Frequencies of vibrational fundamentals of the water molecules in the dimer were identified in the infrared spectroscopy studies in the gas phase^{67–69} and in the N₂,^{70,72,74} Ar,^{70,73} and Ne⁷¹ matrixes. The frequencies of fundamentals of the water dimer trapped in solid neon⁷¹ are closer to the positions of gas-phase absorptions than those in the heavier rare-gas matrixes and, especially, in the nitrogen matrix. However, the study in the Ar⁷⁰ matrix provides the most full data on the vibrational frequencies including D₂O and HDO isotopomers. This is the reason these data were used for the scaling of the B3LYP/DZP+diff force field in this work. The results of this scaling are summarized in the Table 3. Because scaling factors used to fit experimental frequencies mainly include anharmonic corrections, it is natural to suppose that these corrections are different for free and H-bonded OH bonds. Therefore, we introduced independent scaling constants for each type of the OH bond. The refinement of three scale factors to fit 18 experimental frequencies of the intramolecular water vibrations (no reliable frequencies of the intermolecular vibrations are reported) in the three isotopomers of the dimer gave the 0.907 scale factor for the nonbonded OH stretch and 0.951 for the H-bonded one. The scale factor for the HOH deformation is 0.975. The intermolecular coordinates corresponding to the low-frequency vibrations were not scaled.

The transfer of these factors to the theoretical force fields of the water trimer and tetramer allowed us to predict experimental (anharmonic) frequencies of these species. They coincide well with experimental vibrational frequencies for H₂O, D₂O, and HDO observed in the Ar matrix⁷⁰ and assigned to trimers and multimers (Table 3). However, there is a certain underestimation of the frequencies of ν_1 fundamentals in trimers, especially in the deuterated species.

The scaling factor for the H-bonded OH stretch (0.951) obtained for the water dimer is transferred to the methanol B3LYP force field. Other scaling factors for methanol are refined on the basis of experimental vibrational frequencies of CH₃OH and CD₃OD.¹¹¹ Experimental frequencies of the OH stretches of the methanol dimer⁹¹ and trimer⁹² were obtained by Huisken et al. employing molecular beam depletion spectroscopy. Two bands for the methanol dimer and three bands for the methanol trimer have been identified in these studies (Table 5). Perchard and Mielke⁹³ reported frequencies of OH stretching, OH bending, and one of the intramolecular vibrations for various isotopomers of the methanol dimer obtained in a

TABLE 3: Observed and Theoretical (B3LYP/DZP+diff) Vibrational Frequencies (cm⁻¹) of Water Oligomers

assignment	H ₂ O					D ₂ O		HDO (D donor)	
	ω_{theor}	ω_{exp}^a	ν_{sc}^b	ν_{exp}		ν_{sc}	$\nu_{\text{exp}}^{\text{Ar}^d}$	ν_{sc}	$\nu_{\text{exp}}^{\text{Ar}^d}$
				gas ^c	Ar ^d				
Dimer									
ν_3 acceptor	3926	3899	3742	3746	3726	2743	2766	3701	3681
ν_3 donor	3898	3880	3726	3735	3715	2728	2746	3689	3694
ν_1 acceptor	3814	3797	3632		3634	2617	2615	2678	2706
ν_1 donor	3694	3718	3590	3601	3574	2591	2600	2629	2639
ν_2 donor	1644	1669	1619		1611	1182	1189	1386	1398
ν_2 acceptor	1624	1653	1602		1593	1174	1178	1408	1403
Trimer									
ν_3			3715			2714	2738	3704	
			3714	3726	3700	2712		3704	
			3709			2709	2733	3699	
ν_1			3510	3533	3528	2540	2580	2561	2587
			3498		3516	2532		2551	2577
			3431			2496		2506	
ν_2			1640			1194		1388	
			1614		1620	1179	1183	1382	
			1610		1602	1175		1377	
Tetramer									
ν_3			3705			2701		3700	
			3704	3714	3690	2700		3699	
			3704			2700		3699	
			3703			2699		3699	
ν_1			3368	3416	3390	2444	2456	2454	2465
			3325		3374	2415		2425	
			3325			2415		2425	
			3215			2338		2348	
			1670			1212		1396	
ν_2			1635			1192		1382	
			1635		1626	1192		1382	
			1618			1184		1369	

^a Reference 72, estimated from experimental frequencies with harmonic corrections of ref 115. ^b Scale factors for free OH (0.907), H-bonded OH (0.951), and HOH deformation (0.975) are fit to experimental data (18 frequencies) for three isotopomers of the water dimer. ^c In a supersonic molecular beam; ref 68. ^d In Ar matrixes; ref 70.

