

Comparisons of Photoinduced Oxidative Addition of B–H, B–B, and Si–H Bonds at Rhodium(η^5 -cyclopentadienyl)phosphine Centers

Marius V. Câmpian,[†] Jeremy L. Harris,[†] Naser Jasim,[†] Robin N. Perutz,^{*,†}
Todd B. Marder,[‡] and Adrian C. Whitwood[†]

Department of Chemistry, University of York, York, U.K., YO10 5DD, and Department of Chemistry, University of Durham, Durham, U.K., DH1 3LE

Received June 6, 2006

Ultraviolet irradiation of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ (**1a**), $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ (**1b**), and $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ (**1c**) (collectively abbreviated as $[\text{Rh}(\text{Cp}')(\text{PR}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$) in the presence of HBpin (pinacolate = pin = 1,2- $\text{O}_2\text{C}_2\text{Me}_4$) results in elimination of C_2H_4 and B–H oxidative addition, leading to the formation of boryl hydride complexes $[\text{Rh}(\text{Cp}')(\text{Bpin})(\text{H})(\text{PR}_3)]$. Complete conversion is achieved in liquid HBpin or by photolysis in hexane at -10°C . Similarly, photolysis of **1a–c** in the presence of B_2pin_2 in hexane at -10°C leads to B–B oxidative addition products, $[\text{Rh}(\text{Cp}')(\text{Bpin})_2(\text{PR}_3)]$. Irradiation at room temperature leads to formation of $[\text{Rh}(\text{Cp}')(\text{PR}_3)_2]$ in addition to the desired products. The rhodium boryl products were characterized by multinuclear NMR spectroscopy and, in the case of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{Bpin})(\text{H})(\text{PPh}_3)]$, by X-ray crystallography. The structure reveals a Rh–B distance of 2.0196(15) Å. The H $\cdots$ B separation of 2.09(2) Å together with the bond angles at the metal suggest some residual H $\cdots$ B interaction. Photolysis of **1a–c** in the presence of tertiary and secondary silanes (HSiEt_3 , HSi^iPr_3 , $\text{HSi}(\text{OMe})_3$, HSiMe_2Et , H_2SiEt_2 , and H_2SiMe_2) results in rhodium silyl hydride complexes $[\text{Rh}(\text{Cp}')(\text{SiR}'_2\text{R}'')(\text{H})(\text{PR}_3)]$. The structure of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{Si}^i\text{Pr}_3)(\text{H})(\text{PMe}_3)]$ was determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction, yielding a Rh–Si bond length of 2.3617(3) Å and a Rh–H bond length of 1.508(17) Å. The H $\cdots$ Si distance of 2.278(17) Å and the very unequal H–Rh–P and H–Rh–Si angles suggest some residual H $\cdots$ Si interaction. Competition reactions were performed with **1b** dissolved in hexane in the presence of HBpin and B_2pin_2 simultaneously. ^{31}P NMR measurements, made after brief irradiation, showed a slight preference for B–B oxidative addition over B–H oxidative addition. Similar experiments with three-way competition among HBpin, HSiMe_2Et , and HC_6F_5 , analyzed by ^1H NMR spectroscopy, showed negligible selectivity among H–B, H–C, and H–Si oxidative addition. Molecular structures were also determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction for **1b**, **1c**, $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$, and $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)\text{Cl}_2(\text{PPh}_3)]$.

Introduction

In the last few years, major advances have been made in transition-metal-catalyzed borylation of C–H bonds in arenes, alkanes, and heterocyclic compounds.^{1–10} These reactions can be considered as a combination of C–H bond activation with either B–H or B–B activation. One of the most effective catalysts is recognized to be $[\text{Ir}(\text{cod})(\text{OME})_2]_2 + \text{dtbpy}$ (dtbpy

= 4,4'-di-*tert*-butyl-2,2'-bipyridine), proceeding via the reaction intermediate $[\text{Ir}(\text{Bpin})_3(\text{dtbpy})]$.^{6,11} The borylation of heteroarenes and polycyclic aromatics with this catalyst has proved very effective.^{6,12} The reactions of late transition metal complexes with boranes, $\text{HB}(\text{OR})_2$ [(OR)₂ is usually pinacolate = pin = 1,2- $\text{O}_2\text{C}_2\text{Me}_4$ or catecholate = cat = 1,2- $\text{O}_2\text{C}_6\text{H}_4$] can involve either B–H oxidative addition to yield boryl hydride complexes^{5,13} or formation of σ -B–H com-

* Corresponding author. E-mail: mp1@york.ac.uk.

[†] University of York.

[‡] University of Durham.

(1) (a) Waltz, K. M.; Hartwig, J. F. *Science* **1997**, *277*, 211. (b) Chen, H.; Schlecht, S.; Semple, T. C.; Hartwig, J. F. *Science* **2000**, *287*, 1995. (c) Chen, H.; Hartwig, J. F. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **1999**, *38*, 3391.

(2) Murata, M.; Kawakita, K.; Asana, T.; Watanabe, S.; Masuda, Y. *Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn.* **2002**, *75*, 825.

(3) Cho, J.-Y.; Tse, M. K.; Holmes, D.; Maleczka, R. E.; Smith, M. R., III. *Science* **2002**, *295*, 305.

(4) Shimada, S.; Batsanov, A. S.; Howard, J. A. K.; Marder, T. B. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2001**, *40*, 2168.

(5) Ishiyama, T.; Miyaura, N. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **2003**, *680*, 3.

(6) (a) Ishiyama, T.; Takagi, J.; Ishida, K.; Miyaura, N.; Anastasi, N. R.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 390. (b) Ishiyama, T.; Ishida, K.; Takagi, J.; Miyaura, N. *Chem. Lett.* **2001**, 1082. (c) Takagi, J.; Sato, K.; Hartwig, J. F.; Ishiyama, T.; Miyaura, N. *Tetrahedron Lett.* **2002**, *43*, 5649. (d) Ishiyama, T.; Nobuta, Y.; Hartwig, J. F.; Miyaura, N. *Chem. Commun.* **2003**, 2924. (e) Datta, A.; Köllhofer, A.; Plenio, H. *Chem. Commun.* **2004**, 1508.

(7) (a) Iverson, C. N.; Smith, M. R., III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1999**, *121*, 7696. (b) Tse, M. K.; Cho, J. Y.; Smith, M. R., III. *Org. Lett.* **2001**, *18*, 2831. (c) Cho, J. Y.; Iverson, C. N.; Smith, M. R., III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 12868. (d) Chotana, G. A.; Rak, M. A.; Smith, M. R., III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 10539.

(8) Lawrence, J. D.; Takahashi, M.; Bae, C.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2004**, *126*, 15334.

(9) Dick, A. R.; Sanford, M. S. *Tetrahedron* **2006**, *62*, 2439.

(10) Kurotobi, K.; Miyauchi, M.; Takakura, K.; Murafuji, T.; Sugihara, Y. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2003**, 3663.

(11) (a) Ishiyama, T.; Takagi, J.; Hartwig, J. F.; Miyaura, N. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2002**, *41*, 3056. (b) Boller, T. M.; Murphy, J. M.; Hapke, M.; Ishiyama, T.; Miyaura, N.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 14263.

(12) (a) Coventry, D. N.; Batsanov, A. S.; Goeta, A. E.; Howard, J. A. K.; Marder, T. B.; Perutz, R. N. *Chem. Commun.* **2005**, 2172. (b) Mkhaliid, I. A. I.; Coventry, D. N.; Albesa-Jové, D.; Batsanov, A. S.; Howard, J. A. K.; Perutz, R. N.; Marder, T. B. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2006**, *45*, 489. (c) Ishiyama, T.; Takagi, J.; Yonekawa, Y.; Hartwig, J. F.; Miyaura, N. *Adv. Synth. Catal.* **2003**, *345*, 1003.

plexes.^{14,15} B–H oxidative addition is also implicated in catalytic hydroboration and dehydrogenative borylation of alkenes.^{2,16,17} Equivalent principles apply to borylation with diboranes (RO)₂BB–(OR)₂ where B–B oxidative addition dominates.^{5,18} The formation and properties of metal boryl complexes, key intermediates in all of these reactions have been reviewed.¹⁹ Borylation reactions have also been studied in detail by theoretical methods.²⁰

Photochemical B–H oxidative addition was first mentioned by Hartwig as a very low yield process for [W(η^5 -C₅H₅)₂H₂].²¹ In 2004, we reported photoinduced B–H oxidative addition of HBpin at [Ru(depe)₂H₂] and [Rh(tripphos)H₃].²² We used laser flash photolysis to measure the second-order rate constants for oxidative addition of boranes and found that the rate constants for reaction of {Ru(depe)₂} and the related intermediates followed the order $k(\text{H}_2) > k(\text{HBpin}) > k(\text{Et}_3\text{SiH})$. Photochemical B–B oxidative addition occurs cleanly on irradiation of [W(η^5 -C₅H₅)₂H₂] with B₂(cat-3,5-*i*-Bu)₂, yielding [W(η^5 -C₅H₅)₂-(Bcat-3,5-*i*-Bu)₂]; notably, B–B activation occurs in preference to C–H activation of the benzene solvent or the C–H bonds of the substrate.²¹ Similarly, irradiation of [Re(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(CO)₃] with B₂pin₂ yields *cis* and *trans* isomers of [Re(η^5 -C₅Me₅)-(Bpin)₂(CO)₂].^{1c}

Hartwig et al. have shown that the photochemical reaction of HBpin in cyclohexane with [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(η^4 -C₆Me₆)] yields boryl hydride complex [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)₂(Bpin)₂], which reacts in neat HBpin to form [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin)₃] and release H₂; both complexes are formally in the Rh(V) oxidation state. Structural and computational investigations suggest that these complexes each involve one partial B...H bond.²³ These two complexes and [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(η^4 -C₆Me₆)] are active catalysts for the borylation of hydrocarbons.^{8,23} Thermal reaction of [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)₂(Bpin)₂] with P(*p*-tol)₃ yields the Rh(III) complex [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin){P(*p*-tol)₃}], while reaction of [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin)₃] with PET₃ yields [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(Bpin)₂-(PET₃)]. Thermal or photochemical reaction of [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)-(H)₂(SiEt₃)₂] with HBpin yields [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)₂(SiEt₃)(Bpin)], another complex with partial B...H bonding. This species reacts with P(*p*-tol)₃ to give a mixture of boryl hydride and silyl hydride complexes of [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅){P(*p*-tol)₃}].²⁴ The very closely related complex [Ir(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin)(PMe₃)] was synthesized by Iverson and Smith by displacement of cyclohexane from the cyclohexyl hydride complex with HBpin and was the first complex demonstrated to be a catalyst precursor for the borylation of benzene.⁷

Photoinduced Si–H bond oxidative addition is long established,²⁵ and we have used it as a benchmark in laser studies of the reaction of coordinatively unsaturated complexes derived by photolysis of metal dihydride complexes.²⁶ We have also studied the oxidative addition of trialkylsilanes at rhodium by photolysis of [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(C₂H₄)₂] and its derivatives.²⁷ Related reactions have been reported at C₅Me₅ complexes²⁸ and at dinuclear rhodium complexes with linked cyclopentadienyl groups.²⁹ Silyl hydride species are key intermediates in catalytic hydrosilylation,³⁰ a process that is practiced on an industrial scale.³¹

The complex [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(PMe₃)(C₂H₄)] (**1a**) was first observed in 1975 by Cramer and Seiwel³² and investigated as a metal base by Werner and Feser.³³ Upon photolysis, loss of ethene from [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(PR₃)(C₂H₄)] (R = Me, Ph) complexes leads to the formation of an unsaturated 16e[−] species capable

