

Definitive heat of formation of methylenimine, $\text{CH}_2=\text{NH}$, and of methylenimmonium ion, CH_2NH_2^+ , by means of W2 theory*

Glênisson de Oliveira[†], Jan M.L. Martin[‡], and Indira K.C. Silwal

Department of Organic Chemistry, Weizmann Institute of Science, IL-76100 Rehovot, Israel

Joel F. Liebman

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC),

Baltimore, Maryland 21250

(Submitted to *J. Comput. Chem.* Dec. 14, 2000; Accepted Dec. 17, 2000)

Abstract

A long-standing controversy concerning the heat of formation of methylenimine has been addressed by means of the W2 (Weizmann-2) thermochemical approach. Our best calculated values, $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ(\text{CH}_2\text{NH})=21.1\pm0.5$ kcal/mol and $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ(\text{CH}_2\text{NH}_2^+)=179.4\pm0.5$ kcal/mol, are in good agreement with the most recent measurements but carry a much smaller uncertainty. As a by-product, we obtain the first-ever accurate anharmonic force field for methylenimine: upon consideration of the appropriate resonances, the experimental gas-phase band origins are all reproduced to better than 10 cm^{-1} . Consideration of the difference between a fully anharmonic zero-point vibrational energy and B3LYP/cc-pVTZ harmonic frequencies scaled by 0.985 suggests

*Dedicated to Prof. Paul von Ragué Schleyer on the occasion of his 70th birthday

[†]Present address: Chemistry Department, Pensacola Christian College, 250 Brent Lane, Pensacola, FL 32503

[‡]Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: `comartin@wicc.weizmann.ac.il`

that the calculation of anharmonic zero-point vibrational energies can generally be dispensed with, even in benchmark work, for rigid molecules.

I. INTRODUCTION

Methylene imine (methanimine, formaldimine, $\text{CH}_2=\text{NH}$) is a pyrolysis product of amines [1] as well as a photolysis product of methylazide [2] and diazomethane [3]. It has obvious chemical importance as the simplest imine [4], and with its carbon-nitrogen double bond, methylenimine is a bonding paradigm for numerous nitrogen-containing heterocycles. The molecule is also of astrophysical interest, having been detected in dark interstellar dust clouds [5].

The heat of formation of methylenimine (methanimine, formaldimine, $\text{CH}_2=\text{NH}$), is the subject of a long-standing controversy in the literature. Experimental values for the heat of formation (ΔH_f°) of this molecule span a range of 10 kcal/mol, and have fairly large experimental uncertainties (about 2 to 3 kcal/mol). The first experiment, by DeFrees and Hehre in 1978, [6] used the bracketing method to evaluate the hydride affinity of HCNH^+ , and hence derived $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ[\text{CH}_2=\text{NH}]=26.4\pm3.2$ kcal/mol. Ten years later, Grela and Colussi [7] obtained a value of 25 ± 3 kcal/mol from the deprotonation reaction of CH_3NH . A Moscow group had meanwhile obtained [8] 21 ± 4 kcal/mol by photoionization mass spectrometry of pyrolysis products of azetidine. In 1990, Peerboom, Ingemann, Nibbering, and Liebman (PINL) [9] bracketed the proton affinity (PA) of CH_2NH as 204 ± 2 kcal/mol by means of ion cyclotron resonance: in combination with an earlier determination of the heat of formation of CH_2NH_2^+ (177–178 kcal/mol) by Lossing et al. [10] from appearance energy measurements, they obtained $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ[\text{CH}_2=\text{NH}]=16.5\pm2$ kcal/mol. Then in 1992, Holmes et al. [11] determined the ionization potential of the CH_2NH radical by means of energy-resolved electron impact, and derived an upper limit of 22 ± 3 kcal/mol for $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ[\text{CH}_2=\text{NH}]$: they propose an ‘evaluated’ $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ[\text{CH}_2=\text{NH}]=21\pm4$ kcal/mol, which happens to be identical to the Moscow group value. Around the same time, Smith, Pople, Curtiss, and Radom (SPCR) [12] carried out a computational study in which reaction energies for ten reactions involving CH_2NH were computed by means of G2 theory [13]: in combination with experimental data for the auxiliary species [14], they obtained $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ=20.6\pm2.4$ kcal/mol averaged over the

ten reactions. Although this is in good agreement with the Holmes et al. experiment, the error bars are still a far cry from ‘chemical accuracy’ (1 kcal/mol).

Very recently, two of us proposed [15] two new computational thermochemistry methods known as W1 and W2 (Weizmann-1 and Weizmann-2) theory which, for molecules dominated by dynamical correlation, yield heats of formation to within 0.25 kcal/mol (1 kJ/mol) accuracy, on average. A subsequent validation study [16] for a much larger data set came to similar conclusions. Since CH₂NH is still small enough for a W2 calculation to be carried out on fast workstation computers, this would appear to be the tool of choice for resolving the controversy on its heat of formation for once and for all. This is the primary purpose of the present paper.

