ORGANOMETALLICS

Heterolytic H₂ Cleavage and Catalytic Hydrogenation by an Iron Metallaboratrane

Henry Fong, Marc-Etienne Moret,[†] Yunho Lee,[‡] and Jonas C. Peters*

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

Supporting Information

ABSTRACT: Reversible, heterolytic addition of H_2 across an ironboron bond in a ferraboratrane with formal hydride transfer to the boron gives iron-borohydrido-hydride complexes. These compounds catalyze the hydrogenation of alkenes and alkynes to the respective alkanes. Notably, the boron is capable of acting as a shuttle for hydride transfer to substrates. The results are interesting in the context of heterolytic substrate addition across metal-boron bonds in metallaboratranes and related systems, as well as metal-ligand bifunctional catalysis.



INTRODUCTION

Transition metal-catalyzed bond-forming reactions often involve formal two-electron redox steps (e.g., oxidative addition and reductive elimination). Noble metal catalysts are commonly used in these reactions due, in part, to their propensity to facilitate multielectron processes.¹ There is growing interest in developing catalysts for bond forming/ cleavage reactions based on earth-abundant mid to late first-row transition metals, a goal that presents a unique set of challenges.² First-row transition metal catalysts that can circumvent undesirable one-electron processes in favor of concerted two-electron reaction steps present one plausible design criterion.³

Cooperative catalysis strategies that utilize ligands that operate in tandem with a coordinated metal center to activate substrates have shown promise in addressing this issue.^{4,5} Firstrow metallaboratranes and related compounds that contain a retrodative $M \rightarrow B \sigma$ -interaction⁶ are appealing as catalysts⁷ because of the boron center's ability to stabilize low-valent metals.⁸ Akin to frustrated Lewis pairs,⁹ it has also been recently demonstrated that the metal—boron interaction can cooperatively facilitate the activation of H₂.^{5,7} For instance, our lab recently reported that the diphosphine-borane nickel (^{Mes}DPB^{Ph})Ni complex undergoes reversible oxidative addition of H₂ to afford a nickel-borohydrido-hydride complex (Scheme 1).¹⁰ This nickel system is an efficient catalyst for olefin hydrogenation. Kameo and Nakazawa have also reported on





the transfer hydrogenation of ketones catalyzed by a rhodium diphosphine-borane complex. $^{11}\,$

Herein we report on studies of heterolytic H–H bond cleavage at a ferraboratrane complex¹² of a triphosphine-borane (TPB) ligand.¹³ Dihydrogen is shown to add reversibly across the Fe–B bond of (TPB)Fe(L) complexes to form corresponding iron-borohydrido-hydride complexes of the type (TPB)(μ -H)Fe(L)(H). Like the nickel system reported previously, olefin hydrogenation catalysis is accessible, albeit much slower, thereby facilitating detailed studies. As discussed below, other E–H bonds are also activated by the ferraboratanes described, including the terminal C–H bonds of arylacetylenes and the C–H bonds of formaldehyde.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Reversible H₂ Addition. Exposing the previously reported (TPB)Fe(N₂) complex^{12a} (1) in d_6 -benzene to H₂ (1.2 equiv) at room temperature results in H₂ addition across the Fe-B bond to give a yellow solution of the six-coordinate borohydride-hydride-N₂ complex $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)(H)$ (2) (Scheme 2, Figure 1). The XRD structure of 2 shows that the Fe–B distance is significantly elongated relative to 1(2.604(3))Å in **2** versus the calculated distance of 2.2 Å in 1^{12b} (Figure 1). A terminal hydride ligand and a bridging hydride ligand located between the B and Fe atoms can be assigned from the electron density difference map. This structure also prevails in solution. In the ¹H NMR spectrum (d_6 -benzene), the terminal hydride ligand on iron is observed as a triplet-of-doublets at -9.6 ppm, and the bridging hydride is observed as a broad singlet at -30.4 ppm. Replacing H₂ with D₂ in the reaction gives the corresponding isotopologue $(TPB)(\mu-D)Fe(N_2)(D)$. Along with the expected deuteride signals in the ²H NMR spectrum, deuterium signals from the methine and terminal

 Received:
 April 3, 2013

 Published:
 May 6, 2013





Scheme 2. H–H and E–H Bond Activations across Fe–B Bonds

Figure 1. XRD structures of 2 (left) and 5 (right). Ellipsoids are shown at 50% probability. Selected bond distances (Å): 2, Fe1-H1 = 1.42(2), Fe1-H2 = 1.49(2), B1-H2 = 1.17(2), Fe1-B1 = 2.604(3); 5, Fe1-H42 = 1.35(2), Fe1-H43 = 1.52(2), B1-H43 = 1.20(2), Fe1-B1 = 2.673(2).

methyl positions of the isopropyl groups of the TPB ligand are observed. This observation establishes that facile scrambling of the hydridic ligands into the TPB isopropyl groups occurs, presumably via a reversible C–H metalation process.

The dinitrogen ligand ($\nu_{\rm NN} = 2070 \ {\rm cm}^{-1}$) in 2 is labile, and it can be substituted under excess H₂ to give the dihydrogen analogue (TPB)(μ -H)Fe(H₂)(H) (3) (Scheme 2). Exposing 1 to excess H₂ (1 atm) also generates 3. Its XRD structure again confirms the presence of a bridging hydride (Figure 2). Although electron density can be located in the difference map between a widened P–Fe–P angle (136.54(2)°) and in the apical position *trans* to the borohydride unit, the data do not allow us to reliably distinguish between classical and non-



Figure 2. XRD- (left) and DFT-optimized (right) structures of **3**. Ellipsoids shown at 50% probability. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (deg): XRD, Fe1-H42 = 1.56(2), B1-H42 = 1.21(2), Fe1-B1, 2.63(2), P2-Fe1-P3 = 136.54(2); DFT predicted, Fe1-H42 = 1.51, Fe1-H43 = 1.50, Fe1-H44 = 1.62, Fe1-P45 = 1.59, B1-H42 = 1.24, Fe1-B1 = 2.63, H44-H45 = 0.84, P2-Fe1-P3 = 140.63.

classical hydrides. We therefore turned to NMR spectroscopy to aid in the formulation of **3**.

The 20 °C ¹H NMR spectrum (d_{s} -toluene) of 3 (Figure 3) shows a broad singlet resonance at -15.1 ppm, indicative of



Figure 3. ¹H VT-NMR spectra of 3 in d_8 -toluene under 1 atm of H₂.

hydridic protons. A broad deuteride signal is observed in the ²H NMR spectrum when D_2 is used in place of H_2 , and, like in 2, deuterium signals are also observed in the methyl and methine positions of the isopropyl groups of the TPB ligand. Cooling a d_8 -toluene solution of 3 under an H₂ atmosphere to -20 °C leads to sharpening of the resonance at -15.1 ppm, which integrates to three protons (3H). A second, broad hydridic resonance integrating to one proton is also observed at -24.9ppm, and in analogy with 2, this resonance is assigned to the bridging borohydride (μ -H). Cooling to -90 °C leads to broadening of the 3H resonance without reaching decoalescence, suggesting that exchange of three hydrogenic ligands is fast on the NMR time scale. Compound 3 can be heated to 50 °C before significant sample decomposition is observed (vide *infra*). At 50 °C, the 3H and μ -H signals both broaden into the baseline, suggesting that exchange of all four hydrogens is facile at this temperature.

To further assign the 3H unit in 3 (i.e., dihydrogen-hydride versus trihydride), we turned to minimal longitudinal relaxation $(T_{1 \text{ min}})$ measurements.^{14,15} The $T_{1 \text{ min}}$ is 35 ms at -32 °C for the 3H resonance, which suggests that the 3H unit is best described as dihydrogen-hydride and implying the following assignment for 3: (TPB)(μ -H)Fe(H₂)(H). This interpretation is additionally supported by DFT calculations (RB3LYP/6-

31G(d)) that identify a dihydrogen-hydride structure (Figure 2 and Supporting Information) as the lowest energy isomer of **3**. A stereoisomer in which the H₂ ligand occupies the equatorial position and the hydride ligand is in the axial position *trans* to boron is calculated to be 6.1 kcal/mol higher in energy. This geometric preference parallels that of the well-characterized iron-dihydrogen-dihydride complex *mer*-Fe(H₂)-(H)₂(PEt₂Ph)₃.¹⁶ The transition state for conversion of **3** into this higher energy stereoisomer involving H–H scission is calculated to be 6.7 kcal/mol above the most stable isomer and is in line with the observed exchange behavior on the NMR time scale.

