# **Inorganic Chemistry**

# Hydricity of an Fe-H Species and Catalytic CO<sub>2</sub> Hydrogenation

Henry Fong and Jonas C. Peters\*

Division of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91125, United States

**S** Supporting Information

**ABSTRACT:** Despite renewed interest in carbon dioxide  $(CO_2)$  reduction chemistry, examples of homogeneous iron catalysts that hydrogenate  $CO_2$  are limited compared to their noble-metal counterparts. Knowledge of the thermodynamic properties of iron hydride complexes, including M–H hydricities  $(\Delta G_{H^-})$ , could aid in the development of new iron-based catalysts. Here we present the experimentally determined hydricity of an iron hydride complex:  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$ ,  $\Delta G_{H^-} = 54.3 \pm 0.9$  kcal/mol  $[SiP^{iPr}_{3} = [Si(o-C_6H_4PiPr_2)_3]^-]$ . We also explore the CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation chemistry of a series of triphosphinoiron complexes, each with a distinct apical unit on the ligand chelate  $(Si^-, C^-, PhB^-, N, B)$ . The silyliron  $(SiP^R_3)Fe(R = iPr \text{ and } Ph)$  and boratoiron



 $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$   $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3} = [PhB(CH_2PiPr_2)_3]^{-})$  systems, as well as the recently reported  $(CP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$   $(CP^{iPr}_{3} = [C(o-C_6H_4PiPr_2)_3]^{-})$ , are also catalysts for CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation in methanol and in the presence of triethylamine, generating methylformate and triethylammonium formate at up to 200 TON using  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})FeCl$  as the precatalyst. Under stoichiometric conditions, the iron hydride complexes of this series react with CO<sub>2</sub> to give formate complexes. Finally, the proposed mechanism of the  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})$ -Fe system proceeds through a monohydride intermediate  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$ , in contrast to that of the known and highly active tetraphosphinoiron, (tetraphos)Fe (tetraphos =  $P(o-C_6H_4PPh_2)_3$ ), CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation catalyst.

# INTRODUCTION

The reduction of carbon dioxide  $(CO_2)$  into value-added chemicals and liquid fuels has received considerable attention recently because of increasing interest in the development of carbon neutral energy sources.<sup>1</sup> The production of liquid fuels such as methanol<sup>2</sup> or formic acid<sup>3</sup> from CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> (or its formal equivalents) is particularly attractive. However, selective production of these products using heterogeneous catalysts remains challenging.<sup>4–6</sup> One interesting approach toward CO<sub>2</sub> reduction is to use molecular catalysis, where product selectivity may be better controlled than heterogeneous systems.<sup>7</sup> The catalytically active species in molecular systems can often be probed either directly or indirectly, thereby offering opportunities to understand the catalytic mechanism and synthetically tune systems in a well-defined manner.<sup>8</sup>

One of the simplest CO<sub>2</sub> reduction reactions is its hydrogenation to formic acid.<sup>3</sup> While a number of noblemetal catalysts for the hydrogenation of CO<sub>2</sub> to formic acid exist,<sup>9–17</sup> there are only a handful of examples using first-row transition metals such as iron<sup>18–24</sup> and cobalt,<sup>25–28</sup> and information about their thermodynamic properties and elementary reaction steps is needed.<sup>29–34</sup> For example, the hydricity ( $\Delta G_{\rm H}^-$ ), which is the heterolytic dissociation energy of [M–H]<sup>n+</sup> into M<sup>n+</sup> and H<sup>-</sup> (eq 1), has only been experimentally determined for one iron hydride complex (FpH)<sup>35</sup> despite recent reports of iron-catalyzed CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation.<sup>18–24</sup> Knowledge of the hydricities of hydrogenation catalysts can aid the design of new catalysts. This is highlighted by the recent work of Linehan and co-workers on a cobalt hydride catalyst,<sup>26,27</sup> in which the design of this efficient  $CO_2$ -to-formate hydrogenation system was achieved, in part, by using a cobalt hydride that was more hydridic (i.e., <43 kcal/mol) than the formate<sup>36</sup> (eq 2).

$$[M-H]^{n+} \to M^{n+1} + H^{-} \qquad \Delta G_{H^{-}} \tag{1}$$

$$OCHO^- \rightarrow CO_2 + H^- \qquad \Delta G_{H^-} = 43 \text{ kcal/mol}$$
(2)

As part of our exploratory research of phosphine-supported iron complexes in small-molecule activation reactions,  $^{37-42}$  we were interested in studying the catalytic CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation chemistry of a series of triphosphinoiron species (Chart 1): (SiP<sup>R</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(L)(H) (L = H<sub>2</sub> or N<sub>2</sub>; SiP<sup>R</sup><sub>3</sub> = [Si(o-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>PR<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>-</sup>, R = *i*Pr or Ph),  $^{37,43,44}$  (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(H)<sub>3</sub>(PMe<sub>3</sub>) (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub> = PhB(CH<sub>2</sub>PiPr<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>),  $^{45}$  [(NP<sup>*i*Pr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H)](PF<sub>6</sub>) (NP<sup>*i*Pr</sup><sub>3</sub> = N(CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>PiPr<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>),  $^{46}$  (TPB)( $\mu$ -H)Fe(L)(H) (L = N<sub>2</sub> or H<sub>2</sub>; TPB = B(o-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>PiPr<sub>3</sub>)<sub>3</sub>),  $^{44}$  (CP<sup>*i*Pr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe (CP<sup>*i*Pr</sup><sub>3</sub> = [C(o-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>PiPr<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>-</sup>),  $^{42}$  and (C<sup>Si</sup>P<sup>Ph</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe (C<sup>SiPPh</sup><sub>3</sub> = [C(Si(CH<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>PPh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>]<sup>-</sup>),  $^{47}$  (Chart 1). These systems are structurally related to two tetraphosphinoiron hydride CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation catalysts ([(PP<sub>3</sub>)Fe(H<sub>2</sub>)(H)](BF<sub>4</sub>)<sup>19,48</sup> and

Received: October 18, 2014

Special Issue: Small Molecule Activation: From Biological Principles to Energy Applications

Chart 1. Select Phosphine–Metal Complexes of Relevance to Catalytic CO<sub>2</sub> Hydrogenation

#### Previous Reports:



(tetraphos)Fe(H<sub>2</sub>)(H)](BF<sub>4</sub>),<sup>20</sup> where PP<sub>3</sub> = P-(CH<sub>2</sub>CH<sub>2</sub>PPh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub> and tetraphos = P(o-C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>4</sub>PPh<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub>), studied in a similar context by the groups of Beller and Laurenczy (Chart 1). A distinguishing feature of the present series of triphosphinoiron complexes is that each of the present ligand scaffolds possesses a different apical unit. These include an Xtype silyl in SiP<sup>R</sup><sub>3</sub>, an X-type alkyl in (CP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe and (C<sup>Si</sup>P<sup>Ph</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe, a noncoordinating borate in PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>, an L-type amine in NP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>, and a Z-type borane in TPB. Each of these apical units can confer different (i) geometries at iron, (ii) formal oxidation states at iron, and (iii) reactivity patterns for otherwise structurally similar species, as we have studied previously with respect to N<sub>2</sub> activation chemistry.<sup>37-42</sup>

In the present work, we experimentally determined the  $pK_a$ and hydricity for the  $(SiP^{iP_T}_3)Fe$  system and studied the catalytic and stoichiometric hydrogenation of CO<sub>2</sub> in this and the related triphosphinoiron species shown in Chart 1. Under elevated temperatures and pressures of CO<sub>2</sub> and H<sub>2</sub> and with triethylamine as the base, the  $(SiP^{iP_T}_3)Fe$ ,  $(SiP^{Ph}_3)Fe$ ,  $(PhBP^{iP_T}_3)Fe$ , and  $(CP^{iP_T}_3)Fe$  systems catalytically hydrogenated CO<sub>2</sub> to triethylammonium formate and methylformate, while  $(NP^{iP_T}_3)Fe$ , (TPB)Fe, and  $(C^{Si}P^{Ph}_3)Fe$  did not catalyze CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation. We also show that despite a low hydricity (i.e., large  $\Delta G_{H^-}$  value) for the complex  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)(H)$  $(\Delta G_{H^-} = 54.3 \pm 0.9 \text{ kcal/mol})$  coordination of the formate product to the iron center following hydride transfer to CO<sub>2</sub> provides enough driving force to make the reaction thermally accessible.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

 $pK_a$  and Hydricity for  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe$ . Because Fe–H species have been invoked as intermediates for CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation, we were curious if  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)(H)$  was sufficiently hydridic to react with CO<sub>2</sub>. One method for determining hydricities is to use a thermochemical cycle that involves deprotonating the

conjugate acid of the metal hydride of interest. We previously reported H<sub>2</sub> chemistry of the  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$  system,<sup>44</sup> including deprotonation of the cationic iron dihydrogen complex  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_4)$   $(BAr^F_4 = [(3,5-(CF_3)_2-C_6H_3)_4B]^-)$  by Hünig's base under H<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) to afford  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)-(H)$ .<sup>43</sup> This motivated us to use this deprotonation reaction to experimentally determine the hydricity of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  using the series of equations in Scheme 1. The equilibrium in

Scheme 1. Reactions Relevant to Determination of the  $pK_a$ and Hydricity of  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe (B = Base)^a$ 

 $H_2 \longrightarrow H^+ + H^-$  76.0 kcal/mol (5)  $\Delta G_{H^-} = -RTln(K_{eol}) - RTln(1/K_a) + 76.0$  (6)

 $H_{2}$   $H_{2$ 



eq 3 was followed by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy independently with 1,8-bis(dimethylamino)naphthalene (proton sponge;  $K_{eq} = 4.3$ ), 2,6-lutidine ( $K_{eq} = 3.3 \times 10^{-5}$ ), and 2,4,6-trimethylpyridine ( $K_{eq} = 5.1 \times 10^{-5}$ ) in deuterated tetrahydrofuran (THF- $d_8$ ). The reverse protonation of (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe-(H<sub>2</sub>)(H) with the BAr<sup>F</sup><sub>4</sub> salt of 1,8-bis(dimethylammonium)-naphthalene ( $K_{eq} = 2.6$ ) was also followed by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy in THF- $d_8$ .<sup>49</sup>

We note that  $pK_a$  of the  $H_2$  ligand in  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)]$ -(BAr<sup>F</sup><sub>4</sub>) can be estimated using eqs 3 and 4. The experimentally determined  $pK_a$  in THF using this method is  $pK_a^{\text{THF}} = 10.8 \pm$ 0.6 for  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_4)$ . Notably, the  $pK_a^{\text{THF}}$  agrees very well with the predicted value of 10.2 obtained from the ligand acidity constant method recently developed by Morris.<sup>50,51</sup> We caution that this is only a rough estimate of the  $pK_a$  of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_4)$  because the  $pK_a$  of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_4)$  is a measure of the removal of a proton to afford " $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H)$ ", whereas in the observed deprotonation reaction,  $H_2$  coordinates to this species to afford  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)(H)$  and contributes to the equilibrium depicted in eq 3.