As a by-product, we shall obtain an accurate ab initio anharmonic force field for CH₂NH. (For the highest possible accuracy, it is *in principle* advisable to obtain the molecular zero-point vibrational energy ZPVE from an anharmonic force field rather than from scaled harmonic frequencies.) Aside from matrix isolation work [2,17], a respectable amount of high-resolution IR data is available for this molecule. Following early high-resolution work by Johnson and Lovas [18], Allegrini et al. [19] obtained a high-resolution ν_4 by CO laser Stark spectroscopy. Duxbury and Le Lerre [20] studied the ν_5 and ν_6 bands by Fourier transform IR (FTIR) spectroscopy, including an analysis of the Coriolis interaction (along the *c* axis) between those modes. The ν_7 , ν_8 , and ν_9 modes, as well as the strong Coriolis interactions between them, were studied by Halonen and Duxbury [21], while these same authors studied ν_2 and the ($\nu_3, 2\nu_5$) Fermi resonant band pair in a companion paper [22] and reported ν_1 elsewhere [23].

General harmonic force fields were derived by Jacox and Milligan [17], by Hamada et al. [24] and by Halonen, Deeley, and Mills [25]: the latter authors also remeasured and reanalyzed the (ν_7, ν_8, ν_9) triad. (A microwave substitution structure was obtained by Pearson and Lovas [26].) To the authors’ knowledge, the only anharmonic force field available is a comparatively low-level (MP2/6-311G**) ab initio calculation by Pouchan and Zaki [27]. Extensive experience has shown (e.g. [28] and references therein) that the CCSD(T) (coupled

cluster with all single and double substitutions [29] and a quasiperturbative correction for connected triple excitations [30]) electron correlation method in conjunction with a basis set of *spdf* quality generally yields computed fundamentals within better than 10 cm^{-1} of the observed gas-phase values. Thus, obtaining a force field of such quality is the secondary purpose of the present note.

II. COMPUTATIONAL METHODS

Geometry optimizations and vibrational frequency calculations using the B3LYP (Becke 3-parameter-Lee-Yang-Parr [31,32]) density functional method have been carried out using Gaussian 98 revision A7 [33]. All other calculations were carried out using MOLPRO 98.1 [34], and a driver for the W1/W2 calculations [35] written in MOLPRO's scripting language, running on Compaq XP1000 and Compaq ES40 computers in our research group.

W1 and W2 theory are described in detail elsewhere [15,16]. Briefly, both methods involve separate extrapolations to the infinite-basis limit, using a sequence of Dunning correlation consistent [36,37] (cc-pVnZ) and augmented correlation consistent [38] (aug-cc-pVnZ) basis sets, of the SCF, CCSD valence correlation, and (T) valence correlation energies. In addition, contributions of inner-shell correlation and (Darwin and mass-velocity [39,40]) scalar relativistic effects are obtained at the CCSD(T) and ACPF (averaged coupled pair functional [41]) levels with the MTsmall basis set [15]. While the more economical W1 theory uses a B3LYP/cc-pVTZ reference geometry and extrapolates from aug'-cc-pVnZ ($n=D,T,Q$) basis sets, the more expensive (and rigorous) W2 theory employs a CCSD(T)/cc-pVQZ reference geometry and aug'-cc-pVnZ ($n=T,Q,5$) basis sets. (Regular cc-pVnZ basis sets are used throughout on hydrogen.) In addition, we considered W1h and W2h results, where the 'h' (for 'hetero-atom') indicates that augmented basis sets are only used on group V, VI, and VII elements and not on group III and IV elements.

The largest basis set CCSD calculations in W2 and W2h theory were carried out using the direct CCSD implementation [42] of Lindh, Schütz, and Werner as present in MOLPRO 98.1. All energies for the open-shell separated atoms were obtained using the restricted

open-shell CCSD(T) energy as defined in Ref. [43].

For comparison, we shall also present data for the isoelectronic C_2H_4 and N_2H_2 molecules.

A complete CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ quartic force field for CH_2NH was generated in internal coordinates (four stretches, three bends, two torsions). Internal coordinate geometries were generated by recursive application of the central difference formula to the coordinates being differentiated, with step sizes of 0.01 Å or radian around the minimum energy geometry being used. Cartesian coordinates for this ‘grande list’ of points were generated using INTDER [44]: this list of geometries was reduced to a ‘petite list’ of unique points by means of comparison of sorted distance matrices. Thus, 2241 points in C_s symmetry and 460 additional points in C_1 symmetry are obtained. Since this type of application is a textbook example of an ‘embarrassingly parallel’ [45] computational problem, the energy calculations were carried out on a 26-node experimental PC-farm at the Department of Particle Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science. In order to minimize roundoff error in the finite differentiation, integral evaluation cutoffs as well as SCF and CCSD convergence criteria were tightened such that the energies are obtained to essentially machine precision. Quartic contamination was removed from the quadratic force constants. The final internal coordinate force field was transformed to Cartesian coordinates using INTDER, and transformed to normal coordinates as well as subjected to a standard second-order rovibrational perturbation theory (VIB-PT2) analysis [46] using SPECTRO [47] and POLYAD [48].

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Anharmonic force field

A plethora of resonances exists involving the three XH stretching modes ν_1, ν_2, ν_3 on the one hand and two-quantum states within the ν_4, ν_5, ν_6 block on the other hand (the modes involved are the CN stretch, the HNC bend, and the HCH scissoring mode, respectively). For this reason, we deperturbed the anharmonic constants for all resonances of the type $\nu_x \approx \nu_y + \nu_z$ (where $x=\{1,2,3\}$ and $y,z=\{4,5,6\}$, e.g. $\nu_2 \approx \nu_4 + \nu_6$ or $\nu_3 \approx 2\nu_5$), and set up

and diagonalized a 9×9 resonance matrix involving all these states. (Formulas for the various higher-order resonance matrix elements were taken from Ref. [49].) The resonance matrix and its eigensolution are given in Table I, while the computed harmonic frequencies and fundamentals (as well as any bands in resonance with them) are given in Table II, compared with experiment and with results from the previous lower-level (MP2/6-311G**) calculation by Pouchan and Zaki [27]. A complete force field and sets of spectroscopic constants are available as supplementary material to the present paper.