Analogous $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(L)(H)$ complexes $(L = CN^{t}Bu$ (5), CO (7)) can be synthesized (Scheme 2, Figure 1). To explore the effect of the apical ligand L on the H-H bond activation process, (TPB)Fe(L) complexes $(L = CN^{t}Bu, 4; L =$ CO, 6) were prepared. The previously reported carbonyl complex 6 displays a η^3 -interaction with a P-C_{Ar}-C_{Ar} unit of the TPB ligand,^{12a} whereas isocyanide adduct 4, whose structure has been determined, does not: its Fe center is rigorously five-coordinate. Complex 6 is diamagnetic, whereas 4 gives rise to a solution magnetic susceptibility ($\mu_{eff} = 1.7 \mu_B$) at room temperature in C_6D_6 . The temperature dependence of the solution susceptibility suggests an S = 0 ground state with a thermally accessible S = 1 state. No reaction occurs between (TPB)Fe(CN^tBu) (4, $\mu_{\text{eff}} = 1.7 \mu_{\text{B}}$) or the previously reported (TPB)Fe(CO)^{12a} (6) with H₂ (1 atm) at room temperature over a period of hours. Compound 4 is fully consumed by H_2 (1 atm) over the course of 3 days at 40 $^{\circ}$ C to generate 5, while compound **6** is fully consumed by H_2 (1 atm) over the course of 5 days at 80 $^{\circ}\mathrm{C}$ to give 7. The increase in temperature and reaction time compared to the facile room temperature reaction between 1 and H₂ is consistent with a scenario in which H₂ substitution for L occurs prior to H₂ addition across the Fe-B bond. Complex 7 can be alternatively synthesized from 1 or 2 and formaldehyde (Scheme 2).

Dihydrogen addition across the Fe–B bond of 1 is reversible. Conversion of 3 to 2 and subsequently back to 1 can be effected by exposing 3 to dynamic vacuum and then N_2 or by repeated freeze–pump–thaw– N_2 cycles. Re-formation of the Fe–B bond can also occur through hydride transfer to unsaturated substrates (*vide infra*). Dihydrogen elimination from 5 and 7 does not occur when treated similarly.

Worth underscoring is that cleavage of the Fe-B bond in the present ferraboratrane system is distinct from the H₂ chemistry observed for a structurally related (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe silatrane system $(SiP^{iPr}_{3} = [Si(o-C_{6}H_{4}P^{iPr_{2}})_{3}]^{-})$ that we have introduced elsewhere.^{17–19} For instance, the reaction between $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe$ (N_2) and H_2 affords $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(H_2)$, and that between $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_{2})]^{+}$ and H_{2} affords $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_{2})]^{+}$. No disruption of the Fe-Si bond is observed in either case, even if for instance isolated $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(N_{2})]^{+}$ or $[(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_{2})]^{+}$ is exposed to excess H₂. Ligand substitution instead occurs. This sharply contrasts isoelectronic (TPB)Fe(N_2) 1, where H_2 addition readily affords the cleavage product 2 or 3. We also find (this report, Scheme 3) that hydrogenolysis of the iron(II) methyl complex (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(Me) occurs slowly at 60 °C to give an H₂/H product, but once again without disruption of the Fe-Si bond. Addition of exogenous donor ligands such as H_{2} N_{2} and CO effect substitution of the coordinated H₂ ligand, but the Fe-Si bond is maintained. One factor contributing to the difference between the two systems is likely the more flexible Fe–B bond in the (TPB)Fe system, as reflected in the variable





Fe–B bond distances (varying by ca. 0.5 Å)^{12b} versus more rigid Fe–Si bond distances (varying by ca. 0.2 Å)^{17–19} in (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe that have been observed over several formal iron oxidation states. The rigidity of the Fe–Si interaction presumably reflects an appreciably stronger Fe–Si bond relative to Fe–B. One can additionally consider the relative Lewis acidity of the Ar₃B versus the Ar₃Si⁺ subunit¹⁸ in these respective systems and their propensity to serve as H⁻ acceptors, but one might then predict the Ar₃Si⁺ to be the better acceptor, in contrast to the experimental observations. Indeed, this latter point may be the reason the Fe–Si interaction is stronger than the Fe–B interaction.

Reaction with Unsaturated Substrates. The ability of the (TPB)Fe scaffold to reversibly cleave H₂ prompted us to study if the transfer of hydrogen from (TPB)(μ -H)Fe(L)(H) to substrates is possible. The reaction of 1 with ethylene, styrene, and arylacetylenes was probed. A degassed d_6 -benzene solution of 1 reacts with ethylene to give a light brown solution of the paramagnetic iron-ethylene adduct (TPB)Fe(C₂H₄) (8; $\mu_{\text{eff}} = 3.2 \ \mu_{\text{B}}, S = 1$) (Scheme 4). Brown XRD quality crystals of

Scheme 4. Ethylene Coordination and Arylacetylene C-H



8 can be grown under an atmosphere of ethylene at 0 °C. Two molecules of 8 are found in the asymmetric unit cell. The iron center is bound η^2 to ethylene ((Fe-C)_{av} = 2.108(1) Å) and lies above the plane defined by the phosphine donors by an average distance of 0.641 Å, with a corresponding elongation of the average Fe-B distance to 2.491(2) Å (compared to 2.2 Å in 1). The average C-C bond distance ((C-C)_{av} = 1.397(2) Å)

of the η^2 -coordinated ethylene molecule is significantly elongated from that in free ethylene (1.337 Å).²⁰ The data are consistent with π -back-bonding from iron to ethylene, which confers significant ferracyclopropane character to 8.²¹ Storing 8 for 2 days under an atmosphere of N₂ fully regenerates 1.

Compound 1 does not afford a detectable styrene adduct but reacts with both phenyl- and tolylacetylene with formal hydride transfer from the terminal C(sp)–H of the arylacetylene to the boron, forming S = 2 iron-borohydrido-arylacetylide complexes (TPBH)Fe(C₂Ar) (Ar = Ph, 9, $\mu_{eff} = 5.1 \mu_B$; Ar = Tol, 10, $\mu_{eff} = 5.2 \mu_B$) (Scheme 4). Two molecules of 10 are found in the asymmetric unit, and the XRD structure shows the presence of a tolylacetylide ligand coordinated to a pyramidalized iron center (Figure 4). While the hydride on the boron cannot be



Figure 4. XRD structures of **8** (left) and **10** (right). Ellipsoids are shown at 50% probability. Selected bond distances (Å) and angles (deg): **8** (average for two molecules in the asymmetric unit cell), Fe1–B1 = 2.491(1), Fe1–C37 = 2.103(1), Fe1–C38 = 2.113(1), C37–C38 = 1.397(2), \sum (P–Fe–P) = 338.76(3); **10** (average for two molecules in the asymmetric unit cell), Fe1–B1 = 2.761(2), Fe1–C37 = 1.918(2) C37–C38 = 1.169(3), \sum (P–Fe–P) = 345.07(2).

reliably located by XRD, the IR spectra for both **9** and **10** show B–H stretches at 2490 and 2500 cm⁻¹, respectively, most consistent with a nonbridging B–H unit. The vibrational bands shift to 1826 cm⁻¹ (predicted 1834 cm⁻¹) for **9** and 1824 cm⁻¹ (predicted 1841 cm⁻¹) for **10** upon labeling with the monodeuterated arylacetylene (ArC=CD).

The activation of the arylacetylene C(sp)-H bond by 1 is reversible. Mixing a d_6 -benzene solution of 9 with tolylacetylene (4 equiv) and, conversely, mixing a d_6 -benzene solution of 10 with phenylacetylene (4 equiv) both result in a mixture of 9 and 10 (Scheme 5A). The corresponding exchange reactions with B-D-labeled isotopologues of 9 or 10 ((TPBD)Fe-(C₂Ar)) and a different all-protio arylacetylene (Ar'C=CH) result in the exclusive formation of free ArC=CD, indicating that the arylacetylene unit is reductively eliminated from the iron-borohydrido-arylacetylide complexes prior to activation of an incoming acetylene substrate, presumably by reversible hydride transfer from the boron to the arylacetylide to form intermediate π -adducts akin to 8 (Scheme 5B).

Stoichiometric Hydrogenations. We also explored whether the transfer of hydrogen from $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(L)(H)$ species to unsaturated substrates might be possible. Exposing 8 to excess H₂ (1 atm) results in complete conversion of ethylene to ethane and 3 as the iron-containing product (Scheme 6-i) in less than 12 h. A paramagnetic intermediate (A) and 8 can be observed by *in situ* ¹H NMR spectroscopy. The same





Scheme 6. Stoichiometric Hydrogenation Reactions



paramagnetic intermediate A and 8 can also be observed by in situ ¹H NMR spectroscopy if the same reaction is run under ethylene (1 atm) and H₂ (1 atm). The IR spectrum of the reaction mixture shows a diagnostic terminal B-H vibration at 2470 cm⁻¹ that is attributed to A. Akin to the ironborohydrido-alkynyl complexes 9 and 10, A is assigned to the iron-borohydrido-ethyl complex (Scheme 6-i).²² Using D₂ in place of H₂ in the ethylene hydrogenation reaction and monitoring leads to the observation of both B-D and B-H stretches in the IR spectrum, which is consistent with facile insertion/ β -hydride elimination processes prior to ethane elimination from A. We note the similarity of A (and 9 and 10) to the well-characterized zwitterionic tris(phosphino)borate-iron-ethyl complex (PhBP₃)Fe(Et) that was observed as an intermediate in ethylene hydrogenation with the previously reported iron (PhBP₃)Fe system.³⁶

Complexes 1, 2, and 3 hydrogenate both phenylacetylene (1 equiv) and styrene (1 equiv) to ethylbenzene (1 atm H₂) with 3 as the observable iron-containing product. The *in situ* ¹H NMR spectrum of styrene hydrogenation reactions using 1, 2, or 3 show styrene, ethylbenzene, and 3 in solution during the reaction course. Furthermore, for styrene hydrogenation with D₂ the ²H NMR spectrum and GC-MS data of the reaction mixture show incorporation of deuterium onto both olefinic

Organometallics

carbon atoms of free styrene, indicating that styrene coordination to the iron center and insertion/ β -hydride elimination processes are reversible.