- (13) Kawamura, K.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2001**, *123*, 8422.
- (14) (a) Montiel-Palma, V.; Lumbierres, M.; Donnadieu, B.; Sabo-Etienne, S.; Chaudret, B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 5624. (b) Lachaize, S.; Essalah, K.; Montiel-Palma, V.; Vendier, L.; Chaudret, B.; Barthelat, J.-C.; Sabo-Etienne, S. *Organometallics* **2005**, *24*, 2935. (c) Crestani, M. G.; Munoz-Hernandez, M.; Arevalo, A.; Acosta-Ramirez, A.; Garcia, J. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 18066.
- (15) (a) Schlecht, S.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2000**, *122*, 9435. (b) Muhoro, C. N.; Hartwig, J. F. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **1997**, *36*, 1510. (c) Muhoro, C. N.; He, X.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1999**, *121*, 5033. (d) Lam, W. H.; Lin, Z. Y. *Organometallics* **2000**, *19*, 2625.
- (16) (a) Fernandez, E.; Maeda, K.; Hooper, M. W.; Brown, J. M. *Chem. Eur. J.* **2000**, *6*, 1840. (b) Manning, D.; Nöth, H. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **1985**, *24*, 878. For reviews see: (c) Burgess, K.; Ohlmeyer, M. *J. Chem. Rev.* **1991**, *91*, 1179. (d) Burgess, K.; van der Donk, W. A. In *Encyclopedia of Inorganic Chemistry*; King, R. B., Ed.; Wiley: Chichester, 1994; Vol. 3, p 1420. (e) Fu, G. C.; Evans, D. A.; Muci, A. R. In *Advances in Catalytic Processes*; Doyle, M. P., Ed.; JAI: Greenwich, CT, 1995; p 95. (f) Beletskaya, I.; Pelter, A. *Tetrahedron* **1997**, *53*, 4957. (g) Crudden, C. M.; Edwards, D. *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2003**, 4695.
- (17) For metal-catalyzed dehydrogenative borylation of alkenes see: Coapes, R. B.; Souza, F. E. S.; Thomas, R. L.; Hall, J. J.; Marder, T. B. *Chem. Commun.* **2003**, 614, and references therein.
- (18) For recent reviews on catalyzed diborations, see: (a) Marder, T. B.; Norman, N. C. *Top. Catal.* **1998**, *5*, 63. (b) Ishiyama, T.; Miyaura, N. *J. Synth. Org. Chem. Jpn.* **1999**, *57*, 503. (c) Ishiyama, T.; Miyaura, N. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **2000**, *611*, 392. (d) Dembitsky, V. M.; Abu, A. A. H.; Srebnik, M. *Appl. Organomet. Chem.* **2003**, *17*, 327. (e) Dembitsky, V. M.; Abu, A. A. H.; Srebnik, M. *Adv. Organomet. Chem.* **2004**, *51*, 193. (f) Ishiyama, T.; Miyaura, N. *Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *3*, 271.
- (19) (a) Irvine, G. J.; Lesley, G.; Marder, T. B.; Norman, N. C.; Rice, C. R.; Robins, E. G.; Roper, W. R.; Whittell, G. R.; Wright, J. *Chem. Rev.* **1998**, *98*, 2685. (b) Hartwig, J. F.; Waltz, K. M.; Muhoro, C. N.; He, X.; Eisenstein, O.; Bosque, R.; Maseras, F. In *Advances in Boron Chemistry*; Siebert, W., Ed.; Spec. Publ. No. 201; The Royal Society of Chemistry: Cambridge, 1997; p 373. (c) Wade, H. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. Engl.* **1997**, *36*, 2441. (d) Braunschweig, H. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **1998**, *37*, 1786. (e) Smith, M. R., III. *Prog. Inorg. Chem.* **1999**, *48*, 505. (f) Braunschweig, H.; Colling, M. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2001**, *223*, 1. (g) Aldridge, S.; Coombs, D. L. *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2004**, *248*, 535.
- (20) (a) Wan, X.; Wang, X.; Luo, Y.; Takami, S.; Kubo, M.; Miyamoto, A. *Organometallics* **2002**, *21*, 3703. (b) Webster, C. E.; Fan, Y.; Hall, M. B.; Kunz, D.; Hartwig, J. F. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 858. (c) Lam, W. H.; Lin, Z. Y. *Organometallics* **2003**, *22*, 473. (d) Tamura, H.; Yamazaki, H.; Sato, H.; Sakaki, S. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2003**, *125*, 16114. (e) Lam, W. H.; Lam, K. C.; Lin, Z.; Shimada, S.; Perutz, R. N.; Marder, T. B. *Dalton Trans.* **2004**, 1556.
- (21) Hartwig, J. F.; He, X. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **1996**, *35*, 315. Hartwig, J. F.; He, X. *Organometallics* **1996**, *15*, 5350.
- (22) Callaghan, P. L.; Fernandez-Pacheco, R.; Jasim, N.; Lachaize, S.; Marder, T. B.; Perutz, R. N.; Rivalta, E.; Sabo-Etienne, S. *Chem. Commun.* **2004**, 242.

- (23) Hartwig, J. F.; Cook, K. S.; Hapke, M.; Incarvito, C. D.; Fan, Y.; Webster, C. E.; Hall, M. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2005**, *127*, 2538.
- (24) Cook, K. S.; Incarvito, C. D.; Webster, C. E.; Fan, Y.; Hall, M. B.; Hartwig, J. F. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2004**, *43*, 5474.
- (25) Corey, J. Y.; Braddock-Wilking, J. *Chem. Rev.* **1999**, *99*, 175.
- (26) (a) Whittlesey, M. K.; Mawby, R. J.; Osman, R.; Perutz, R. N.; Field, L. D.; Wilkinson, M. P.; George, M. W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 8627. (b) Hall, C.; Jones, W. D.; Mawby, R. J.; Osman, R.; Perutz, R. N.; Whittlesey, M. K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, *114*, 7425. (c) Cronin, L.; Nicasio, M. C.; Perutz, R. N.; Peters, R. G.; Roddick, D. M.; Whittlesey, M. K. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1995**, *117*, 10047. (d) Montiel-Palma, V.; Perutz, R. N.; George, M. W.; Jina, O. S.; Sabo-Etienne, S. *Chem. Commun.* **2000**, 1175–76. (e) Montiel-Palma, V.; Pattison, D. I.; Perutz, R. N.; Turner, C. *Organometallics* **2004**, *23*, 4034.
- (27) (a) Haddleton, D. M.; Perutz, R. N. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1985**, 1372. (b) Duckett, S. B.; Haddleton, D. M.; Jackson, S. A.; Perutz, R. N.; Poliakoff, M.; Upmacis, R. K. *Organometallics* **1988**, *7*, 1526. (c) Ampt, K. A. M.; Duckett, S. B.; Perutz, R. N. *Dalton Trans.* **2005**, 1319.
- (28) (a) Bentz, P. O.; Ruiz, J.; Mann, B. E.; Spencer, C. M.; Maitlis, P. M. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1985**, 1374. (b) Fernandez, M.-J.; Bailey, P. M.; Bentz, P. O.; Ricci, J. S.; Koetzle, T. F.; Maitlis, P. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1984**, *106*, 1650. (c) Ruiz, J.; Bentz, P. O.; Mann, B. E.; Spencer, C. M.; Taylor, B. F.; Maitlis, P. M. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1987**, 2709.
- (29) Cunningham, J. L.; Duckett, S. B. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **2005**, 744.
- (30) (a) Duckett, S. B.; Perutz, R. N. *Organometallics* **1992**, *11*, 90. (b) Brookhart, M.; Grant, B. E.; Lenges, C. P.; Prosenc, M. H.; White, P. S. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2000**, *39*, 1676.
- (31) Speier, J. L. *Adv. Organomet. Chem.* **1979**, *17*, 407. (b) Ojima, I. In *The Chemistry of Organic Silicon Compounds*; Patai, S., Rappaport, Z., Eds.; Wiley: Chichester, 1989; Chapter 25.
- (32) Cramer, R.; Seiwel, L. P. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1975**, *92*, 245.
- (33) Werner, H.; Feser, R. *J. Organomet. Chem.* **1982**, *232*, 351.

Table 1. Selected NMR Spectroscopic Data in C₆D₆ [δ (J/Hz)] for Precursors and Products of Photoreaction with Boranes


	1a	1b	1c
¹ H Cp	5.09 s, 5H	5.06 s, 5H	5.18 br m, 2H 4.99 br m, 2H
¹ H PR ₃	0.77 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 9.2, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 1.1, 9H	6.75–7.65 m, 15H	0.71 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 9.6 <i>J</i> _{RhH} 1.1, 9H
¹ H C ₂ H ₄	2.74 m, 2H 1.46 m, 2H	2.83 m, 2H 1.31 m, 2H	2.80 br m, 2H, 1.49 br m, 2H
³¹ P{ ¹ H}	4.4 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 200	59.5 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 210	6.9 dq, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 198, <i>J</i> _{PF} 2 –54.4 m
¹⁹ F			
	2a	2b	2c
¹ H hydride	–14.04 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.7, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 35.1	–13.04 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 29.6, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.8	–14.58 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 34.6, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 36.8
¹ H Cp	5.36 s	5.33 s	5.19 br s, 5.31 br s, 5.52 br s, 5.75 br s
³¹ P{ ¹ H}	12.4 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 170	62.5 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 180	13.7 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 169
¹¹ B	45.4	44.8	43.9
	3a	3b	3c
¹ H Cp	5.29 s	5.10 s	4.64 br s, 5.01 br s, 5.30 br s, 5.52 vs
³¹ P{ ¹ H}	–2.2 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 217	58.3 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 223	–0.8 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 215
	4a	4b	4c
¹ H Cp	5.46 s	5.41 s	5.43 br s, 5.76 br s
³¹ P{ ¹ H}	14.8 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 177	55.5 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 182	19.0 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 176
¹¹ B	45.1	43.7	43.8

of activating aromatic C–H bonds and Si–H bonds. The photochemistry of [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(PMe₃)(C₂H₄)] (**1a**) was intensively studied by Perutz et al. in C–H bond activation reactions of arenes³⁴ and partially fluorinated aromatic hydrocarbons.³⁵ The activation of a C–H bond of benzene was shown by laser flash photolysis to occur via an η^2 -C₆H₆ intermediate. Further investigations revealed stable η^2 -arene complexes, equilibria between aryl hydride and η^2 -arene complexes, and C–F bond activation reactions.^{36,37} Complementary studies of η^5 -C₅Me₅ analogues, usually formed by thermal reaction of [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(PMe₃)(C₆H₅)(H)] or by photochemical reaction of [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(PMe₃)(H)₂], have been studied extensively by Jones et al.^{35,36,38,39}

The complex [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(PPh₃)(C₂H₄)] (**1b**) was first reported by Oliver and Graham;⁴⁰ it was also observed as a photolytic²⁷ or thermal⁴¹ reaction product of [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(C₂H₄)₂] in the presence of PPh₃. The photochemistry of **1b** resembles that of **1a**, but has not been investigated as extensively. Partially fluorinated benzenes form C–H bond activation products that are stable at room temperature. Irradiation of **1b** in neat tertiary alkyl silanes R₃SiH (R = Et, ⁱPr) generates single products assigned to the Si–H activation complexes; [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(PPh₃)(SiⁱPr₃)(H)] has been characterized crystallographically.⁴² The related complexes [Rh(η^5 : η^1 -C₅H₄SiMe₂CH₂PPh₂)(C₂H₄)] and [Rh(η^5 : η^1 -C₅H₄SiMe₂CH₂PPh₂)(H)₂] have been studied by Jones et al.⁴³

The effect of an electron-withdrawing CF₃ group on the properties of metallocenes and methylated metallocenes was investigated by Gassman et al.^{44,45} Notably, the redox potential of [Fe(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(η^5 -C₅H₅)] is shifted by 0.64 V with respect to ferrocene. The C₅H₄CF₃ group also has a marked effect on the kinetics of substitution reactions of cyclopentadienyl rhodium dicarbonyls,⁴⁶ but little effect on charge-transfer complexes with sulfur dioxide.⁴⁷

In this paper, we describe the photochemical reactivity of complexes **1a**, **1b**, and [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(PMe₃)(C₂H₄)] (**1c**) in the presence of B–H-, B–B-, and Si–H-containing reagents. We show that **1a–c** undergo B–H oxidative addition with HBpin, B–B oxidative addition with B₂pin₂, and Si–H oxidative addition with a variety of silanes. All of the products were characterized by NMR spectroscopy, and a few representative examples were chosen for more detailed spectroscopy and crystallography. We also report the relative yields of oxidative addition of B–H, B–B, Si–H, and C–H bonds investigated by competition reactions, the first such comparison.