First of all, as readily seen from the solution of the 9×9 resonance matrix, the $\nu_3 \approx 2\nu_5$ resonance is so severe that the two perturbed states are basically 50:50 mixtures of the respective deperturbed states, and that an assignment of an observed band to either ν_3 or $2\nu_5$ is somewhat academic. Similar remarks apply to the $\nu_2 \approx \nu_4 + \nu_6$ resonance: in both cases, the assignments in the table were made based on the ordering of the deperturbed states. The $\nu_1 \approx 2\nu_4$ resonance is also quite severe but an unambiguous assignment is still possible there. (For a system like this, a full nine-dimensional solution by variational methods [50] or high-order canonical Van Vleck perturbation theory [51] would certainly be helpful: this is however beyond the scope of the present study since we are primarily interested in the thermochemistry.)

This being said, agreement between computed and observed vibrational band origins is basically as good as we can reasonably expect at this level of theory, with all computed-observed discrepancies lying below 10 cm^{-1} . The very good agreement between the present band origins and the earlier lower-level results is somewhat fortuitous, given the discrepancies of up to 50 cm^{-1} between the two sets of *harmonic* frequencies. It has been our experience that MP2 computed anharmonicities for XH stretching modes tend to be seriously overestimated, and the present system forms no exception.

The only experimental equilibrium geometry available from the literature is a microwave (r_s) substitution structure [26]. Agreement between our calculations and the r_s geometry is as good as we can reasonably expect (Table III). The effect of correlating the (1s)-like inner-shell electrons on the geometry follows expected trends [52] (Table III). (The MTsmall

core correlation basis set [15] as used in W1 and W2 theory was employed for this purpose.) No experimental r_e or r_z geometry is available, but an indirect measure of the quality of our computed CCSD(T)/MTsmall geometry can be obtained by substituting it in the VIB-PT2 analysis and comparing the ground-state rotational constants thus obtained with their precisely known [21] experimental counterparts. Our computed $A_0=6.54242$, $B_0=1.15615$, $C_0=0.97936$ cm⁻¹ agree to better than 0.1% with the observed values [21] 6.544896(1), 1.1555459(1), and 0.9790851(1) cm⁻¹: given the quadratic dependence of the rotational constants on the geometry, this in fact suggests an even better agreement between the underlying computed r_e geometry and Nature. In order to assist future experimental work on the protonated species CH₂NH₂⁺, we have computed its geometry at the same level (Table III).

For the mode pairs in Coriolis resonance, the computed interaction constants $\xi_{79}^a=4.701$, $\xi_{79}^b=-0.315$, $\xi_{78}^a=3.630$, and $\xi_{78}^b=1.918$ cm⁻¹ are in fair agreement with the experimental values [21] 4.529(1), -0.3305(1), 4.212(1), and 1.8125(1) cm⁻¹, respectively. The computed $\xi_{56}^c=0.552$ cm⁻¹ is likewise in reasonable agreement with the observed value [20] of 0.6911(1) cm⁻¹.

Let us finally turn to the zero-point vibrational energy (ZPVE). Our computed value from the CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ quartic force field, and including the E_0 correction, is 24.69 kcal/mol. As seen in Table IV, this differs by no more than 0.10 kcal/mol from the zero-point correction used in W1 theory, i.e. B3LYP/cc-pVTZ harmonic frequencies scaled by 0.985. The same remark holds true (Table IV) for the isoelectronic molecules C₂H₄ (difference +0.04 kcal/mol) and trans-HNNH (difference +0.03 kcal/mol), for which large basis set CCSD(T) quartic force fields are available from previous work [53,54]. There are certainly situations (e.g. nonrigid molecules — i.e. those exhibiting low-barrier internal rotations and/or inversions, or very low frequency modes — or very anharmonic systems such as H_3^+) where anything less than an anharmonic force field is fundamentally inappropriate for the zero-point energy. Yet it would appear to be that the immensely less expensive scaled harmonic B3LYP ZPVE is appropriate even for benchmark work: any situation where accuracy of ± 0.1 kcal/mol on

the computed atomization energy is essential is presently beyond direct treatment even by W2 theory.

B. Heat of formation

Total atomization energies (TAE_e if zero-point exclusive, TAE_0 at 0 K) at the W1, W1h, W2, and W2h levels for CH_2NH , CH_2NH_2^+ , trans-HNNH, and C_2H_4 are given in Table IV, together with a breakdown by components of the results at the highest level of theory (W2).

In the light of our observation above, and in order to achieve consistency among the species considered (including CH_2NH_2^+ , for which no anharmonic force field is available), all heats of formation reported in Table IV use the scaled B3LYP ZPVEs rather than their anharmonic counterparts.

At the highest level of theory, we obtain $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ(\text{CH}_2\text{NH})=21.1$ kcal/mol. The W2h result is essentially identical; the W1 and W1h results are slightly different, but still by less than 0.2 kcal/mol. In the original W2 paper [15], the mean absolute error for a sample of some 30 very accurately known total atomization energies was 0.23 kcal/mol; we shall conservatively take our error bar to be twice that amount, or (after roundoff) ± 0.5 kcal/mol.