Under stoichiometric conditions, the addition of 1 equiv of styrene to a solution of **2** in d_6 -benzene and under N₂ (1 atm) cleanly generates 1 equiv of ethylbenzene and **1** (Scheme 6-ii). In contrast, running the same reaction under a static vacuum yields a mixture of styrene, ethylbenzene, **1**, and **2** (Scheme 6-iii). These observations suggest that excess H₂ or N₂ is required for the hydrogenations to proceed to completion. Moreover, the bridging monohydride appears competent for transfer to a substrate.

Substrates including *trans*-stilbene, *N*-benzylideneaniline, acetone, and acetophenone were not hydrogenated under similar conditions. Compounds **5** and **7** also do not hydrogenate ethylene, styrene, or phenylacetylene under the same conditions.

Catalytic Hydrogenations. Under the catalytic conditions of 0.01 M 1, 1 atm of H_2 , and 30 equiv of the substrate in d_6 -benzene at room temperature, ethylene, styrene, and phenyl-acetylene are hydrogenated to ethane and ethylbenzene, respectively (Table 1). Compounds 2 and 3 can also be used

Table 1. Catalytic Hydrogenations by 1 with H₂^a

precatalyst	substrate	product	TOF $(h^{-1})^d$
1	ethylene ^b	ethane	15
1	styrene ^b	ethylbenzene	0.27
1	phenylacetylene ^c	ethylbenzene	0.16

^{*a*}Conditions: Room temperature, 0.01 M **1**, 1 atm H₂, and 0.01 M ferrocene as an internal integration standard in d_{c} -benzene. ^{*b*}0.3 M substrate. ^{*c*}0.29 M substrate. ^{*d*}As determined by ¹H NMR spectros-copy at >95% product.

as precatalysts. Ambient laboratory light does not affect the reaction and the catalysis is not inhibited by elemental mercury; it thus appears to be a homogeneous process. Norbornene is hydrogenated to norbornane, and with an atmosphere of D₂ in place of H₂ the *cis*-addition product *exo*,*exo*-2,3- d_2 norbornane²³ is exclusively observed, indicating the *syn*-addition of hydrogen and arguing against radical processes.

The hydrogenation catalysis was monitored by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with ferrocene as an internal integration standard. As with stoichiometric ethylene hydrogenation, the *in situ* ¹H NMR spectra of the catalytic ethylene hydrogenation reaction indicate the presence of ethylene adduct 8 and the putative ethyl-borohydride intermediate A as the iron-containing species during the reaction course. Complex 3 is the iron-containing product at the completion of the reaction. For styrene hydrogenation, styrene, ethylbenzene, and 3 are observed during catalysis, and scrambling of deuterium into the vinylic positions of styrene is observed under D2. In contrast, for phenylacetylene hydrogenation complex 9 is the only observed iron species early in the reaction when the phenylacetylene concentration is high. As phenylacetylene is consumed, styrene and 3 form, and ethylbenzene begins to develop slowly thereafter.

Attempting to increase the rate of catalysis by elevating the reaction temperature results in catalyst decomposition. The decomposition product (11) can be synthesized independently in near quantitative yields by heating 3 (80 °C) under H₂ (1 atm) for 2 h. The XRD structure of 11 indicates that a $B-C_{Ar}$ bond is cleaved from the TPB ligand fragment (Figure 5). This

result offers the cautionary note that $B-C_{Ar}$ bond cleavage to give metal-borohydride products is a viable catalyst decomposition pathway.



Figure 5. Chemical line representation and XRD structure of 11. Ellipsoids are shown at 50% probability. Selected bond distances (Å): Fe1-H1 = 1.59(1), Fe1-H2 = 1.63(1), Fe1-B1 = 2.0900(6), Fe1-P1 = 2.2481(2).

On the basis of the results from the stoichiometric and catalytic experiments, we propose a plausible mechanistic scenario to account for the observed catalytic styrene hydrogenation by 1 (Scheme 7A) and, in doing so, underscore





interesting aspects of the mechanism that remain unanswered. Starting from precatalyst **1**, addition of H_2 generates **3**, a species that can be observed by ¹H NMR spectroscopy during catalytic runs (resting state). Subsequent substitution of the apical H_2 ligand for styrene forms the unobserved iron-styrene-hydride-borohydride species **B**, and insertion into the terminal hydride affords the iron-alkyl intermediate **A**'. Intermediate **A**' is analogous to the ethyl species **A** (Scheme 6-i) and is also related to the structurally characterized acetylide-borohydride complex **10** (Scheme 4). Olefin coordination and insertion appear to be reversible, as labeling studies show deuterium is

exchanged into the vinylic positions of *free* styrene under a D_2 atmosphere. Elimination of ethylbenzene in the presence of H_2 regenerates the catalyst resting state.

The conversion of 1 to 3 likely proceeds via the H_2 -adduct intermediate C depicted in Scheme 7B by H2-for-N2 ligand exchange. While we have not detected such a species in the present (TPB)Fe system, its cobalt analogue (TPB)Co(H_2) can be isolated and has been thoroughly characterized,²⁴ as has the isoelectronic iron complex $[(SiP_{1}^{iP_{3}})Fe(H_{2})]^{+17} N_{2}/H_{2}$ exchange is facile in these well-defined Co and Fe systems, and by extension we infer it would also be facile for $(TPB)Fe(N_2)$ 1 to afford (TPB)Fe(H_2) C before additional reactions ensue. Since H_2 reacts with 1, but not with 5 and 7 at room temperature, we think that facile H₂ substitution for N₂ most likely occurs prior to H-H bond cleavage. We appreciate that while this scenario is consistent with the data available, it is not demanded by the available data. For instance, it is alternatively possible that styrene substitution for the N₂ ligand in 1 precedes H₂ addition to form intermediate B. No direct evidence rules out this possibility. We prefer suggesting that the H_2 /dihydride species 3 precedes styrene binding because of the observation that H_2 addition/activation by other (TPB)Fe(L) adducts, for example 4 and 6, is very slow and also because N2, and presumably therefore also H₂, displaces ethylene from 8 in solution (regenerating 1 or $(TPB)Fe(H_2)$).

The final ethylbenzene elimination step can be envisioned to occur through two plausible routes (Scheme 7B). One such pathway involves a reductive elimination step where hydride transfer directly from the borohydride subunit generates the alkane product to form 3, likely via the dihydrogen adduct intermediate C. The other pathway proceeds through alkane elimination by hydrogenolysis of the phenylethyl group without hydride transfer from the borohydride subunit.

While the available data do not firmly distinguish between the two product elimination pathways shown in Scheme 7B, the stoichiometric hydrogenation studies described above show that 1 equiv of styrene is completely hydrogenated to ethylbenzene by 2 under an N_2 atmosphere (Scheme 6-ii). This observation implies that 2 can serve as the source of the two H-atom equivalents delivered to styrene. From complex 2, substitution of the apical N2 ligand for styrene in 2 would generate the styrene adduct intermediate B. Subsequent insertion of the bound styrene into the cis Fe-H would afford intermediate A', which in the absence of H_2 , at least, eliminates ethylbenzene concomitant with N₂ binding to re-form 1. The presence of exogenous N2 (or alternatively H2) facilitates the generation of ethylbenzene. As noted in Scheme 6-iii, the stoichiometric reaction under static vacuum between 2 and styrene is quite slow compared with the same reaction under N₂ (Scheme 6-ii). This observation can be explained by presuming the conversion of intermediate A' to 1 requires N₂ association prior to elimination to generate ethylbenzene.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we have demonstrated that the Fe–B bond in ferraboratranes (TPB)Fe(L) (where $L = N_2$, 1; CN^tBu, 4; CO, 6) can facilitate heterolytic cleavage of H₂ and of the C(sp)–H and C(sp²)–H bonds of arylacetylenes and formaldehyde, respectively, resulting in Fe–B bond rupture and formal hydride transfer to the boron of the ligand scaffold. The formal hydride transfer from the C(sp)–H of arylacetylenes to give iron-acetylide complexes is distinct from traditional syntheses of metal-acetylide complexes in that a hydride equivalent is

formally abstracted by the Lewis acidic borane unit in 1 from a $C(sp){-}H$ hydrogen. 25

Dihydrogen addition across the Fe–B bond is reversible, and the boron is also capable of shuttling the hydride equivalent derived from H_2 to unsaturated substrates under stoichiometric hydrogenation conditions. The hydrogen chemistry of this (TPB)Fe(L) system contrasts with the related nickel²⁶ and cobalt²⁴ complexes of TPB, where the metal–boron bond remains intact under an H_2 atmosphere.