Results

Starting Materials. Complexes **1a** and **1b** were synthesized by standard procedures, but **1c** has not been reported previously. The sample of **1c** was synthesized by a procedure similar to that for **1b**, but using Ti(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃) instead of Li(C₅H₅).⁴⁴ NMR data for **1a**, **1b**, and **1c** are summarized in Table 1.

Crystals of **1b**, suitable for X-ray diffraction, were obtained from hexane at –18 °C; the molecular structure of **1b** is shown

(34) (a) Belt, S. T.; Duckett, S. B.; Helliwell, M.; Perutz, R. N. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1989**, 928. (b) Belt, S. T.; Dong, L.; Duckett, S. B.; Jones, W. D.; Partridge, M. G.; Perutz, R. N. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1991**, 266.

(35) Selmecey, A. D.; Jones, W. D.; Partridge, M. G.; Perutz, R. N. *Organometallics* **1994**, 13, 522.

(36) (a) Belt, S. T.; Helliwell, M.; Jones, W. D.; Partridge, M. G.; Perutz, R. N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, 115, 1429. (b) Chin, R. M.; Dong, L.; Duckett, S. B.; Partridge, M. G.; Jones, W. D.; Perutz, R. N. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, 115, 7685.

(37) Ballhorn, M.; Partridge, M. G.; Perutz, R. N.; Whittlesey, M. K. *J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun.* **1996**, 961.

(38) Jones, W. D. *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, 44, 4475.

(39) Jones, W. D. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2003**, 36, 140.

(40) Oliver, A. J.; Graham, W. A. G. *Inorg. Chem.* **1971**, 10, 1165.

(41) Belt, S. T.; Duckett, S. B.; Haddleton, D. M.; Perutz, R. N. *Organometallics* **1989**, 8, 748.

(42) Heaton, S. N.; Partridge, M. G.; Perutz, R. N.; Parsons, S. J.; Zimmermann, F. J. *Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1998**, 2515.

(43) Lefort, L.; Crane, T. W.; Farwell, M. D.; Baruch, D. M.; Kaeuper, J. A.; Lachicotte, R. J.; Jones, W. D. *Organometallics* **1998**, 17, 3889.

(44) Gassman, P. G.; Winter, C. H. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, 108, 4228.

(45) Gassman, P. G.; Mickelson, J. W.; Sowa, J. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, 114, 6942.

(46) Cheong, M.; Basolo, F. *Organometallics* **1988**, 7, 2041.

(47) Hall, C.; Harris, J. L.; Killey, A.; Maddox, T. P.; Palmer, S.; Perutz, R. N.; Rooney, A. D.; Goff, S. E. J.; Kazarian, S. G.; Poliakov, M. J. *Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1994**, 3515.




Figure 1. Molecular structure of **1c** (thermal ellipsoids shown at 50% probability, hydrogen atoms omitted).

Table 2. Selected Bond Lengths (Å) and Angles (deg) for 1c

Rh–P(1)	2.2149(5)	C(6)–Rh(1)–C(7)	39.02(14)
Rh(1)–C(7)	2.106(3)	C(7)–Rh(1)–P(1)	94.84(8)
Rh(1)–C(8)	2.106(2)	C(8)–Rh(1)–P(1)	91.46(8)
C(7)–C(8)	1.407(5)	P(1)–Rh(1)–C(1)	162.38(6)
C(1)–C(6)	1.473(3)		
C(6)–F	1.313(3)–1.353(3)		
Rh(1)–C(Cp)	2.232(2)–2.295(2)		

in Figure S1 (Supporting Information). The ethene hydrogen atoms were located and refined. The structure is similar to those of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]^{48}$ and $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{CO})]^{49}$.

Crystals of **1c** suitable for X-ray crystallography were obtained by very slow sublimation under vacuum. The Rh–C bond lengths of the coordinated ethene ligand (Table 2, Figure 1) are equal (2.106 Å) and insignificantly different from those of **1b**; changes in other bond lengths are also minimal. As for **1b**, we can define an approximate mirror plane passing through the rhodium and phosphorus atoms and the center of the ethene C=C bond.

Reactions with HBpin. Photochemical reaction of a solution of **1a** and HBpin in hexane, contained in a Pyrex NMR tube ($\lambda > 290$ nm), at room temperature, leads to formation of the hydride boryl complex $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{H})(\text{Bpin})(\text{PMe}_3)]$ (**2a**) and the bis(phosphine) complex $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)_2]$ (**3a**). When the photolysis temperature is reduced to about -10 °C, **2a** is still formed, but there is a drastic decrease in formation of byproduct **3a**. Irradiation of **1a** in neat HBpin at -10 °C leads to formation of the desired product **2a** only; after 15 h, conversion is complete (Scheme 1). Complex **2a** can be purified by sublimation at 35 °C, yielding a white solid. The boryl complex **2a** exhibits a doublet in the $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$ NMR spectrum at δ 12.4 with a coupling constant $J_{\text{RHP}} = 170$ Hz characteristic of a half-sandwich Rh(III) complex. In this complex, and its analogues, the ^{31}P resonance is shifted downfield of the precursor, here **1a**. With partial ^1H decoupling, the ^{31}P resonance becomes a doublet of doublets, consistent with the presence of a single hydride in the molecule. In keeping with a Rh(III) complex, the ^1H NMR spectrum reveals a hydride resonance at δ -14.04 as a doublet of doublets ($J_{\text{PH}} = 33.7$, $J_{\text{RH}} = 35.1$ Hz). The Bpin methyl groups are all coincident at δ 1.16 in the ^1H NMR spectrum. The ^{11}B NMR spectrum of the boryl product **2a** reveals a broad resonance at δ 45.4 in the region characteristic of metal–boryl complexes¹⁹ and to low field of HBpin (δ 27.2). Broad-band proton decoupling did not affect the ^{11}B resonance of **2a** or of the other boryl complexes reported here. In the $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$ spectrum, the Bpin resonances of **2a** are found at 81.2 (s, $\text{BO}_2\text{C}_2(\text{CH}_3)_4$), 25.4 (s, $\text{BO}_2\text{C}_2(\text{CH}_3)_4$), and 25.3 (s, $\text{BO}_2\text{C}_2(\text{CH}_3)_4$) compared to free HBpin, which resonates at δ 83.1 and 24.9. As has been observed previously,²² the quaternary




Figure 2. Molecular structure (50% thermal ellipsoids) of **2b**, with hydrogen atoms omitted except for H1A.

carbon shows an upfield shift on borylation. The chirality of the rhodium center could be expected to lead to four inequivalent methyl resonances in the ^{13}C and in the ^1H NMR spectra. The presence of only two Bpin methyl resonances in the ^{13}C spectrum is consistent with rapid rotation about the Rh–B bond; the corresponding ^1H resonances are not resolved.

Traces of the bis(phosphine) byproduct **3a** were also observed by NMR spectroscopy in reactions of the fragment $\{\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\}$ in the presence of partially fluorinated arenes.⁵⁰ Complex **3a** exhibits a doublet in the $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$ NMR spectrum at δ -2.2 with a J_{RHP} value of 217 Hz characteristic of a half-sandwich Rh(I) complex.⁵¹

The photolysis of **1b** at room temperature in the presence of HBpin follows the same path as that for **1a**. The product, $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{H})(\text{Bpin})(\text{PPh}_3)]$ (**2b**), shows spectra similar to **2a**, but the coupling constants, $J_{\text{PH}} = 29.6$ and $J_{\text{RH}} = 32.8$ Hz, of the products are smaller than for the PMe_3 analogue, while J_{RHP} is characteristically larger. Similar changes are observed in the spectra of other complexes on replacing PMe_3 by PPh_3 (see below). Both the ^1H and the ^{13}C NMR spectra show two closely spaced resonances for the Bpin methyl groups. The full widths at half-height of the hydride peaks for **2b** are essentially identical to those for analogues in which the boryl group is replaced by a silyl or a fluoroaryl group (see Competition Reactions below). It follows that any residual BH spin–spin coupling is negligible. Initial reactions carried out on a small scale yielded mixtures of **2b** and **3b**. A larger scale reaction, with careful control of the photolysis time, yielded **2b** only, with complete conversion to product; chromatographic purification yielded an analytically pure sample.

It was already known that **3b** is formed photochemically from $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)_2]$ in the presence of 2 equiv of PPh_3 ⁴¹ and also thermally from reaction of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ with PPh_3 .²⁷ To establish the source of **3b**, we investigated the thermal reaction of each of **1b** and **2b** with triphenylphosphine by heating to 75 °C overnight. $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$ (**3b**) was formed both from the Rh(I) and from the Rh(III) species.

We succeeded in avoiding the formation of complexes **3a** and **3b** and in obtaining only the boryl complexes, by lowering the photolysis temperature to -10 °C and/or by using HBpin as a solvent as well as a substrate. This strategy also resulted in the desired product $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)(\text{Bpin})(\text{H})(\text{PMe}_3)]$ (**2c**) on photolysis of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ (**1c**). Relevant

(48) Porzio, W.; Zocchi, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1978**, *100*, 2048.

(49) Choi, M.-G.; Brown, T. L. *Inorg. Chem.* **1993**, *32*, 5603.

(50) Cronin, L.; Higgitt, C. L.; Perutz, R. N. *Organometallics* **2000**, *19*, 672.

(51) Jones, R. A.; Mayor Real, F.; Wilkinson, G.; Galas, A. M. R.; Hursthouse, M. B. *J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans.* **1981**, 126.

Scheme 1. Photochemical Reactions of 1a–1c




Table 3. Selected Bond Lengths (Å) and Angles (deg) for 2b

Rh(1)–P(1)	2.2157(4)	B(1)–Rh(1)–P(1)	88.82(4)
Rh(1)–B(1)	2.0196(15)	O(1)–B(1)–Rh(1)	125.87(10)
B(1)–O(1)	1.3835(18)	O(2)–B(1)–Rh(1)	123.44(10)
B(1)–O(2)	1.3909(18)	O(1)–B(1)–O(2)	110.67(12)
Rh(1)–C(Cp)	2.2233(14)–2.3198(14)	H(1A)–Rh(1)–B(1)	71.0(8)
C(6)–O(1)	1.4533(16)	H(1A)–Rh(1)–P(1)	88.5(8)
C(7)–O(2)	1.4601(16)		
Rh(1)–H(1A)	1.50(2)		
B(1)···H(1A)	2.09(2)		

NMR spectroscopic data for the products are summarized in Table 1 and illustrated in the Supporting Information (Figures S8–S10).

Orange crystals of **2b**, from the large-scale preparation, were grown from hexane at room temperature. The crystal structure (Figure 2, Table 3) confirmed the identity of the product and showed a Rh–B distance of 2.0196(15) Å. The puckering of the boronate ring was indicated by the torsional angle B(1)–O(1)–C(6)–C(7) of $-19.69(14)^\circ$. The B(1)–Rh(1)–P(1) angle is $88.82(4)^\circ$, close to the expected value for a pseudo-octahedral complex. The hydride was located in the difference map and was refined at a Rh(1)–H(1A) distance of 1.50(2) Å with an acute B(1)–Rh(1)–H(1A) angle of $71.0(8)^\circ$, leading to an H···B separation of 2.09(2) Å. The P(1)–Rh(1)–H(1A) angle is considerably larger at $88.5(8)^\circ$. Since the B(1)–Rh(1)–P(1) angle is so close to 90° , we see no steric reason for the acute B–Rh–H angle. These parameters are very similar to those determined by X-ray diffraction at 120 K for [Rh(Cl)(H)(Bpin)(PⁱPr₃)₂], for which Rh–H = 1.47(2) Å, B–Rh–H = $70.0(8)^\circ$, and H···B = 2.02(2) Å.⁵² However, Rh–H distances determined by accurate X-ray diffraction measurements are systematically underestimated by ca. 0.1 Å, although the direction of the bond can be obtained with reasonable accuracy.⁵² In [Rh(Cl)(H)(Bpin)(PⁱPr₃)₂], neutron diffraction data obtained at 20 K gave Rh–H = 1.571(5) Å and B–Rh–H = $67.8(2)^\circ$, resulting in an H···B separation of 2.013(5) Å.⁵² DFT studies on [Rh(Cl)(H)(Bpin)(PⁱPr₃)₂] showed evidence for a weak residual H···B interaction, although the structure is much closer to that of a formal hydrido–boryl complex than that of a σ -borane complex (e.g., $r(\text{B}–\text{H}) = 1.35$ Å in ref 14). Thus, given the strong similarity of the structural data for **2b** and [Rh(Cl)(H)(Bpin)(PⁱPr₃)₂], a similar description seems appropriate.