Our calculation stays below the Holmes et al. upper limit and is in excellent agreement with both the Holmes et al. evaluated $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ$ and the G2-thermodynamic cycle derived value of SPCR: of course, our error bar is an order of magnitude smaller than the former and several times smaller than the latter.


What is the source of the 5 kcal/mol disagreement between these values and the earlier PINL measurement? In order to shed light upon this question, we calculated the heat of formation of protonated methylenimine, and hence also the PA of the latter compound. At the W1 and W2 levels, we find $\text{PA}(\text{CH}_2\text{NH})=207.8$ and 207.5 kcal/mol, respectively: this is a minor exception to the rule [16] that W1 and W2 theory yield essentially identical proton affinities. Our W2 PA is 3.5 kcal/mol higher than the bracketed value of 204 ± 2 kcal/mol, but lies within the error bar of the very recent Bouchoux and Salpin [55] value, 206.2 ± 1.5 kcal/mol, obtained by the thermokinetic method. [56] We note that the accuracy

of the bracketing is, by its very nature, in turn dependent on the accuracy of the PAs of the bases involved in the bracketing experiments. For the five bases used, namely pyrrole, diisopropyl ether, ammonia, styrene, and diethyl ether, the PA values from the 1988 Lias et al. compilation [57] employed by PINL differ by up to 2.5 kcal/mol from the more recent 1998 compilation of Hunter and Lias [58].


As for the heat of formation of CH_2NH_2^+ , our computed W1 and W2 values are 1.0 and 1.4 kcal/mol higher, respectively, than the value of Lossing et al. [10] used by PINL. Hammerum and S  lling (HS) [59] recently re-evaluated the experimental data of Lossing et al., using the 298 K enthalpy contributions of Traeger and McLoughlin [60] to convert the reported threshold energy measurements into heats of formation at 298 K. In this manner, the value found for methylenimine is 179.7 kcal/mol, in excellent agreement with our W2 calculated result of 179.4 ± 0.5 kcal/mol. HS also calculated the heat of formation of CH_2NH_2^+ at the G2(MP2) and CBS-Q levels, and found 179.0 and 180.2 kcal/mol, respectively. For CH_2NH , the corresponding values are 20.8 and 22.0 kcal/mol; agreement with our W1 and W2 values is as good as can reasonably be expected for the G2(MP2) and CBS-Q methods.

W2 is most reliable for molecules that are dominated by dynamical correlation energy. One index which we found to be very reliable for this purpose is the percentage of the binding energy that is recovered at the SCF level. For CH_2NH this is found to be 70%, which is closer to C_2H_4 (77%) and to molecules essentially devoid of nondynamical correlation at their equilibrium geometry (e.g. water, H_2) than to trans-HNNH (52%, comparable to N_2) which is in a regime of moderate nondynamical correlation. For CH_2NH_2^+ , SCF accounts for about 63% of the binding energy.


Interestingly, the reaction



is computed to be exergonic by about 9 kcal/mol. At the SCF level, this is even slightly larger: electron correlation reduces the difference by about 1.1 kcal/mol. For comparison, the reaction



is exergonic by 6.7 kcal/mol [61], while



is *endergonic* by 6.9 kcal/mol [62].

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have calculated benchmark heats of formation of methylenimine and protonated methylenimine by means of W2 theory. Our best calculated values, $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ(\text{CH}_2\text{NH})=21.1\pm0.5$ kcal/mol and $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ(\text{CH}_2\text{NH}_2^+)=179.4\pm0.5$ kcal/mol, are in good agreement with the most recent measurements but carry a much smaller uncertainty. As such, they resolve a long-standing experimental controversy.

As for many other systems, the difference between a fully anharmonic ZPVE (zero-point vibrational energy) and a simple B3LYP/cc-pVTZ calculation scaled by 0.985 is negligible for our purposes.

A first-ever high-quality quartic force field for CH_2NH has been made available. Agreement with experimental high-resolution IR data is better than 10 cm^{-1} . Reliable band origins for the stretching modes require diagonalization of a 9×9 resonance polyad involving $\nu_x + \nu_y$ ($x, y=4,5,6$).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

GdO was a Postdoctoral Fellow of the Feinberg Graduate School (Weizmann Institute) when this work was initiated. JM is the incumbent of the Helen and Milton A. Kimmelman Career Development Chair. The Weizmann Institute Pilot PC Farm was used courtesy of the Department of Particle Physics and the Weizmann Institute Computing Center. JL thanks the US National Institute of Standards and Technology for partial support of his thermochemical studies.