An understanding of the factors that govern metal-boron bond cleavage will aid in the development of cooperative catalytic reactions in metallaboratranes. The direct role, if any, of the borane ligand in assisting the H₂ cleavage step is an interesting question in this context for the present iron and recently reported diphosphine-borane-iron systems²⁷ and also conceptually related to the nickel system (Scheme 1).¹⁰ Determining whether there is a cooperative interaction between the coordinated H₂ ligand, the iron center, and the borane subunit en route to H–H cleavage (and its microscopic reverse), akin to H–H cleavage by frustrated Lewis pairs,⁹ calls for detailed theoretical studies that are the subject of ongoing research.

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

General Considerations. All manipulations were carried out using standard glovebox or Schlenk techniques under an N₂ atmosphere. Unless otherwise noted, solvents were deoxygenated and dried by thoroughly sparging with N₂ gas followed by passage through an activated alumina column in the solvent purification system by SG Water, USA LLC. Deuterated solvents and D₂ gas were purchased from Cambridge Isotope Laboratories, Inc. 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. TPB,¹³ (SiP^{IPr}₃)Fe(Me),¹⁹ (SiP^{IPr}₃)-Fe(N₂)(H),¹⁷ and monodeuterated phenyl- and tolylacetylene (PhC₂D and TolC₂D)²⁸ were synthesized by literature procedures. Elemental analyses were performed by Midwest Microlab, LLC, Indianapolis, IN.

NMR spectra were recorded on Varian 300 MHz, 400 MHz, and 500 MHz spectrometers. ¹H and ¹³C chemical shifts are reported in ppm relative to residual solvent as internal standards. ³¹P and ¹¹B chemical shifts are reported in ppm relative to 85% aqueous H_3PO_4 and $BF_3\cdot Et_2O$, respectively. Multiplicities are indicated by br (broad), s (singlet), d (doublet), t (triplet), quart (quartet), quin (quintet), multiplet (m), d-d (doublet-of-doublets), and t-d (triplet-of-doublets).

FT-IR measurements were obtained on samples prepared as KBr pellets or in solution using a Bio-Rad Excalibur FTS 300 spectrometer with Varian Resolutions Pro software at 4 cm⁻¹ resolution. The ATR-IR measurements were measured on a thin film of the complex obtained from evaporating 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⁻¹ resolution. IR intensities are indicated by s (strong), m (medium), and w (weak).

X-ray Crystallography. X-ray diffraction was measured on the Bruker Kappa Apex II diffractometer with Mo K α radiation. Structures were solved using the SHELXS software and refined against F^2 on all data sets by full matrix least-squares with SHELXL. The crystals were mounted on a glass fiber with Paratone oil.

Computational Methods. Geometry optimizations were performed using the Gaussian03 package. The B3LYP exchange– correlation functional was employed with a 6-31G(d) basis set. The GDIIS algorithm was used. A full frequency calculation was performed on each structure to ensure that they were the true minima. A single negative vibrational frequency was observed for the transition state between 3 and its equatorial-H₂ isomer, confirming that this structure was the transition state. See Supporting Information for a full description of the computational method. HD Gas Generation. D_2O (1 mL) was added to an evacuated, cooled sample (-78 °C) of solid lithium aluminum hydride (316 mg, 8.2 mmol) in a Schlenk flask. An evacuated Schlenk line was filled with the resulting HD gas (ca. 1 atm) as the Schlenk flask was warmed to room temperature. A J-Young NMR tube containing a freeze–pump–thawed solution of the respective complex was exposed to the HD gas.

Synthesis of (TPB)(µ-H)Fe(N₂)(H) (2). A J-Young NMR tube containing a brown-red solution of 1 (20.3 mg, 31.1 mmol) in C₆D₆ (0.8 mL) was freeze-pump-thawed $(3\times)$ and, with the J-Young tube frozen with liquid nitrogen, exposed to H_2 (1.2 equiv). The solution was thawed and mixed, giving a yellow solution. An atmosphere of N2 was subsequently introduced, and the reaction was mixed for 2 h to yield 2 (100% yield by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with a ferrocene integration standard). Alternatively, 2 could be synthesized from 3 by removing free H_2 from a solution of 3 by freeze-pump-thaw (3×), exposing it to an N2 atmosphere, and mixing the solution overnight (100% yield by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with a ferrocene integration standard). Yields could not be determined by mass because 2 was unstable to prolonged exposure to dynamic vacuum. Yellow-orange XRD quality crystals were grown in a concentrated solution of pentane/THF (10:1) at -30 \degree C. ¹H NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ 7.9 $(2H, d, {}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6 Hz, Ar-H), 7.7 (1H, br s, Ar-H), 7.3 (3H, d, {}^{3}J_{H-H} =$ 6 Hz, Ar-H), 7.0 (3H, t, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 9$ Hz, Ar-H), 2.7 (4H, d, ${}^{2}J_{P-H} = 18$ Hz, PCH), 2.4 (2H, br s, PCH), 1.4 (6H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, CH₃), 1.3 (12H, br s, CH₃), 1.1 (6H, d-d, ${}^{3}J_{P-H} = 15$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, CH₃), 1.3 (6H, d, ${}^{3}J_{P-H} = 9$ Hz, CH₃), -9.6 (1H, d-t, ${}^{2}J_{H-Pcis} = 81$ Hz, ${}^{2}J_{H-Prans} = 36$ Hz, Fe-H), -30.4 (1H, s, Fe-(μ -H)-B). ²H NMR (C₆H₆/C₆D₆, 76 MHz): δ -9.5 (1D, br s), -30.3 (1D, br s). ³¹P NMR (C₆D₆, 121 MHz): δ 73.6 (2P, s), 64.2 (1P, s). ¹³C NMR (C₆D₆, 125 MHz): δ 161.9 (s, C^{Ar}), 143.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 141.0 (s, C^{Ar}), 132.3 (s, C^{Ar}), 131.8 (s, (C^{Ar}) , 131.3 (s, $C^{Ar})$, 130.3 (s, $C^{Ar})$, 124.6 (s, $C^{Ar})$, 124.0 (s, $C^{Ar})$, 32.0 (s, PCH), 29.4 (s, PCH), 28.5 (s, PCH), 22.8 (s, CH₃), 20.1 (s, CH₃), 19.7 (s, CH₃), 18.9 (s, CH₃). ¹¹B NMR (C₆D₆, 128 MHz): δ 8.2 (br). IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 2071 (s, N≡N), 1960 (w) 1934 (w). UV-vis (THF, nm $\{M^{-1} \ cm^{-1}\}$: 328 {shoulder, 500}, 280 {shoulder, 11250}. Elemental analysis could not be obtained because of the instability of the compound under dynamic vacuum.

Synthesis of (TPB)(µ-H)Fe(H₂)(H) (3). A J-Young NMR tube containing a brown-red solution of 1 (21 mg, 31.1 mmol) in C_6H_6 (0.8 mL) was freeze-pump-thawed (3×). Upon warming to room temperature, the sample was exposed to H_2 (1 atm), resulting in a clear yellow solution. The reaction was mixed for 24 h to give 3 (100% by ¹H NMR spectroscopy with a ferrocene integration standard). The yield could not be determined by mass because 3 was unstable to prolonged exposure to dynamic vacuum. Yellow-orange XRD quality crystals were grown under 1 atm of H₂ in a concentrated solution of pentane/THF (10:1) at -78 °C. ¹H NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ 8.0 $(3H, d, {}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6 Hz, Ar-H), 7.3 (3H, t, {}^{3}J_{H-H} = 9 Hz, Ar-H), 7.2 (3H, t)$ t, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 9$ Hz, Ar-H), 7.0 (3H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, Ar-H), 4.47 (s, free H₂), 2.3 (6H, m, PCH), 1.0 (18H, d-d, ${}^{3}J_{H-P} = 15$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, CH₃), 0.8 (18H, d-d, ${}^{3}J_{H-P} = 15$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, CH₃), -15.1 (br s, 2H). $T_{1 \text{ min}}$ (d_8 -toluene): 35 ms (δ -15.1, -32 °C). ²H NMR ($C_6H_6/$ $C_6 D_{67} 76$ MHz): $\delta - 15.4$ (1D, br s). ³¹P NMR ($C_6 D_{67} 121$ MHz): δ 90.0 (3P, s). ¹³C NMR (C_6D_6 , 125 MHz): δ 163.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 144.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 144.1 (s, C^{Ar}), 130.9 (d, $J_{\text{P-C}}$ = 23 Hz, C^{Ar}), 124.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 123.9 (s, C^{Ar}), 28.6 (s, PCH), 21.2 (s, CH₃), 19.9 (s, CH₃). ¹¹B NMR (C₆D₆) 128 MHz): δ 7.5 (br). IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 2278 (w), 19618 (w), 1845 (w). UV–vis (THF, nm {M⁻¹ cm⁻¹}): 377 {shoulder, 1532}, 275 {14532}. Elemental analysis could not be obtained because of the instability of the compound under dynamic vacuum.

