

Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

LBL Publications

Title

ACTIVATION OF C-H BONDS IN SATURATED HYDRO-CARBONS ON PHOTOLYSIS OF (n5-C5Me5) (PMe3)IrH2. RELATIVE RATES OF REACTION OF THE INTERMEDIATE WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF C-H BONDS, AND FUNCTIONALIZATION OF THE METAL-BOUND ALKYL GROUPS

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5sd7t5bx>

Authors

Janowicz, A.H.
Bergman, R.G.

Publication Date

1982-10-01



Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RECEIVED

LAWRENCE
BERKELEY LABORATORY

JAN 11 1983

LIBRARY AND
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Materials & Molecular Research Division

Submitted to the Journal of the American Chemical
Society


Activation of C-H Bonds in Saturated Hydrocarbons on
Photolysis of $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrH}_2$. Relative Rates
of Reaction of the Intermediate with Different Types
of C-H Bonds, and Functionalization of the Metal-
Bound Alkyl Groups.

Andrew H. Janowicz and Robert G. Bergman

October 1982

TWO-WEEK LOAN COPY

*This is a Library Circulating Copy
which may be borrowed for two weeks.
For a personal retention copy, call
Tech. Info. Division, Ext. 6782.*



LBL-15145
c. 2

DISCLAIMER

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. While this document is believed to contain correct information, neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor the Regents of the University of California, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof, or the Regents of the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof or the Regents of the University of California.

ACTIVATION OF C-H BONDS IN SATURATED HYDROCARBONS ON
PHOTOLYSIS OF $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrH}_2$.
RELATIVE RATES OF REACTION OF THE INTERMEDIATE WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF
C-H BONDS, AND FUNCTIONALIZATION OF THE METAL-BOUND ALKYL GROUPS.

By Andrew H. Janowicz and Robert G. Bergman

MATERIALS & MOLECULAR
RESEARCH DIVISION

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research,
Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division of the
U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.

ACTIVATION OF C-H BONDS IN SATURATED HYDROCARBONS ON
PHOTOLYSIS OF $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrH}_2$.
RELATIVE RATES OF REACTION OF THE INTERMEDIATE WITH DIFFERENT TYPES OF
C-H BONDS, AND FUNCTIONALIZATION OF THE METAL-BOUND ALKYL GROUPS.

Andrew H. Janowicz and Robert G. Bergman

Contribution from Department of Chemistry, University of California
and Materials and Molecular Research Division
Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory
Berkeley, California 94720

Abstract. The full details of experiments on a homogeneous system which successfully converts completely saturated alkanes into hydridoalkylmetal complexes ($M + RH \rightarrow R-M-H$) are reported. Irradiation of $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrH}_2$ (5) in saturated hydrocarbons (R-H) using a 500 watt Oriel focused-beam mercury lamp leads to extrusion of H_2 , and production of the hydridoalkyl complexes $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Ir(R)(H)}$. Competition experiments have allowed measurement of the relative rates at which the intermediate formed on H_2 loss (presumably the coordinatively unsaturated complex $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Ir}$) reacts with different types of C-H bonds. Relative to cyclohexane (1.0), these are: benzene (4.0), cyclopropane (2.65), neopentane (1.14), cyclodecane (0.23) and cyclooctane (0.09). Reductive elimination of hydrocarbon occurs at elevated temperature, regenerating $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Ir}$, which may then react with another hydrocarbon acting as solvent; thus the C-H activation process can also be induced thermally. C-H bonds having high bond energies react relatively rapidly; this fact, along with crossover experiments, suggests that radical intermediates are not involved in the C-H activation reaction. Treatment of the hydridoneopentyl complex 8 with CHBr_3 converts it to the corresponding bromoneopentyl complex 10. This material reacts with HgCl_2 to give neopentylmercuric chloride, which forms neopentyl bromide on reaction with Br_2 . Thus overall stoichiometric conversion of

hydrocarbons to functionalized organic molecules is feasible in this system. The factors which have been presumed to influence the rates of reaction of transition metal complexes with saturated C-H bonds—notably the need for electron rich metals and close proximity of reacting centers—are discussed in detail.