With the equilibrium of eq 3 in hand, the hydricity of the conjugate base  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  can be determined by the summation of eqs 3–5 to give eq 6.<sup>52,53</sup> Most hydricity values have been reported in acetonitrile in part because of the known heterolytic dissociation energy of H<sub>2</sub> in acetonitrile (eq 5). However, irreversible coordination of acetonitrile to  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})-Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_{4})$  precluded the use of this solvent. An empirical relationship relates the  $pK_a^{THF}$  of a metal complex to the  $pK_a$  in acetonitrile  $(pK_a^{MeCN})$ .<sup>54</sup> Using this relationship, the  $pK_a^{MeCN}$  of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_{4})$  is 15.9  $\pm$  0.7. When the  $pK_a^{MeCN}$  of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_{4})$  is combined with eq 5, the hydricity of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  in MeCN is 54.3  $\pm$  0.9 kcal/mol. To the

best of our knowledge, this is only the second experimentally estimated hydricity value of an iron hydride complex.<sup>35</sup>

Formal hydride transfer from phosphine-ligated iron hydride complexes to  $CO_2$  to give formate is well-known.<sup>29–34,55</sup> A comparison of the hydricity of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  to that of formate (eq 2) indicates that the reaction for hydride transfer from  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  to  $CO_2$  to afford formate is endergonic by over 10 kcal/mol. Yet, as will be shown below,  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  can still react with  $CO_2$  both stoichiometrically and catalytically to afford formate.

Stoichiometric Reactivity of Fe–H Species with CO<sub>2</sub>. In addition to  $(SiP^{iP_3})Fe(L)(H)^{43,44}$  (where  $L = N_2$  or  $H_2$ ), we have previously reported the synthesis and characterization of three other related triphosphinoiron hydride complexes,  $(PhBP^{iP_3})Fe(H)_3(PMe_3)$ ,<sup>45</sup>  $[(NP^{iP_3})Fe(N_2)(H)](PF_6)$ ,<sup>46</sup> and  $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)(H)^{44}$  (Chart 1), and demonstrated that the two former complexes,  $(PhBP^{iP_3})Fe(H)_3(PMe_3)$  and  $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)(H)$ , are olefin hydrogenation catalysts. The iron hydride species of the *tris*(diphenylphosphino)silyl ligand,  $(SiP^{Ph_3})Fe(N_2)(H)$ , had not previously been reported, but it has now been synthesized in a manner analogous to that of the preparation of the isopropyl analogue  $(SiP^{iP_3})Fe(N_2)$ -(H) (vide infra). The reactivity of these iron hydrides to CO<sub>2</sub> was probed.

Synthesis of Iron Formate Species. A solution of  $(\text{SiP}^{\text{Ph}}_3)\text{Fe}(N_2)(\text{H})$  reacted with CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) at 50 °C to afford the yellow iron formate species  $(\text{SiP}^{\text{Ph}}_3)\text{Fe}(\text{OCHO})$  (Scheme 2a). Consistent with the  $\kappa^1$ -bound formate ligand,<sup>56</sup> attenuated total reflectance infrared (ATR-IR) spectroscopy showed two signature vibrational features at 1618 and 1316 cm<sup>-1</sup> ( $^{13}\text{CO}_2$ : 1587 and 1254 cm<sup>-1</sup>) with a  $\Delta\nu(\text{O-C-O})$  of 302 cm<sup>-1</sup> (Table 1). As expected for a five-coordinate ( $\text{SiP}^{\text{R}}_3$ )Fe<sup>II</sup> complex,<sup>57</sup> ( $\text{SiP}^{\text{Ph}}_3$ )Fe(OCHO) is S = 1 (2.7  $\mu_{\text{B}}$ 





<sup>a</sup>See Chart 1 for detailed representations of the ligands indicated.

in C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub> at RT). Similarly,  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)$  reacted with CO<sub>2</sub> to afford  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(OCHO)$ . The ATR-IR spectrum showed an asymmetric O–C–O stretch at 1623 cm<sup>-1</sup> (<sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>: 1583 cm<sup>-1</sup>). While the symmetric O–C–O stretch could not be reliably discerned (Table 1), its *S* = 1 spin state (2.8  $\mu_B$  in C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub> at room temperature (RT)) and yellow color indicate a five-coordinate (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO) complex.

Similarly, a THF solution of  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H)_{3}(PMe_{3})$ reacted with CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) at RT to afford the  $\kappa^{2}$ -bound formate adduct  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$  (Scheme 2b). The ATR-IR spectrum of this S = 2 species (5.0  $\mu_{B}$ , C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub> at RT) exhibited features of a formate ligand at 1595 and 1362 cm<sup>-1</sup> ( $^{13}CO_{2}$ : 1546 and 1355 cm<sup>-1</sup>) with a  $\Delta\nu(O-C-O) = 233$ cm<sup>-1</sup> that is consistent with the  $\kappa^{2}$ -bound formate assignment.<sup>56</sup> The formate coordination mode is in contrast to the  $\kappa^{1}$ -bound formate ligands in (SiP<sup>R</sup>\_{3})Fe(OCHO), [(NP<sup>iPr</sup>\_{3})Fe(OCHO)]-(PF<sub>6</sub>), and (TPB)Fe(OCHO). We presume this arises because of the lower coordination number in (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup>\_{3})Fe.

A solution of  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_{2})(H)](PF_{6})$  also reacted with CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) at RT to afford the formate adduct  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})-Fe(OCHO)](PF_{6})$  (Scheme 2c).  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)](PF_{6})$  is S = 2 (5.1  $\mu_{\rm B}$ , C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub> at RT), analogous to  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})FeCI]-(PF_{6})$ ,<sup>46</sup> with a diagnostic  $\nu_{\rm asym}(O-C-O)$  vibrational feature at 1613 cm<sup>-1</sup> (<sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>: 1579 cm<sup>-1</sup>) in the ATR-IR spectrum. However, the accompanying lower-energy  $\nu_{\rm sym}(O-C-O)$  vibrational feature could not be reliably assigned because of overlapping ligand vibrational modes in the 1200–1300 cm<sup>-1</sup> region. The obscured  $\nu_{\rm sym}(O-C-O)$  feature prevented assignment of the formate binding mode, but  $\nu_{\rm asym}(O-C-O)$  most closely matches  $\kappa^{1}$ -bound formate ligands (Table 1).<sup>56</sup>

Mixing a benzene solution of  $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)(H)$  with CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) afforded the  $\kappa^1$ -formate complex (TPB)Fe-(OCHO) (Scheme 2d) as a yellow solution. The color, <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum, and solution magnetic moment (4.2  $\mu_B$ ,  $S = {}^3/_2$  in C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub> at RT) are consistent with the formulation of (TPB)Fe(OCHO) as a {Fe-B}<sup>7</sup> species, <sup>58,59</sup> and vibrational modes in the IR spectrum at 1627 and 1291 cm<sup>-1</sup> (<sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub>: 1588 and 1269 cm<sup>-1</sup>) with a  $\Delta\nu(O-C-O)$  value of 336 cm<sup>-1</sup> (Table 1) are diagnostic for a  $\kappa^1$ -formate ligand.<sup>56</sup> The IR spectrum of (TPB)Fe(OCHO) lacks any feature that is diagnostic for a B–H unit.<sup>60</sup> For comparison, in the related S = 2 (TPBH)Fe(CCAr) (Ar = phenyl or tolyl) complex, where a terminal B–H is present, the IR spectra exhibit diagnostic B–H vibrations at 2490 cm<sup>-1</sup> for Ar = phenyl and 2500 cm<sup>-1</sup> for Ar = tolyl.<sup>44</sup>

The formation of (TPB)Fe(OCHO) from the reaction of (TPB)( $\mu$ -H)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H) with CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) is notable in that there is a formal loss of an hydrogen atom (Schemes 2d and 3). The loss of 0.5 equiv of H<sub>2</sub> (relative to the starting iron complex) was confirmed by gas chromatography with a thermal conductivity detector (GC-TCD; 0.44 equiv of H<sub>2</sub> quantified). The reaction between the previously reported (TPB)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)<sup>58</sup> with formic acid also formed (TPB)Fe(OCHO), with 0.42 equiv of H<sub>2</sub> detected by GC-TCD as a product (Scheme 3).

**Reactivity of Fe(OCHO) Species.** The formate ligands in all five of the aforementioned iron formate complexes are substitutionally labile. The addition of triethylammonium chloride (10 equiv) into either benzene or methanol solutions of these complexes resulted in the formation of the respective iron chloride complexes and triethylammonium formate (Scheme 2). Furthermore, the iron chloride products from these metathesis reactions are synthons for the respective iron hydride complexes.

Table	1.	IR	Stretchi	ng Fre	equencies	and	Solution	Magnetic	Moments	for	Iron	Formate	Comp	lexes
				• /				• • •						

		$\nu_{\rm asym}(O-C-O) \ (\rm cm^{-1})^b$		$\nu_{\rm sym}({\rm O-C-O}) \ ({\rm cm}^{-1})^b$		
	$\mu_{ ext{eff}} \; (\mu_{ ext{B}})^a$	CO <sub>2</sub>	<sup>13</sup> CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	<sup>13</sup> CO <sub>2</sub>	$\Delta \nu_{\rm asym} (O-C-O) (\rm cm^{-1})^c$
(SiP <sup>ph</sup> <sub>3</sub> )Fe(OCHO)	2.7	1618	1587	1316	1254	302
(SiP <sup>iPr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )Fe(OCHO)	2.8	1623	1583			
(PhBP <sup>iPr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )Fe(OCHO)	5.0	1595	1546	1362	1355	233
[(NP <sup><i>i</i>Pr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )Fe(OCHO)][PF <sub>6</sub> ]	5.1	1613	1579			
(TPB)Fe(OCHO)	4.2	1627	1588	1291	1269	336
<sup>a</sup> Solution magnetic moments at RT. <sup>b</sup> ATR-IR data of solution thin films. <sup>c</sup> Difference between $\nu_{asym}(O-C-O)$ and $\nu_{sym}(O-C-O)$ .						

Scheme 3. Reactivity of (TPB)Fe Complexes with  $CO_2$  and Formic Acid<sup>*a*</sup>



<sup>a</sup>See Chart 1 for a full detailed ligand representation.

With this metathesis reaction and known reaction chemistry for the  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$  scaffold, we can construct a synthetic cycle for CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation, which may inform the catalytic CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation reaction (vide infra). Starting from the Fe–Cl species,  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$  reacts with MeMgCl (1 equiv) to afford the iron methyl complex  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeMe$  (this work, Scheme 4a).

Scheme 4. Synthetic Cycle for  $CO_2$  Hydrogenation to Formate by  $(SiP^{iP_1})Fe^a$ 



<sup>a</sup>See Chart 1 for a full detailed ligand representation. Conditions: (a) MeMgCl, THF; (b)  $H_2$ , THF (plus  $N_2$  workup for  $L = N_2$ ); (c) (HBAr<sup>F</sup><sub>4</sub>)(Et<sub>2</sub>O)<sub>2</sub>, C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>6</sub>; (d)  $H_2$  (forward),  $N_2$  (reverse), THF; (e) Et<sub>3</sub>N, THF (plus  $N_2$  workup for  $L = N_2$ ); (f) CO<sub>2</sub>, MeOH, THF, or C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>6</sub>; (g) (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)Cl, C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>6</sub> or MeOH; (h) 1 atm:1 atm H<sub>2</sub>/D<sub>2</sub>, Et<sub>3</sub>N, 10:1 CD<sub>3</sub>OD/THF-d<sub>8</sub> (HD is produced); (i) for  $L = N_2$ , Et<sub>3</sub>NHCl, 10:1 CD<sub>3</sub>OD/THF-d<sub>8</sub>.

Subsequent reaction with H<sub>2</sub> affords  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_2)(H)$ (Scheme 4b).<sup>43</sup> Alternatively, the iron methyl complex  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeMe$  can be converted to the cationic H<sub>2</sub> complex  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)](BAr^{F_4})^{43}$  (Scheme 4c,d). The H<sub>2</sub> ligand in the latter complex can be deprotonated by triethylamine (this work) to generate  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(L)(H)$  (where L = N<sub>2</sub> or H<sub>2</sub>; Scheme 4e). As shown above,  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_2)(H)$  reacts with CO<sub>2</sub> to afford  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$  (Scheme 4f), which can undergo metathesis with (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)Cl to afford the starting iron chloride complex (Scheme 4g).