Hartwig et al. reacted [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)₂(Bpin)₂] with P(*p*-tol)₃ to form [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin){P(*p*-tol)₃}], a close

analogue of **2b**. NMR spectroscopic data include a hydride resonance at $\delta -13.08$ ($J_{\text{RhH}} = J_{\text{PH}} = 33.8$ Hz) and a J_{RhP} value of 179 Hz, as well as an ¹¹B resonance at $\delta 42.3$.²³ They reported no NMR spectroscopic evidence for B···H interaction. The molecular structure of [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin){P(*p*-tol)₃}] was also determined by X-ray diffraction data at 183 K, which gave Rh–B = 2.029(4) Å, Rh–H = 1.42(3) Å, B–Rh–H = $78.5(12)^\circ$, and a resulting H···B separation of 2.23(3) Å.

We would anticipate that the degree of formal oxidative addition of the B–H bond will be enhanced by electron-rich metal centers. Comparison of the structures of **2b** and [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin){P(*p*-tol)₃}] show changes in the expected direction with a decrease in $r(\text{Rh}–\text{H})$, an increase in H···B, and a less acute B–Rh–H angle. The differences are on the order of 3σ in $r(\text{Rh}–\text{H})$, but 7σ in the B–Rh–H angle. DFT calculations¹⁸ on the model complex [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(H)(BOCH₂-CH₂O)(PH₃)], where the C₅Me₅ was replaced by C₅H₅, Bpin by BOCH₂CH₂O, and P(*p*-tol)₃ by PH₃, gave Rh–B = 2.033 Å, Rh–H = 1.56 Å, B–Rh–H = 71.7° , and a resulting B···H separation of 2.14 Å. These values are indeed closer to the measurements on **2b** as expected by the reduction in electron-donating ability of the ligands. Importantly, there must be a continuum of structures available representing various degrees of oxidative addition, and the differences in structure between **2b** and [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin){P(*p*-tol)₃}], especially in the B–Rh–H angle, show this clearly. In **2b**, the B···H interaction is demonstrably stronger than in [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin){P(*p*-tol)₃}], although neither can be described as a σ -borane complex, and the lack of BH coupling in solution is significant.⁵³

A hexane solution containing a mixture of **2b** and **3b**, formed by photoreaction of **1b** with HBpin at room temperature, was left at -18°C , yielding orange crystals, which were also investigated by X-ray diffraction. The crystal structure reveals


(53) Comparisons may be drawn to M(η^5 -C₅R₅)(H)₂(Bcat') (M = Nb, Ta; R = H, Me; cat' = O₂C₆H₄ or O₂C₆H₃-3'-Bu). The Ta complexes are best described as boryl hydride complexes, while the dominant form of the niobium complexes is the dihydridoborate. However, isotopic perturbation of the ¹H resonance shows that the niobium complexes are in equilibrium with another species, either the boryl hydride complexes or Nb(H)(η^2 -HBcat) (Hartwig, J. F.; De Gala, S. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 3661. Lantero, D. R.; Ward, D. L.; Smith, M. R., III. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1997**, *119*, 9699). A related situation exists for Rh and Ir compounds, where the former prefer a square-planar Rh^I hydridoborate structure, while the latter prefer an octahedral Ir^{III}(H)₂(BR₂) structure (Baker, R. T.; Ovenall, D. W.; Calabrese, J. C.; Westcott, S. A.; Taylor, N. J.; Williams, I. D.; Marder, T. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1990**, *112*, 9399. Baker, R. T.; Ovenall, D. W.; Harlow, R. L.; Westcott, S. A.; Taylor, N. J.; Marder, T. B. *Organometallics* **1990**, *9*, 3028. Westcott, S. A.; Marder, T. B.; Baker, R. T.; Calabrese, J. C.; Harlow, R. L.; Lam, K. C.; Lin, Z. *Polyhedron* **2004**, *23*, 2665).

(52) Lam, W. H.; Shimada, S.; Batsanov, A. S.; Lin, Z.; Marder, T. B.; Cowan, J. A.; Howard, J. A. K.; Mason, S. A.; McIntyre, G. J. *Organometallics* **2003**, *22*, 4557.

Table 4. NMR Spectroscopic Data [solvent C₆D₆, δ (J/Hz)] for Products of Photoreaction of **1a**–**1c** with Silanes^a

	5a SiMe ₂ Et	6a SiMeEt ₂	7a Si(OMe) ₃	8a SiEt ₂ H	9a SiEt ₃	10a Si ⁱ Pr ₃
¹ H hydride	−14.5 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.1, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.1	−14.58 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.1, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.4	−14.06 t, <i>J</i> _{PH} 31.5, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.3	−14.6 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.5, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.1	−14.55 t, <i>J</i> _{PH} 32.3, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 31.5	−14.6 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.2, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 29.8
¹ H Cp	5.10 s	5.11 s	5.22 s	5.10 s	5.14 s	5.12 s
³¹ P{ ¹ H}	5.5 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 171	5.3 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 171	9.6 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 160	8.2 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 165	5.2 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 171	0.87 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 174
	5b	6b	7b	8b	9b ⁴²	10b ⁴²
¹ H hydride	−13.38 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 29.3, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 30.2	−13.40 app t, <i>J</i> _{PH} 29.3, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 29.3	−12.99 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 28.3, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 29.1	−13.57 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 29.9, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 29.5	−13.49 app t, <i>J</i> _{PH} 29.1, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 29.1	−13.60 dd, <i>J</i> _{PH} 29.9, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 28.2
¹ H Cp	5.07 s	5.08 s	5.21 s	5.13 s	5.10 s	5.10 t, <i>J</i> _{RhH} = <i>J</i> _{PH} 0.5
³¹ P{ ¹ H}	62.5 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 184	62.0 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 185	59.2 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 175	62.8 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 178	59.6, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 188	56.8, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 185
	5c	6c	7c	8c	9c	10c
¹ H hydride	−15.24 ddq, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.3, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 33.1 <i>J</i> _{PH} 2.8	−15.20 ddq, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.3, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.8 <i>J</i> _{PH} 2.8	−14.52 ddq, <i>J</i> _{PH} 31.1, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 33.1, <i>J</i> _{PH} 2	−15.14 ddq, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.3, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.8 <i>J</i> _{PH} 2.9	−15.14 ddq, <i>J</i> _{PH} 35.7, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 32.8 <i>J</i> _{PH} 2.9	−14.91 ddq, <i>J</i> _{PH} 33.2, <i>J</i> _{RhH} 30.7, <i>J</i> _{PH} 2.9
¹ H Cp	4.72 s, 5.18 s, 5.30 s, 5.39 s	4.73 s, 5.20 s, 5.29 s, 5.41 s	4.93 s, 5.27 s, 5.42 s, 5.57 s	4.74 s, 5.06 s, 5.38 s, 5.43 s	4.76 s, 5.21 s, 5.28 s, 5.44 s	4.86 s, 5.21 s, 5.37 s, 5.40 s
³¹ P{ ¹ H}	6.8 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 171	8.7 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 171	9.6 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 160	9.1 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 165	4.7 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 171	0.3 d, <i>J</i> _{RhP} 174

^a Values of *J*_{RhH} were determined by recording ¹H{³¹P} spectra; app = apparent.

**Figure 3.** Molecular structure of **10a** (50% thermal ellipsoids, hydrogen atoms omitted except H1A).

that **2b** and **3b** had cocrystallized (Figure S4 and S5, Tables S1). The bond lengths and angles measured for **2b** in this structure are similar to those in the crystal structure described above, but are less well determined. The most notable feature of the structure of **3b** is a π – π interaction between a phenyl ring of one phosphine and a phenyl ring of the other phosphine, with a centroid-to-centroid distance of 3.6069(17) Å and an angle between planes of 4.2°.

Reaction with B₂(pin)₂. The complex **1a** was irradiated in the presence of a 2-fold excess of B₂pin₂ in hexane solution. At room temperature, the product of B–B bond activation, [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(Bpin)₂(PMe₃)] (**4a**), was formed along with the bis-(phosphine) complex **3a**, but this byproduct could be avoided by carrying out the photolysis at −10 °C. The reaction was taken to complete conversion to **4a**; elution of a hexane solution of the mixture through a silica column separated the boryl complex **4a** from boron-containing impurities. Final purification of **4a** was achieved by sublimation. The product **4a** exhibits a doublet at δ 14.7 with a *J*_{RhP} value of 177 Hz in the ³¹P{¹H} NMR spectrum, downfield of **1a** (contrast to **2a**). Further evidence for the identity of the complex came from the ¹H and ¹³C resonances of the Bpin groups, the ¹¹B NMR resonance at δ 45.1 to low field of that of B₂pin₂ at δ 34.4 (Figure S11, Supporting Information), and the parent ion in the mass spectrum. We also observed the characteristic upfield shift in the ¹³C resonance of the quaternary carbons of the Bpin ligands. Crystals were grown from hexane as very thin plates, but the quality of the resulting diffraction data was low. Nevertheless, the data were consistent with the formulation.

The above procedure was also used for the photochemical reactions of complex **1b** and **1c** to give the B–B activation products [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(Bpin)₂(PPh₃)] (**4b**) and [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄-CF₃)(Bpin)₂(PMe₃)] (**4c**), respectively, with complete conversion. Selected NMR data for the boryl complexes are summarized in Table 1 and illustrated in the Supporting Information (Figures S11–S13); full data may be found in the Experimental Section. Hartwig et al. have reacted [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(H)(Bpin)₃] with PEt₃ at 70 °C in cyclohexane, yielding the analogue [Rh(η^5 -C₅Me₅)(Bpin)₂(PEt₃)], which exhibits an ¹¹B resonance at δ 42.3 and a doublet in the ³¹P NMR spectrum with a *J*_{RhP} value of 169 Hz.²³

The limiting factor in the synthesis of **4b** is the solubility of the precursor **1b** in inert solvents. We attempted to irradiate **1b** with B₂pin₂ in a variety of alternative solvents without success. Photolysis in chlorinated solvents yielded [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)Cl₂-(PPh₃)] (**11b**), which was crystallized from toluene. Details of the molecular structure are given in the Supporting Information.

Reactions with Tertiary and Secondary Silanes. Complex **1a** was irradiated in neat trialkyl or trialkoxy silanes HSiR₃ (R = Et, ⁱPr, OMe) or mixed trialkyl silanes HSiMe₂Et, HSiMeEt₂, and H₂SiEt₂, at room temperature, on an NMR scale (Table 4). The most thoroughly characterized reaction was that of **1a** with ⁱPr₃SiH. The reaction generated [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiⁱPr₃)(H)(PMe₃)] (**10a**) in greater than 90% yield (by NMR spectroscopy) together with traces of [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiⁱPr₃)₂(H)₂] (δ −14.5 d, *J*_{RhH} 30 Hz)²⁷ and another {Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(PMe₃)} product that could not be identified. Complex **10a** exhibits a characteristic doublet of doublets in the ¹H NMR spectrum (δ −14.6, *J*_{RhH} 29.8 and *J*_{PH} 33.2 Hz) and a doublet in the ³¹P NMR spectrum (δ 0.87, *J*_{RhP} 174 Hz). The {¹H–²⁹Si} correlation linked the isopropyl resonances to a ²⁹Si resonance at δ 52.1 with passive doublet couplings to rhodium and phosphorus of 14 and 33 Hz, respectively. We could not establish a correlation to the hydride resonance, implying that *J*_{SiH} for the hydride is very small, with a value less than 2 Hz. In contrast, [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiⁱPr₃)₂(H)₂] exhibited a correlation from hydride to ²⁹Si at δ 52.1 with *J*_{RhSi} = 15 Hz.