Introduction

One of the most intriguing—and yet elusive—goals of organometallic chemistry has been the use of transition metal complexes to "activate" carbon-hydrogen bonds in completely saturated organic compounds.¹ One impetus for research in this area is that saturated hydrocarbons are among the most ubiquitous, and chemically stable, of all organic materials, due to the high values of their C-H and C-C bond energies. It is important to learn the chemical requirements for causing such stable substances to react and, if such reactions are found, to understand their mechanisms. On a more practical level, understanding C-H activation should help to develop methods for converting saturated hydrocarbons, such as those found in petroleum and formed in Fischer-Tropsch reactions, into functionalized compounds more easily utilized in chemical conversions.

Saturated hydrocarbons are of course not completely unreactive, and as a result they have a long history of activation by non-metallic reagents and methods. Hydrocarbon thermal reactions and combustion have been studied by both chemists and chemical engineers, and there are well-known free radical reactions (e.g., autooxidation, photochlorination) which can serve to functionalize these materials.² More recently, reagents such as ozone and H_2O_2 have been used to activate hydrocarbons.³

The reactions summarized above often require large amounts of energy (either light, heat, or chemical), and are usually very unselective. The

hope of carrying out C-H activation with higher selectivity has been one of the major incentives to organometallic research in this area. Much work has been done over the past ten or fifteen years, and while certain types of C-H activation have been achieved, the direct intermolecular insertion (oxidative addition) of a metal center into a C-H bond, leading to a stable hydridoalkyl complex (reaction (1) in Scheme 1), has eluded discovery.

A few examples of C-H activation reactions which were known when this work was initiated are shown in Scheme 2. In the late 1960's and early 1970's it was demonstrated that certain platinum salts, in the presence of acid, could be used to effect H-D exchange (eq. (3)), first in aromatic compounds and then in alkanes.⁴ Many studies have also been done in which alkane oxidations have been mediated by metals.⁵ Although there is a possibility that some of these reactions are initiated by oxidative addition of a metal center to a C-H bond, many clearly involve free-radical mechanisms, and some may even be heterogeneous processes. More recent studies of alkane activation utilizing porphyrin complexes (e.g., reaction (4)) stimulated by the importance of biological alkane hydroxylation, have been clearly shown to proceed by free radical pathways.⁶

The search for direct intermolecular oxidative addition has been less rewarding. It has been made even more frustrating by the facility of certain C-H oxidative additions which appear to proceed easily in intramolecular situations (eq. (2) in Scheme 1), but apparently cannot be extended to the intermolecular case. The insertion of a metal into the C-H bond of a ligand already attached to it at some other point (such as a phosphorus atom) is a ubiquitous process when aromatic or otherwise activated C-H bonds are involved, but cases are now known in which metals undergo intramolecular insertion into C-H bonds not activated (i.e., lowered in bond energy or increased in acidity) by adjacent organic functional groups.⁷ As illustrated

in the examples shown in eqs. (5) and (6), this latter process has been developed as a useful method for synthesizing metallacycles.^{7a,d,e} It appears, however, that the metal centers in these systems resist reaction with C-H bonds not present in the same molecule as the metal center.

Intermolecular metal/hydrocarbon reactions have been achieved with certain very reactive metal fragments, such as metal atoms in matrices and metal ions in the gas phase.⁸ In solution, a few relatively electron-rich complexes have been demonstrated to undergo insertion into C-H bonds activated by adjacent functional groups (e.g., eq. (7) and (8)), but the metal centers in these molecules apparently react with C-H bonds in their own ligands more rapidly than with saturated hydrocarbons.⁹

Recently, the two very interesting and unique intermolecular C-H activation reactions shown in eqs. (9) and (10) were reported.^{10,11} These may be initiated by C-H insertion, but it has so far been difficult to determine this conclusively, because the reactions are quite complicated. They involve multiple hydrogen loss in the saturated hydrocarbon reactants, and require an added alkene as a hydrogen acceptor. A most unusual aspect of the iridium reaction is that it is carried out in methylene chloride as a solvent. Thus C-H activation takes place in preference to reaction with the normally much more labile C-Cl bonds of the solvent.

Despite this extensive work in the C-H activation area, when the discovery discussed in this paper was made, no intermolecular example of the reaction shown in eq. (1) was known for organotransition metal complexes and completely saturated hydrocarbons in homogeneous solution. Early in 1982 we reported such a reaction in a new iridium complex.¹² The details of this work, along with additional information on the chemistry and selectivity of the iridium system, are described here.