Reaction of  $(SiP_{3}^{iPr})$ FeCl with H<sub>2</sub> is also possible. A CD<sub>3</sub>OD/THF-d<sub>8</sub> (10:1) solution of  $(SiP_{3}^{iPr})$ FeCl with excess

triethylamine in the presence of H<sub>2</sub> and D<sub>2</sub> (ca. 1 atm:1 atm) gives HD (Scheme 4h). Related, the cationic H<sub>2</sub> adduct  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)][BAr^F_4]$ , a model for  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)]^+$ , scrambles a mixture of H<sub>2</sub> and D<sub>2</sub> (ca. 1 atm:1 atm) to HD in a CD<sub>3</sub>OD/THF-*d*<sub>8</sub> solution (10:1). (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl is the sole observed iron-containing species by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy in the former experiment, indicating that the equilibrium with the putative  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)]^+$  responsible for scrambling H<sub>2</sub>/D<sub>2</sub> heavily favors (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl.

**Catalytic Hydrogenation.** Having realized a synthetic cycle for  $CO_2$  hydrogenation to formate, we explored whether the process could be made catalytic. Following literature precedent, the triphosphinoiron chloride complexes were tested in an initial screen for catalysis,  $^{9-16,18-26,28}$  and triethylamine was added to serve as a base.  $^{61}$  <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy with *N*,*N*-dimethylformamide (DMF) added as an integration standard was used to quantify triethylammonium formate yields. Other known products of  $CO_2$  hydrogenation are formate esters such as methylformate that are obtained from the esterification of formate with methanol. <sup>19,20</sup> Because of the volatility and low yields of MeOCHO, GC-FID (GC with flame ionization detection) was used to quantify this product.

Under the standardized reaction conditions of 29 atm of CO<sub>2</sub> and 29 atm of H<sub>2</sub> in a methanol solvent with triethylamine, (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl, (SiP<sup>Ph</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl, and (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl are precatalysts for hydrogenation of CO<sub>2</sub> to triethylammonium formate and methylformate (Table 2, entries 1-3). (SiP<sup>Ph</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl is the most active, having an average turnover number of 200. These three systems are also more selective for (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) than MeOCHO, with (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup>3)FeCl being the most selective of the three with a 10:1 (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) to MeOCHO product ratio. It is also worth noting that the primary coordination sphere of the zwitterionic (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe system is structurally similar to a known cationic ruthenium system (triphos)Ru  $(triphos = CH_3C(CH_2PPh_2)_3)$  that hydrogenates  $CO_2$  to methanol<sup>62</sup> and also dehydrogenates formic acid<sup>63</sup> (Chart 1). We have also reported the reduction of  $CO_2$  to oxalate by (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe.<sup>64</sup>

Under the standard conditions,  $[(NP^{iP_{3}})FeCl](PF_{6})$  and (TPB)FeCl are not precatalysts for the reaction (Table 2, entries 4 and 5). The recently reported  $(CP^{iP_{3}})FeCl$  complex (Chart 1),<sup>42</sup> where the silicon atom in  $(SiP^{iP_{3}})FeCl$  is substituted by a carbon atom, is also catalytically competent (Table 2, entry 6) but is significantly less active than  $(SiP^{Ph_{3}})FeCl$ . Another carbon variant of the triphosphinoiron series of complexes,  $(C^{SiP^{Ph}_{3}})FeCl^{47}$  (Chart 1), is not catalytically competent (Table 2, entry 7).

For a direct comparison with known iron  $CO_2$  hydrogenation catalysts and as a benchmark of the method employed, we subjected the (PP<sub>3</sub>)Fe<sup>19</sup> and (tetraphos)Fe<sup>20</sup> systems to our standardized conditions. Beller and Laurency reported that a mixture of the PP<sub>3</sub> ligand with Fe(BF<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub> is one of the more

# Table 2. Triphosphinoiron-Catalyzed CO<sub>2</sub> Hydrogenation<sup>a</sup>

	0.1 $CO_2 + H_2 + Et_3N$ —	mol % [Fe] MeOH 100 °C 20 h	(Et <sub>3</sub> NH)(OCHO) + MeOCHO
entry	precatalyst	$TON^b$	(Et <sub>3</sub> NH)(OCHO):MeOCHO ratio <sup>f</sup>
1	(SiP <sup>iPr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )FeCl	53	3:1
2	(SiP <sup>Ph</sup> <sub>3</sub> )FeCl	200	2:1
3	(PhBP <sup>iPr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )FeCl	27	10:1
4	$[(NP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl](PF_{6})$	0	0
5	(TPB)FeCl	0	0
6	(CP <sup>iPr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )FeCl	27	6:1
7	(C <sup>Si</sup> P <sup>Ph</sup> <sub>3</sub> )FeCl	0	0
8	$PP_3/Fe(BF_4)_2^{c,d}$	486	3:1
9	[(tetraphos)FeF]BF4 <sup><i>c</i>,</sup>	<sup>e</sup> 1661	1:1
10	FeCl <sub>2</sub>	0	0
11	FeCl <sub>2</sub> /4PPh <sub>3</sub>	0	0
12	no iron	0	0

<sup>*a*</sup>Conditions: 0.1 mol % (0.7 mM) iron precatalyst (relative to Et<sub>3</sub>N), methanol, 651 mM Et<sub>3</sub>N, 29 atm of CO<sub>2</sub> (RT), 29 atm of H<sub>2</sub> (RT), 100 °C, 20 h. <sup>*b*</sup>Turnover number: combined yield (moles) of (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) and MeOCHO divided by moles of precatalyst. <sup>*c*</sup>Previously studied under slightly different conditions. <sup>*d*</sup>See ref 19. <sup>*e*</sup>See ref 20. <sup>*f*</sup>Ratio of the amount of (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) product to the amount of MeOCHO product.

active conditions for  $CO_2$  hydrogenation in the PP<sub>3</sub> system. Under the standard conditions of this study, a 1:1 mixture of PP<sub>3</sub> and Fe(BF<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub> hydrogenates  $CO_2$  to triethylammonium formate and methylformate, as well, at a total TON of 486 (Table 2, entry 8). The (tetraphos)Fe(F)(BF<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub> complex also catalyzes  $CO_2$  hydrogenation to the same products at a total TON of 1661 (Table 2, entry 9). These values are in near agreement with the respective literature reports. The (tetraphos)Fe(F)(BF<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub> complex is the least selective of the series in Table 2 for formate production.

A series of control experiments were performed to probe the homogeneity of the reaction. The catalytic reaction is uninhibited by the addition of elemental mercury (see the Supporting Information, SI). Also,  $CO_2$  hydrogenation does not occur with the iron salt FeCl<sub>2</sub> (Table 2, entry 10) or with a 1:4 mixture of FeCl<sub>2</sub> and triphenylphosphine (Table 2, entry 11), nor does it proceed in the absence of an iron source (Table 2, entry 12). These experiments do not preclude a role for heterogeneous species but provide evidence consistent with a homogeneous process.

To gain insight into the reaction, we chose to study the hydrogenation catalysis by the  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$  system further because it is more active than  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$  and because its coordination chemistry has been studied in greater detail than that of its phenyl analogue  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe.^{43,44}$ 

Under standard conditions but in the absence of  $H_2$ , triethylammonium formate and methylformate were not detected (Table 3, entry 1). Furthermore, when the reaction was run in CD<sub>3</sub>OD instead of CH<sub>3</sub>OH, (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) was detected by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy at the conclusion of the reaction, while (Et<sub>3</sub>ND)(OCDO) was not detected by <sup>2</sup>H NMR spectroscopy (Table 3, entry 2). The data collectively indicate that  $H_2$  is the source of the hydrogen atom equivalents.

High pressures of  $CO_2$  and  $H_2$  are critical because the reaction does not proceed at or near atmospheric pressures of  $H_2$  and  $CO_2$  (see the SI) in agreement with most literature

Table 3. (SiP<sup>*i*Pr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl-Catalyzed CO<sub>2</sub> Hydrogenation under Varied Conditions

	0.1 mol %	[Fe]	
C	$D_2 + H_2 + Et_3N$ —	→ (Et <sub>3</sub> )	NH)(OCHO) + MeOCHO
entry	deviation from standard conditions <sup>a</sup>	TON <sup>b</sup>	(Et <sub>3</sub> NH) (OCHO):MeOCHO ratio <sup>f</sup>
0	none	53	3:1
1	0 atm of H <sub>2</sub>	0	0
$2^{c}$	CD <sub>3</sub> OD	32	2:1
3	150 °C	40	2:1
4	20 °C	0	0
5	2 h	16	1:0
6	0.5 equiv of (Et <sub>3</sub> NH)Cl <sup>d</sup>	41	5:1
7	0.5 equiv of NaBF <sub>4</sub> <sup>d</sup>	93	6:1
8	0.5 equiv of NaBAr <sup>F</sup> <sub>4</sub> <sup>d</sup>	69	2:1
9	0.5 equiv of NaF <sup>d</sup>	45	8:1
10	0.5 equiv of TBAF <sup>d,e</sup>	33	12:1
11	0.5 equiv of CsF <sup>d</sup>	26	9:1
12	0.5 equiv of K <sub>2</sub> CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>d</sup>	57	21:1

<sup>a</sup>Standard conditions: 0.1 mol % (0.7 mM) iron precatalyst (relative to  $Et_3N$ ), methanol, 651 mM  $Et_3N$ , 29 atm of  $CO_2$  (RT), 29 atm of  $H_2$  (RT), 100 °C, 20 h. <sup>b</sup>Turnover number: combined yield (moles) of  $(Et_3NH)(OCHO)$  and MeOCHO divided by moles of precatalyst. <sup>c</sup>( $Et_3NH$ )(OCHO) was detected by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy, but neither ( $Et_3ND$ )(OCDO), ( $Et_3NH$ )(OCDO), nor ( $Et_3ND$ )(OCHO) was detected by <sup>2</sup>H NMR spectroscopy. <sup>d</sup>Relative to moles of ( $SiP^{Pr}_3$ )FeCl. <sup>e</sup>TBAF = tetrabutylammonium fluoride. <sup>f</sup>Ratio of the amount of ( $Et_3NH$ )(OCHO) product to the amount of MeOCHO product.

examples.<sup>3,9–16,19–26,28</sup> Milstein and co-workers have reported  $CO_2$  hydrogenation to formate at a relatively low 10 total atm of  $H_2$  and  $CO_2$ .<sup>18</sup> Also critical is methanol because the catalytic activity does not occur in neat THF under any pressures of  $CO_2$  and  $H_2$  studied here (see the SI), highlighting the importance of polar, protic solvents in phosphinoiron  $CO_2$  hydrogenation catalysis.<sup>61</sup>

It was determined that 100 °C and 20 h are optimal for the reaction under the conditions studied here. Running the reaction at 150 °C slightly reduces the turnover relative to the standard conditions (Table 3, entry 3), which is likely a result of catalyst decomposition (vide infra). At 20 °C, no reaction occurs (Table 3, entry 4), and the starting precatalyst (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl is the only iron-containing species at the end of the reaction. Reducing the reaction time to 2 h at 100 °C reduces the TON by a factor of 3 (Table 3, entry 5) compared to the standard conditions.