N₂ and Ar matrixes study. Their proton donor OH stretch frequency (3505 cm⁻¹ in N₂ and 3527 cm⁻¹ in Ar) differs significantly from the experimental value of Huisken et al.⁹¹ as well as from our theoretical prediction and is much more close to the corresponding frequency of the methanol trimer (Table 5). The reported COH bending frequencies⁹³ are in a good agreement with our predictions:

	(CH ₃ OH) ₂	(CD ₃ OH) ₂	(CH ₃ OD) ₂	(CD ₃ OD) ₂
expt ⁹³	1401	1365	929	814
	1345	1307	876	786
theory	1403	1372	920	809
	1342	1282	857	772

This indicates that the scaling factor refined for the isolated methanol molecule describes well the bending COH frequencies of the hydrogen-bonded clusters.

The scaling factors for the SiH₃O group of silanols were determined by fitting the theoretical vibrational frequencies to the experimental spectra of SiH₃OCH₃ and SiD₃OCD₃.¹¹² In this procedure, the scaling factors for the methoxy group internal coordinates (nonredundant sets as defined in ref 110 were used for OCH₃ and OSiH₃ groups) are taken from the methanol calculation and fixed. The factor for the silanol monomer OH stretch was also transferred from methanol. However, for OH stretching coordinates involved in hydrogen bonding, the scale

factor ω_{OH} was transferred from the water dimer, as it was done for the water trimer and tetramer as well as for methanol clusters. Thus, all scale factors for silanol were not varied but rather transferred from other molecules, with the exclusion of ν_{SiOH} , corresponding to the SiOH bending coordinate, which cannot be determined in this way.

Fortunately, although the complete experimental vibrational spectrum of the silanol molecule was not reported, there exists an assignment of the SiO stretch of this molecule. Among the IR absorption bands which belong to the photolysis products of the reaction between SiH₄ (SiD₄) and ozone, co-deposited with argon at 17 K, the bands at 859 (SiH₄) and 874 cm⁻¹ (SiD₄) were ascribed to vibrations of SiH₃OH and SiD₃OD correspondingly.¹¹³ Two other bands for the species with ¹⁸O, i.e., 851 and 850 cm⁻¹, were assigned to SiH₃¹⁸OH and SiD₃¹⁸OD. The 15 cm⁻¹ blue shift of the SiO stretch upon deuteration may be explained by the fact that in SiH₃OH this stretch is perturbed and shifted down by the SiOH bend, whereas in SiD₃OD, this coupling disappears because of the lowering of the SiOD deformation frequency. Thus, the mode corresponding to the observed band is strongly coupled with the SiOH bend, and therefore, these data allow us to determine the scale factor for the bending coordinate. The best fit to experimental frequencies (with $c_{\text{SiO}} = 1.046$ fixed to the value refined for silyl methyl ether) gives $c_{\text{SiOH}} = 1.115$:

	(SiH ₃ OH)	SiH ₃ ¹⁸ OH	SiD ₃ OD	SiD ₃ ¹⁸ OD
expt ¹¹³	859	851	874	850
theory	854	827	881	856

The similar harmonic frequencies were found in the CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ study:¹⁰ 858, 829, 883, and 859 cm⁻¹. The only significant discrepancy between our scaled B3LYP result and that of CCSD, on one hand, and the observed frequencies, on the other, is the overestimation of the red shift of the ν SiO (δ SiOH) band in SiH₃¹⁸OH.