Results and Discussion

Synthesis and reactions of $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PPh}_3)_2\text{H}_2$ (2). Our initial experiments centered around the previously unknown dihydrido-iridium complex 2. As shown in Scheme 3, 2 was prepared in 42% yield by treatment of the dichloride dimer 1^{13} with PPh_3 , followed by two equivalents of LiEt_3BH . Irradiation of this material through pyrex in benzene solution resulted in extrusion of dihydrogen. The loss of H_2 upon photolysis of transition metal di- and polyhydrides is a well documented process.^{9b,c;14} The resulting organometallic products were the hydridophenyl complex 3 and the ortho-metallated complex 4 in a ratio of 47:53, respectively.

These materials were formed presumably via the coordinatively unsaturated intermediate $\text{Cp}'\text{IrPPh}_3$ ($\text{Cp}' = \eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5$). Hydridophenyl complex 3 is the result of an intermolecular reaction of the intermediate with the C-H bonds in benzene, whereas complex 4 results from an intramolecular C-H oxidative addition. Thus, even in the presence of a bound triphenylphosphine group, there was considerable intermolecular reaction with the benzene solvent. Irradiation in other solvents (e.g., acetonitrile, cyclohexane) gave either all or mostly the ortho-metallated product 4. However, in the case of cyclohexane, a significant amount (30%) of a new hydride was detected by NMR in the crude reaction mixture. Its ^1H -NMR in benzene- d_6 showed a broad singlet at δ 1.71 for the C_5Me_5 group (15 H), broad resonances from δ 1.50-2.30 (11 H), multiplets at 7.00 and 7.57 for the bound PPh_3 , and a doublet ($J=35$ Hz) at δ -17.91 for the new hydride (1 H). These NMR data suggested that this material might be the intermolecular C-H activation product, $\text{Cp}'\text{Ir}(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{H})(\text{C}_6\text{H}_{11})$. This new material could not be separated successfully from the orthometallated complex. We therefore decided to prepare and examine the photolysis of the corresponding PMe_3 dihydride, in

hopes of making orthometallation less favorable.

Synthesis and reactions of $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)\text{H}_2$ (5). As in the synthesis of triphenylphosphine dihydride 2, treatment of dichloride dimer 1 with trimethylphosphine, followed by LiEt_3BH , gave 5 in 80% yield (Scheme 4).¹⁵ Irradiation of 5 in benzene resulted in loss of H_2 and attack on the solvent, leading to the hydridophenyliridium complex 6. We detected only the intermolecular product; no evidence for any intramolecular reaction was found.¹⁶ When, the irradiation was carried out in cyclohexane, a compound with completely unactivated C-H bonds, a new material was formed (90% yield at 68% conversion of starting material after 5.5 hr irradiation) in which both the PMe_3 and C_5Me_5 ligands were clearly intact.¹⁷ Although thermally stable at room temperature, it was very sensitive both to air and chromatography supports (reductively eliminating cyclohexane in certain cases, which will be discussed later). Purification was finally effected, although with significant loss of material, by rapid chromatography using 4% THF/cyclohexane eluent on alumina III under air-free conditions, followed by evaporation of solvent. The structure of this material was confirmed as that of $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{-}(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{hydrido})\text{cyclohexyliridium(III)}$ (7, Scheme 5) on the basis of spectral data (Table 1) and chemical conversion to the more sparingly soluble bromocyclohexyl complex 9 (Scheme 6). Thus, the intermediate formed on irradiation of dihydride 5, presumably $\text{Cp}'\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)$, reacts cleanly with unactivated C-H bonds.

An interesting feature of these alkyl hydrides can be seen in examining the ^{13}C -NMR spectrum of cyclohexyl complex 7. The iridium atom, having four different substituents, is a chiral center. Thus, the β and γ carbon atoms form pairs of diastereomeric carbon atoms, and two signals appear for each set of carbons (Table 1).

Irradiation of dihydride 5 in neopentane solvent gives, after 5.3 hr irradiation time (64% NMR yield after 83% conversion), a new complex once again seen by NMR to contain alkyl and hydride ligands, and intact C_5Me_5 and PMe_3 groups. Its structure is assigned as 8, the neopentyl hydride (the hydridoalkyl complex analogous to 7 (Scheme 5)), on the basis of spectral data (Table 1) and conversion to the corresponding bromoneopentyl complex 10 (Scheme 6).

Treatment of hydridoalkyl complexes 7 and 8 with reagents such as $ZnBr_2$, H_2O_2 , Br_2 , BF_3 , or O_2 resulted in reductive elimination of the hydrocarbon. In a particularly mild reaction, which accounts for part of the difficulty encountered in purification by chromatography, stirring 7 or 8 with Al_2O_3 in benzene solution for one hr generates the hydridophenyl complex 6 and cyclohexane (95% yield) or neopentane (98% yield), respectively (Scheme 6).