Crystals of **10a** were grown from hexane, and the structure was determined (Figure 3, Table 5). The Rh–Si bond length is 2.3617(3) Å, and the Si–Rh–P angle is 99.224(11). The hydride was located, leading to a Rh–H bond length of 1.508(17) Å

Table 5. Selected Bond Lengths (Å) and Angles (deg) for 10a

Rh(1)–P(1)	2.2251(3)	Si(1)–Rh(1)–P(1)	99.224(11)
Rh(1)–Si(1)	2.3617(3)	H(1A)–Rh(1)–P(1)	84.7(6)
Rh(1)–C(Cp)	2.2556(11)	H(1A)–Rh(1)–Si(1)	68.0(6)
Rh(1)–H(1A)	1.508(17)		
Si···H(1A)	2.278(18)		

and a Si···H distance of 2.278(17) Å. The H–Rh–P and H–Rh–Si angles are 84.7(6)° and 68.0(6)°, respectively. It is striking that these two angles are so different and that the very acute angle is associated with silicon despite the greater steric demand of the SiⁱPr₃ group compared to the PMe₃ group. For comparison, Maitlis et al. determined the structure of [Rh(η⁵-C₅Me₅)(SiEt₃)₂(H)₂] by X-ray and neutron diffraction at 20 K. The neutron determination gave an average Rh–H bond length of 1.581(3) Å and an average Si···H distance of 2.27(6) Å.⁵⁴ Sabo-Etienne et al. have published several structures with both σ-disilane and hydride ligands and have highlighted the role of secondary Si···H interactions (SISHA interactions). Their importance has been demonstrated by structure determinations, NMR dynamics, and DFT calculations. These SISHA Si···H distances are typically close to 2.2 Å.⁵⁵ In conclusion, the structure of **10a** suggests the presence of some residual Si···H interaction, although there is negligible SiH coupling in the solution NMR spectrum.

Photochemical reaction of **1a** in the presence of the other silanes leads to formation of [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(SiR₂R')(H)(PMe₃)] **5a–9a** assigned on the basis of NMR spectra as the major products (Table 4). Traces of the rhodium(V) hydride [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(SiR₂R')₂(H)₂] are also formed. In addition, other minor products are observed in the ³¹P{¹H} NMR spectrum that have no associated hydride resonances. These complexes have not been identified conclusively and hamper full characterization. In the case of HSi(OMe)₃, the reaction is as clean as for HSiⁱ-Pr₃. The value of *J*_{RhP} is 160 Hz for [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅){Si(OMe)₃}(H)(PMe₃)], compared to 171–174 Hz for the trialkylsilyl derivatives.

The irradiation of **1b** with HSiEt₃ and HSiⁱPr₃ leading to [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(SiR₃)(H)(PPh₃)] (R = Et, **9b**; R = ⁱPr, **10b**) has been reported previously, and the structure of **10b** has been determined.⁴² The current experiments were conducted on an NMR scale in neat silane HSiMe₂Et, HSiMeEt₂, H₂SiEt₂, and HSi(OMe)₃ at –10 °C. In contrast to **1a**, photochemical reactions of triphenylphosphine complex **1b** lead to formation of single products, [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(SiR₃)(H)(PPh₃)], with NMR spectra similar to the PMe₃ analogues (Table 4).

Irradiation at –10 °C of complex **1c** in the presence of neat silanes results in rhodium hydride silyl complexes as the major products. For instance, the reaction of **1c** in HSiMeEt₂ leads to formation of a single product, assigned on the basis of ¹H and ³¹P NMR spectra as [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₄CF₃)(SiMeEt₂)(H)(PMe₃)] (**6c**). The hydride region of the ¹H NMR spectrum reveals a ddq pattern at δ –15.2 (*J*_{PH} 33.3, *J*_{RhH} 32.8, *J*_{FH} 2.8 Hz). The ³¹P{¹H} spectrum shows a doublet at δ 8.5 (*J*_{RhP} 171 Hz), and a doublet is also observed in the ¹⁹F NMR spectrum (δ –53.6, *J* 2.7 Hz).

NMR spectra are summarized in Table 4 and illustrated in the Supporting Information (Figures S14–S27).

Competition Reactions. To investigate the selectivity of reaction of the complex **1b** for the activation of E–H and B–B

bonds, we conducted photochemical experiments in the presence of two or three of the substrates HBpin, HSiEt₃, HSiMe₂Et, HC₆F₅, and B₂pin₂ simultaneously. The results are summarized in Table 6.

Complex **1b** was irradiated in hexane in the presence of HBpin (10 equiv) and B₂pin₂ (10 equiv), and product formation was followed in situ by ³¹P{¹H} NMR spectroscopy (Figure 4a). Integration (quantitative ³¹P NMR and ³¹P{¹H} gave identical results) shows a ratio of boryl hydride **2b** to bis-boryl **4b** complex of 1:3.2 after 30 min of photolysis, increasing to 1:4 after 90 min of photolysis, indicating a significant preference for B–B over B–H oxidative addition.

Formation of [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(C₆F₅)(H)(PPh₃)] (**12b**) on irradiation of **1b** with HC₆F₅ was reported previously.⁴² Irradiation of **1b** in C₆D₁₂, in the presence of HBpin and HC₆F₅, was followed by ¹H NMR spectroscopy in the hydride region. There is a very slight selectivity for B–H over C–H oxidative addition. A three-way competition reaction among HBpin, HC₆F₅, and HSiMe₂-Et is illustrated in Figure 4b and again shows only a slight selectivity. The choice of silane was governed by the need to avoid overlap of the hydride resonances. Finally, competition between HBpin and HSiEt₃ showed only a slight selectivity after short irradiation, although there was preference for Si–H oxidative addition on longer irradiation. Figure 4b also illustrates the absence of broadening of the hydride resonance of the boryl hydride complex **2b** compared to the aryl hydride and silyl hydride analogues, **12b** and **5b**.

The results of the competition reactions could reflect kinetic or thermodynamic selectivity. Since it would be possible, in principle, for the Rh(III) products to equilibrate, we carried out control experiments as follows: (a) **4b** + excess HSiEt₃; (b) **5b** + excess HBpin; (c) **5b** + B₂pin₂; (d) **2b** + HSiEt₃. The solutions were made up in C₆D₆ and followed by ¹H and ³¹P NMR spectroscopy; they were left to stand at room temperature for at least 2 h, except for the first solution, which was heated to 75 °C. In no case, was any reaction observed. We can therefore exclude thermal equilibration of the final products. Photochemical equilibration of the final products was also excluded since the reactions were taken to relatively small conversion and the product distribution varied only slightly with photolysis time. Moreover, such Rh(III) species absorb very little light in the region λ > 290 nm.

It is more difficult to exclude equilibration between the Rh–(I) reaction intermediates that may be involved in most of these reactions (Scheme 2). The intermediacy of η²-arene complexes is already established in arene C–H bond activation.³⁴ Considering that η²-silane and η²-borane complexes are well known,^{15,55,56} species of the type [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(η²-HE)(PPh₃)] (HE = HBpin, HSiR₃) are likely to act as intermediates in the reactions with HBpin and with silanes. The rate constant for conversion of [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(η²-C₆H₆)(PMe₃)] to [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(Ph)(H)(PMe₃)] at 263 K may be estimated to be ca. 50 s^{–1} from published data.³⁴ If we assume that the lifetime of species such as [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(η²-HSiEt₃)(PPh₃)] and [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(η²-C₆HF₅)(PPh₃)] is of the same order, equilibration would become competitive if the rate constant for cross-reactions such as HBpin + [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(η²-HSiEt₃)(PPh₃)] were greater than about 500 dm³ mol^{–1} s^{–1}. We conclude that the observed selectivity in the competition reactions represents either kinetic selection of [Rh(η⁵-C₅H₅)(PPh₃)(S)] (S = hexane solvent) for substrates or

(54) Fernandez, M.-J.; Bailey, P. M.; Bentz, P. O.; Ricci, J. S.; Koetzle, T. F.; Maitlis, P. M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1984**, *106*, 5458.

(55) (a) Lachaize, S.; Sabo-Etienne, S. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2006**, 2115. (b) Atheaux, I.; Delpech, F.; Donnadiou, B.; Sabo-Etienne, S.; Chaudret, B.; Hussein, K.; Barthelat, J. C.; Braun, T.; Duckett, S. B.; Perutz, R. N. *Organometallics* **2002**, *21*, 5347.

(56) (a) Corey, J. Y.; Braddock-Wilking, J. *Chem. Rev.* **1999**, *99*, 175. (b) Lin, Z. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2002**, *31*, 239. (c) Nikonov, G. I. *Adv. Organomet. Chem.* **2005**, *53*, 217.

Table 6. Results of Competition Reactions

	substrates				
	HBpin/B ₂ pin ₂	HBpin/HC ₆ F ₅	HBpin/HC ₆ F ₅ /HSiMe ₂ Et	HBpin/HSiEt ₃	HBpin/HSiEt ₃
conc rel to 1b /eq NMR method	10:10 ³¹ P{ ¹ H}	10:10 ¹ H	10:10:10 ¹ H	10:10 ¹ H	15:5 ¹ H
irradiation time/min	integrations ^a 2b:4b:1b	integrations ^a 2b:12b	integrations ^a 2b:12b:5b	integrations ^a 2b:9b	integrations ^a 2b:9b
30	1:3.2:7.7	1:0.91	1:0.94:1.06		
60	1:3.8:2.6	1:0.89	1:0.99:1.07	1:1.07	
90	1:4.0:2.4	1:0.94	1:1.01:0.95		
120		1:0.97		1:2.5	1:0.64

^a The error bars on relative integration are estimated as $\pm 10\%$.





Figure 4. Competition reactions of **1b** after 30 min of photolysis: (a) ³¹P NMR spectrum in hexane with HBpin and B₂pin₂; (b) hydride region of ¹H NMR spectrum in C₆D₁₂ with C₆F₅H, HBpin, and HSiMe₂Et.

equilibration between Rh(I) intermediates (Scheme 2). It is worth mentioning that no such Rh(I) intermediate is anticipated in the case of B₂pin₂.

Comparisons of NMR Data. Comparison of the ³¹P NMR spectra of the Rh(I) complexes **1a**, **1b**, and **1c** shows that J_{RhP} is 10 Hz higher for the PPh₃ complex than for the PMe₃ complexes, but the CF₃ group changes J_{RhP} by only 2 Hz when compared to **1a**. The changes in **3a**–**3c** are similar (Table 1). The NMR data for Rh(III) complexes [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(X)(H)-(PPh₃)] show that the values of J_{PH} for the PPh₃ complexes are consistently about 4 Hz lower than those of the PMe₃ complexes. In contrast, the values of J_{RhP} are consistently 10–15 Hz higher for the PPh₃ complexes than for the PMe₃ complexes. Furthermore, the values of J_{RhP} follow the order X (J/Hz) = SiR₃ (188–184) > B(OR)₂ (180) > Si(OMe)₃ (175) > H ~ C₆H₅ (166) > C₆F₅ (155).⁵⁷

To our surprise, the CF₃ substituent on the Cp ring had a negligible effect on the values of J_{PH} and J_{RhP} (Tables 1 and

Scheme 2. Basis for Selectivity in an Illustrative Competition Reaction



4). A recent DFT study of a broad range of complexes *trans*-[Pt(T)(Cl)(PMe₃)₂] established the following order of *trans* influence based on the variation in the Pt–Cl bond length: T = SiMe₃ > Bpin > Bcat $\approx$ SiH₃ > H > C₆H₅.⁵⁸ Crystallographic data for [Pt(Ph₂CH₂CH₂PPh₂)₂] show the following mean Pt–P distances: X = Bcat 2.318(2) > X = SiPr₂H 2.304(3) > X = C₆F₅ 2.276(3) Å.⁵⁹ Thus the Rh–P coupling constants reflect the σ -donor strengths of the X ligands (also related to their *trans* influence),⁵⁸ with larger values of J_{RhP} reflecting increased electron density at the metal center.

Conclusions

Photochemical reactions of half-sandwich rhodium complexes [Rh(Cp')(PR₃)(C₂H₄)] (R = Me, Ph; Cp' = (η^5 -C₅H₅), η^5 -C₅H₄-CF₃) at room temperature in the presence of mono- and diboron

(57) The dihydride complex [Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(H)₂(PPh₃)] gives a ³¹P signal at δ 64.5 (d, J_{RhP} = 167 Hz) and ¹H resonances at δ 5.23 (s, 5H, C₅H₅), –13.27 (dd, 2H, J_{PH} = 35.1, J_{RhH} = 26.7 Hz). Câmpian, M. V.; Perutz, R. N. Unpublished data.