The vibrational spectra of silanol clusters obtained with the scaling procedure described above are shown in the Table 4. Comparing these spectra, one may notice that among the internal vibrations of silanol the δ SiOH mode exhibits the greatest changes with the cluster size in addition to the well-known red shift of the OH stretch (Table 4). The high frequency totally symmetric components of δ SiOH (1272 cm⁻¹ in trimer and 1352 cm⁻¹ in tetramer) are inactive in the IR spectra. However, the frequencies of δ SiOH degenerate modes for the trimer and tetramer also lie substantially higher than that for the monomer (by 172 and 299 cm⁻¹). Thus the frequency gap between ν SiO and δ SiOH steadily increases in going from the monomer to the tetramer. Therefore, the coupling of the SiO stretch and SiOH bending vibrations, which is inherent to the monomer and partly to the dimer, completely disappears in trimers and tetramers. The scaled values of the IR active tetramer δ SiOH vibrations are 1237 and 1232 cm⁻¹ (Table 4). Note, that the tendency for the ROH bending frequency to increase with n may be found for water and methanol oligomers. However, in silanol, the B3LYP/DZP+diff frequency shift (unscaled) is 463 cm⁻¹ (from monomer to the high frequency component in tetramer), whereas in the two other systems, they are considerably smaller (116 cm⁻¹ for methanol and 75 cm⁻¹ for water).

Despite the pronounced dependence of the δ SiOH mode on the cluster size, this feature hardly may be used for the identification of oligomers of the more complex silanols because of contamination of the 1100–1300 cm⁻¹ spectral range by the deformation modes of substituents.^{20,21} The more common range

TABLE 4: Harmonic Theoretical and Scaled Vibrational Frequencies (cm⁻¹) of Silanol and Its Oligomers

monomer			dimer		trimer		tetramer		assignment
unsc. ^a	sc. ^b	CCSD ^c	unsc. ^a	sc. ^d	unsc. ^a	sc. ^d	unsc. ^a	sc. ^d	
3903	3750	3916	3880 3671	3728 3579	3564 3563 3488	3475 3475 3402	3392 3347 3347 3235	3308 3264 3264 3155	ν OH
2276	2228	2254	2289 2259	2240 2211	2263 2262 2262	2215 2214 2214	2261 2261 2261 2261	2213 2213 2213 2213	ν'_{as} SiH ₃
2223	2176	2250	2243 2240	2196 2193	2231 2229 2229	2184 2182 2182	2236 2234 2234 2233	2188 2186 2186 2185	ν''_{as} SiH ₃
2215	2168	2248	2208 2197	2161 2150	2226 2224 2224	2179 2177 2177	2231 2230 2230 2230	2184 2182 2182 2182	ν_{s} SiH ₃
1011	988	1011	1023 999	992 977	1017 994 994	996 972 972	1018 997 997 997	997 974 974 969	δ_{s} SiH ₃
981	963	974	984 969	953 945	984 965 965	955 945 945	978 975 975 972	954 952 952 950	δ_{as}' SiH ₃
963	939	974	966 960	945 939	964 962 962	942 941 941	965 965 965 965	942 942 941 941	δ_{as}'' SiH ₃
889	912	925	1008 939	1044 999	1272 1061 1061	1344 1108 1108	1352 1188 1188 1117	1369 1237 1237 1232	δ SiOH
830	854	858	880 840	898 856	889 854 854	906 874 874	885 884 874 874	901 890 894 894	ν SiO
723	720	725	751 728	750 727	749 733 733	750 736 736	733 733 729 726	730 730 729 723	ρ'' SiH ₃
682	690	695	721 718	718 716	725 725 708	726 726 729	710 707 707 698	707 706 706 703	ρ' SiH ₃
202	202	198	91 76	92 77	65 65 59	65 65 59	92 80 76 76	92 78 75 75	τ SiH ₃
Intermolecular Vibrations									
			614	620	785 570 570	785 570 570	828 811 811 800	845 818 818 823	δ H \cdots O–H (out-of-plane)
			253	253	143 51 51	143 65 65	146 65 65 63	146 65 65 63	δ H \cdots O–H (in-plane)
			169	169	194 194 179	194 194 179	268 242 242 152	268 242 242 152	ν O–O
			46	47	22	22	57 54	57 54	τ H–O \cdots H–O
			37	37	13	13	43 43	43 43	τ H–O \cdots H–O
			27	27	11	11	28 10	28 10	τ H–O \cdots H–O

