



Following the Morokuma method, the effect of intermolecular distance and the molecules mutual orientation on the terminal interaction energy and its constituents was analyzed for each model (see the table).

In the case of model B, weak intermolecular interactions at $r = 8\text{--}10$ Å were by an order of magnitude larger than those in the other two models. The molecules interaction energy (ΔE) was mainly due to electrostatic energy (E_{es}); the positive ΔE meant that the interaction was repulsive.

At $r = 4.6\text{--}4.9$ Å, weak intermolecular interactions were observed in all the studied models, and constituents other than E_{es} contributed to the full energy. The charge transfer energy (E_{ct}) was dominative in ΔE : the absolute value of E_{ct} was 4 times greater than E_{es} in model A, 1.9 times greater than E_{es} in model B, 1.7 times greater than E_{es} in model C. It was the charge transfer energy that led to weak attraction of the molecules

The electrostatic energy of repulsion between (4-*n*-butoxyphenyl)-*N*-(*p*-tolyl)methanimine molecules was larger at $r = 4.6\text{--}4.9$ Å than at $r = 8\text{--}10$ Å (see the table). The repulsive character of the interaction

between the molecules followed also from the values of the exchange energy (E_{ex}), which was positive as well; in model A it was comparable to E_{es} . For models B and C E_{ex} was almost three times lower than E_{es} . Thus, as two (4-*n*-butoxyphenyl)-*N*-(*p*-tolyl)methanimine molecules came closer, both the value of ΔE and the interaction type changed.

From the tabulated data, it may be noted that the highest interaction energy between the (4-*n*-but-

Constituents of the interaction energy of the 1-(4-butoxyphenyl)-*N*-(*p*-tolyl)methanimine molecules

r , Å	Constituents of the interaction energy, 10^5 Hartree					
	E_{es}	E_{ex}	E_{pl}	E_{ct}	E_{mix}	ΔE
Model A						
8.57	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6
4.64	2.0	2.2	-0.1	-8.1	0.2	-3.8
Model B						
7.90	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
4.79	2.8	1.0	-0.1	-5.4	0.1	-1.7
Model C						
10.27	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5
4.88	3.2	0.9	-0.2	-5.3	0.1	-1.3

oxyphenyl)-*N*-(*p*-tolyl)methanimine molecules was achieved in model A ($r = 4.64 \text{ \AA}$), that is, when the terminal interaction occurred between terminal groups of different type. This likely resulted from the orientation of the dipole moments of the interacting molecules.

The orientation of the electrical dipole moment (μ) is defined as the direction of the radius-vector from the negative charge center of gravity to the positive charge center of gravity [12].

Thus, the orientation of the dipole moments of the molecules was opposite in the molecules B and C, and the repulsive interactions should dominate; this was confirmed by the results of the calculations. The highest energy of the electrostatic interaction was observed when the dipole moments of the molecules were in reversed orientation. When the dipole moments orientation was identical (model A), the charge transfer energy increased (E_{ct} was twice as high as the sum of E_{es} and E_{ex}). Basing on the obtained values of the intermolecular interaction energy, it was concluded that the terminal interactions did not significantly affect the self-organization of the (4-*n*-butoxyphenyl)-*N*-(*p*-tolyl)methanimine molecules and their mesomorphic properties. The results obtained are well consistent with the data of X-ray analysis [8] and of computer simulation [13, 14] of nematic liquid crystals, both having revealed the dominating role of stacking and planar interactions between the molecules.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was performed under the support of the Ministry of Education and Science, project "Synthesis and study of practically important amines and their functional derivatives using catalysts based on carbon nanomaterials."

REFERENCES

1. Volkova, T.G., Nebukina, E.G., Usanova, N.N., and Klyuev, M.V., *Russ. J. Gen. Chem.*, 2008, vol. 78, no. 7, pp. 1407–1410.
2. Volkova, T.G., Usanova, N.N., and Klyuev, M.V., *Zhdk. Krist. ikh Prakt. Ispol'z.*, 2008, no. 2(24), pp. 63–71.
3. Neverov, V.S., Komolkin, A.V., and Volkova, T.G., *Vestn. S-Peterb. Univ.*, Ser. 4, 2011, no. 1, p. 34.
4. Sokolova, E.P., Sizova, O.V., and Tokhadze, I.K., Abstract of Papers, *Tezisy XIV Int. Conf. Chem. Thermodyn.*, Sankt Petersburg, 2002, p. 354.
5. Blinov, L.M., Kac, E.I., and Sonin, A.A., *Usp. Phys. Nauk*, 1987, vol. 152, no. 7, pp. 449–477.
6. *HyperChem Release 7.5*, no.12-750-1503700446.
7. Granovsky, A.A., *PC GAMESS version 7.1*.
8. Shestakova, R.G., Prosochkina, T.R., Tokunova, E.F., Tyurina, L.A., and Kantor, E.A., *Russ. J. Gen. Chem.*, 2006, vol. 76, no. 4, pp. 615–620.
9. Shestakova, R.G., Prosochkina, T.R., Tokunova, E.F., Tyurina, L.A., and Kantor, E.A., *Bashk. Khim. Zh.*, 2005, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 80.
10. Prosochkina, T.R., Shestakova, R.G., and Kantor, E.A., *Bashk. Khim. Zh.*, 2004, vol. 11, no. 1, p. 68.
11. Prosochkina, T.R., Shestakova, R.G., and Kantor, E.A., *Bashk. Khim. Zh.*, 2003, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 71.
12. Minkin, V.I., Osipov, O.A., and Zhdanov, Yu.A., *Dipol'nye momenty v organicheskoy khimii* (Dipole Moments in Organic Chemistry), Leningrad: Khimiya, 1968.
13. Odzhkha, D.P., *Russ. J. Gen. Chem.*, 2005, vol. 79, no. 5, pp. 669–672.
14. Odzhkha, D.P., *Russ. J. Gen. Chem.*, 2006, vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 361–365.