Supplementary material

The CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ quartic force field of methylenimine in internal and in normal coordinates is available on the World Wide Web at the Uniform Resource Locator (URL)
<http://theochem.weizmann.ac.il/web/papers/ch2nh.html>

REFERENCES

- [1] D. R. Johnson and F. J. Lovas, Chem. Phys. Lett. **15**, 65 (1972)
- [2] D. E. Milligan, J. Chem. Phys. **35**, 1491 (1961)
- [3] C. B. Moore, G. C. Pimentel, and T. D. Goldfarb, J. Chem. Phys. **43**, 63 (1965)
- [4] S. W. Slayden and J. F. Liebman, “Thermochemistry of olefins, carbonyl compounds, and imines”, in *The chemistry of functional groups A3: the chemistry of double-bonded functional groups* (ed. S. Patai), J. Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1997, pp. 537–609.
- [5] P. D. Godfrey, R. D. Brown, B. J. Robinson, and M. W. Sinclair, Astrophys. Lett. **13**, 119 (1973)
- [6] D. J. DeFrees and W. J. Hehre, J. Phys. Chem. **82**, 391 (1978)
- [7] M. A. Grela and A. J. Colussi, Int. J. Chem. Kinet. **20**, 733 (1988)
- [8] N. A. Tarasenko, A. A. Tishenkov, V. G. Zaikin, V. V. Volkova, and L. E. Gusel’nikov, *Izvestiya Akademia Nauk SSSR, Seriya Khimicheskaya* 2397 (1986) [In Russian: English translation p. 2397 (1986).]
- [9] R. A. L. Peerboom, S. Ingemann, N. M. M. Nibbering, and J. F. Liebman, *J. Chem. Soc. Perkin 2*, 1825 (1990)
- [10] F. P. Lossing, Y.-T. Lam, and A. MacColl, Can. J. Chem. **59**, 2228 (1981)
- [11] J. L. Holmes, F. P. Lossing, and P. M. Mayer, Chem. Phys. Lett. **198**, 211 (1992)
- [12] B. J. Smith, J. A. Pople, L. A. Curtiss, and L. Radom, Aust. J. Chem. **45**, 285 (1992)
- [13] L.A. Curtiss, K. Raghavachari, G.W. Trucks, and J.A. Pople, J. Chem. Phys. **94**, 7221 (1991)
- [14] Holmes and his coworkers derived the current value using estimated values for the enthalpy of formation of azetidine and propargylamine; the Moscow group was likewise

- forced to estimate the former value as well. The consistency of these results suggests consistency in the energetics of aliphatic and alicyclic amines, cf. J. F. Liebman, M. S. Campbell and S. W. Slayden, “Thermochemistry of amines, nitroso compounds, nitro compounds and related species” in *The chemistry of functional groups Supplement F2: The chemistry of amino, nitroso, nitro and related groups* (ed. S. Patai), John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1996, pp. 337–378.
- [15] J.M.L. Martin and G. De Oliveira, *J. Chem. Phys.* **111**, 1843 (1999)
 - [16] S. Parthiban and J. M. L. Martin, *J. Chem. Phys.*, in press.
 - [17] M. E. Jacox and D. E. Milligan, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **56**, 333 (1975)
 - [18] D. R. Johnson and F. J. Lovas, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **15**, 65 (1972); W. H. Kirchhoff, D. R. Johnson, and F. J. Lovas, *J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data* **2**, 1 (1973)
 - [19] M. Allegrini, J. W. C. Johns, and A. R. W. McKellar, *J. Chem. Phys.* **70**, 2829 (1979)
 - [20] G. Duxbury and M. L. Le Lerre, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **92**, 326 (1982); see also Ref. [63].
 - [21] L. Halonen and G. Duxbury, *J. Chem. Phys.* **83**, 2078 (1985)
 - [22] L. Halonen and G. Duxbury, *J. Chem. Phys.* **83**, 2091 (1985)
 - [23] L. Halonen and G. Duxbury, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **118**, 246 (1985)
 - [24] Y. Hamada, K. Hashiguchi, M. Tsuboi, Y. Koga, and S. Kondo, *J. Mol. Spectrosc.* **105**, 70 (1984)
 - [25] L. Halonen, C. M. Deeley, and I. M. Mills, *J. Chem. Phys.* **85**, 692 (1986)
 - [26] R. Pearson and F. Lovas, *J. Chem. Phys.* **66**, 4149 (1977)
 - [27] C. Pouchan and K. Zaki, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 342 (1997); see also K. Zaki, M. Gelize, and C. Pouchan, *J. Chim. Phys. (Paris)* **94**, 37 (1997)
 - [28] J. M. L. Martin, T. J. Lee, P. R. Taylor, and J. P. François, *J. Chem. Phys.* **103**, 2589

- (1995).
- [29] G. D. Purvis III and R. J. Bartlett, J. Chem. Phys. **76**, 1910 (1982)
 - [30] K. Raghavachari, G. W. Trucks, J. A. Pople, and M. Head-Gordon, Chem. Phys. Lett. **157**, 479 (1989).
 - [31] A.D. Becke, J. Chem. Phys. **98**, 5648 (1993).
 - [32] C. Lee, W. Yang, and R. G. Parr, Phys. Rev. B **37**, 785 (1988)
 - [33] M.J. Frisch, G.W. Trucks, H.B. Schlegel, G.E. Scuseria, M.A. Robb, J.R. Cheeseman, V.G. Zakrzewski, J.A. Montgomery Jr., R. E. Stratmann, J. C. Burant, S. Dapprich, J. M. Millam, A. D. Daniels, K. N. Kudin, M. C. Strain, O. Farkas, J. Tomasi, V. Barone, M. Cossi, R. Cammi, B. Mennucci, C. Pomelli, C. Adamo, S. Clifford, J. Ochterski, G. A. Petersson, P. Y. Ayala, Q. Cui, K. Morokuma, D. K. Malick, A. D. Rabuck, K. Raghavachari, J. B. Foresman, J. Cioslowski, J. V. Ortiz, A. G. Baboul, B. B. Stefanov, G. Liu, A. Liashenko, P. Piskorz, I. Komaromi, R. Gomperts, R. L. Martin, D. J. Fox, T. Keith, M.A. Al-Laham, C. Y. Peng, A. Nanayakkara, C. Gonzalez, M. Challacombe, P. M. W. Gill, B. Johnson, W. Chen, M. W. Wong, J. L. Andres, C. Gonzalez, M. Head-Gordon, E. S. Replogle, and J. A. Pople, *Gaussian 98, Revision A.7* (Gaussian, Inc., Pittsburgh, PA, 1998).
 - [34] MOLPRO is a package of ab initio programs written by H.-J. Werner and P. J. Knowles, with contributions from J. Almlöf, R. D. Amos, A. Berning, D. L. Cooper, M. J. O. Deegan, A. J. Dobbyn, F. Eckert, S. T. Elbert, C. Hampel, R. Lindh, A. W. Lloyd, W. Meyer, A. Nicklass, K. Peterson, R. Pitzer, A. J. Stone, P. R. Taylor, M. E. Mura, P. Pulay, M. Schütz, H. Stoll, and T. Thorsteinsson.
 - [35] J. M. L. Martin and S. Parthiban, *autoW1W2* (Weizmann Institute of Science, 2000).
This driver is available on request from the authors.
 - [36] T. H. Dunning Jr., J. Chem. Phys. **90**, 1007 (1989)