^a B3LYP/DZP+diff; this work. ^b Scale factors for the siloxy group refined for CH₃OSiH₃ with the fixed scale factors of the methoxy group. They are $c_{\text{SiH}} = 0.958$, $c_{\text{SiO}} = 1.046$, $c_{\text{SiH3def}} = 0.952$, and $c_{\text{SiH3rock}} = 0.988$. Scale factor for OH stretch ($c_{\text{OH}} = 0.923$) transferred from methanol. That for OH bend ($c_{\text{SiOH}} = 1.115$) refined to fit the observed frequencies 859 (SiH₃OH), 874 (SiD₃OD), 851 (SiH₃¹⁸OH), and 850 cm⁻¹ (SiD₃¹⁸OD).¹¹³
^c Reference 10. ^d Scale factors for oligomers are transferred from the monomer with the exclusion of $c_{\text{OH}} = 0.951$ for H-bonded OH, which is transferred from the water dimer.

TABLE 5: Predicted Frequencies,^a in cm⁻¹, and IR Intensities, in km mol⁻¹, (in Parentheses) of the OH Stretching Vibrations of Methanol and Silanol Clusters. For Methanol Clusters They Are Compared with Experimental Data

dimer		trimer		tetramer		
theor.	exp. ^b	theor.	exp. ^c	theor.	exp. ^c	exp. ^d
Methanol						
3694 (42)	3684	3498 (871)	3503	3344 (12)	3335	
3584 (544)	3574	3485 (926)	3472	3302 (2091)	3270	3293
		3424 (35)	3433	3302 (2091)		
				3199 (0)		
Silanol						
3728 (102)		3475 (1455)		3308 (388)		
3580 (862)		3475 (1455)		3264 (2874)		
		3402 (0)		3264 (2874)		
				3155 (0)		

^a The B3LYP/DZP+diff force field scaled with the factor of the H-bonded OH stretch (0.951) transferred from the water dimer; in methanol and silanol dimers, the scale factor 0.923 for free OH stretching coordinates is taken from the methanol monomer. ^b Reference 91. ^c Reference 92. ^d Reference 114.

for these purposes is that of OH stretching vibrations. There are no experimental data on silanol, but certain bands of methanol clusters in this region were ascribed to dimers,⁹¹ trimers,⁹² and tetramers.^{85,114} The general agreement of our predicted (with fixed scaling factors) vibrational frequencies of methanol clusters with the experiment is fair (Table 5), although in the methanol trimer the predicted separation between the two high-frequency bands (13 cm⁻¹) is considerably smaller than the experimental one (31 cm⁻¹). Likewise, the calculated IR intensities for the trimer also differ from the experimental ones: the predicted intensities of the two high frequency components are higher by 1 order of magnitude than that of the low frequency totally symmetric component, whereas in the experiment, the intensities of the high and low frequency bands are nearly equal.⁹² Thus, the theoretical spectrum is closer to that of the *C*_{3h} symmetry group, under which two upper vibrations belong to the *E* irreducible representation (IR active), whereas the lower one belongs to *A*₁ (Raman active). Therefore, the B3LYP equilibrium geometry and force field of the methanol trimer underestimates the deviation of the structure from that of *C*_{3h}.

Because experimental OH stretching frequencies either for the isolated SiH₃OH molecule or for silanol clusters are not available, we cannot compare directly our predicted frequencies with the experiment. However, there exist spectral data on trimethylsilanol in different phases.^{19–22} Although the structure of the trimethylsilanol liquid phase is unknown, we may consider that the OH stretching frequency of the tetramer is close to the hydrogen bond network limit. This assumption is based on the fact that the experimental frequency of the water tetramer 3416 cm⁻¹⁶⁸ is close to 3415 cm⁻¹ for liquid water.⁶⁴ The experimental ν OH IR band in the gas phase of (CH₃)₃SiOH is 3737 cm⁻¹.²¹ Our predicted value for the silanol monomer is 3750 cm⁻¹. This is a good agreement with the gas-phase experimental frequency of (CH₃)₃SiOH, especially if one takes into account the fact that the methyl substitution in silanol results in the 7 cm⁻¹ decrease of the ν OH frequency. This estimate is based on the calculation of the vibrational spectrum of trimethylsilanol, details of which will be reported elsewhere. The experimental IR frequency in the liquid phase is 3290 cm⁻¹.²¹ This value is within the range of our predicted frequencies of IR active vibrations for tetramer, i.e., 3308 and 3264 cm⁻¹.