Using the stoichiometric reactions as a guide, we also probed the effects of additives and precatalysts on the catalysis. The stoichiometric metathesis reaction for the transformation of (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO) to (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl suggests that chloride substitution for formate may be a route for formate release. However, the addition of 0.5 equiv of (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)Cl (relative to iron) into the reaction reduces the TON, although the selectivity for (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) over MeOCHO slightly increases to 5:1 (Table 3, entry 6). It appears that while chloride may substitute for formate, excess chloride may also slow H<sub>2</sub> substitution at iron (vide infra) and reduces the overall TON. The addition of a noncoordinating anion in the form of NaBF4 to the catalytic mixture is beneficial, yielding a TON of 93 and 6:1 selectivity for (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) (Table 3, entry 7), while the addition of  $Na(BAr_{4}^{F})$  only modestly increases the TON to 69 and without significantly affecting the selectivity

(Table 3, entry 8). The origin of the effect from the Na<sup>+</sup> and/or borate anion is not understood, but one effect may be that Na<sup>+</sup> facilitates removal of the inner-sphere chloride as NaCl. Additionally, alkali metals are known to facilitate CO<sub>2</sub> coordination to cobalt centers.<sup>65</sup> It is also noteworthy that  $BF_4^-$  is the counteranion of the highly active tetraphosphinoiron  $(PP_3)Fe^{19}$  and  $(tetraphos)Fe^{20}$  systems and is also beneficial for iron-catalyzed formic acid dehydrogenation.<sup>66</sup> It is unlikely that fluoride, which may be a decomposition product of  $BF_4^-$ , is the source of the positive response because fluoride salts decrease the TON but increase the selectivity for (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)-(OCHO) (Table 3, entries 9-11). Finally, the addition of K<sub>2</sub>CO<sub>3</sub>, which has been reported to enhance CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation catalysis for some noble- and non-noble-metal systems,<sup>67</sup> has no effect on the TON but significantly increases the selectivity for (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) compared to the other additives (Table 3, entry 12). The additives containing coordinating anions are more selective for (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)(OCHO) over MeOCHO, presumably a result of anion coordination inhibiting iron-catalyzed esterification of formate to methylformate.<sup>68</sup> However, we caution that these results are qualitative. A systematic study of the effects of these and other additives on catalysis would be warranted to draw quantitative conclusions.

Other important factors known to affect catalysis are the base identity<sup>26</sup> and base concentrations.<sup>61</sup> A careful study of the effect of different bases and concentrations on catalysis in the present series is beyond the scope of this report, but we point out that the  $pK_a$  of triethylamine is suitably matched to the  $pK_a$  of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)]^+$  (vide supra), an intermediate in the catalytic cycle of the  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe$  system (Scheme 5; vide infra).

Other  $(SiP^{iP_{3}})Fe$  species are also competent precatalysts. The iron formate  $(SiP^{iP_{3}})Fe(OCHO)$  and iron hydride complex  $(SiP^{iP_{3}})Fe(N_{2})(H)$  are each catalytically competent precatalysts (Table 4, entries 1 and 2), with TONs comparable to that of  $(SiP^{iP_{1}})FeCl$ . The cationic N<sub>2</sub> complex  $[(SiP^{iP_{3}})Fe-(N_{2})](BAr^{F}_{4})$ , which is a synthon for  $(SiP^{iP_{1}})Fe(N_{2})(H)$  in the presence of H<sub>2</sub> and triethylamine (Scheme 4), is also a catalytically competent precatalyst (Table 4, entry 3). Finally, a 1:1 mixture of the free ligand HSiP<sup>iP\_{1}</sup> and FeCl<sub>2</sub> is significantly

Table 4.  $CO_2$  Hydrogenation Catalyzed by Various (SiP<sup>*i*Pr</sup><sub>3</sub>) Fe Species<sup>*a*</sup>

	0. CO <sub>2</sub> + H <sub>2</sub> + Et <sub>2</sub> N	1 mol % [Fe] MeOH	(Et-NH)(OCHO) + MeOCHO
	223.1	100 °C 20 h	(3)()
entry	precatalyst	$TON^{b}$	(Et <sub>3</sub> NH)(OCHO):MeOCHO ratio <sup>d</sup>
,	1		
0	(SiP <sup>iPr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )FeCl	53	3:1
1	(SiP <sup><i>i</i>Pr</sup> <sub>3</sub> )Fe(OCHO)	52	15:1
2	$(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_{2})(H)$	47	3:1
3	$[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_{2})] \\ (BAr^{F}_{4})$	18	8:1
4	$HSiP^{iPr}_{3}/FeCl_{2}$ (1:1) <sup>c</sup>	12	4:1

<sup>*a*</sup>Conditions: 0.1 mol % (0.7 mM) iron precatalyst (relative to  $Et_3N$ ), methanol, 651 mM  $Et_3N$ , 29 atm of  $CO_2$  (RT), 29 atm of  $H_2$  (RT), 100 °C, 20 h. <sup>*b*</sup>Turnover number: combined yield (moles) of ( $Et_3NH$ )(OCHO) and MeOCHO divided by moles of precatalyst. <sup>c</sup>1:1 mixture of HSiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>:FeCl<sub>2</sub> (0.7 mM) was used as the precatalyst in place of ( $SiP^{iPr}_3$ )FeCl. <sup>*d*</sup>Ratio of the amount of ( $Et_3NH$ )(OCHO) product to the amount of MeOCHO product. less catalytically competent than the synthesized iron complex  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$  (Table 4, entry 4). All four of these precatalysts are more selective than  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$  for  $(Et_{3}NH)(OCHO)$ .

We also probed the fate of the iron precatalyst  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$ under the reaction conditions. At the end of the reaction under standard conditions, the <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectrum showed a mixture of phosphorus-containing material, including significant quantities of free ligand  $(HSiP^{iPr}_{3})$ . If the reaction was run at RT, only the starting precatalyst  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$  was observed by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy. These observations indicate that while the catalysis requires heating, elevated temperatures lead to eventual catalyst decomposition.

A possible catalytic cycle based in part on the observed stoichiometric reactions discussed in Scheme 4 is proposed in Scheme 5 for the  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$  system. Starting from precatalyst





<sup>a</sup>See Chart 1 for a full detailed ligand representation.

 $(\mathrm{SiP}^{i\mathrm{Pr}}_{3})$ FeCl in Scheme 5, H<sub>2</sub> substitution forms the cationic H<sub>2</sub> adduct  $[(\mathrm{SiP}^{i\mathrm{Pr}}_{3})\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{H}_{2})]^{+}$ . The viability of this H<sub>2</sub> for Cl<sup>-</sup> substitution step is demonstrated by H/D scrambling experiments discussed above. However, we cannot rule out a process wherein methanol is involved in the displacement of Cl<sup>-</sup> through, for example, methanol for Cl<sup>-</sup> substitution at iron followed by H<sub>2</sub> substitution of methanol. The cationic H<sub>2</sub> adduct  $[(\mathrm{SiP}^{i\mathrm{Pr}}_{3})\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{H}_{2})]^{+}$  in the catalytic cycle can be deprotonated by triethylamine to give  $(\mathrm{SiP}^{i\mathrm{Pr}}_{3})\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{H}_{2})(\mathrm{H})$ , as we have observed in the stoichiometric reaction (Scheme 4e). The reverse of this reaction is also possible: a 1:1 mixture of  $(\mathrm{Et}_{3}\mathrm{NH})\mathrm{Cl}$  and  $(\mathrm{SiP}^{i\mathrm{Pr}}_{3})\mathrm{Fe}(\mathrm{H}_{2})(\mathrm{H})$  reacts to afford  $(\mathrm{SiP}^{i\mathrm{Pr}}_{3})$ -FeCl (Scheme 4i).

The iron hydride intermediate  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  can then react with CO<sub>2</sub> to form the iron formate complex  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ , which can subsequently react with  $(Et_3NH)Cl$ , reform  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$ , and release  $(Et_3NH)(OCHO)$ . The direct conversion of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$  to  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)]^+$ may also be a viable pathway because chloride-free  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_2)](BAr^F_4)$ ,  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_2)(H)$ , and  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ are catalytically competent.

An alternative mechanism involving an iron dihydride species cannot be ruled out but is unlikely for the  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$  system (Scheme 6a). A similar mechanism was proposed by Beller et al. for the cationic (tetraphos)Fe catalyst based on in situ NMR data, where the intermediate [(tetraphos)Fe(H<sub>2</sub>)(H)]<sup>+</sup> was deprotonated by Et<sub>3</sub>N to give (tetraphos)Fe(H)<sub>2</sub> (Scheme

### Scheme 6. Dihydride Pathways for Catalytic $CO_2$ Hydrogenation<sup>*a*</sup>



<sup>a</sup>See Chart 1 for a full detailed representation of the ligands indicated.

6b).<sup>20</sup> This iron dihydride intermediate was suggested to react with CO<sub>2</sub> to give the iron hydride formate intermediate (tetraphos)Fe(H)(OCHO). However, we note that a dihydride intermediate in the (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe system would be unlikely because the analogous deprotonaton of (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(H<sub>2</sub>)(H) would form an anionic iron dihydride species "[(SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe-(H)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>-</sup>", which is likely to be thermodynamically inaccessible. For example, a solution of (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(H<sub>2</sub>)(H) with excess triethylamine is stable for hours at 90 °C. While this does not rule out the possibility of an equilibrium mixture of (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(H<sub>2</sub>)(H) and [(SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(H)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>-</sup>, heavily favoring the neutral monohydride species, we also note that the estimated pK<sub>a</sub> of the H<sub>2</sub> and H<sup>-</sup> ligands in (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(H<sub>2</sub>)(H) is greater than 45 in THF,<sup>51</sup> vastly higher than that for triethylamine ([Et<sub>3</sub>NH]<sup>+</sup>; pK<sub>a</sub> = 12.5 in THF).<sup>69</sup>

It is of interest to compare the (SiP<sup>R</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe system to the catalytically incompetent (TPB)Fe system because (TPB)(u-H)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H) is an olefin hydrogenation catalyst.<sup>44</sup> A key step that may be required for catalysis is the substitution of Cl<sup>-</sup> by  $H_2$  in  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)$ FeCl to give the cationic  $H_2$  adduct  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)$ - $Fe(H_2)$ ]<sup>+</sup>. Deprotonation of the H<sub>2</sub> ligand in a C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>/THF-d<sub>8</sub> mixture by triethylamine leads to the CO<sub>2</sub>-reactive iron hydride complex  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_{2})(H)$ . The initial H<sub>2</sub> substitution step, therefore, is critical towards forming  $(\tilde{SiP}^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_{2})(H)$ . However, the  ${Fe-B}^7$  complexes (TPB)Fe(OCHO) and (TPB)FeCl do not react with H<sub>2</sub> (4 atm). Related, the previously reported  $\{Fe-B\}^7$  [(TPB)Fe](BAr<sup>F</sup><sub>4</sub>) complex,<sup>41</sup> which has a vacant fifth coordination site, does not react with  $H_2$  in the presence of excess triethylamine under 1 atm of  $H_2$  at 90 °C for 12 h. Furthermore, [(TPB)Fe](BArF<sub>4</sub>) does not hydrogenate CO<sub>2</sub> under the catalytic conditions (see the SI). [(NP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl](PF<sub>6</sub>) is not a hydrogenation precatalyst for possibly the same reason. Qualitatively, it appears that the inability of these latter systems to coordinate H<sub>2</sub>, presumably a reflection of their weaker ligand-field strengths by comparison to the SiP<sup>R</sup><sub>3</sub> system and hence their tendency to populate highspin configurations ([(NP<sup>*i*Pr</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl](PF<sub>6</sub>), S = 2;<sup>46</sup> (TPB)FeCl,  $S = \frac{3}{2}^{58}$ , limits their efficacy toward CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation by comparison with the  $(SiP_{3}^{R})$ Fe system [ $(SiP_{3}^{Pr})$ FeCl;  $S = 1^{57}$ ].

An additional factor preventing catalysis in the (TPB)Fe system is the unproductive loss of 0.5 equiv of H<sub>2</sub> following the reaction of (TPB)( $\mu$ -H)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H) with CO<sub>2</sub>, which generates the catalytically incompetent (TPB)Fe(OCHO) (Scheme 3).