Synthesis of (TPB)Fe(CN'Bu) (4). *tert*-Butyl isocyanide (20 mg, 0.24 mmol) was added to a brown solution of (TPB)Fe(N₂) 1 (40 mg, 59 μ mol) in benzene (2 mL), causing an instantaneous darkening upon gentle shaking. The volatiles were removed by lyophilization, and the residue was extracted with tetramethylsilane (2 mL). The resulting dark brown solution was slowly concentrated down to ca. 0.2 mL by vapor diffusion into hexamethyldisiloxane. Removal of the mother liquor by decantation, washing with cold tetramethylsilane (2 × 0.1 mL), and drying *in vacuo* afforded (TPB)Fe(CN'Bu) 4 as brown crystals (33 mg, 77%). ¹H NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ 11.2 (3H), 9.2

(3H), 8.6 (3H), 8.5 (9H), 6.4 (3H), 5.2 (9H), 3.7 (12H), 2.9 (9H), -1.5 (9H), -2.3 (3H). IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1972 (C \equiv N). UV-vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 600 {shoulder, 428}, 910 {70}. μ_{eff} (C₆D₆, method of Evans, 20 °C): 1.7 μ_{B} . Anal. Calcd for C₄₁H₆₄BFeNP₃: C, 67.50; H, 8.70; N, 1.92. Found: C, 67.20; H, 8.54; N, 1.72.

Synthesis of (TPB)(µ-H)Fe(CN^tBu)(H) (5). A heavy-walled Schlenk tube containing a yellow-brown solution of 4 (16.4 mg, 22.4 mmol) in C₆H₆ (10 mL) was freeze-pump-thawed (3×). Upon warming to room temperature, the sample was exposed to H_2 (1 atm) for a few minutes. The Schlenk tube was sealed and heated under vigorous mixing at 40 °C for 85 h. Removal of the solvent in vacuo, extraction with C_6H_6 , and lyophilization yielded a solid of 5 (17.3 mg, 98%). Room temperature evaporation of a solution of 5 in a diethyl ether/pentane (2 to 1 mL) mixture yielded yellow crystals suitable for XRD analysis. ¹H NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 MHz): δ 8.1 (1H, d, ³ J_{H-H} = 9 Hz, Ar-H), 7.4 (3H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 9$ Hz, Ar-H), 7.2 (3H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, Ar-H), 7.1 (3H, d, ³J_{H-H} = 9 Hz, Ar-H), 2.7 (2H, br s, PCH), 2.5 (2H, br ¹¹), ¹¹ (31, ¹), ¹¹ (31, ¹), ¹¹ (31, ¹¹), Hz, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, CH₃), 0.7 (6H, br s, CH₃), -11.7 (1H, t-d, ${}^{2}J_{H-Pcis} = 87$ Hz, ${}^{2}J_{H-Ptrans} = 27$ Hz, Fe-H), -23.9 (1H, br s, Fe-(μ -H)-B). ${}^{13}C$ NMR (C_6D_6 , 125 MHz): δ 176.9 (quart, ${}^2J_{C-P} = 8$ Hz, CN^tBu), 163.5 (br s, C^{Ar}), 163.0 (br s, C^{Ar}), 144.9 (m, C^{Ar}), 143.0 (d, $J_{C-P} = 20$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 131.9 (d, ${}^{2}J_{C-P} = 7.5$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 130.6 (d, $J_{C-P} = 3.2$ H, C^{Ar}), 130.5 (d, $J_{C-P} = 2.5$ H, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 124.2 (s, C^{Ar}), $I_{C-P} = 2.5$ H, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 124.2 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 124.2 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s (d, $_{J,C-P}$ = 2.5 (d, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 (d, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, PCH), 29.2 (m, PCH), 28.5 (d, $_{2}^{2}C_{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, CH₃), 20.4 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, CH₃), 20.4 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, CH₃), 20.4 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, CH₃), 20.4 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, CH₃), 20.4 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, CH₃), 20.4 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, CH₃), 20.4 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 Hz, PCH), 23.8 (s, $_{2}^{C-P}$ = 7.5 CH₃), 20.3 (m, CH₃), 20.2 (s, CH₃), 19.9 (s, CH₃), 19.7 (s, CH₃). ³¹P NMR (C_6D_6 , 121 MHz): δ 81.3 (2P, d, ${}^2J_{P-P} = 63$ Hz), 72.4 (1P, s). IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 2027 (s, C \equiv N), 1942 (w, Fe–H). UV–vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 205 {5530}, 224 {15437}, 245 {17142}, 255 {16635}, 285 {4117}, 335 {shoulder, 2166}, 400 {1830}. Anal. Calcd for C41H66BFeNP3: C, 67.32; H, 8.96; N, 1.91. Found: C, 66.59; H, 8.61; N, 1.30.

Synthesis of (TPB)(μ -H)Fe(CO)(H) (7) from 6 and H₂. In a J-Young NMR tube, 6 (6.0 mg, 8.9 μ mol) was dissolved in C₆H₆ (0.7 mL) to give a brown-red solution. The solution was freeze-pumpthawed $(3\times)$ and subsequently exposed to H₂ (1 atm) for ca. 5 min. The reaction was then heated at 80 °C for 5 days, during which time a clear yellow solution developed. Removal of the solvent in vacuo, extraction with C_6H_6 , and lyophilization yielded a yellow solid of 7(5.9 mg, 98%). Room temperature evaporation of a solution of 7 in a diethyl ether/pentane (1 to 0.5 mL) mixture yielded yellow analytically pure 7. ¹H NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ 8.1 (2H, d, ³J_{H-H} = 6 Hz, Ar-H), 7.9 (1H, d, ${}^{2}J_{P-H}$ = 9 Hz, Ar-H), 7.2 (4H, m, Ar-H), 7.0 (4H, m, Ar-H), 2.6 (2H, t, ${}^{2}J_{H-P}$ = 3 Hz, PCH), 2.4 (2H, q, ${}^{2}J_{H-P}$ = 6 Hz, PCH), 2.2 (2H, t, ${}^{2}J_{H-P} = 6$ Hz, PCH), 1.4 (6H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-P} = 6$ Hz, CH_3), 1.2 (12H, m, CH_3), 0.9 (6H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-P} = 6$ Hz, CH_3), 0.8 (6H, d- J_{H-P} = 8 Hz, J_{H-H} = 6 Hz, CH_3), 0.6 (6H, d, J_{H-P} = 6 Hz, CH_3), 0.3 (0H, d⁻¹), -11.6 (1H, t-d, J_{H-Pcis} = 81 Hz, $J_{H-Ptrans}$ = 21 Hz, Fe-H), -20.0 (1H, br s, Fe-(μ-H)-B). ²H NMR (C₆H₆, 76 Hz): δ −12.3 (1D, t, J_{P-D} = 10 Hz), -20.8 (1D, br s). $^{13}\mathrm{C}$ NMR (THF with 1 drop of $\mathrm{C_6D_6}$, 125 MHz): δ 222.7 (br s, CO), 161.8 (br s, C^{Ar}), 142.9 (br s, ¹J_{C-P} = 19 Hz, C^{Ar}), 140.8 (br s, ²J_{C-P} = 16 Hz, C^{Ar}), 131.0 (s, C^{Ar}), δ 129.8 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 128.0 (s, C^{Ar}), 124.0 (s, C^{Ar}), 123.4 (s, C^{Ar}), 30.8 (s, PCH), 28.3 (s, PCH), 27.7 (s, PCH), 22.3 (s, CH₃), 19.1 (s, CH₃), 18.8 (s, CH₃), 18.1 (s, CH₃). ³¹P NMR (C₆D₆, 121 MHz): δ 83.4 (2P, d, ${}^{2}J_{P-H} = 21 \text{ Hz}$), 72.8 (1P, s). IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 1898 (s, C \equiv O), 1967 (w, Fe-H). UV-vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M^{-1} }): 270 {4333}, 280 {4111}, 390 {1400}. Anal. Calcd for C37H56BFeOP3: C, 65.70; H, 8.34. Found: C, 65.64; H, 8.08.

Synthesis of $(\text{TPB})(\mu-\text{H})\text{Fe}(\text{CO})(\text{H})$ (7) from Formaldehyde. Compound 1 (8 mg, 11.8 μ mol) or 2 (6 mg, 8.9 μ mol) was mixed with excess paraformaldehyde in C₆H₆ for 3 h to give a turbid, light yellow solution. The excess paraformaldehyde was filtered away, and the solution was pumped down to give 7 as a yellow solid (from 1, 8 mg, 100%; from 2, 7 mg, 100%). Spectroscopic data are identical to those listed above.