Conclusions

1. Cyclic structures with *S*₄ symmetry, similar in the hydrogen-bond arrangement to that of the water tetramer, were found as minima at the PES of methanol and silanol tetramers.

2. The cyclic silanol trimer, in contrast to the water and methanol trimers, has a planar hydrogen-bond ring.

3. In the (ROH)_{*n*} (R = H, CH₃, and SiH₃) systems the interatomic O–O separation and hence the hydrogen bond strength grow with *n* and in going from H to SiH₃.

4. The silanol tetramer is characterized by the largest binding energy among the systems studied in this work as well as by the highest binding enthalpy per monomer. This advantage of the tetramers may be the reason for the fact that the tetrameric arrangement of silanols is the most common pattern of the hydrogen bonding among the structures of silanols in the condensed phase determined by the X-ray diffraction.

5. Along with the red shift of the OH stretchings, the most notable tendency in the predicted vibrational frequency changes with the cluster size is the blue shift of ROH bendings (R = H, CH₃, and SiH₃). This shift in silanols is substantially higher than those for water and methanol (compare the 463 cm⁻¹ increase in the silanol δ SiOH frequency in going from the monomer to tetramer to those of 116 cm⁻¹ for the methanol δ COH frequency and 75 cm⁻¹ for the water δ HOH frequency).

6. The predicted OH stretching frequencies for the methanol dimer and trimer (with the OH scale factor transferred from the water dimer) are in a good agreement with the experimental ones. Predicted frequencies of the IR active ν OH vibrations for silanol tetramer 3264 cm⁻¹ (*E*) and 3308 cm⁻¹ (*A*) are close to the observed IR value for liquid trimethylsilanol, i.e., 3290 cm⁻¹.

Acknowledgment. The authors and especially I.I. thank the SEEU of the ECD Ministry of Spain (Grant Ref. SAB 200-0148) for supporting this work.

References and Notes

- Brinker, C. J.; Scherer, G. W. *Sol–gel science: the physics and chemistry of sol–gel processing*; Academic Press: New York, 1990.
- Raghavachari, K.; Chandrasekhar, J.; Frisch, M. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1982**, *104*, 3779.
- Sauer, J.; Ahlrichs, R. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1990**, *93*, 2575.
- Hill, J.-R.; Sauer, J. *Mol. Phys.* **1991**, *73*, 335.
- Nicholas, J. B.; Winans, R. E.; Harrison, R. J.; Iton, L. E.; Curtiss, L. A.; Hopfinger, A. J. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1992**, *96*, 10247.
- Darling, C. L.; Schlegel, H. B. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *97*, 8207.
- Stave, M. S.; Nicholas, J. B. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, *97*, 9630.
- Bleiber, A.; Sauer, J. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1995**, *238*, 243.
- Nicholas, J. B.; Feyereisen, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *103*, 8031.
- Koput, J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2000**, *104*, 10017.
- Tielens, F.; DeProft, F.; Geerlings, P. *J. Mol. Struct. (THEOCHEM)* **2001**, *542*, 227.
- Beckmann, J.; Jurkschat, K.; Müller, D.; Rabe, S.; Schürmann, M. *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 2326.
- Lickiss, P. D. *Adv. Inorg. Chem.* **1995**, *42*, 147.
- Beckmann, J.; Jurkschat, K.; Schürmann, M. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **2000**, *602*, 170.
- Puff, M. H.; Braun, K.; Reuter, H. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1991**, *409*, 119.
- Buttrus, N. H.; Eaborn, C.; Hitchcock, P. B.; Saxena, A. K. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1985**, *287*, 157.
- Al-Mansour, A. I.; Al-Juaid, S. S.; Eaborn, C.; Hitchcock, P. B. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1994**, *480*, 139.
- Aiube, Z. H.; Buttrus, N. H.; Eaborn, C.; Hitchcock, P. B.; Zora, J. A. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1985**, *292*, 177.
- Kriegsmann, H. Z. *Anorg. Allg. Chem.* **1959**, *294*, 113.
- Licht, K.; Kriegsmann, H. Z. *Anorg. Allg. Chem.* **1963**, *323*, 190.
- Rouviere, J.; Tabacik, V.; Fleury, G. *Spectrochim. Acta A* **1973**, *29*, 229.
- Minkwitz, R.; Schneider, S. Z. *Naturforsch.* **1998**, *53 B*, 426.