Influence of the Hydricity on the Reaction with CO<sub>2</sub>. On the basis of only the hydricity  $(54.3 \pm 0.9 \text{ kcal/mol})$ , the reaction of  $(\text{SiP}^{i\text{Pr}}_3)\text{Fe}(\text{H}_2)(\text{H})$  with CO<sub>2</sub> to afford formate  $(\Delta G_{\text{H}^-} = 43 \text{ kcal/mol})$  is endergonic by over 10 kcal/mol. However, comparisons of only the hydricities of the iron hydride and formate neglect to take into account the observed formate coordination to iron (Scheme 2). To estimate the free energy afforded by formate coordination to iron, we determined the formate binding constant by UV–vis titration for the reaction of  $[(\text{SiP}^{i\text{Pr}}_3)\text{Fe}(\text{N}_2)](\text{BArF}_4)$  and Li(OCHO) to  $(\text{SiP}^{i\text{Pr}}_3)\text{Fe}(\text{OCHO})$  (Scheme 7, eq 7). The titration in THF







indicates that the binding constant of formate to the iron complex is on the order of  $10^6 \text{ M}^{-1}$ . This is equivalent to  $\Delta G < -8 \text{ kcal/mol}$  for formate binding. Thus, the added driving force from formate coordination brings the free-energy change for the reaction of  $(\text{SiP}^{i\text{Pr}}_3)\text{Fe}(\text{H}_2)(\text{H})$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  to form  $(\text{SiP}^{i\text{Pr}}_3)\text{Fe}(\text{OCHO})$  to about 3 kcal/mol (Scheme 7, eq 10; from the sum of eqs 7–9). This is thermally accessible at the elevated temperatures at which the stoichiometric and catalytic reactions are run.

We caution that  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  may not be the actual iron hydride intermediate that reacts with CO<sub>2</sub>; i.e., an intermediate elementary step may occur prior to CO<sub>2</sub> reacting with the iron complex. The hydricity of such a species is likely different from that of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  owing to the transinfluencing Si<sup>-</sup>. We also note that these hydricity values are for acetonitrile, while the catalytic reactions were run in methanol. The magnitude of the difference in hydricities between formate and metal hydrides is known to decrease upon a change from acetonitrile to water.<sup>70</sup> A similar phenomenon may be occurring in methanol, where the difference in the hydricity between  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  and formate may not be as large as the values in acetonitrile. This, combined with formate coordination to iron (Scheme 7, eq 7), may, in fact, make this formal  $CO_2$  insertion step exergonic in methanol.

# CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we studied a series of triphosphinoiron hydride complexes, including  $(SiP_3^R)Fe(L)(H)$ ,  $(PhBP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H)_3(PMe_3)$ ,  $[(NP^{iPr}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)](PF_6)$ , and  $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)(H)$  in the context of CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation. These iron hydride complexes react with CO<sub>2</sub> to afford iron formate complexes, which can undergo metathesis with triethylammonium chloride to release triethylammonium formate and well-defined iron chloride complexes, which are themselves synthons for the CO<sub>2</sub>-reactive iron hydride complexes (Scheme 2). Subjecting these iron complexes to catalytic conditions under elevated pressures of H<sub>2</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub>, we found that  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)FeCl$ ,  $(SiP^{Ph}_3)FeCl$ , and  $(PhBP^{iPr}_3)FeCl$  are precatalysts for catalytic CO<sub>2</sub> hydrogenation to formate and methylformate (Table 2).  $(CP^{iPr}_3)FeCl$ , in which carbon replaces the silicon atom in  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)FeCl$ , was also a competent catalyst. The catalytic reactions proceeded in methanol but not in THF, highlighting the importance of solvent in the catalytic reaction.<sup>61</sup>

As depicted in Scheme 5, we believe that  $H_2$  substitution into  $(SiP^{iPr}{}_3)FeCl \mbox{ or } (SiP^{iPr}{}_3)Fe(OCHO)$  to form  $[(SiP^{iPr}{}_3)Fe(H_2)]^+$  followed by deprotonation to form the  $CO_2$ -reactive  $(SiP^{iPr}{}_3)Fe(H_2)(H)$  are key steps in the catalytic cycle and determine catalytic competency. The proposed mechanism for  $(SiP^{iPr}{}_3)Fe$  also differs from the mechanism for the highly active (tetraphos)Fe system, which proceeds through a dihydride intermediate.

Finally, the hydricity value of an iron hydride species has also been experimentally determined. The hydricity of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  is 54.3 ± 0.9 kcal/mol in acetonitrile, and the estimated  $pK_a^{MeCN}$  of the related conjugate acid  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_4)$  is 15.9 ± 0.7. Despite the low hydricity,  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  hydrogenates  $CO_2$  to formate, and part of the driving force for the reaction is coordination of formate to the iron center. Thus, the free-energy change for the reaction between  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$  and  $CO_2$  to  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$  is only slightly uphill at 3 kcal/mol and accessible under the reactions conditions. It will be of interest to measure the hydricities of other iron hydrides, including within the present series of complexes, in the context of  $CO_2$  hydrogenation to better understand the factors that may lead to improved catalytic activity.

## EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

**General Considerations.** All manipulations were carried out using standard glovebox or Schlenk techniques under an N<sub>2</sub> atmosphere. Unless otherwise noted, solvents were deoxygenated and dried by thorough sparging with N<sub>2</sub> gas followed by passage through an activated alumina column in the solvent purification system by SG Water, USA LLC, Nashua, NH. Deuterated solvents and <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> gas were purchased from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories, Inc., Tewksbury, MA. The deuterated solvents were degassed and dried over activated 3 Å sieves prior to use. Unless otherwise noted, all compounds were purchased commercially and used without further purification. (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H),<sup>43</sup> (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(Cl,<sup>57</sup> [(SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)]-(BAr<sup>F</sup><sub>4</sub>),<sup>37</sup> (SiP<sup>iPh</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(Cl,<sup>38</sup> [(NP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H)](PF<sub>6</sub>),<sup>46</sup> (TPB)( $\mu$ -H)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H),<sup>44</sup> (CP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(Cl,<sup>42</sup> and (C<sup>SiPPh</sup><sub>3</sub>)FeCl<sup>47</sup> were synthesized by literature procedures. Elemental analyses were performed by Robertson Microlit Laboratories, Ledgewood, NJ.

NMR spectra were recorded on Varian 300, 400, and 500 MHz spectrometers. <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>13</sup>C chemical shifts are reported in ppm relative to residual solvent as internal standards. <sup>31</sup>P and <sup>11</sup>B chemical shifts are reported in ppm relative to 85% aqueous  $H_3PO_4$  and  $BF_3$ ·Et<sub>2</sub>O, respectively. Multiplicities are indicated by br (broad), s (singlet), d (doublet), t (triplet), quart (quart), quin (quintet), multiplet (m), d–d (doublet of doublets), and t–d (triplet of doublets).

The ATR-IR measurements were performed in a glovebox on a thin film of the complex obtained from evaporation of a drop of the solution on the surface of a Bruker APLHA ATR-IR spectrometer probe (Platinum Sampling Module, diamond, *OPUS* software package) at 2 cm<sup>-1</sup> resolution. IR intensities indicated by s (strong), m (medium), and w (weak).

UV-vis spectra were collected on a Cary 60 UV-vis spectrophotometer. The titration experiments were performed in a glovebox using an Ocean Optics HR4000CG spectrometer.

**H<sub>2</sub> Quantification by GC-TCD.** H<sub>2</sub> was quantified on an Agilent 7890A gas chromotograph (HP-PLOT U, 30 m, 0.32 mm i.d.; 30 °C isothermal; 1 mL/min flow rate; helium carrier gas) using a thermal conductivity detector. The total amount of H<sub>2</sub> produced was determined as the sum of H<sub>2</sub> in the headspace plus dissolved H<sub>2</sub> in the solution calculated by Henry's law with a constant of 328 MPa.<sup>71</sup>

**Methylformate Quantification by GC-FID.** Methylformate quantification was performed on a 1.2 mL aliquot of the crude reaction mixture by GC-FID against a methylformate calibration curve. GC-FID instrument: Hewlett-Packard 5890 with a 57 m Restek RTX-VRX column (0.32 mm i.d., 1.8  $\mu$ m films). Method parameters: helium carrier gas, 1  $\mu$ L injection volume, 200 °C inlet temperature, 250 °C detector temperature, 7:1 split ratio, 2.9 mL/min flow rate, 20 psi pressure, 35 cm/s velocity. Ramp rate: 35 °C initial temperature held for 8 min, followed by 10 °C/min steps up to 100 °C, then immediately followed by 25 °C/min steps up to 230 °C, which was held for 4 min.

**Synthetic Protocols.** Synthesis of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeMe$  from  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$ . A yellow solution of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCl$  (44.4 mg, 73  $\mu$ mol) in THF (10 mL) was cooled to -78 °C. A solution of MeMgCl (24  $\mu$ L of a 3 M THF solution, 73  $\mu$ mol) was diluted with THF (1 mL) and then added dropwise to the stirring reaction, causing a gradual change to a red solution. The stirring solution was allowed to warm to RT overnight. The crude mixture was filtered through a glass frit to remove black precipitate, and the volatiles were removed in vacuo to reveal a red solid. The material was taken up in a minimal amount of pentane and allowed to sit at -35 °C overnight, revealing red crystals of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeMe$  (11.3 mg, 22%). The <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra of this material were identical with the reported spectra.<sup>57</sup>

Synthesis of (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO). A yellow THF solution (10 mL) of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_{2})(H)$  (50 mg, 72 µmol) was degassed by freezepump-thaw cycles  $(3\times)$ . Subsequently, CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) was introduced to the thawed solution. The reaction was sealed and then heated for 1 h at 50 °C to give a yellow solution. The volatiles were removed in vacuo to give a yellow solid. The material was extracted with C6H6 and lyophilized to give (SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO) as a yellow solid (46 mg, 90%). Analytically pure material was obtained by layering a concentrated solution of (SiPiPr3)Fe(OCHO) in THF (1 mL) under HMDSO (5 mL) and allowing the solution to sit at -35 °C for 3 days. <sup>1</sup>H NMR ( $C_6D_6$ , 400 MHz):  $\delta$  12.2, 12.1, 4.7, 4.6, 1.3, 0.2, -2.0, -2.2, -4.9.  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, method of Evans, 20 °C): 2.8  $\mu_{\text{B}}$  (S = 1). IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1623 (m,  $\nu_{asym}$ (O-C-O)). UV-vis (THF, nm {M<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>}): 357 {shoulder, 3247}, 426 {2243}, 478 {253}, 963 {br abs starting at 884 nm, 451}. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>37</sub>H<sub>55</sub>FeO<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>Si: C, 62.71; H, 7.82. Found: C, 61.81; H, 7.24.

Synthesis of  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(O^{13}CHO)$ . The procedures used to synthesize  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(OCHO)$  were used here, except that  $^{13}CO_2$  was used in place of  $CO_2$ . The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum was identical with that of  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(OCHO)$ . IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1583 (m,  $\nu_{asym}(O^{-13}C^{-}O))$ .