(58) Zhu, J.; Lin, Z.; Marder, T. B. *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 9384.

(59) (a) Lesley, G.; Nguyen, P.; Taylor, N. J.; Marder, T. B.; Scott, A. J.; Clegg, W.; Norman, N. C. *Organometallics* **1996**, *15*, 5137. (b) Pham, E. K.; West, R. *Organometallics* **1990**, *9*, 1517. (c) Deacon, G. B.; Elliott, P. W.; Erven, A. P.; Meyer, G. Z. *Anorg. Allg. Chem.* **2005**, *631*, 843.

reagents, HBpin and B₂pin₂, lead to formation of the boryl complexes along with byproducts. Lowering the photolysis temperature to -10°C permitted the selective formation, in good yield, of the oxidative addition products of B–H and B–B bonds. Alternatively, pure boryl hydride complexes were formed by photolysis in liquid HBpin. To prevent the formation of C–H bond activation products, it is essential to avoid the presence of aromatic C–H bonds in the solvent or in the boronate esters. Thus, use of benzene as a solvent and/or HBcat as the borane resulted in mixtures of products. This observation appears to contrast with that for $[\text{W}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)_2\text{H}_2]$, which reacts photochemically with diboron dicatcholates even in benzene solution, although the selectivity of $\{\text{W}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)_2\}$ may have been dictated by the *tert*-butyl substituents on the catechol groups.²¹

Photolysis of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ in the presence of silanes leads to clean conversion to silyl hydride complexes. However, the photoreactions of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ and $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ generate the silyl hydride complexes cleanly only in certain cases, such as with HSi^iPr_3 . Crystal and molecular structures of the complexes $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ (**1b**), $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ (**1c**), $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{Bpin})(\text{H})(\text{PPh}_3)]$ (**2b**), $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{Si}^i\text{Pr}_3)(\text{H})(\text{PMe}_3)]$ (**10a**), and $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)_2]$ (**3b**) were determined by single-crystal X-ray diffraction.

Comparisons of NMR coupling constants show that the values of the phosphorus–hydride coupling, J_{PH} , for the PPh_3 complexes are consistently lower than those of the PMe_3 complexes, while J_{RHP} is consistently higher. The values of J_{RHP} are also sensitive to the substituent X in $\text{Rh}(\text{III})$ complexes $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{X})(\text{H})(\text{PPh}_3)]$ and increase with the σ -donor strength of X. Surprisingly, the CF_3 group appears to exert no significant effect on the reactivity toward oxidative addition or on the NMR parameters of the products.

Competition reactions reveal that the photogenerated fragment, $\{\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)\}$, is remarkably unselective. There is a slight preference for B–B over B–H oxidative addition, but no significant difference among B–H, Si–H, and C–H bond activation processes. The lack of selectivity originates either in very similar rate constants for reaction of $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{alkane})]$ with the substrates or in fast equilibration between $\text{Rh}(\text{I})$ intermediates of the type $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)(\eta^2\text{-HE})]$ (Scheme 2).

In conclusion, photoinduced B–H and B–B oxidative addition reactions are as straightforward as Si–H oxidative addition. It is striking that B–H and B–B oxidative additions are efficient at $\{\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PPh}_3)\}$, whereas C–H oxidative addition yields stable products only for those arenes such as HC_6F_5 with exceptionally strong rhodium–carbon bonds in the product. The effectiveness of such reactions is often determined by the thermodynamic stability of the products⁶⁰ and points again to the strong σ -donor properties of the Bpin ligand.^{20e,58}

Experimental Section

General Procedures. All operations were performed under a nitrogen or argon atmosphere, either on a high-vacuum line (10^{-4} mbar) using modified Schlenk techniques, on standard Schlenk (10^{-2} mbar) lines, or in a glovebox. Solvents for general use (THF, benzene, toluene) were of AR grade, dried by distillation over classical reagents, and stored under Ar in ampules fitted with

Young's PTFE stopcocks. Deuterated solvents were dried by stirring over potassium and were distilled under high vacuum into small ampules with potassium mirrors.

Photochemical reactions, at room temperature, were performed in glass NMR tubes fitted with Young's PTFE stopcocks, using a 125 W medium-pressure mercury vapor lamp with a water filter (10 cm). UV–vis irradiations, at lower temperatures, were performed using a 300 W Oriel 66011 xenon lamp with a thermostatically controlled cooling system based on gaseous nitrogen boil-off obtained from a JEOL NMR spectrometer.

All NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker AMX500 spectrometers in glass tubes fitted with Young's PTFE stopcocks. All ^1H and ^{13}C chemical shifts are reported in ppm (δ) relative to tetramethylsilane and are referenced using the chemical shifts of residual protio solvent resonances (benzene, δ 7.16). The $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$ and ^{11}B NMR spectra were referenced to external H_3PO_4 and $\text{BF}_3\cdot\text{Et}_2\text{O}$, respectively. In general, ^1H decoupling did not affect the ^{11}B spectra reported in this paper.

Mass spectra were recorded on a VG-Autospec spectrometer and are quoted for ^{11}B .

Syntheses and NMR Experiments. $[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{PR}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)]$ ($\text{R} = \text{Me}, \text{Ph}$) complexes were synthesized by literature procedures, but replacing TiCp by LiCp .^{33,40} $\text{Ti}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)$ was synthesized by the literature method, via reaction of nickelocene with CF_3I followed by thallium ethoxide.⁴⁴

$[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)(\text{PMe}_3)]$, **1c.** Complex **1c** was prepared by reaction of $\text{Ti}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)$ (1 g, 3 mmol) with $[\text{RhCl}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_4)(\text{PMe}_3)]_2$ (0.51 g, 1.3 mmol) in THF at 0°C . The mixture was stirred for 3 h at 0°C and was then allowed to warm to room temperature. The supernatant was decanted, and the solid residue was washed with hexane. The combined liquors were pumped to dryness, yielding a dark brown solid. The latter was extracted with hexane, forming a dark yellow solution, which was eluted through a 5 cm Celite column with hexane. The solution was pumped to dryness, and the resulting yellow solid was sublimed without heating onto a liquid-nitrogen-cooled finger (10^{-4} mbar). The product was washed off the finger with hexane and pumped down slowly, yielding yellow crystals. Yield: 0.72 g, 49%. The sample for analysis was recrystallized from hexane. Crystals for X-ray diffraction were grown by very slow sublimation in an ampule sealed under vacuum and left at room temperature in the dark. Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{11}\text{H}_{17}\text{F}_3\text{PRh}$: C, 38.84; H, 4.69. Found: C, 38.88; H, 5.04.

NMR (C_6D_6 300 K), ^1H : δ 5.18 (m, 2H, C_5H_4), 4.99 (m, 2H, C_5H_4), 2.8 (m, 2H, C_2H_4), 1.49 (m, 2H, C_2H_4), 0.71 (dd, $J_{\text{PH}} = 9.6$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 1.1$ Hz, 9H, Me); $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$: δ 6.9 (dq $J_{\text{RHP}} = 198$, $J_{\text{FP}} = 2$ Hz). ^{19}F : $-\delta$ 54.4 (m); $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$ NMR (75.4 MHz, toluene- d_6 300 K): δ 86.76 (m C_5H_4), 84.76 (s C_5H_4), 26.89 (dd $J_{\text{PC}} = 16$, $J_{\text{RHC}} = 3$ Hz, C_2H_4), 18.80 (d $J_{\text{PC}} = 29.5$ Hz, Me); $^{13}\text{C}\{^1\text{H}\}$ NMR (THF- d_8 300 K): 125.3 (q, $J_{\text{CF}} = 267$ Hz, CF_3), 93.6 (q, $J_{\text{CF}} = 38$ Hz, CCF_3), 86.4 (s br, C_5H_4), 84.3 (s, C_5H_4), 25.8 (dd, $J_{\text{PC}} = 17$, $J_{\text{RHC}} = 3$ Hz, C_2H_4), 18.2 (d, $J_{\text{PC}} = 29$ Hz, Me). MS (EI, m/z) 340 (26%, M^+), 312 (100%, $\text{M}^+ - \text{C}_2\text{H}_4$), 293 (11%, $\text{M}^+ - \text{C}_2\text{H}_4 - \text{F}$), 236 (13%, $\text{Rh}(\text{C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)^+$) 178 (69%, $\text{Rh}(\text{PMe}_3)^+$). HRMS m/z : exp 340.00753, calcd for $\text{C}_{11}\text{H}_{17}\text{F}_3\text{PRH}$ 340.00750, difference 0.03 mDa.

$[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_5)(\text{Bpin})(\text{H})(\text{PMe}_3)]$, **2a.** An 8 mm diameter NMR tube, fitted with a Young's tap, was charged with **1a** (55 mg) and HBpin (1.5 mL) and irradiated at -10°C with the Oriel Xe arc (17 h), resulting in 100% conversion to **2a**. The excess HBpin was recovered by vacuum transfer on the high-vacuum line, leaving a brown oil. The oil was transferred to the glovebox, redissolved in toluene, and passed through a neutral alumina column (3 cm long, 1 cm diam) eluting with further toluene in order to remove boron-containing impurities. The eluent was pumped to dryness and redissolved in hexane to give a brown solid. In a smaller-scale reaction, an NMR tube was charged with a solution of complex **1a** (1–2 mg, 4–7 μmol) in neat HBpin (1 mL) and irradiated at ca.

(60) (a) Jones, W. D.; Hessel, E. T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, *115*, 554. (b) Wick, D. D.; Jones, W. D. *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 495. (c) Clot, E.; Besora, M.; Maseras, F.; M  gret, C.; Eisenstein, O.; Oelckers, B.; Perutz, R. N. *Chem. Commun.* **2003**, 490. (d) Clot, E.; Oelckers, B.; Klahn, A. H.; Eisenstein, O.; Perutz, R. N. *Dalton Trans.* **2003**, 4065.

−5 °C for 15 h. All volatiles were removed under vacuum to give a dark orange solid. Further purification by sublimation onto a liquid-nitrogen-cooled finger at 35 °C at 10^{-4} mbar yielded a white solid, which darkened on standing. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.36 (s, 5 H, C_5H_5), 1.29 (d, 9 H J_{PH} = 10.7 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), 1.16 (s, 12H $BO_2C_6H_{12}$), −14.04 (dd, 1H, J_{PH} = 33.7 Hz, J_{RHH} = 35.1 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 12.4 (d, J_{RHP} = 170.4 Hz); $^{13}C\{^1H\}$: δ 87.5 (t, C_5H_5 , J_{PC} = J_{RHC} = 2 Hz), 81.2 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 25.4 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 25.3 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 24.2 (dd, J_{PC} = 32, J_{RHC} = 1 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$); $^{11}B\{^1H\}$: δ 45.4. MS m/z : 372 (4%), 369 (1%), 272 (2%), 244 (100%, $[Rh(C_5H_5)(PMe_3)]^+$). HRMS m/z : exp 372.09090, calcd for $C_{14}H_{27}BO_2PrH$ 372.08968, difference 1.2 mDa