Synthesis of (TPB)Fe(C₂H₄) (8). A J-Young NMR tube containing an orange solution of 3 (8.4 mg, 12.5 μ mol) in C₆D₆ (0.8 mL) was freeze–pump–thawed (3×) and exposed to ethylene gas (1 atm) for ca. 1 min. Mixing immediately gave a brown solution of **8**. Removal of solvent *in vacuo* yielded a brown solid (8.3 mg, 99%) of **8**. Dissolution of this solid under N₂ atmosphere gave mostly **8** and small amounts of **1**. Over time, **8** in solution converted to **1**. Crystals suitable for XRD were grown in a saturated, cold pentane/diethyl ether (2:1) solution under an ethylene atmosphere. ¹H NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ 33.1 (1H), 28.8 (1H), 18.7 (4H), 13.3 (1H), 5.25 (s, free C₂H₄), 4.9 (3H), 4.1 (1H), 1.9 (2H), -3.0 (10H), -6.2 (11H), -9.2 (11H), -10.0 (3H). UV–vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 309 {shoulder, 6032}, 553 {1804}, 938 {418}. μ_{eff} (C₆D₆, method of Evans, 20 °C): 3.2 μ_{B} (*S* = 1). Elemental analysis could not be obtained because of the instability of the compound under dynamic vacuum.

Synthesis of (TPBH)Fe(C₂Ph) (9). Phenylacetylene (40.8 mg, 400 μ mol) was added to a C₆H₆ solution (5 mL) of **3** (9.0 mg, 13 μ mol), immediately giving a gray solution. Removal of the solvent *in vacuo* yielded a black powder of **9** (10 mg, 100%). ¹H NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ 28.8 (3H), 13.1 (4H), 4.7 (18H), 2.6 (2H), 2.3 (4H), 1.2 (2H), -29.3 (1H), -30.9 (5H). μ_{eff} (C₆D₆, method of Evans, 20 °C): 5.1 μ_{B} (*S* = 2). UV-vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 325 {20670}, 439 {1051}, 479 {971}, 522 {955}, 601 (br abs extending from 400 to 700 nm, 930}, 883 {1466}. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 2040 (s, C=C), 2490 (m, B–H). Anal. Calcd for C₄₄H₆₀FeP₃B: C, 70.60; H, 8.08. Found: C, 70.39; H, 7.89.

Synthesis of (TPBD)Fe(C₂Ph). The B–D-labeled complex of 9 was generated by the same method described for 9, except that PhC_2H was replaced with PhC_2D . The ¹H NMR spectrum was identical to 10. IR (thin film, cm⁻¹): 1826 (br m, B–D; predicted 1832).

Synthesis of (TPBH)Fe(C₂Tol) (10). Tolylacetylene (16.1 mg, 138 μ mol) was added to a C₆H₆ solution (5 mL) of **3** (22.9 mg, 33.0 μ mol), immediately giving a gray solution. Removal of the solvent *in vacuo* yielded a black powder of **10** (24.0 mg 100%). Black XRD quality crystals of **10** were grown by layering hexamethyldisiloxane on top of a concentrated THF solution of **10**, and allowing the solution to sit overnight. ¹H NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ 44.1 (1H), 29.4 (1H), 13.3 (1H), 4.6 (2H), 3.3 (1H), 2.7 (2H), 2.3 (4H), 1.8 (2H), -32.3 (1H). μ_{eff} (C₆D₆, method of Evans, 20 °C): 5.2 μ_{B} (S = 2). UV-vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 326 {24 476}, 444 {1243}, 486 {1138}, 527 {shoulder, 975}, 624 (915}, 887 {1575}. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 2039 (s, C=C), 2500 (m, B–H). Anal. Calcd for C₄₅H₆₂FeP₃B: C, 70.88; H, 8.20. Found: C, 70.44; H, 7.80.

Synthesis of (TPBD)Fe(C_2 Tol). The B–D-labeled complex of 10 was generated by the same method described for 10, except that Tol C_2 H was replaced with Tol C_2 D. The ¹H NMR spectrum was identical to 10. IR (thin film, cm⁻¹): 1824 (br m, B-D; predicted 1841).

Synthesis of 11. A yellow, C_6D_6 solution of 1 (18.2 mg, 27 μ mol) was heated in a J-Young NMR tube under H_2 (1 atm) at 80 °C for 2 h, giving a turbid red-purple solution. The solvent was removed in vacuo, and the dark crude material was redissolved in hexamethyldisiloxane (3 mL) and filtered through a glass frit to remove a black solid (presumably iron metal). Removal of the solvent in vacuo gave a purple solid that is a mixture of 11 (1 equiv) and diisopropylphosphino-benzene (^{iPr2}PPh, 1 equiv). Orange XRD quality crystals of 11 can be grown from slow evaporation of a concentrated hexamethyldisiloxane solution of 11 at room temperature (5.1 mg, 18%). Dissolution of these crystals by heating in benzene or THF results in decomposition. Therefore, spectral data are reported on the mixture of 11 with ^{iPr2}PPh. Compound 11 appears to be fluxional at RT. ¹H NMR (C_6D_{67} 300 MHz): δ 8.4 (4H, s, Ar-H), 7.6 (4H, s, Ar-*H*), 7.5 (3H, d, ${}^{2}J_{H-P} = 6$ Hz, Ar-*H*), 2.7 (1H, d, ${}^{2}J_{H-P} = 6$ Hz, PCH), 2.5 (1H, s, PCH), 1.9 (1H, quart, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6$ Hz, PCH), 1.3 (6H, d-d, ${}^{3}J_{P-H} = 4 \text{ Hz}, {}^{3}J_{H-H} = 2 \text{ Hz}, \hat{CH}_{3}, 1.2 (6H, d, {}^{3}J_{H-H} = 3 \text{ Hz}, CH_{3}), 1.1$ (6H, quart, ${}^{3}J_{P-H} = 4 \text{ Hz}$, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 2 \text{ Hz}$, CH_{3}), 0.9 (12H, m, CH_{3}), -17.0 (0.25H, t, ${}^{2}J_{H-P} = 36 \text{ Hz}$, B-H). ${}^{13}C \text{ NMR} (C_{6}D_{6}, 125 \text{ MHz}): \delta$ 157.4 (br s, C^{Ar}), 144.2 (br s, C^{Ar}), 134.9 (d, ${}^{2}J_{C-P} = 19$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 130.5 (s, C^{Ar}), 129.3 (s, C^{Ar}), 125.7 (d, ${}^{2}J_{C-P} = 23$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 25.5 (br s, C^{Ar}), 25.5 (br s, C^{Ar}), 25.7 (d, ${}^{2}J_{C-P} = 23$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 25.5 (br s, C^{Ar}), 25.5 (br s, C^{Ar}), 25.7 (d, ${}^{2}J_{C-P} = 23$ Hz, C^A PCH), 24.9 (br s, PCH), 24.4 (br s, PCH), 23.7 (br s, PCH), 23.1 (br s, PCH), 20.0 (m, CH₃), 19.4 (m, CH₃), 18.2 (m, CH₃). ³¹P NMR $(C_6 D_{6t} 121 \text{ MHz}): \delta 99.1 (4P, s), 9.5 (2P, s).$ ¹¹B NMR $(C_6 D_{6t} 128 \text{ MHz}): \delta 99.1 (4P, s), 9.5 (2P, s).$

MHz): δ 41.0 (br). UV–vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 264 {shoulder, 31650}, 520 {826}. IR (KBr, cm⁻¹): 2088 (s, B–H), 1838 (m, B–H). Anal. Calcd for $C_{51}H_{86}FeP_4B_2Si$ (i.e., **11** + Me₃SiH): C, 65.96; H, 9.33. Found: C, 65.70; H, 9.16.

Synthesis of (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(H₂)(H). In a 100 mL Schlenk tube a red solution of $(SiP_{3}^{iPr})Fe(Me)$ (1.05 g, 1.547 mmol) in C₆H₆ (50 mL) was degassed by freeze-pump-thaw $(3\times)$. H₂ gas (1 atm) was charged into the reaction mixture. The reaction was heated at 60 °C for over a week. The reaction solution was then quickly 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 $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_{2})(H)$ (950 mg, 1.425 mmol, 92%) was obtained as a light yellow powder after drying under vacuum. ¹H NMR (C_6D_6 , 300 MHz): δ 8.3 (3H, d, ³ J_{H-P} = 6.8 Hz, Ar-H), 7.3 (3H, m, Ar-H), 7.2 (3H, t, ${}^{3}J_{H-H}$ = 7.2 Hz, Ar-H), 7.1 (3H, t, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 7$ Hz, Ar-H), 4.5 (s, free H₂), 2.2 (6H, m, PCH), 1.0 (18H, m, CH₃), 0.8 (18H, br s, CH₃), 0.16 (s, free CH₄), -10.0 (3H, quin, ${}^{2}J_{P-H} = 18.4$ Hz, Fe-H). $T_{1 \text{ min}} (d_8 \text{-toluene})$: 32 ms (δ -10.0, -30 °C). ${}^{31}\text{P}$ NMR (C_6D_6 , 121 MHz): δ 100 (br); (d_8 -toluene, 121 MHz, -80 °C): δ 117.9 (d, ${}^{3}J_{P-P} = 43.5$ Hz), 94.7 (br s), 84.7 (d, ${}^{3}J_{P-P} = 43.5 \text{ Hz}$). ¹³C NMR (THF with 1 drop of C₆D₆, 125 MHz): δ 157.3 (d, $J_{C-P} = 22.5$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 150.5 (d, $J_{C-P} = 21.3$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 130.1 (d, $J_{C-P} = 9.3$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 128.6 (s, C^{Ar}), 127.4 (s C^{Ar}), 126.0 (d, $J_{C-P} =$ 2.5 Hz, C^{Ar}), 29.0 (br s, PCH), 20.4 (br s, CH₃), 19.2 (br s, CH₃). UV-vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 353 {3040}. IR (KBr pellet; cm¹): 1941 (w, Fe-H). Elemental analysis could not be obtained because of the instability of the compound under prolonged exposure to N2