- (23) Kirtenmacher, H.; Lie, G. C.; Popkie, H.; Clementi, E. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1974**, *61*, 546.
- (24) Kim, K. S.; Dupuis, M.; Lie, G. C.; Clementi, E. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1986**, *131*, 451.
- (25) Graf, S.; Leutwyler, S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *109*, 5393.
- (26) van Duijneveldt-van de Rijdt, J. G. C. M.; van Duijneveldt, F. B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *97*, 5019.
- (27) Xantheas, S. S.; Dunning, T. H. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *99*, 8774.
- (28) Xantheas, S. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, *100*, 7523.
- (29) Lee, C.; Chen, H.; Fitzgerald, G. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, *102*, 1266.
- (30) Kloppe, W.; Shütz, M.; Lüthi, H. P.; Leutwyler, S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *103*, 1085.
- (31) Fowler, J. E.; Schaefer, H. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1995**, *117*, 446.
- (32) Kim, J.; Lee, J. Y.; Lee, S.; Mhin, B. J.; Kim, K. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, *102*, 310.
- (33) Halkier, A.; Koch, H.; Jørgensen, P.; Christiansen, O.; Nielsen, I. B. M.; Helgaker, T. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **1997**, *97*, 150.
- (34) Schütz, M.; Brdarski, S.; Widmark, P.-O.; Lindh, R.; Karlström, G. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1997**, *107*, 4597.
- (35) Nielsen, I. M. B.; Seidl, E.; Janssen, C. L. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *110*, 9435.
- (36) Hobza, P.; Bludský, O.; Suhai, S. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *1*, 3073.
- (37) van Duijneveldt-van de Rijdt, J. G. C. M.; van Duijneveldt, F. B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *111*, 9157.
- (38) Kloppe, W.; van Duijneveldt-van de Rijdt, J. G. C. M.; van Duijneveldt, F. B. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *2*, 2227.
- (39) Halkier, A.; Kloppe, W.; Helgaker, T.; Jørgensen, P.; Taylor, P. R. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *111*, 9157.
- (40) Tschumper, G. S.; Leininger, M. L.; Hoffman, B. C.; Valeev, E. F.; Schaefer, H. F.; Quack, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2002**, *116*, 690.
- (41) Kloppe, W.; Lüthi, H. P. *Mol. Phys.* **1999**, *96*, 559.
- (42) Masella, M.; Gresh, N.; Flament, J. P. *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.* **1998**, *94*, 2745.
- (43) Schütz, M.; Bürgi, T.; Leutwyler, S.; Bürgi, H. B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *99*, 5228.
- (44) Walsh, T. R.; Wales, D. J. *J. Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.* **1996**, *92*, 2505.
- (45) Mó, O.; Yáñez, M.; Elguero, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *97*, 6628.
- (46) González, L.; Mó, O.; Yáñez, M.; Elguero, J. *J. Mol. Struct. (THEOCHEM)* **1996**, *371*, 1.
- (47) Estrin, D. A.; Paglieri, G.; Corongiu, G.; Clementi, E. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1996**, *100*, 8701.
- (48) Tsuzuki, S.; Lüthi, H. P. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *114*, 3949.
- (49) Rabuck, A. D.; Scuseria, G. E. *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **2000**, *104*, 439.
- (50) Rappe, A. K.; Bernstein, E. R. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **2000**, *104*, 6117.
- (51) Takahashi, H.; Hori, T.; Wakabayashi, T.; Nitta, T. *Chem. Lett.* **2000**, 222.
- (52) Tuma, C.; Boese, A. D.; Handy, N. C. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *1*, 3939.
- (53) Wu, X.; Vargas, M. C.; Nayak, S.; Lotrich, V.; Scoles, G. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *115*, 8748.
- (54) Koch, W.; Holthausen, M. C. *A Chemist's Guide to Density Functional Theory*; Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, Germany, 2000.
- (55) Dyke, T. R.; Muentner, J. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1972**, *57*, 5011.