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(Bpin)₂(PMe₃)], **4a**. An 8 mm diameter NMR tube, fitted with a Young's tap, was charged with **1a** (55 mg) in hexane and a ca. 2-fold excess of B₂pin₂ and irradiated at −10 °C with the Oriel Xe arc (37 h), resulting in 100% conversion to **4a**. The solution was pumped to dryness, leaving an orange-brown solid. The solid was transferred to the glovebox, redissolved in toluene, and eluted through a neutral alumina column (3 cm long, 1 cm diam) with toluene in order to remove boron-containing impurities; the eluent was pumped to dryness. Fractional sublimation (sample at 40 °C) onto a liquid-nitrogen-cooled finger initially removed excess B₂pin₂. On heating for longer periods, the product **4a** also sublimed; multiple sublimations yielded off-white **4a**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.46 (s, 5 H, C_5H_5), 1.41 (dd, 9 H J_{PH} = 10.6 J_{Rh-H} = 1.3 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), 1.19 (s, 24 H, $BO_2C_6H_{12}$); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 14.8 (d, J_{RHP} = 177 Hz); $^{13}C\{^1H\}$: δ 89.7 (t, C_5H_5 , J_{PC} = J_{RHC} = 2.29 Hz), 81.09 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 25.4 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 25.3 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 23.6 (dd, J_{PC} = 32.0, J_{RHC} = 1.5 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$); ^{11}B : δ 45.1. MS, (EI, m/z : 498 (2%, M^+), 414 (3.8%, $M^+ - C_2Me_4$), 371 (25%, $M^+ - Bpin$), 244 (100%, $M^+ - B_2pin_2$).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiMe₂Et)(H)(PMe₃)], **5a**. An NMR tube was charged with **1a** (1–2 mg, 4–7 μ mol) and neat Me₂EtSiH (1 mL) and irradiated at room temperature for 10 h. All volatiles were removed under vacuum, giving a brown oil. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.10 (s, 5H, C_5H_5), 1.22 (t, 3 H, J_{HH} 7.9 Hz, CH₃), 1.02 (d, 9 H, J_{PH} = 9.5 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), 0.86 (m, 2 H, CH₂), 0.51 (s, 3 H, CH₃), 0.48 (s, 3 H, SiCH₃), −14.5 (dd, 1 H, J_{RHH} = 32.1 Hz, J_{PH} = 33.1 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 5.5 (d, J_{RHP} = 171 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiMeEt₂)(H)(PMe₃)], **6a**. The same procedure was followed as for **5a**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.11 (s, 5 H, C_5H_5), 1.20 (t, 6 H, J_{HH} = 7.7 Hz, CH₃), 1.01 (d, 9 H, J_{PH} = 10.8 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), 0.88 (m, 4 H, CH₂), 0.43 (s, 3 H SiCH₃), −14.58 (dd, 1 H, J_{RHH} = 32.4, J_{PH} = 33.1 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 5.3 (d, J_{RHP} = 171 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(Si(OMe)₃)(H)(PMe₃)], **7a**. The same procedure was followed as for **5a**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.22 (s, 5 H, C_5H_5), 3.61 (s, 9H, CH₃), 1.18 (dd, 9H, J_{PH} = 10.5, J_{RHH} = 1 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), −14.06 (dd, 1 H, J_{PH} = 31.5, J_{RHH} = 32.3 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 9.6 (d, J_{RHP} = 160 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiEt₂H)(H)(PMe₃)], **8a**. The same procedure was followed as for **5a**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.10 (s, 5 H, C_5H_5), 3.94 (d, 1H, J_{HP} = 16 Hz, SiH), 1.31 (m, 6 H, CH₃), 1.07 (d, 9 H J_{PH} = 9.5 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), 0.96 (m, 4 H, CH₂), −14.6 (dd, 1 H, J_{PH} = 33.5, J_{RHH} = 32.1 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 8.2 (d, J_{RHP} = 165 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiEt₃)(H)(PMe₃)], **9a**. The same procedure was followed as for **5a**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.14 (s, 5 H, C_5H_5), 1.27 (t, 9H, J_{HH} = 7.8 Hz, CH₃), 0.99 (d, 9H, J_{PH} = 10.1 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), 0.86 (m, 6H, CH₂), −14.55 (dd, 1H, J_{PH} = 32.3, J_{RHH} = 31.5 Hz, RhH) $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 5.2 (d, J_{RHP} = 171 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiPr₃)(H)(PMe₃)], **10a**. The same procedure was followed as for **5a**. Slow evaporation of a hexane solution in the glovebox gave yellow crystals. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 5.12 (s, 5 H, C_5H_5), 1.23 (dd, 18H, J_{HH} = 13.7 Hz, CH₃), 1.13 (m, 3H, CH), 0.95 (d, 9H, J_{PH} = 9.6 Hz, $P(CH_3)_3$), −14.6 (dd, 1H, J_{PH} = 33.2, J_{RHH} = 29.8 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 0.87 (d, J_{RHP} = 174 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(Bpin)(H)(PPh₃)], **2b**. A 15 mm diameter NMR tube, fitted with a Young's tap, was charged with **1b** (40 mg) and HBpin (5.5 mL) and irradiated with a medium-pressure Hg arc (6 h), resulting in 100% conversion to **2b**. The excess HBpin was recovered by vacuum transfer on a high-vacuum line, leaving a brown oil. The oil was transferred to a glovebox, redissolved in toluene, and passed through a neutral alumina column (3 cm long, 1 cm diam) eluting with further toluene in order to remove boron-containing impurities. The eluent was pumped to dryness and redissolved in hexane. Slow evaporation of the solution in the glovebox gave brown crystals of **2b**. In a smaller-scale reaction, a 5 mm diameter NMR was charged with **1b** (3 mg) and HBpin (ca. 1 mL) and irradiated similarly for 6 h. The HBpin was removed under vacuum and the residue was dissolved in hexane and cooled to −18 °C, yielding cocrystals of **2b**·**3b**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 7.68–6.68 (m, 15H, C_6H_5), 5.33 (s, 5H, C_5H_5), 0.95 (s, 6H $BO_2C_6H_{12}$), 0.88 (s, 6H $BO_2C_6H_{12}$), −13.04 (dd, 1H, J_{PH} = 29.6, J_{RHH} = 32.8 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 62.5 (d, J_{RHP} = 180 Hz); $^{13}C\{^1H\}$: δ 134.4 (d, J_{PC} = 11.9 Hz, *o*-Ph), 132.5 (d, J_{PC} = 9.6 Hz, *m*-Ph), 131.6 (d, J_{PC} = 2.8 Hz, *p*-Ph), 89.2 (t, J_{PC} = J_{RHC} = 2.5 Hz, C_5H_5), 82.9 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 24.59 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 24.58 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$); $^{11}B\{^1H\}$: δ 44.8. MS (EI, m/z : 558 (3%, M^+), 430 (100%, $M^+ - HBpin$), 286 (26%), 183 (20%), 168 (7%). HRMS (FAB m/z): exp 581.1271 ($M + Na^+$), calcd for $C_{29}H_{33}BO_2NaPrH$ 581.1264, difference 0.7 mDa. Anal. Calcd for $C_{29}H_{33}BO_2NaPrH$: C, 62.39; H, 5.96. Found: C, 62.38; H, 5.97.

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(Bpin)₂(PPh₃)], **4b**. A 15 mm diameter NMR tube fitted with a Young's tap was charged with **1b** (15 mg) in hexane and B₂pin₂ (26 mg) and irradiated at −20 °C with the medium-pressure Hg arc (14 h), resulting in 100% conversion (by NMR spectroscopy) to **4b**. The solution was pumped to dryness, leaving an orange-brown solid. The solid was transferred to the glovebox, redissolved in toluene, and passed through a neutral alumina column (3 cm long, 1 cm diam) eluting with further toluene in order to remove boron-containing impurities. The eluent was pumped to dryness, and the excess B₂pin₂ was removed by sublimation to give an orange-brown solid. A smaller-scale reaction at room temperature gave a mixture of two products that were eluted through an alumina column with toluene to give **4b**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 7.68–6.68 (m, 15H, Ph), 5.41 (s, 5H, C_5H_5), 1.07 (s, 6H $BO_2C_6H_{12}$), 1.04 (s, 6H $BO_2C_6H_{12}$); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 55.5 (d, J_{RHP} = 182 Hz); $^{13}C\{^1H\}$: δ 134.8 (d, J_{PC} = 11.7 Hz, *o*-Ph), 129.1 (d, J_{PC} = 2.3 Hz, *p*-Ph), 127.3 (d, J_{PC} = 10.2 Hz, *m*-Ph), 91.9 (t, J_{PC} = J_{RHC} = 2.2 Hz, C_5H_5), 81.35 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 25.21 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$), 25.14 (s, $BO_2C_2(CH_3)_4$); $^{11}B\{^1H\}$: δ 43.7. MS, (ESI, m/z): 707 (100%, $M + Na^+$), 579 (5%, $M + Na^+ - Bpin$), 501 (25%).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiMe₂Et)(H)(PPh₃)], **5b**. An NMR tube was charged with **1b** (1–2 mg, 2–4 μ mol) and neat Me₂EtSiH (1 mL) and irradiated at ca. −10 °C for 15 h. All volatiles were removed under vacuum to give a dark brown oil. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 7.68–6.68 (m, 15H, Ph), 5.07 (s, 5H, C_5H_5), 1.16 (t, 3H, J_{HH} = 7.7 Hz CH₃), 0.75 (m, 2H, CH₂), 0.3 (s, 3H, CH₃), 0.1 (s, 3H, CH₃), −13.38 (dd, 1H, J_{PH} = 29.3, J_{RHH} = 30.2 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 62.5 (d, J_{RHP} = 184 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiMeEt₂)(H)(PPh₃)], **6b**. The same procedure was followed as for **5b**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 7.68–6.68 (m, 15H, Ph), 5.08 (s, 5H, C_5H_5), 1.13 (m, 6H, CH₃), 0.89 (m, 2H, CH₂), 0.78 (2H, CH₂), 0.07 (m, 3H, CH₃), −13.4 (apparent t, 1H, $J_{PH} \sim J_{RHH}$ = 29.3 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 62 (d, J_{RHP} = 185 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(Si(OMe)₃)(H)(PPh₃)], **7b**. The same procedure was followed as for **5b**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 7.69–7.03 (m, 15H, Ph), 5.21 (s, 5H, C_5H_5), 3.4 (s, 9H, CH₃), −12.99 (dd, 1 H, J_{PH} = 28.3, J_{RHH} = 29.1 Hz, RhH); $^{31}P\{^1H\}$: δ 59.2 (d, J_{RHP} = 175 Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)(SiEt₂H)(H)(PPh₃)], **8b**. The same procedure was followed as for **5b**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), 1H : δ 7.68–6.68 (m, 15H, Ph), 5.13 (s, 5H, C_5H_5), 3.82 (d, 1H, J_{HP} = 15 Hz, SiH), 1.31

Table 7. Summary of Crystallographic Data for **1b**, **1c**, **2b**, **2b·3b**, **10a**, and **11b·C₆H₅CH₃**

	1b	1c	2b	2b·3b	10a	11b·C₆H₅CH₃
formula	C ₂₅ H ₂₄ PRh	C ₁₁ H ₁₇ F ₃ PRh	C ₂₉ H ₃₃ BO ₂ PRh	C ₇₀ H ₆₈ BO ₂ P ₃ Rh ₂	C ₁₇ H ₃₆ PRhSi	C ₃₀ H ₂₈ C ₁₂ PRh
fw	458.32	340.13	558.24	1250.78	402.43	593.30
temp (K)	115(2)	115(2)	110(2)	115(2)	110(2)	110(2)
cryst syst	monoclinic	orthorhombic	triclinic	triclinic	triclinic	monoclinic
space group	<i>P</i> 2 ₁ / <i>n</i>	<i>Pbca</i>	<i>P</i> $\bar{1}$	<i>P</i> $\bar{1}$	<i>P</i> $\bar{1}$	<i>P</i> 2 ₁ / <i>c</i>
<i>a</i> (Å)	19.6790(18)	10.7234(6)	10.7735(7)	12.0010(7)	8.6515(4)	13.5551(15)
<i>b</i> (Å)	9.6720(9)	14.3049(8)	10.9101(7)	14.0158(8)	10.4606(5)	10.2404(11)
<i>c</i> (Å)	21.451(2)	16.7704(10)	11.7832(7)	18.2082(11)	12.1019(6)	19.151(2)
α (deg)	90	90	77.068(1)	72.634(1)	74.981(1)	90
β (deg)	95.435(2)	90	77.854(1)	85.868(1)	71.512(1)	100.272(2)
γ (deg)	90	90	77.895(1)	89.726(1)	72.050(1)	90
volume (Å ³)	4064.6(7)	2572.5(3)	1300.29(14)	2915.0(3)	972.20(8)	2615.8(5)
<i>Z</i>	8	8	2	2	2	4
density (calcd) (Mg/m ³)	1.498	1.756	1.426	1.425	1.375	1.507
<i>F</i> (000)	1872	1360	576	1288	424	1208
no. of reflns collected	22 114	27 291	14 651	23 235	11 103	19 928
no. of ind reflns	7168	3743	7284	16 255	5479	4621
no. of ind reflns [<i>I</i> > 2 σ (<i>I</i>)]	4455	3413	6836	11762	5285	3766
no. of data/restraints/params	7168/0/487	3743/0/160	7284/0/315	16 255/0/711	5479/0/194	4621/0/308
H atoms	riding + diff	riding + diff	riding + diff	riding + diff	riding + diff	riding
goodness-of-fit on <i>F</i> ²	0.930	1.033	1.060	0.996	1.049	1.019
final <i>R</i> indices [<i>I</i> > 2 σ (<i>I</i>)]	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0349, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0695	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0251, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0645	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0223, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0574	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0400, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0838	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0158, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0407	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0364, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0833
<i>R</i> indices (all data)	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0786, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0822	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0284, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0662	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0243, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0583	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0687, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0960	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0166, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0409	<i>R</i> 1 = 0.0503, <i>wR</i> 2 = 0.0887
max. diff peak and hole (e/Å ³)	0.807 and −0.757	1.117 and −0.360	0.830 and −0.567	1.111 and −0.543	0.549 and −0.240	1.165 and −0.945
CCDC no.	616691	616692	616693	616694	616695	616696