- [37] T.H. Dunning Jr., K.A. Peterson, D.E. Woon, "Correlation consistent basis sets for molecular calculations", in *Encyclopedia of Computational Chemistry*(P. v. R. Schleyer, Ed.), Wiley & Sons, Chichester, UK, 1998.
- [38] R. A. Kendall, T. H. Dunning, and R. J. Harrison, *J. Chem. Phys.* **96**, 6796 (1992)
- [39] Cowan, R.D.; Griffin, M. *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **66**, 1010 (1976)
- [40] R.L. Martin *J. Phys. Chem.* **87**, 750 (1983)
- [41] R. J. Gdanitz and R. Ahlrichs, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **143**, 413 (1988)
- [42] M. Schütz, R. Lindh, and H.-J. Werner, *Mol. Phys.* **96**, 719 (1999)
- [43] J. D. Watts, J. Gauss, and R. J. Bartlett, *J. Chem. Phys.* **98**, 8718 (1993)
- [44] W. D. Allen, INTDER, a program for general internal coordinate transformations (Stanford University, 1992).
- [45] To the authors' knowledge, the term 'embarrassingly parallel' was introduced in G. C. Fox, P. Messina, and R. Williams, "Parallel Computing Works!" (Morgan Kauffman, San Francisco, 1994), Chapter 7; see also <http://www.npac.syr.edu/copywrite/pcw/>.
- [46] D. Papoušek and M. R. Aliev, *Molecular Vibrational-Rotational Spectra* (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1982) and references therein.
- [47] J. F. Gaw, A. Willetts, W. H. Green, and N. C. Handy, in *Advances in molecular vibrations and collision dynamics* (ed. J. M. Bowman), JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 1990.
- [48] J. M. L. Martin, *POLYAD, a program for vibrational anharmonic spectroscopy of asymmetric and symmetric top molecules* (Weizmann Institute of Science, 1997).
- [49] J. M. L. Martin and P. R. Taylor, *Spectrochim. Acta A* **53**, 1039 (1997)
- [50] S. Carter, H. M. Shnider, and Joel M. Bowman, *J. Chem. Phys.* **110**, 8417 (1999); S. Carter, J. M. Bowman, and N. C. Handy, *Theor. Chem. Acc.* **100**, 191 (1998); S. Carter and J. M. Bowman, *J. Chem. Phys.* **108**, 4397 (1998)

- [51] A. B. McCoy and E. L. Sibert III, in *Dynamics of Molecules and Chemical Reactions*, R. E. Wyatt and J. Z. H. Zhang, eds. (Marcel Dekker, inc.: New York 1995) and references therein.
- [52] J. M. L. Martin, Chem. Phys. Lett. **242**, 343 (1995)
- [53] J. M. L. Martin and P. R. Taylor, Chem. Phys. Lett. **248**, 336 (1995).
- [54] J. M. L. Martin and P. R. Taylor, Mol. Phys. **96**, 681 (1999)
- [55] G. Bouchoux and J.-Y. Salpin, Rapid Commun. Mass Spec. **13**, 932 (1999)
- [56] G. Bouchoux, J.-Y. Salpin, and D. Leblanc, Int. J. Mass Spectrom. Ion Proc. **153**, 37 (1996)
- [57] S.G. Lias, J.E. Bartmess, J.F. Liebman, J.L. Holmes, R.D. Levin, and W.G. Mallard, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data **17**, 1 (1988)
- [58] E. P. Hunter and S. G. Lias, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data **27**, 413 (1998); E. P. Hunter and S. G. Lias, "Proton Affinity Evaluation", in *NIST Chemistry WebBook*, NIST Standard Reference Database Number 69 (Eds. W.G. Mallard and P.J. Linstrom), February 2000, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg MD, 20899 (<http://webbook.nist.gov>).
- [59] S. Hammerum and T. I. Sølling, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **121**, 6002 (1999)
- [60] J. C. Traeger and R. G. McLoughlin, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **103**, 3647 (1981)
- [61] This is based on $\Delta H_{f,298}^{\circ}[\text{C}_2\text{H}_6] = -20.08 \pm 0.09$ kcal/mol [64], $\Delta H_{f,298}^{\circ}[\text{N}_2\text{H}_4] = 22.75 \pm 0.12$ kcal/mol [64], and $\Delta H_{f,298}^{\circ}[\text{H}_3\text{CNH}_2] = -5.38$ kcal/mol from M. Frenkel, K. N. Marsh, R. C. Wilhoit, G. J. Kabo, and G. N. Roganov, *Thermodynamics of Organic Compounds in the Gas State*, Thermodynamics Research Center, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, 1994.
- [62] J. M. L. Martin, Chem. Phys. Lett. **259**, 679 (1996)