Synthesis of  $(SiP^{Ph}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)$ . A procedure nearly identical with that used to synthesize  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)$  was used to synthesize  $(SiP^{Ph}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)$ . In a 100 mL Schlenk tube, a red solution of  $(SiP^{Ph}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)$ . In a 100 mL Schlenk tube, a red solution of  $(SiP^{Ph}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)$ .

freeze-pump-thaw cycles  $(3\times)$ . H<sub>2</sub> gas (1 atm) was charged into the thawed solution. The reaction was then sealed and heated to 60  $^\circ$ C for over 1 week. The reaction was then filtered through Celite, and volatiles were removed in vacuo to give a light-yellow powder. The solid was collected on a glass frit and washed with pentane (3 mL  $\times$ 2). The resulting product  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(N_{2})(H)$  (24.4 mg, 91%) was obtained as a light-yellow powder after drying under vacuum. Layering a THF solution of  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(N_{2})(H)$  under Et<sub>2</sub>O and letting the solution stand for 2 days yielded an analytically pure powder of  $(SiP_{3}^{Ph})Fe(N_{2})(H)$ . <sup>1</sup>H NMR (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, 300 MHz):  $\delta$  8.55 (2H, d, <sup>2</sup>J<sub>H-H</sub> = 6 Hz, Ar-H), 8.32 (2H, d,  ${}^{2}J_{H-H}$  = 3 Hz, Ar-H), 7.62 (3H, br s, Ar-H), 7.45 (2H, br s, Ar-H), 7.34 (4H, d,  ${}^{2}J_{H-H} = 6$  Hz, Ar-H), 6.85 (2H, t,  ${}^{2}J_{H-H} = 6$  Hz, Ar–H), 6.69 (3H, q,  ${}^{2}J_{H-H} = 3$  Hz, Ar–H), 6.52 (2H, q,  ${}^{2}J_{H-H}$  = 3 Hz, Ar-H), -11.88 (1H, t-d,  ${}^{2}J_{P_{ck}-H}$  = 54 Hz,  ${}^{2}J_{P_{true}-H} = 12 \text{ Hz}, \text{ Fe}-H$ ).  ${}^{31}P \text{ NMR} (C_{6}D_{6}, 121 \text{ MHz}): \delta 85.3 (2P, s),$ 78.7 (1P, s). <sup>13</sup>C NMR (THF with 1 drop of  $C_6D_6$ , 125 MHz):  $\delta$  156.3 (d,  $J_{C-P} = 38$  Hz,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 155.8 (d,  $J_{C-P} = 35$  Hz,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 150.7 (d,  $J_{C-P} = 5$  Hz,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 150.4 (s,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 150.2 (s,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 143.0 (s,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 141.6 (d, J = 23Hz,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 141.0 (s,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 139.6 (d, J = 28 Hz,  $C^{Ar}$ ), 138.6 (d, J = 10 Hz, C<sup>Ar</sup>), 133.8 (s, C<sup>Ar</sup>), 132.6 (s, C<sup>Ar</sup>), 132.3 (s, C<sup>Ar</sup>), 129.5 (s, C<sup>Ar</sup>), 128.4  $(s, C^{Ar}), 128.2 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.1 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.5 (d, J = 5 Hz, C^{Ar}).$  IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 2073 (s,  $\nu$ (N–N)), 1889 (w,  $\nu$ (Fe–H)). UV–vis (THF, nm  $\{M^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}\}$ : 335  $\{\text{shoulder, 8125}\}$ , 437  $\{\text{shoulder, 4500}\}$ . Anal. Calcd for C54H43FeN2P3Si: C, 72.32; H, 4.83; N, 3.12. Found: C, 72.94; H, 5.22; N, 2.83.

Synthesis of (SiP<sup>Ph</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO). A yellow THF solution (10 mL) of  $(SiP^{Ph})Fe(N_2)(H)$  (51 mg, 57  $\mu$ mol) was degassed by freeze-pumpthaw cycles  $(3\times)$ . CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) was introduced to the thawed solution. The reaction was sealed and then heated for 1 h at 50 °C to give a yellow solution. The volatiles were removed in vacuo to give a yellow solid. The material was redissolved in C<sub>6</sub>H<sub>6</sub> and filtered through a pipet filter to remove a small amount of black material. The filtrate was lyophilized in vacuo to give (SiP<sup>Ph</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO) as a yellow solid (41 mg, 79%). Analytically pure material was obtained by layering a concentrated THF solution of (SiP<sup>Ph</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO) (3 mL) under pentane (5 mL) and allowing it to stand for 2 days at RT. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (3:2 mixture of  $C_6 D_6 / THF \cdot d_8$ , 300 MHz):  $\delta$  12.2, 6.5, 5.7, 4.8, -2.1, -4.7.  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  (THF- $d_8$ , method of Evans, 20 °C): 2.7  $\mu_{\text{B}}$  (S = 1). IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1618 (m,  $\nu_{asym}$ (O–C–O)), 1316 (m,  $\nu_{sym}$ (O–C–O)). UV–vis (THF, nm {M<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>}): 325 {shoulder, 4775}, 415 {4100}, 474 {3700}, 995 {br abs starting at 900 nm, 263}. Anal. Calcd for  $C_{55}H_{43}FeO_2P_3Si: C, 72.37; H, 4.75.$  Found: C, 73.21; H, 5.48. Synthesis of  $(SiP^{Ph}_3)Fe(O^{13}CHO)$ . The same procedures as those

Synthesis of  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(O^{13}CHO)$ . The same procedures as those used to synthesize  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$  were used here, except that  ${}^{13}CO_2$  was used in place of  $CO_2$ . The  ${}^{1}H$  NMR spectrum of  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(O^{13}CHO)$  was identical with that of  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ . IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1587 (m,  $\nu_{asym}(O^{-13}C-O))$ , 1254 (m,  $\nu_{sym}(O^{-13}C-O))$ .

Synthesis of (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO). A yellow THF solution (1 mL) of  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H)_{3}(PMe_{3})$  (6.7 mg, 12  $\mu$ mol) was degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles (3x). Subsequently, CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) was introduced to the thawed solution. The reaction was sealed and then stirred for 12 h at RT to give a light-yellow solution. The volatiles were removed to give an light-yellow solid. The material was triterated with pentane, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The material was then redissolved in  $C_6H_6$  (3 mL) and filtered through a glass frit to remove a black solid. Removal of the solvent in vacuo gave (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe-(OCHO) (4.7 mg, 70%) as a light-yellow solid. Analytically pure material was obtained by layering HDMSO on top of a THF solution of (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO) and allowing it to stand overnight. <sup>1</sup>H NMR  $(C_6D_{6t} 300 \text{ MHz})$ :  $\delta$  41.1, 19.9, 18.6, 13.5, 9.2, 4.5, 3.6, 1.6, -1.2, -11.2, -12.1, -32.6, -37.7.  $\mu_{\text{eff}}$  (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, method of Evans, 20 °C): 5.0  $\mu_{\rm B}$  (S = 2). IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1595 (m,  $\nu_{\rm asym}$ (O–C–O)), 1362 (m,  $\nu_{\rm sym}$ (O–C–O)). UV–vis (THF, nm {M<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>}): 298 {1173}, 410 {274}. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>28</sub>H<sub>54</sub>FeO<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>: C, 57.75; H, 9.35. Found: C, 58.12; H, 9.67.

Synthesis of  $(PhBP^{iPr}_3)Fe(O^{13}CHO)$ . The same procedures as those used to synthesize  $(PhBP^{iPr}_3)Fe(OCHO)$  were used here, except that  $^{13}CO_2$  was used in place of CO<sub>2</sub>. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of

(PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(O<sup>13</sup>CHO) was identical with that of (PhBP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO). IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1546 (m,  $\nu_{asym}(O^{-13}C^{-}O))$ , 1355 (m,  $\nu_{sym}(O^{-13}C^{-}O))$ .

Synthesis of  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)](PF_{6})$ . A yellow THF solution (10) mL) of  $[(NP^{iPr}_3)Fe(N_2)(H)](PF_6)$  (29 mg, 40  $\mu$ mol) was degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles  $(3\times)$ . Subsequently, CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) was introduced. The reaction was then sealed and stirred for 3 h at RT to give a colorless solution. The solvent was removed in vacuo to give a colorless solid. The material was triturated with pentane, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The solid was washed with diethyl ether  $(3 \times 1 \text{ mL})$  to give  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)](PF_{6})$  (29 mg, 97%) as a white solid. Analytically pure material was obtained by layering Et<sub>2</sub>O on top of a THF solution of [(NP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(OCHO)](PF<sub>6</sub>) and allowing it to stand overnight at -35 °C. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (3:2 mixture of C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>/THF $d_{8}$ , 300 MHz):  $\delta$  27.6, 9.4, 8.9, 6.4, 2.1, 1.9, 0.4, -8.3. <sup>31</sup>P NMR (3:2 mixture of C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>/THF- $d_8$ , 121 MHz):  $\delta$  -144.4 (h,  ${}^{1}J_{P-F}$  = 708 Hz,  $PF_6$ ). <sup>19</sup>F NMR (3:2 mixture of C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>/THF-d<sub>8</sub>, 282 MHz): -73.4 (d,  ${}^{1}J_{P-F} = 710$  Hz, PF<sub>6</sub>).  $\mu_{eff}$  (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, method of Evans, 20 °C): 5.1  $\mu_{B}$  (S = 2). IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1613 (m,  $\nu_{asym}$ (O–C–O)). UV–vis (THF, nm {M<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>}): 311 {shoulder, 660}, 379 {shoulder, 249}. Anal. Calcd for C25H55F6FeNO2P4: C, 43.18; H, 7.97; N, 2.01. Found: C, 44.10; H, 8.25; N, 1.86.

Synthesis of  $[(NP^{iPr}_3)Fe(O^{13}CHO)](PF_6)$ . The same procedures as those used to synthesize  $[(NP^{iPr}_3)Fe(OCHO)](PF_6)$  were used here, except that  ${}^{13}CO_2$  was used in place of CO<sub>2</sub>. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum of  $[(NP^{iPr}_3)Fe(O^{13}CHO)](PF_6)$  was identical with that of  $[(NP^{iPr}_3)Fe(OCHO)](PF_6)$ . IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1579 (m,  $\nu_{asym}(O^{-13}C-O))$ .

Synthesis of (TPB)FeCl. The procedures used to synthesize (TPB)FeBr<sup>58</sup> were used to synthesize (TPB)FeCl, except that FeCl<sub>2</sub> was used in place of FeBr2. A Schlenk tube was charged with TPB (117 mg, 172 μmol), FeCl<sub>2</sub> (26 mg, 200 μmol), iron powder (113 mg, 2000  $\mu$ mol), and THF (20 mL). The reaction was heated to 90 °C for 3 days with vigorous stirring, resulting in a color change of the liquid phase from light yellow to dark green-brown. The remaining iron powder was removed by filtration, and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The residue was taken up in toluene (5 mL), and the solvent was removed in vacuo. Pentane (200 mL) was added, and the mixture was stirred for 3 h and filtered. Removal of the solvent in vacuo yielded a yellow-brown powder of (TPB)FeCl (123 mg, 91%). <sup>1</sup>H NMR (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, 300 MHz): δ 97.6, 35.1, 23.6, 9.6, 5.8, 3.4, 1.9, -0.2, -2.3, -22.5.  $\mu_{eff}$  (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, method of Evans, 20 °C): 4.1  $\mu_{B}$  (S = 2). UV-vis (THF, nm  $\{M^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1}\}$ ): 275 {14086}, 317 {10385}, 556 {sh, 80}, 774 {66}, 897 {91}. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>36</sub>H<sub>54</sub>BClFeP<sub>3</sub>: C, 63.41; H, 7.98. Found: C, 64.06; H, 8.89.

Synthesis of (TPB)Fe(OCHO). A yellow benzene solution (6 mL) of (TPB)( $\mu$ -H)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H) (20.7 mg, 31  $\mu$ mol) was degassed by freeze–pump–thaw cycles (3×). Subsequently, CO<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) was introduced. The reaction was then sealed, and the yellow solution was mixed for 1 h at RT. The solvent was lyophilized in vacuo to give (TPB)Fe(OCHO) as a dark-yellow solid (21.0 mg, 99%). Analytically pure material was obtained by cooling a concentrated pentane solution of (TPB)Fe(OCHO) to -35 °C overnight. <sup>1</sup>H NMR (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, 300 MHz):  $\delta$  86.1, 66.3, 38.5, 26.3, 15.5, 4.3, 2.7, 1.4, 1.0, -0.7, -2.6, -3.5, -24.1.  $\mu_{\rm eff}$  (C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub>, method of Evans, 20 °C): 4.2  $\mu_{\rm B}$  (S = 2). IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1627 (m,  $\nu_{\rm asym}$ (O–C–O)), 1291 (m,  $\nu_{\rm sym}$ (O–C–O)). UV–vis (THF, nm {M<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>}): 278 {16400}, 317 {12800}, 773 {br abs, 98}, 958 {127}. Anal. Calcd for C<sub>37</sub>H<sub>55</sub>BFeO<sub>2</sub>P<sub>3</sub>: C, 64.27; H, 8.02. Found: C, 63.16; H, 7.75.