- (56) Hoy, A. R.; Bunker, P. R. *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **1975**, *59*, 159.
- (57) Dyke, T. R.; Mack, K. M.; Muentner, J. S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1977**, *66*, 498.
- (58) Pugliano, N.; Saykally, R. J. *Science* **1992**, *257*, 1937.
- (59) Curtiss, L. A.; Frurip, D. J.; Blander, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1979**, *71*, 2703.
- (60) Odutola, J. A.; Dyke, T. R. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1980**, *72*, 5062.
- (61) Reimers, J.; Watts, R.; Klein, M. *Chem. Phys.* **1982**, *64*, 95.
- (62) Mas, E. M.; Bukowski, R.; Szalewicz, K.; Gronenboom, G. C.; Wormer, P. E. S.; van der Avoird, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *113*, 6687.
- (63) Smith, B. J.; Swanton, D. J.; Pople, J. A.; Schaefer, H. F.; Radom, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1990**, *92*, 1240.
- (64) Xantheas, S. S. *Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *258*, 225.
- (65) Cruzan, J. D.; Braly, L. B.; Liu, K.; Brown, M. G.; Loeser, J. G.; Saykally, R. J. *Science* **1996**, *271*, 59.
- (66) Liu, K.; Brown, M. G.; Viant, M. R.; Cruzan, J. D.; Saykally, R. J. *Mol. Phys.* **1996**, *89*, 1373.
- (67) Coker, D. F.; Miller, R. E.; Watts, R. O. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1985**, *82*, 3554.
- (68) Huisken, F.; Kaloudis, M.; Kulcke, A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *104*, 17.
- (69) Page, R. H.; Frey, J. G.; Shen, Y.-R.; Lee, Y. T. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1984**, *106*, 373.
- (70) Bentwood, R. M.; Barnes, A. J.; Orville-Thomas, W. J. *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **1980**, *84*, 391.
- (71) Forney, D.; Jacox, M. E.; Thompson, W. E. *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **1993**, *157*, 479.
- (72) Fredin, L.; Nelander, B.; Ribbegard, G. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1977**, *66*, 4065.
- (73) Perchard, J. P. *Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *264*, 217.
- (74) Perchard, J. P. *Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *266*, 109.
- (75) Ugliengo, P.; Bleiber, A.; Garrone, E.; Sauer, J.; Ferrari, A. M. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1992**, *191*, 537.
- (76) Anwander, E. H. S.; Probst, M. M.; Rode, B. M. *Chem. Phys.* **1992**, *166*, 341.
- (77) Mó, O.; Yáñez, M.; Elguero, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1997**, *107*, 3592.
- (78) Hagemester, F. C.; Gruenloh, C. J.; Zwier, T. S. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **1998**, *102*, 82.
- (79) Mó, O.; Yáñez, M.; Elguero, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *109*, 139.
- (80) Sauer, J.; Bleiber, A. *Pol. J. Chem.* **1998**, *72*, 1524.
- (81) George, W.; Has, T.; Hossain, M. F.; Jones, B. F.; Lewis, R. J. *Chem. Soc., Faraday Trans.* **1998**, *94*, 2701.
- (82) Bizzarri, A.; Stolte, S.; Reuss, J.; van Duijneveldt-van de Rijdt, J. G. C. M.; van Duijneveldt, F. B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1990**, *143*, 423.
- (83) Coussan, S.; Bakkas, N.; Loutellier, A.; Perchard, J. P.; Racine, S. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1994**, *217*, 123.
- (84) Coussan, S.; Loutellier, A.; Perchard, J. P.; Racine, S.; Peremans, A.; Tadjeddine, A.; Zheng, W. Q. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1997**, *107*, 6526.
- (85) Buck, U.; Ettischer, I. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1998**, *108*, 33.
- (86) Provencal, R. A.; Paul, J. B.; Roth, K.; Chapo, C.; Casaes, R. N.; Saykally, R. J.; Tschumper, G. S.; Schaefer, H. F. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *110*, 4258.
- (87) Tschumper, G. S.; Gonzales, J. M.; Schaefer, H. F. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *111*, 3027.
- (88) González, L.; Mó, O.; Yáñez, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *111*, 3855.