- [63] G. Duxbury, H. Kato, and M. L. Le Lerre, *Faraday Discuss.* **71**, 97 (1981)
- [64] L. V. Gurvich, I. V. Veyts, and C. B. Alcock (Eds.), *Thermodynamic properties of individual substances*, 4th Ed. (Hemisphere, New York, 1989)
- [65] K. Kuchitsu, in *Accurate molecular structures: their determination and importance* (Ed. A. Domenicano and I. Hargittai), Oxford University Press, 1992.
- [66] J. M. L. Martin and P. R. Taylor, *J. Chem. Phys.* **106**, 8620 (1997)

TABLES

TABLE I. Computed harmonic frequencies ω_i of CH₂NH; computed and observed fundamental frequencies and selected overtones and combination bands of CH₂NH. All quantities in cm⁻¹.

i	ω_i	ω_i	ν_i	ν_i	ν_i	ν_i
	CCSD(T)/	MP2/	Expt	Expt.	CCSD(T)/	MP2/
	cc-pVTZ	6-311G**	gas phase	Ar matrix ^a	cc-pVTZ	6-311G**
1	3440.5	3491.5	3262.622 ^b		3268.5	3260.7
2	3152.1	3198.3	3024.452 ^c	3036	3024.7	3017.4
3	3052.0	3086.8	2914.184 ^c	2926	2914.4	2903.1
4	1675.3	1685.1	1638.30 ^d	1641	1634.8	
5	1483.2	1510.1	1452.039 ^e	1453	1451.9	
6	1386.9	1397.2	1344.267 ^e	1348	1350.1	
7	1073.0	1089.4	1058.181 ^f	1059	1058.1	
8	1162.0	1186.4	1126.988 ^f	1123	1131.6	
9	1080.0	1101.9	1060.760 ^f	1063	1059.3	
$2\nu_4$					3257.1	3258.3
$2\nu_5$			2884.986 ^c		2878.4	2886.7
$2\nu_6$					2685.5	—
$\nu_4 + \nu_5$					3080.9	3064.2
$\nu_4 + \nu_6$					2958.3	2944.2
$\nu_5 + \nu_6$					2796.1	2781.4

(a) Refs. [2,17] (b) Ref. [23] (c) Ref. [22] (d) Ref. [63] (e) Ref. [20] (f) Ref. [21]

TABLE II. Resonance matrix involving the stretching modes and eigensolution. Units are cm^{-1} except for the eigenvectors, which are dimensionless.

$ 100000000\rangle$	3255.16								
$ 010000000\rangle$	-2.982	2992.19							
$ 001000000\rangle$	-1.978	4.261	2901.63						
$ 000110000\rangle$	-3.938	12.704	20.856	3076.43					
$ 000101000\rangle$	-17.022	-35.988	16.062	-1.728	2981.60				
$ 000011000\rangle$	-8.823	30.951	-10.313	-2.584	2.868	2802.89			
$ 000200000\rangle$	-5.229	-7.531	-28.565	-1.577	-3.948	-0.131	3256.70		
$ 000020000\rangle$	-0.409	-12.821	-19.947	2.550	-0.511	-1.473	-2.532	2901.09	
$ 000002000\rangle$	-75.390	-4.853	-11.136	-0.478	-4.373	0.066	-1.828	-0.425	2696.37
Eigenvectors:									
	$2\nu_6$	$\nu_5 + \nu_6$	$2\nu_5$	ν_3	$\nu_4 + \nu_6$	ν_2	$\nu_3 + \nu_4$	$2\nu_4$	ν_1
	2685.5	2796.1	2878.4	2914.4	2958.3	3024.7	3080.9	3257.2	3268.5
$ 100000000\rangle$	-0.132	-0.014	0.010	0.019	-0.040	0.034	-0.017	0.434	0.889
$ 010000000\rangle$	-0.018	0.167	-0.056	0.217	-0.579	-0.746	-0.172	-0.027	0.008
$ 001000000\rangle$	-0.052	-0.112	-0.719	-0.612	-0.261	0.082	-0.108	-0.076	0.031
$ 000110000\rangle$	0.001	-0.008	0.090	0.055	0.088	0.165	-0.976	-0.027	-0.010
$ 000101000\rangle$	-0.022	0.056	0.089	0.268	-0.718	0.627	0.065	-0.039	-0.044
$ 000011000\rangle$	-0.009	-0.978	0.088	0.112	-0.113	-0.104	-0.005	-0.009	-0.017
$ 000200000\rangle$	-0.007	-0.004	-0.058	-0.037	-0.047	-0.001	-0.032	0.894	-0.438
$ 000020000\rangle$	-0.008	-0.014	-0.671	0.699	0.236	0.066	0.011	-0.002	0.000
$ 000002000\rangle$	-0.989	0.012	0.041	0.013	0.045	-0.008	0.009	-0.059	-0.116