Isotopomers of the compound under profonged exposure to N₂. Isotopomers of (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(H₂)(H): (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(H₂)(H), (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(HD)-(D), (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(H₂)(D), (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(D₂)(D). (D), and (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(D₂)(D). HD gas was generated by the method described above and charged into a J-young tube containing a degassed solution of (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(Me) in C₆D₆. The solution was heated at 60 °C for over a week. Monitoring the progress of the reaction by ¹H NMR revealed the gradual disappearance of 1 and formation of diamagnetic isotopomers (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(H₂)(H). Spectroscopic features in the ¹H NMR spectrum were identical to (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(H₂)(H) except for the hydridic proton resonances, where isotopologues were observed. ¹H{³IP} NMR (C₆D₆, 300 MHz): δ –10.0 (3H, quart, ²J_{P-H} = 18.4 Hz, H₃), –10.0 (t, ¹J_{H-D} = 9.5 Hz, H₂D), –10.2 (quin, ¹J_{H-D} = 9.3 Hz, HD₂).

Synthesis of (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(CO)(H). In a 50 mL Schlenk tube a yellow solution of $(SiP^{iPr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$ (330 mg, 0.495 mmol) in C_6H_6 (20 mL) was freeze–pump–thawed (3×). The solution was charged with CO (1 atm). The reaction was mixed overnight at RT and then for 1 h at 60 °C, resulting in a light yellow solution. After completion, the solution was degassed by freeze-pump-thaw (3×). The solution was filtered through Celite, and the volatiles were removed in vacuo to give a light yellow powder. The solid was collected on a glass frit and washed with pentane (5 mL \times 3). Removal of the solvent in vacuo yielded (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(CO)(H) (266 mg, 0.384 mmol, 78%) as a light yellow powder. Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained by RT evaporation of a pentane solution of (SiP^{iPr}₃)Fe(CO)(H). ¹H NMR (d_8 -toluene, 300 MHz): δ 8.2 (2H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-H}$ = 7.2 Hz), 8.1 (1H, d, ${}^{3}J_{H-H}$ = 7.2 Hz), 7.3 (3H, m), 7.2 (3H, m), 7.1 (3H, m), 2.7 (2H, m), 2.4 (2H, m), 2.2 (2H, m), 1.5 (6H, d-d, ${}^{3}J_{H-P} = 15.2$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{H-P} =$ 6.8 Hz), 1.3 (6H, m), 1.1 (6H, d-d, ${}^{3}J_{H-P} = 12.6$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{H-H} = 6.6$ Hz), 0.8 (12H, m), 0.5 (6H, s), -14.9 (1H, t-d, ${}^{3}J_{H-Pcis} = 81.0$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{H-Ptrans} =$ 14.1 Hz). ³¹P NMR (C₆D₆, 121 MHz, RT): δ 88.0 (br), 90.0 (s); (d₈toluene, 121 MHz, -80 °C): δ 109.9 (t, ${}^{3}J_{P-P} = 65$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{P-H} = 80$ Hz), 90.0 (s), 77.9 (t, ${}^{3}J_{P-P} = 65$ Hz, ${}^{3}J_{P-H} = 80$ Hz). 13 C NMR (THF with 1 drop of C₆D₆, 125 MHz): δ 223.0 (d, ${}^{2}J_{C-P}$ = 6.3 Hz, CO), 157.2 (d, $J_{C-P} = 8.8 \text{ Hz}, C^{Ar}$, 155.2 (d, $J_{C-P} = 10.6 \text{ Hz}, C^{Ar}$), 150.5 (d, $J_{C-P} =$ 11.3 Hz, C^{Ar}), 150.2 (d, J_{C-P} = 8.8 Hz, C^{Ar}), 148.6 (d, J_{C-P} = 18.1 Hz, C^{Ar}), 132.4 (d, $J_{\text{C-P}} = 9.4$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 131.9 (d, $J_{\text{C-P}} = 8.8$ Hz, C^{Ar}), 130.9 $\begin{array}{l} (s, C^{Ar}), 128.3 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 128.5 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 127.1 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 126.8 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 126.4 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 125.8 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 124.7 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 32.4 \ (s, PCH), 30.7 \ (s, C^{Ar}), 30$ PCH), 30.0 (s, PCH), 29.6 (s, PCH), 28.7 (s, PCH), 22.8 (s, CH₃), 22.1 (s, CH₃), 20.2 (s, CH₃), 19.5 (s, CH₃), 19.2 (s, CH₃), 19.1 (s, CH₃), 18.9 (s, CH₃), 18.0 (s, CH₃). UV-vis (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 340 {2050}, 400 {1500}. IR (KBr pellet; cm⁻¹): 1882 (s, C≡O), 1944

Organometallics

(m, Fe–H). Anal. Calcd for $C_{37}H_{57}FeOP_3Si$: C, 64.16; H, 8.00. Found: C, 64.15; H, 8.13.

Synthesis of $(SIP^{Pr}_{3})Fe(^{13}CO)(H)$. In a J-Young NMR tube an orange C_6D_6 solution of $(SiP^{Pr}_{3})Fe(H_2)(H)$ was degassed by freeze– pump–thaw (3×). Subsequently, ¹³CO (1 atm) was added and the reaction was allowed to mix overnight at RT. The ¹H NMR spectrum was identical to $(SiP^{Pr}_{3})Fe(CO)(H)$. IR (KBr; cm⁻¹): 1836 (s, ¹³C \equiv O).

Generation of (TPBH)Fe(Et) (A). Compound A was observed as an intermediate of catalytic ethylene hydrogenation under the reaction conditions described in the Catalytic Hydrogenation Studies section. We were also able to generate A starting from complex 8. The procedure described below is more amendable to observing A spectroscopically. A dark yellow C₆D₆ solution (0.5 mL) of 8 (2.8 mg, 4.2 μ mol) under ethylene (1 atm) in a J-Young tube was frozen $(-196 \ ^{\circ}C)$, and H₂ was added (1 atm). The reaction was thaved and quickly mixed only immediately prior to measuring the ¹H NMR spectrum, revealing a mixture of 8 and A. Further mixing of the solution for ca. 45 min yielded a purple solution of A with a small residual amount of 8 by 1 H NMR spectroscopy. Free C₂H₄, C₂H₆, and H₂ were also observed in the ¹H NMR spectrum. Compound A could not be isolated as a solid due to its instability. For example, an ATR-IR spectrum of a thin film of the reaction mixture obtained by solvent evaporation under an N2 atmosphere over a period less than 30 s gave vibrational bands diagnostic of 1, 2, and Å. $^1\mathrm{H}$ NMR (C_6D_6, 300 MHz): δ 17.3 (1H), 6.6 (1H), 5.26 (s, free C₂H₄), 4.4 (1H), 4.47 (br s, free H₂), 3.3 (2H), 0.80 (s, free C₂H₆), -1.9 (8H), -5.5 (6H). IR (thin film; cm⁻¹): 2470 (br s, B–H of A), 2069 (m, N \equiv N of $(TPB)(\mu-H)Fe(N_2)(H)$ 2), 2009 (s, N \equiv N of $(TPB)Fe(N_2)$ 1). UVvis, obtained 45 min after exposing A under 1 atm of ethylene to 1 atm of H₂ (THF, nm {cm⁻¹ M⁻¹}): 325 {20670}, 439 {1051}, 479 {971}, 522 {955}, 601 (br abs extending from 400 to 600 nm, 930}, 883 {1466}. Magnetic data could not be obtained due to residual 10 in the reaction mixture. Elemental analysis could not be obtained because of the instability of the compound under dynamic vacuum.

Catalytic Hydrogenation Studies. Compound 1 (0.045 g, 0.07 mmol) and ferrocene (0.012 g, 0.07 mmol) were dissolved in 1.5 mL of C₆D₆, giving a 0.045 M precatalyst stock solution. Ferrocene was used as an internal ¹H NMR integration standard and did not affect the rates of hydrogenation. For a catalytic run, 0.1 mL of the stock solution was taken and mixed with 0.35 mL of C₆D₆ and 30 equiv of substrate in a J-Young NMR tube (3.2 mL capacity). For styrene hydrogenation, this equates to 0.01 M 1 and 0.3 M styrene. For phenylacetylene hydrogenation, this equates to 0.01 M 1 and 0.29 M phenylacetylene. For ethylene hydrogenation, this equates to 0.01 M 1 and 0.30 M ethylene. The sample in the J-Young NMR tube was subsequently degassed by freeze-pump-thaw (3×) and backfilled with 1 atm of H₂ (0.11 mmol). The J-Young NMR tube was continually inverted (12 min⁻¹) to ensure adequate mass transfer. The tube was periodically refilled with H₂ to maintain 1 atm of H₂. All reactions were monitored periodically by ¹H NMR spectroscopy until >95% completion. All reactions resulted in clean conversion of the substrate to the corresponding product. Catalytic runs in the presence of a drop of mercury or in the absence of ambient laboratory light had no affect on the reactions. Catalytic hydrogenations could also be cleanly effected by pregenerating 2 or 3 before the addition of the substrate.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information

Spectral data, catalysis data, computational details, solid-state structures (4 and $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(CO)(H)$), and CIF files (for 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, and $(SiP^{iPr}_3)Fe(CO)(H)$). This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Corresponding Author

*E-mail: jpeters@caltech.edu.