- (89) Mooij, W. T. M.; van Duijneveldt, F. B.; van Duijneveldt-van de Rijdt, J. G. C. M.; van Eijck, B. P. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **1999**, *103*, 9872.
- (90) Vener, M. V.; Sauer, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *114*, 2623.
- (91) Huisken, F.; Kulcke, A.; Laush, C.; Lisy, J. M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, *95*, 3924.
- (92) Huisken, F.; Kaloudis, M.; Koch, M.; Werhahn, O. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *105*, 8965.
- (93) Perchard, J. P.; Mielke, Z. *Chem. Phys.* **2001**, *264*, 221.
- (94) Lovas, F. J.; Belov, S. P.; Tret'yakov, M. J.; Stahl, W.; Suenram, R. D. *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **1995**, *170*, 478.
- (95) West, R.; Baney, R. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1959**, *81*, 6145.
- (96) Hendewerk, M. L.; Frey, R.; Dixon, D. A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1983**, *87*, 2026.
- (97) Cypryk, M. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1997**, *546*, 483.
- (98) Koput, J. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **2001**, *333*, 504.
- (99) Becke, A. D. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1993**, *98*, 5648.
- (100) Lee, C.; Yang, W.; Parr, R. G. *Phys. Rev. B* **1988**, *785*.
- (101) Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Montgomery, J. A., Jr.; Stratmann, R. E.; Burant, J. C.; Dapprich, S.; Millam, M. J.; Daniels, A. D.; Kudin, K. N.; Strain, M. C.; Farkas, O.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.; Cossi, M.; Cammi, R.; Mennucci, B.; Pomelli, C.; Adamo, C.; Clifford, S.; Ochterski, J.; Petersson, G. A.; Ayala, P. Y.; Cui, Q.; Morokuma, K.; Malick, D. K.; Rabuck, A. D.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, J. B.; Cioslowski, J.; Ortiz, J. V.; Stefanov, B. B.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.; Piskorz, P.; Komaromi, I.; Gomperts, R.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, M. A.; Peng, C. Y.; Nanayakkara, A.; Gonzalez, C.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, P. M. W.; Johnson, B. G.; Chen, W.; Wong, M. W.; Andres, J. L.; Head-Gordon, M.; Replogle, E. S.; Pople, J. A. *Gaussian 98*, revision A.7; Gaussian, Inc.: Pittsburgh, PA, 1998.
- (102) Huzinaga, S. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1965**, *42*, 1293. Dunning, T. H. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1970**, *53*, 2823. Dunning, T. H.; Hay, P. J. In *Modern Theoretical Chemistry*; Schaefer, H. F., Ed.; Plenum Press: New York, 1977; Vol. 3, pp 1–27.
- (103) Sundius, T. *J. Mol. Struct.* **1990**, *218*, 321. Sundius, T. MOLVIB: A Program for Harmonic Force Field Calculations, QCPE program No. 604; Indiana University: Bloomington, IN, 1991.
- (104) Boys, S. F.; Bernardi, F. *Mol. Phys.* **1970**, *19*, 553.
- (105) Frurip, D. J.; Curtiss, L. A.; Blander, M. *Int. J. Thermophys.* **1981**, *2*, 115.
- (106) Weltner, W.; Pitzer, K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1951**, *73*, 2606.
- (107) Liu, K.; Brown, M. G.; Carter, C.; Saykally, R. J.; Gregory, J. K.; Clary, D. C. *Nature* **1996**, *381*, 501.
- (108) Liu, K.; Brown, M. G.; Saykally, R. J. *J. Phys. Chem. A* **1997**, *101*, 8995.
- (109) Ferguson, G.; Gallagher, J. F.; Glidewell, C.; Low, J. N.; Scrimgeour, S. N. *Acta Crystallogr. C* **1992**, *48*, 1272.
- (110) Fogarasi, G.; Pulay, P. In *Vibrational Spectra and Structure*; Durig, J., Ed.; Elsevier: Amsterdam, 1985; Vol. 14, pp 125–219.
- (111) Cruz, F. C.; Scalabrin, A.; Pereira, D.; Vazquez, P. A. M.; Hase, Y.; Strumia, F. *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **1992**, *156*, 22.
- (112) Weiss, G. S.; Nixon, E. R. *Spectrochim. Acta* **1965**, *21*, 903.
- (113) Withnall, R.; Andrews, L. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1985**, *89*, 3261.
- (114) Häber, T.; Schmitt, U.; Suhm, M. *J. Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **1999**, *1*, 5573.