TABLE III. Computed and observed equilibrium geometries for CH_2NH and CH_2NH_2^+

	CCSD(T)/ cc-pVTZ	CCSD(T)/ cc-pVTZ	CCSD(T)/ cc-pVTZ	CCSD(T)/ cc-pVQZ	CCSD(T)/ MTsmall	CCSD(T)/ MTsmall	Microwave Ref. [26]
e^- correlated	valence	valence	valence	valence	valence	all	
	r_e	$r_g - r_e$	$r_z - r_e$	r_e	r_e	r_e	r_s
CH_2NH							
$r(\text{CN})$	1.27746	0.00626	0.00576	1.27416	1.27331	1.27077	1.273
$r(\text{NH})$	1.02168	0.02040	0.00863	1.02000	1.02033	1.01912	1.021
$r(\text{CH})$ cis	1.09236	0.02164	0.01088	1.09148	1.09168	1.09033	1.09
$r(\text{CH})$ trans	1.08815	0.02141	0.01060	1.08728	1.08733	1.08602	1.09
$\theta(\text{HNC})$	109.510	0.131	0.271	109.934	109.640	109.784	110.4
$\theta(\text{NCHcis})$	124.624	-0.133	0.194	124.418	124.614	124.591	125.1
$\theta(\text{NCHtrans})$	118.637	-0.320	-0.091	118.672	118.679	118.715	117.9
CH_2NH_2^+							
$r(\text{CN})$	1.27995			1.27693	1.27631	1.27393	
$r(\text{NH})$	1.01657			1.01549	1.01550	1.01465	
$r(\text{CH})$	1.08350			1.08271	1.08264	1.08136	
$\theta(\text{HNC})$	121.510			121.501	121.525	121.534	
$\theta(\text{HCN})$	119.404			119.394	119.425	119.457	

For an overview of the different types of molecular geometries and the mathematical relationships between them, see the review by Kuchitsu [65]. r_e is the bottom-of-the-well equilibrium geometry, r_z the position-averaged geometry in the vibrational ground state, while r_g is the geometry obtained in a gas-phase electron diffraction experiment.

TABLE IV. Computed and observed heats of formation of CH_2NH and CH_2NH_2^+ , and break-down by components of the W2 computed heat of formation. All values in kcal/mol.

	CH_2NH	C_2H_4	trans-HNNH	(a)	CH_2NH_2^+
SCF/AV5Z	305.38	434.93	155.30	-10.27	214.56
SCF/ $\text{AV}\infty\text{Z}$	305.44	434.98	155.31	-10.30	214.64
CCSD-SCF/AV5Z	122.30	117.90	128.52	0.91	115.93
CCSD-SCF/ $\text{AV}\infty\text{Z}$	123.96	119.40	130.30	0.89	117.56
(T)/AVQZ	8.23	7.18	9.66	0.19	6.61
(T)/ $\text{AV}\infty\text{Z}$	8.51	7.45	9.97	0.20	6.84
inner-shell corr.	1.53	2.27	0.74	-0.03	1.70
scalar relativistic	-0.34	-0.33	-0.31	0.02	-0.41
spin-orbit coupling	-0.08	-0.17	0.00	0.00	-0.08
TAE_e	439.02	563.64	296.04	-9.18	340.23
ZPVE(scaled B3LYP) ^b	24.59	31.48	17.50	-0.10	33.46
anharmonic ZPVE	24.69 ^c	31.52 ^d	17.53 ^e	-0.17	—
TAE_0	414.43	532.16	278.54	-9.08	306.77
Previous benchmark		531.89 [66]	278.73 [54]		
W2 $\Delta H_{f,0}^\circ$	22.98	14.33	49.78	-9.08	182.27
W2 $\Delta H_{f,298}^\circ$	21.08	12.28	48.07	-9.10	179.40
W2h	21.07	12.21	48.07	-9.07	179.41
W1	20.82	11.90	47.80	-9.03	178.96
W1h	20.86	12.12	47.80	-9.10	178.99
Expt.	26.4±3.2 [6], 25±3 [7], 21±4 [8,11], ≤22±3 [11], 20.6±2.4 ^f	12.52±0.12 [64]	≥47.1±0.5 ^g		178±1 [10], 179.7 [59]

(a) reaction energy of $(1/2) \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 + (1/2) \text{trans-N}_2\text{H}_2 \rightarrow \text{CH}_2=\text{NH}$ with zero-point or temperature corrections following descriptions in the first column

(b) B3LYP/cc-pVTZ harmonic frequencies scaled by 0.985, as prescribed in Ref. [15].

(c) CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ quartic force field, this work.

(d) CCSD(T)/cc-pVQZ harmonics with CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ anharmonicities, Ref. [53]. At CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ level 31.50 kcal/mol. Best estimate in that reference is 31.59 kcal/mol.

(e) CCSD(T)/cc-pVQZ, Ref. [54]. At CCSD(T)/cc-pVTZ level 17.49 kcal/mol.

(f) from G2 reaction energies for 10 reactions, and expt. thermochemical data for auxiliary species [12]

(g) From thermal correction in this work and $\Delta H_{f,0}^\circ \geq 48.8 \pm 0.5$ kcal/mol in H. Biehl and F. Stuhl, J. Chem. Phys. **100**, 141 (1994)