Synthesis of (TPB)Fe(O<sup>13</sup>CHO). The same procedures as those used to synthesize (TPB)Fe(OCHO) were used, except that <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> was used in place of CO<sub>2</sub>. The <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum was identical with that of (TPB)Fe(OCHO). IR (thin film, cm<sup>-1</sup>): 1588 (m,  $\nu_{asym}$ (O<sup>-13</sup>C-O)), 1269 (m,  $\nu_{sym}$ (O<sup>-13</sup>C-O)).

Reaction of (TPB)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>) with Formic Acid. (TPB)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>) (8.2 mg, 12.1  $\mu$ mol) in 2 mL of THF was charged into a round-bottomed flask, and the flask was sealed with a rubber septum. Formic acid (3  $\mu$ L, 80.3  $\mu$ mol) was added by syringe through the septum, immediately resulting in effervescence of H<sub>2</sub> and a yellow-brown solution. The solution was allowed to stir for a few minutes before the volatiles were removed in vacuo to reveal a brown solid. The material was

redissolved in benzene and filtered. Removal of the volatiles in vacuo revealed a brown powder of (TPB)Fe(OCHO) (8.1 mg, 96%). NMR and IR spectral data for this material were identical with those of (TPB)Fe(OCHO).

Deprotonation of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_{2})](BAr^{F}_{4})$  with  $Et_{3}N$ .  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe (N_2)$ ](BAr<sup>F</sup><sub>4</sub>) (14.6 mg, 9.4  $\mu$ mol) and triethylamine (1.7  $\mu$ L, 9.7  $\mu$ mol) were charged into an NMR tube with a *J*-young valve with C<sub>6</sub>D<sub>6</sub> and THF- $d_8$  (ca. 0.4 and 0.1 mL, respectively), yielding a green solution. The solution was degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles  $(3\times)$ , revealing an orange solution consistent with  $[(SiP_{3}^{iPr})Fe$ - $(THF)](BAr_{4}^{F})$ . H<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) was charged into the reaction mixture, yielding a transient gray solution (consistent with  $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_{2})]$ - $(BAr_{4}^{F})$  that immediately changed to orange-yellow upon mixing. The reaction was mixed overnight. The NMR data of the iron species in this reaction mixture were identical with those of  $(SiP_{3}^{iPr})Fe(H_{2})$ -(H).<sup>43</sup> The volatiles were removed in vacuo, and the resulting yellow solid was extracted with pentane. The pentane was removed in vacuo to yield a yellow solid of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(\hat{N_{2}})(H)$  (5.1 mg, 88%). The <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectra of this material are identical with those of  $(\operatorname{SiP}^{i\operatorname{Pr}}_{3})\operatorname{Fe}(\operatorname{N}_{2})(\overline{\operatorname{H}}).$ 

Quantifying H<sub>2</sub> Loss from the Reaction of  $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)$ -(H) with CO<sub>2</sub>. Procedures similar to those of the synthesis of (TPB)Fe(OCHO) were followed. (TPB)( $\mu$ -H)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)(H) (20.0 mg, 31  $\mu$ mol) was dissolved in 6 mL of benzene and charged into a calibrated 200 mL Schlenk tube having a Teflon valve and a 24/40 side joint. The solution was degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles  $(3\times)$ , opened to  $CO_2$  (1 atm) and agitated for ca. 5 s to ensure adequate dissolution of CO2. The reaction was then sealed at the Teflon valve joint and also with a rubber septum at the 24/40 joint. The reaction was stirred vigorously for 30 min, the Teflon valve was opened, and the headspace was sampled through the rubber septum with a 10 mL gastight syringe, being careful to ensure adequate mixing of the gases from the reaction headspace into the 24/40 joint's headspace by repeated extraction and reinjection  $(3\times)$  of the headspace gas with the gastight syringe before a final aliquot was taken for analysis by GC-TCD. A total of 0.44 equiv of H<sub>2</sub> [relative to  $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)(H)$ ] was found.

Quantifying H<sub>2</sub> Loss from the Reaction of (TPB)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>) with Formic Acid. Procedures similar to those of the synthesis of (TPB)Fe(OCHO) from formic acid and (TPB)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>) were followed. (TPB)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>) (24.5 mg, 36  $\mu$ mol) in benzene (3 mL) was charged into a calibrated 100 mL round-bottomed flask and sealed with a rubber septum. Formic acid (1.3  $\mu$ L, 36  $\mu$ mol) was added by syringe. Effervescence was immediately visible. The reaction was allowed to stir for a few minutes before the headspace was sampled through the rubber septum with a 10 mL gastight syringe for analysis by GC-TCD. A total of 0.42 equiv of H<sub>2</sub> [relative to (TPB)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)] was found.

Metathesis Reactions of Iron Formate Complexes with (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)Cl. (Et<sub>3</sub>NH)Cl (10 equiv) was charged into a methanol or benzene solution of  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)](PF_{6})$ , or (TPB)Fe(OCHO). The resulting suspension was stirred overnight and then filtered through a glass frit. The filtrate was concentrated in vacuo into a solid and then extracted. For  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ ,  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ , and (TPB)Fe(OCHO),  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})Fe(OCHO)$ , pentane (3 × 1 mL) was used for extraction, while a 4:1  $C_6H_6/THF$  mixture (3 × 1 mL) was used for  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(OCHO)](PF_6)$ ). The respective <sup>1</sup>H NMR and IR spectra of the extract showed conversion to  $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})FeCI$ ,  $(SiP^{Ph}_{3})FeCI$ ,  $(PhBP^{iPr}_{3})FeCI$ ,  $[(NP^{iPr}_{3})FeCI](PF_{6})$ , or (TPB)FeCI.

 $CO_2$  Hydrogenation Catalysis Protocols. High-pressure hydrogenation reactions were run in a Parr Instruments Company 4590 Micro Bench Top Reactor, with a 20 mL reaction vessel, controlled by a Parr Instruments Company 4834 controller. In a typical catalytic run, an iron precatalyst in 0.1 mL of THF (to solubilize iron precatalyst), 10 mL of methanol, and 1 mL of triethylamine were charged into the Parr reactor. The reactor was sealed, stirred with the attached mechanical stirrer (100 rpm), and charged with CO<sub>2</sub> until the desired pressure at equilibrium was achieved (ca. 10 min). H<sub>2</sub> was subsequently added into the reactor. The gas inlet port was closed, and the reactor was then heated at 100 °C for 20 h. Changes to these conditions were made as described in Tables 2–4 and S1 in the SI. At the conclusion of the reaction, the reactor was cooled to 10 °C with an ice bath over ca. 1.5 h, and the pressure was slowly released through a needle valve. An aliquot of the crude solution was immediately taken for methylformate quantification by GC-FID. The aliquot was then recombined with the crude solution, DMF was added (1 mmol), and 25  $\mu$ L of this solution was taken into 0.5 mL of CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> for triethylammonium formate quantification by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy.

Similar procedures were followed for the low-pressure reactions (1 atm of  $CO_2$  and 1–4 atm of  $H_2$ ), where the reactions were run in a 15 mL Schlenk tube that has a Teflon valve. The solution was degassed by freeze–pump–thaw cycles (3×), and  $CO_2$  (1 atm) was introduced into the vessel at RT. For the reactions requiring 4 atm of  $H_2$ , the entire body of the Schlenk tube was then cooled in a liquid-N<sub>2</sub> bath and 1 atm (RT) of  $H_2$  was introduced. For reactions requiring 1 atm of  $H_2$ , the Schlenk tube was cooled with liquid N<sub>2</sub> up to the solution level only and 1 atm (RT) of  $H_2$  was introduced.

Analysis of the Iron Content Postcatalytic Reaction. The reaction was worked up similarly to the procedures described above for the hydrogenation runs. After the reactor was depressurized, it was brought into the glovebox for workup. The crude solution was transferred to a scintillation vial, and the volatiles were removed in vacuo. The resulting light-yellow solid was dissolved in  $C_6D_6$  and analyzed by <sup>1</sup>H and <sup>31</sup>P NMR spectroscopy.

Hydricity Determination. The hydricity was experimentally determined using the method presented by DuBois et al.<sup>52,53</sup> The equilibrium of eq 3 (Scheme 1) with a given base (proton sponge, 2,6lutidine, or 2,4,6-trimethylpyridine) was measured in THF-d<sub>8</sub>. With proton sponge as the base, [(SiP<sup>iPr</sup><sub>3</sub>)Fe(N<sub>2</sub>)](BAr<sup>F</sup><sub>4</sub>) (8.0 mg, 5.1  $\mu$ mol) was mixed with proton sponge (1.1 mg, 5.1  $\mu$ mol) and the integration standard 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene (1.2 mg, 7.1  $\mu$ mol) in THF- $d_8$  (0.5 mL). With 2,6-lutidine as the base,  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(N_2)]$ - $(BAr_{4}^{F})$  (8.7 mg, 5.6  $\mu$ mol) was mixed with 2,6-lutidine (34  $\mu$ L, 292  $\mu$ mol) and the integration standard 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene (1.1 mg, 6.5  $\mu$ mol) in THF-d<sub>8</sub> (0.5 mL). With 2,4,6-trimethylpyridine as the base,  $[(SiP^{iPr}{}_3)Fe(N_2)](BAr^F_4)$  (8.3 mg, 5.3  $\mu mol)$  was mixed with 2,4,6-trimethylpyridine (1.6  $\mu$ L, 19.8  $\mu$ mol) and the integration standard 1,3,5-trimethoxybenzene (1.3 mg, 7.7  $\mu$ mol) with THF- $d_8$ (0.5 mL). The solutions were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles  $(3\times)$ , and H<sub>2</sub> (1 atm) was introduced. The solutions were mixed using a mechanical rotator at a rate of ca. 12 min<sup>-1</sup>, and the reaction was monitored by <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectroscopy until equilibration: proton sponge, 6 days; 2,6-lutidine, 5 days; 2,4,6-trimethylpyridine, 5 days. Equation 3–5 were used to calculate  $\Delta G_{\text{H}^-}$ . The equilibrium between  $[(SiP^{iP_{3}})Fe(H_{2})](BAr_{4}^{F})$  and its THF adduct  $[(SiP^{iP_{3}})Fe(H_{2})]$ - $(BAr_{4}^{F})$  was also taken into account in the calculations (see the SI).

**UV–Vis Titration.** The UV–vis titration experiments of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)-Fe(N_2)](BAr^F_4)$  (4.8 mM) with Li(OCHO) (48 mM) in THF was performed by adding aliquots of the formate solution to a solution of the iron complex. The decay of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(N_2)](BAr^F_4)$  was monitored, with the absorbance at 752 nm used for fitting to a quadratic equation against  $K_{eq}$ . After the addition of 1 equiv of Li(OCHO), a spectrum corresponding to  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(OCHO)$  was observed.

#### ASSOCIATED CONTENT

#### **S** Supporting Information

NMR, IR, and UV-vis spectra, along with detailed catalytic hydrogenation results and a detailed description of the hydricity calculations. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

#### AUTHOR INFORMATION

#### **Corresponding Author**

\*E-mail: jpeters@caltech.edu.

#### Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work performed by the Joint Center of Artificial Photosynthesis, a DOE Energy Innovation Hub, supported through the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Award DE-SC0004993. The Bercaw Group at the California Institute of Technology is acknowledged for their assistance with the high-pressure reactions. GC-FID instrumentation at the Environmental Analysis Center (EAC) at the California Institute of Technology was used in this work. We acknowledge Dr. Nathan Dalleska of the EAC for his assistance with the GC-FID measurements.

# REFERENCES

(1) Carbon Dioxide as Chemical Feedstock; Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: Weinheim, Germany, 2010.

(2) Olah, G. A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2013, 52, 104-107.

(3) Enthaler, S.; von Langermann, J.; Schmidt, T. Energy Environ. Sci. 2010, 3, 1207–1217.

(4) Arakawa, H.; Aresta, M.; Armor, J. N.; Barteau, M. A.; Beckman, E. J.; Bell, A. T.; Bercaw, J. E.; Creutz, C.; Dinjus, E.; Dixon, D. A.; Domen, K.; DuBois, D. L.; Eckert, J.; Fujita, E.; Gibson, D. H.; Goddard, W. A.; Goodman, D. W.; Keller, J.; Kubas, G. J.; Kung, H. H.; Lyons, J. E.; Manzer, L. E.; Marks, T. J.; Morokuma, K.; Nicholas, K. M.; Periana, R.; Que, L.; Rostrup-Nielson, J.; Sachtler, W. M. H.; Schmidt, L. D.; Sen, A.; Somorjai, G. A.; Stair, P. C.; Stults, B. R.; Tumas, W. Chem. Rev. **2001**, 101, 953–996.

(5) Appel, A. M.; Bercaw, J. E.; Bocarsly, A. B.; Dobbek, H.; DuBois, D. L.; Dupuis, M.; Ferry, J. G.; Fujita, E.; Hille, R.; Kenis, P. J. A.; Kerfeld, C. A.; Morris, R. H.; Peden, C. H. F.; Portis, A. R.; Ragsdale, S. W.; Rauchfuss, T. B.; Reek, J. N. H.; Seefeldt, L. C.; Thauer, R. K.; Waldrop, G. L. Chem. Rev. **2013**, *113*, 6621–6658.

(6) Benson, E. E.; Kubiak, C. P.; Sathrum, A. J.; Smieja, J. M. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2009, 38, 89–99.

(7) Cokoja, M.; Bruckmeier, C.; Rieger, B.; Herrmann, W. A.; Kühn, F. E. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 8510–8537.

(8) *The Handbook of Homogeneous Hydrogenation*; Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH: Weinheim, Germany, 2008.

(9) Jessop, P. G.; Ikariya, T.; Noyori, R. Nature 1994, 368, 231-233.

(10) Tanaka, R.; Yamashita, M.; Nozaki, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 14168–14169.

(11) Graf, E.; Leitner, W. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1992, 623–624.

(12) Lau, C. P.; Chen, Y. Z. J. Mol. Catal. A: Chem. 1995, 101, 33-36.

(13) Erlandsson, M.; Landaeta, V. R.; Gonsalvi, L.; Peruzzini, M.; Phillips, A. D.; Dyson, P. J.; Laurenczy, G. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2008**, 2008, 620–627.

- (14) Huff, C. A.; Sanford, M. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 18122–18125.
- (15) Huff, C. A.; Sanford, M. S. ACS Catal. 2013, 2412-2416.

(16) Schaub, T.; Paciello, R. A. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 7278-7282.

(17) Wang, W.-H.; Muckerman, J. T.; Fujita, E.; Himeda, Y. ACS Catal. 2013, 3, 856–860.

(18) Langer, R.; Diskin-Posner, Y.; Leitus, G.; Shimon, L. J. W.; Ben-David, Y.; Milstein, D. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. **2011**, 50, 9948–9952.

(19) Federsel, C.; Boddien, A.; Jackstell, R.; Jennerjahn, R.; Dyson, P. J.; Scopelliti, R.; Laurenczy, G.; Beller, M. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2010, 49, 9777–9780.

(20) Ziebart, C.; Federsel, C.; Anbarasan, P.; Jackstell, R.; Baumann, W.; Spannenberg, A.; Beller, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, 20701–20704.

(21) Evans, G. O.; Newell, C. J. Inorg. Chim. Acta 1978, 31, L387–L389.

(22) Tai, C.-C.; Chang, T.; Roller, B.; Jessop, P. G. Inorg. Chem. 2003, 42, 7340-7341.

(23) Inoue, Y.; Sasaki, Y.; Hashimoto, H. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1975, 718–719.

(24) Haynes, P.; Slaugh, L. H.; Kohnle, J. F. Tetrahedron Lett. 1970, 11, 365–368.

(25) Federsel, C.; Ziebart, C.; Jackstell, R.; Baumann, W.; Beller, M. *Chem.—Eur. J.* **2012**, *18*, 72–75.

(26) Jeletic, M. S.; Mock, M. T.; Appel, A. M.; Linehan, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2013**, 135, 11533–11536.

(27) Kumar, N.; Camaioni, D.; Dupuis, M.; Raugei, S.; Appel, A. M. Dalton Trans. 2014, 43, 11803–11106.

- (28) Badiei, Y. M.; Wang, W.-H.; Hull, J. F.; Szalda, D. J.; Muckerman, J. T.; Himeda, Y.; Fujita, E. *Inorg. Chem.* **2013**, *52*, 12576–12586.
- (29) Field, L. D.; Lawrenz, E. T.; Shaw, W. J.; Turner, P. Inorg. Chem. 2000, 39, 5632-5638.
- (30) Allen, O. R.; Dalgarno, S. J.; Field, L. D. Organometallics 2008, 27, 3328-3330.
- (31) Field, L. D.; Shaw, W. J.; Turner, P. Chem. Commun. 2002, 46–47.
- (32) Hills, A.; Hughes, D. L.; Jimenez-Tenorio, M.; Leigh, G. J. J. Organomet. Chem. 1990, 391, C41–C44.
- (33) Bianco, V. D.; Doronzo, S.; Gallo, N. Inorg. Nucl. Chem. Lett. 1980, 16, 97–99.
- (34) Bianco, V. D.; Doronzo, S.; Rossi, M. J. Organomet. Chem. 1972, 35, 337–339.

(35) Estes, D. P.; Vannucci, A. K.; Hall, A. R.; Lichtenberger, D. L.; Norton, J. R. Organometallics **2011**, *30*, 3444–3447.

(36) DuBois, D. L.; Berning, D. E. Appl. Organomet. Chem. 2000, 14, 860–862.

(37) Lee, Y.; Mankad, N. P.; Peters, J. C. Nat. Chem. 2010, 2, 558-565.

- (38) Betley, T. A.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2003, 125, 10782-10783.
- (39) Betley, T. A.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 6252–6254.
- (40) Anderson, J. S.; Rittle, J.; Peters, J. C. Nature 2013, 501, 84-87.

(41) Anderson, J. S.; Moret, M.-E.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 135, 534-537.

(42) Creutz, S. E.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 136, 1105–1115.

(43) Lee, Y.; Kinney, R. A.; Hoffman, B. M.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 16366–16369.

- (44) Fong, H.; Moret, M.-E.; Lee, Y.; Peters, J. C. Organometallics 2013, 32, 3053-3062.
- (45) Daida, E. J.; Peters, J. C. Inorg. Chem. 2004, 43, 7474-7485.
- (46) MacBeth, C. E.; Harkins, S. B.; Peters, J. C. Can. J. Chem. 2005, 83, 332–340.
- (47) Rittle, J.; Peters, J. C. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2013, 110, 15898–15903.

(48) Heinekey, D. M.; van Roon, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1996, 118, 12134-12140.

(49) THF is known to bind competitively with  $H_2$  on  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3) Fe(L)](BAr^F_4]$  (where L = THF or  $H_2$ ), and the THF/ $H_2$  binding equilibrium was taken into account in the calculations; see the SI.

(50) The p $K_a$  of  $[(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)](BAr^F_4)$  was estimated using the Morris method. These calculations rely on the ligand acidity constants for each of the ligands of the conjugate base metal complex, which in this case is the deprotonation product  $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)(H)$ . We note that the ligand acidity constants for  $H_2$  and the formally Si<sup>-</sup> ligands of the conjugate base complex are not known. We therefore used the reported ligand acidity constants of  $C_2H_4$  as a model for the  $H_2$  ligand and of  $CH_3^-/H^-$  as a model for the Si<sup>-</sup> ligand unit for these calculations. See ref 51.

(51) Morris, R. H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 1948-1959.

(52) Ciancanelli, R.; Noll, B. C.; DuBois, D. L.; DuBois, M. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2002, 124, 2984–2992.

(53) Price, A. J.; Ciancanelli, R.; Noll, B. C.; Curtis, C. J.; DuBois, D. L.; DuBois, M. R. *Organometallics* **2002**, *21*, 4833–4839.

(54) Abdur-Rashid, K.; Fong, T. P.; Greaves, B.; Gusev, D. G.; Hinman, J. G.; Landau, S. E.; Lough, A. J.; Morris, R. H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2000, 122, 9155–9171.

(55) Chen, J. Z.; Szalda, D. J.; Fujita, E.; Creutz, C. Inorg. Chem. 2010, 49, 9380–9391.

(56) Gibson, D. H. Coord. Chem. Rev. 1999, 185-186, 335-355.

(57) Whited, M. T.; Mankad, N. P.; Lee, Y.; Oblad, P. F.; Peters, J. C. *Inorg. Chem.* **2009**, *48*, 2507–2517.

(58) Moret, M.-E.; Peters, J. C. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 2063–2067.

(59) The  $\{M-B\}^n$  notation refers to the number of valence electrons that are formally assigned to the metal (e.g., iron) and shared with the boron atom. For a discussion of M–B bonding, see: (a) Hill, A. F. *Organometallics* **2006**, *25*, 4741–4743. (b) Parkin, G. *Organometallics* **2006**, *25*, 4744–4747.

(60) Marks, T. J.; Kolb, J. R. Chem. Rev. 1977, 77, 263-293.

(61) Munshi, P.; Main, A. D.; Linehan, J. C.; Tai, C.-C.; Jessop, P. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2002**, 124, 7963–7971.

(62) Wesselbaum, S.; vom Stein, T.; Klankermayer, J.; Leitner, W. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2012, 51, 7499-7502.

(63) Mellone, I.; Peruzzini, M.; Rosi, L.; Mellmann, D.; Junge, H.; Beller, M.; Gonsalvi, L. *Dalton Trans.* **2013**, *42*, 2495–2501.

(64) Saouma, C. T.; Lu, C. C.; Day, M. W.; Peters, J. C. Chem. Sci. 2013, 4, 4042–4051.

(65) Gambarotta, S.; Arena, F.; Floriani, C.; Zanazzi, P. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 5082–5092.

(66) Bielinski, E. A.; Lagaditis, P. O.; Zhang, Y.; Mercado, B. Q.; Würtele, C.; Bernskoetter, W. H.; Hazari, N.; Schneider, S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 10234–10237.

(67) Drake, J. L.; Manna, C. M.; Byers, J. A. Organometallics 2013, 32, 6891–6894.

(68) Otera, J.; Nishikido, J. *Esterification*; Wiley-VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA: Weinheim, Germany, 2010.

(69) Kaljurand, I.; Kütt, A.; Sooväli, L.; Rodima, T.; Mäemets, V.; Leito, I.; Koppel, I. A. J. Org. Chem. 2005, 70, 1019–1028.

(70) Matsubara, Y.; Fujita, E.; Doherty, M. D.; Muckerman, J. T.; Creutz, C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **2012**, 134, 15743–15757.

(71) Brunner, E. J. Chem. Eng. Data 1985, 30, 269-273.