Present Addresses

[†](M.-E. Moret) Organic Chemistry and Catalysis Group, Faculty of Science, Utrecht, Universiteitsweg 99, 3584 CG Utrecht, The Netherlands; e-mail: m.moret@uu.nl.

[‡](Y. Lee) Department of Chemistry, School of Molecular Science, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology, 291 Daehak-ro Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 305-701, Republic of Korea; e-mail: yunholee@kaist.ac.kr.

Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation and the NIH (GM070757) for funding. M.-E.M. acknowledges a Fellowship for Advanced Researchers from the Swiss National Science Foundation. Dr. Charlene Tsay and Lawrence Henling are acknowledged for assistance with X-ray crystallography, and Dr. David VanderVelde is acknowledged for assistance with NMR spectroscopy. We acknowledge the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, the Beckman Institute, and the SanofiAventis BRP at Caltech for their generous support of the Molecular Observatory.

REFERENCES

(1) Hartwig, J. F. Organotransition Metal Chemistry: From Bonding to Catalysis; University Science Books, 2010.

(2) Catalysis Without Precious Metals; Bullock, R. M., Ed.; Wiley-VCH, 2010.

(3) For representative examples of mid to late first-row transition metal catalysts that perform two-electron transformations see: (a) Bolm, C.; Legros, J.; Le Paih, J.; Zani, L. Chem. Rev. 2004, 104, 6217–6254. (b) Hu, X. Chem. Sci. 2011, 2, 1867–1886. (c) Q. Knijnenburg, Q.; Horton, A. D.; van der Heijden, H.; Kooistra, T. M.; Hetterscheid, D. G. H.; Smits, J. M. M.; de Briun, B.; Budzelaar, P. H. M.; Gal, A. W. J. Mol. Catal. A 2005, 232, 151–159. (d) Tondreau, A. M.; Atienza, C. C. H.; Weller, K. J.; Nye, S. A.; Lewis, K. M.; Delis, J. G. P.; Chirik, P. J. Science 2012, 335, 567–570. (e) Daida, E. J.; Peters, J. C. Inorg. Chem. 2004, 43, 7474–7585. (f) 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.

(4) (a) Noyori, R.; Yamakawa, M.; Hashiguchi, S. J. Org. Chem. 2001, 66, 7931-7944.
(b) Morris, R. H. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2009, 38, 2282-2291.
(c) Chakraborty, S.; Guan, H. Dalton Trans. 2010, 39, 7427-7436.
(d) Casey, C. P.; Guan, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2007, 129, 5816-5817.
(e) Sui-Seng, C.; Freutel, F.; Lough, A. J.; Morris, R. H. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2008, 47, 940-943.
(f) Langer, R.; Leitus, G.; Ben-David, Y.; Milstein, D. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 2120-2124.
(5) Tsoureas, N.; Kuo, Y.-Y.; Haddow, M. F.; Owen, G. R. Chem.

Commun. 2011, 47, 484–486.
(6) For discussions on the M–B bonding situation: (a) Sircoglou,
M.; Bontemps, S.; Mercy, M.; Saffon, N.; Takahashi, M.; Bouhadir, G.;
Maron, L.; Bourissou, D. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2007, 46, 8583–8586.
(b) Amgoune, A.; Bourissou, D. Chem. Commun. 2011, 47, 859–871.
(c) Hill, A. F. Organometallics 2006, 25, 4741–4743. (d) Parkin, G.
Organometallics 2006, 25, 4744–4747.

(7) (a) Owen, G. R. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2012, 41, 3535-3546.
(b) NTsoureas, N.; Owen, G. R.; Hamilton, A.; Orpen, A. G. Dalton Trans. 2008, 6039-6044.

(8) (a) Crossley, I. R.; Foreman, M. R. St.-J.; Hill, A. F.; Owen, G. R.; White, A. J. P.; Williams, D. J.; Willis, A. C. Organometallics 2008, 27, 381–386. (b) Crossley, I. R.; Foreman, M. R. St.-J.; Hill, A. F.; White, A. J.; Williams, D. Chem. Commun. 2005, 221–223. (c) Crossley, I. R.; Hill, A. F.; Willis, A. C. Organometallics 2007, 26, 3891–3895. (d) Crossley, I. R.; Hill, A. F. Dalton Trans. 2008, 201–203. (e) Crossley, I. R.; Hill, A. F.; Willis, A. C. Organometallics 2008, 27, 312–315. (f) Hill, A. F.; Smith, M. K.; Wagler, J. Organometallics 2008,

Organometallics

27, 2137–2140. (g) Crossley, I. R.; Hill, A. F.; Willis, A. C. Organometallics 2009, 29, 326–336.

(9) Stephan, D. W.; Erker, G. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2009, 49, 46–76. (10) Harman, W. H.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 5080– 5082.

(11) Kameo, H.; Nakazawa, H. Organometallics **2012**, 31, 7476–7484.

(12) (a) Moret, M.-E.; Peters, J. C. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2011, 50, 2063–2067. (b) Moret, M.-E.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 18118–18121.

(13) Bontemps, S.; Bouhadir, G.; Dyer, P. W.; Miqueu, K.; Bourissou, D. Inorg. Chem. 2007, 46, 5149–5151.

(14) The H–D coupling constant $(J_{\text{H-D}})$ is also in principle an excellent distinguishing characteristic between the η^2 -dihydrogen and dihydride ligands.¹⁵ Unfortunately, H–D coupling cannot be resolved in 3, likely due to fast exchange within the H_nD_{3-n} unit and H/D scrambling into the methine and terminal methyl positons on the isopropyl groups of the TPB ligand.

(15) (a) Desrosiers, P. J.; Cai, L.; Lin, Z.; Richards, R.; Halpern, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1991**, 113, 4173–4184. (b) Kubas, G. J. Chem. Rev. **2007**, 107, 4152–4205. (c) Morris, R. H. Coord. Chem. Rev. **2008**, 252, 2381–2394.

(16) Van der Sluys, L. S.; Eckert, J.; Eisenstein, O.; Hall, J. H.; Huffman, J. C.; Jackson, S. A.; Koetzle, T. F.; Kubas, G. J.; Vergamini, P. J.; Caulton, K. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1990**, 112, 4831–4841.

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

(18) Lee, Y.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 4438-4446.

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

(20) Bartell, L. S.; Roth, E. A.; Hollowell, C. D.; Kuchitsu, K.; Young, J. E. J. Chem. Phys. **1965**, 42, 2683–2683.

(21) Select iron-ethylene complexes of ferracyclopropane character:
(a) Zenneck, U.; Frank, W. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 1986, 25, 831–833.
(b) Schneider, J. J.; Czap, N.; Blaser, D.; Boese, R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1999, 121, 1409–1410.
(c) Bennett, M. A.; Ditzel, E. J.; Hunter, A. D.; Khan, K.; Kopp, M. R.; Neumann, H.; Robertson, G. B.; Zeh, H. J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. 2000, 1733–1741.
(d) Fürstner, A.; Martin, R.; Krause, H.; Seidel, G.; Goddard, R.; Lehmann, C. W. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2008, 130, 8773–8787.

(22) A similar paramagnetic (S = 2) iron ethyl-hydro-tris(pyrazolyl) borate complex: Shirasawa, N.; Nguyet, T. T.; Hikichi, S.; Moro-oka, Y.; Akita, M. *Organometallics* **2001**, *20*, 3582–3598.

(23) Marchand, A. P.; Marchand, N. W. Tetrahedron Lett. 1971, 12, 1365–1368.

(24) Suess, D. L. M.; Tsay, C.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 14158-14164.

(25) (a) Reinhard, N. Coord. Chem. Rev. 1982, 47, 89–124.
(b) Bianchini, C.; Laschi, F.; Masi, D.; Ottaviani, F. M.; Pastor, A.; Peruzzini, M.; Zanello, P.; Zanobini, F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1993, 115, 2723–2730. (c) Field, L. D.; George, A. V.; Malouf, E. Y.; Slip, I. H. M.; Hambley, T. W. Organometallics 1991, 10, 3842–3848.

(26) Tsay, C.; Peters, J. C. Chem. Sci. 2012, 3, 1313-1318.

(27) Suess, D. L. M.; Peters, J. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 4938-4941.

(28) Rubina, M.; Gevorgyan, V. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2001, 123, 11107–11108.