(t, 3H, $J_{\text{HH}} = 7.7$ Hz, CH₃), 1.03–1.10 (m, 7H, CH₃ + 2CH₂), −13.57 (dd, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 29.9$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 29.5$ Hz, RhH); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 62.8 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 178$ Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₅)Cl₂(PPh₃)], **11b.** An NMR tube was charged with **1b** (10 mg) in 1,2-dichloroethane and a 2-fold excess of B₂pin₂ and irradiated at room temperature with the medium-pressure Hg arc (5 h), resulting in 100% conversion to **11b**. All volatiles were removed to give an orange solid. The solid was transferred to the glovebox, redissolved in toluene, and eluted through a neutral alumina column with additional toluene in order to remove boron-containing impurities, followed by sublimation of B₂pin₂. Slow evaporation of the toluene solution in the glovebox gave orange crystals of **11b**. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 7.87–6.99 (m, 15H, Ph), 5.4 (s, 5H, C₅H₅); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 32.8 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 136$ Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(Bpin)(H)(PMe₃)], **2c.** An NMR tube was charged with **1c** (1–2 mg, 2–4 μ mol) and neat HBpin (~1 mL) and irradiated at ca. −10 °C for 15 h. All volatiles were removed under vacuum to give a dark orange solid. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 5.75 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.52 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.31 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.19 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 1.23 (s, 6H, BO₂C₂(CH₃)₄), 1.25 (s, 6H, BO₂C₂-(CH₃)₄), 0.95 (d, 9H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 9.7$ Hz, P(CH₃)₃), −14.58 (dd, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 34.6$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 36.8$ Hz, RhH); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 13.7 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 169$ Hz); ¹³C{¹H}: δ 125.5 (q, $J_{\text{CF}} = 267$, CF₃), 95.3 (qd, $J_{\text{CF}} = 38$, $J_{\text{CRh}} = 3$ Hz, C-CF₃), 90.0 (apparent sextet, $J = 3$ Hz C₅H₄), 89.6 (m, C₅H₄), 89.3 (s, C₅H₄), 85.6 (overlapping dq, $J_{\text{CRh}} = 5$, $J_{\text{CF}} = 3$ Hz, C₅H₄), 81.6 (s, BO₂C₂(CH₃)₄), 25.2 (s, BO₂C₂(CH₃)₄), 24.8 (s, BO₂C₂(CH₃)₄), 22.9 (dd, $J_{\text{PC}} = 34$, $J_{\text{RhC}} = 2$ Hz, P(CH₃)₃); ¹¹B{¹H}: δ 43.9; ¹⁹F: δ −54.0 (s). MS, (EI, *m/z*): 440 (13%, M⁺), 355 (1%, M⁺ − C₆H₁₃), 312 (100%, M⁺ − HBpin). HRMS: exp 440.077062, calcd 440.077680, difference 0.618 mDa.

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(Bpin)₂(PMe₃)], **4c.** An NMR tube was charged with a hexane solution of **1c** (0.01 g, 22.7 μ mol) and a ca. 4-fold-excess of B₂pin₂ (0.02 g, 78.74 μ mol) and irradiated at ca. −10 °C for 15 h. All volatiles were removed under vacuum to give a dark brown solid. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 5.76, 5.43 (s, 4 H, C₅H₄),

1.39 (d, 9 H $J_{\text{PH}} = 12.7$ Hz, P(CH₃)₃), 1.14 (s, 24 H (BO₂C₆H₁₂)₂); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 19 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 176$ Hz); ¹¹B{¹H}: δ 43.8; ¹⁹F: δ −53.5 (s).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(SiMe₂Et)(H)(PMe₃)], **5c.** An NMR tube was charged with **1c** (0.01 g, 23 μ mol) and neat Me₂EtSiH (1 mL) and irradiated at ca. −10 °C for 4 h. All volatiles were removed to give an orange-brown oil. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 5.39 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.30 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.18 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 4.72 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 1.13 (t, 3H, $J_{\text{HH}} = 7.7$ Hz, CH₃), 0.97 (dd, 9H $J_{\text{PH}} = 12.7$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 1.4$ Hz, P(CH₃)₃), 0.77 (m, 2H, CH₂), 0.44 (s, 3H, CH₃), 0.39 (s, 3H, CH₃), −15.24 (ddq, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 33.5$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 33.1$, $J_{\text{FH}} = 2.8$ Hz, RhH); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 6.8 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 171$ Hz); ¹⁹F: δ −53.71 (s).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(SiMeEt₂)(H)(PMe₃)], **6c.** The same procedure was followed as for **5c**. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 5.41 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.29 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.20 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 4.73 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 1.12 (t, 6H, $J_{\text{HH}} = 7.8$ Hz, CH₃), 0.96 (d, 9H $J_{\text{PH}} = 12.7$ Hz, P(CH₃)₃), 0.79 (m, 4H, CH₂), 0.35 (s, 3H, CH₃), −15.2 (ddq, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 33.3$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 32.8$, $J_{\text{FH}} = 2.8$ Hz, RhH); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 8.7 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 171$ Hz); ¹⁹F: δ −53.6 (d, $J_{\text{FRh}} = 3$ Hz).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(SiOMe)₃](H)(PMe₃)], **7c.** The same procedure was followed as for **5c**. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 5.57 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.42 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.27 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 4.93 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 3.52 (s, 9H, CH₃), 1.15 (d, $J_{\text{PH}} = 10.7$, 9H, P(CH₃)₃), −14.52 (ddq, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 31.1$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 33.2$, $J_{\text{FH}} = 2$ Hz, RhH); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 9.6 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 160$ Hz); ¹⁹F: δ −53.72 (s).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(SiEt₂H)(H)(PMe₃)], **8c.** The same procedure was followed as for **5c**. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 5.43 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.38 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.06 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 4.74 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 3.99 (d, 1H, $J_{\text{HP}} = 16$ Hz, SiH), 1.22 (t, 6H, $J_{\text{HH}} = 7.7$ Hz, CH₃), 1.02 (d, 9H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 10.4$ Hz, P(CH₃)₃), 0.94 (m, 4H, CH₂), −15.14 (ddq, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 33.3$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 32.8$, $J_{\text{FH}} = 2.9$ Hz, RhH); ³¹P{¹H}: δ 9.1 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 165$ Hz); ¹⁹F: δ −53.93 (s).

[Rh(η^5 -C₅H₄CF₃)(SiEt₃)(H)(PMe₃)], **9c.** The same procedure was followed as for **5c**. NMR (C₆D₆, 300 K), ¹H: δ 5.44 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.28 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 5.21 (s, 1H, C₅H₄), 4.76 (s, 1H, C₅H₄),

1.21 (t, 6H, $J_{\text{HH}} = 7.7$ Hz, CH_3), 0.96 (dd, 9H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 9.7$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 1.0$ Hz, $\text{P}(\text{CH}_3)_3$), 0.77 (m, 4H, CH_2), -15.14 (ddq, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 35.7$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 32.8$, $J_{\text{FH}} = 2.9$ Hz, RhH); $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$: δ 4.7 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 171$ Hz); ^{19}F : δ -53.4 (d, $J_{\text{FRh}} = 3$ Hz).

$[\text{Rh}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{H}_4\text{CF}_3)(\text{Si}^i\text{Pr}_3)(\text{H})(\text{PMe}_3)]$, 10c. The same procedure was followed as for **5c**. NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 K), ^1H : δ 5.40 (s, 1H, C_5H_4), 5.37 (s, 1H, C_5H_4), 5.21 (s, 1H, C_5H_4), 4.86 (s, 1H, C_5H_4), 1.1–1.21 (m, 21H, $\text{CH}_3 + \text{CH}$), 0.97 (dd, 9H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 9.8$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 1.0$ Hz, $\text{P}(\text{CH}_3)_3$), -14.91 (ddq, 1H, $J_{\text{PH}} = 33.2$, $J_{\text{RHH}} = 30.7$, $J_{\text{FH}} = 2.9$ Hz, RhH); $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$: δ 0.3 (d, $J_{\text{RHP}} = 174$ Hz); ^{19}F : δ -53.0 (d, $J_{\text{FRh}} = 3$ Hz).

Competition Reactions. An NMR tube was charged with **1b** (5 mg, 0.011 mmol), HBpin (10 eq, 15.8 μL), and Et_3SiH (10 equiv, 17.4 μL), all dissolved in hexane (-1 mL), and irradiated at -10 $^\circ\text{C}$ for a specified period. Several similar reactions were carried out with different combinations of reagents in competition (Table 6). In some cases, the reactions were followed by $^{31}\text{P}\{^1\text{H}\}$ NMR spectroscopy with no lock. Otherwise, all volatiles were removed under vacuum, C_6D_6 was added, and the ^1H NMR spectrum was recorded. The reactions followed by ^1H NMR were carried out in C_6D_{12} and those by ^{31}P NMR spectroscopy, in hexane.

X-ray Crystallography. Crystallographic data are listed in Table 7. Diffraction data were collected on a Bruker Smart Apex diffractometer with Mo $\text{K}\alpha$ radiation ($\lambda = 0.71073$ Å) using a SMART CCD camera. Diffractometer control, data collection, and initial unit cell determination were performed using “SMART” (v5.625 Bruker-AXS). Frame integration and unit-cell refinement was carried out with “SAINT+” (v6.22, Bruker AXS). Absorption corrections were applied using SADABS (v2.03, Sheldrick). Structures were solved by direct methods using SHELXS-97 (Sheldrick, 1997) and refined by full-matrix least squares using

SHELXL-97 (Sheldrick, 1997).⁶¹ All non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically. Hydrogen atoms bound to carbon were placed using a “riding model” and included in the refinement at calculated positions with the exception of the C_2H_4 hydrogen atoms in **1b** and **1c**. These hydrogen atoms and the hydrides were located on difference maps after all non-hydrogen atoms had been located and were refined isotropically.

The structure of **1b** was refined in $P2_1/n$ and showed two independent molecules in the asymmetric unit, which differed only by the orientation of one phenyl ring. An attempt to refine in a $P2_1/c$ cell with a reduced by a factor of 2 to 9.8395 Å and Z reduced by a factor of 2 resulted in a structure with unsatisfactory anisotropic displacement parameters.

Acknowledgment. We acknowledge the support of EPSRC and the European Union (Marie Curie Host Fellowship scheme), assistance from Prof. S. B. Duckett, and useful discussions with Dr. Sylviane Sabo-Etienne and Mr. Richard Lindup.

Supporting Information Available: Crystal and molecular structure of **1b**; intermolecular interactions for **2b**; crystal and molecular structure of **2b·3b**, including intramolecular π – π interaction for **2b** and intermolecular interactions in **2b·3b**; crystal and molecular structure of **11b·C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3; intermolecular interactions for **11b·C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_3; ^1H , ^{31}P , and (where appropriate) ^{11}B NMR spectra of **2a–2c**, **4a–4c**, **5a–5c**, **6a–6c**, **7a–7c**, **8a–8c**, **9a**, **9c**. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.****

OM060500M

(61) Sheldrick, G. M. *SHELXS-97*, Program for Structure Solution; University of Göttingen: Göttingen, Germany, 1997. Sheldrick, G. M. *SHELXL-97*, Program for the Refinement of Crystal Structures; University of Göttingen: Göttingen, Germany, 1997.