Photochemical reaction of dihydride 5 with a few other organic compounds was investigated briefly by NMR. A single hydride product was formed in the presence of both acetonitrile and tetramethylsilane. In the case of tetrahydrofuran, four new hydride resonances were detected by NMR. We assume these are products formed by attack at both the 2- and 3- positions, yielding two pairs of diastereomers. The 1H -NMR chemical shifts of the products formed in these experiments are summarized in Table 2.

Mechanism of the C-H Oxidative Addition Reaction. The most straightforward mechanism for the oxidative addition reaction is that shown in Scheme 7. We assume, based on extensive precedent,^{9b,c;14} that irradiation of the trimethylphosphine dihydride complex 5 leads to an electronically excited state which rapidly loses H_2 , forming coordinatively unsaturated complex 11 as a transient intermediate. The reactive 16-electron metal center in this intermediate then undergoes oxidative addition to the C-H bond of a solvent

molecule, presumably via a three-center transition state such as 12.

Given the difficulties which have arisen in elucidating the mechanisms of certain other oxidative addition reactions,¹⁸ before concluding that Scheme 7 is the most likely pathway for our reactions we felt some care should be taken in ruling out other possibilities, especially those involving free radicals. Two possible radical mechanisms are shown in Scheme 8. The first one (mechanism (A)) suggests that irradiation might generate an excited state in which only one M-H bond is cleaved, leading to a paramagnetic intermediate $\text{Cp}'\text{IrLH}$ ($\text{Cp}'=\text{Me}_5\text{C}_5$) and a hydrogen atom. The latter should be sufficiently reactive to abstract a hydrogen atom from an ordinary alkane, leading to H_2 and alkyl radicals. These would then recombine with the iridium fragment, leading to the hydridoalkyl product. In the second mechanism, H_2 is lost in the first step. If, for some reason, the intermediate 11 were to abstract a hydrogen atom rather than undergo insertion, this would generate $\text{Cp}'(\text{L})\text{IrH}$ and an alkyl radical, and these could then recombine to give the final product.

The first mechanism is rather easy to rule out, since it predicts that one of the hydrogens in the starting dihydride remains in the final product. We therefore carried out the reaction of dihydride 5 in perdeuteriocyclohexane. Only $\text{Cp}'(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Ir}(\text{C}_6\text{D}_{11})\text{D}$ and H_2 were formed in this reaction.¹⁹

One type of evidence which may be used to test mechanism (B) in Scheme 8 utilizes the assumption that because the second step in this mechanism generates alkyl radicals, the rate of the reaction should be relatively fast when stable radicals are generated, but slower when less stable radicals are formed. Put another way, weak C-H bonds should be abstracted most readily, as they are in other hydrocarbon radical processes such as autooxidation and chlorination. We have examined this prediction by carrying out some simple

relative rate studies using competition techniques. The general question of selectivity is discussed in the next section, but two experiments relevant to the radical-reaction problem are summarized in Scheme 9. As illustrated, irradiation of dihydride 5 in p-xylene provides the unsaturated intermediate 11 with an opportunity to choose between attack on the aromatic ring and abstraction of the relatively weak benzylic C-H bond. It is well established that radicals preferentially choose the latter,²⁰ our iridium intermediate, in contrast, reacts 3.7 times more rapidly with the aromatic ring (ratio corrected for the number of hydrogens available in each path), giving a preponderance of 13 over 14 (a further discussion of this reaction in the following section details the method of analysis of this reaction mixture). Even more striking is the reaction with cyclopropane. This organic molecule has relatively weak C-C bonds due to strain, but very strong C-H bonds (106 kcal/mole)²¹ due to the large amount of s character in these bonds. As a result, alkyl radicals abstract hydrogen only very slowly from cyclopropane. Even if radical reactivity were not a problem, one might expect the iridium intermediate 11 to insert into the C-C bonds of cyclopropane, rather than abstract a hydrogen. As shown in Scheme 9, however, this does not occur—the exclusive product of the reaction is the hydridocyclopropyl complex 15 formed by C-H insertion. Following this experiment, we irradiated dihydride 5 in a mixture of cyclopropane and cyclohexane. This demonstrated that the Cp'Ir-(PMe₃) intermediate actually reacts faster with the C-H bonds of the smaller ring (rate constant ratio 2.6 after statistical correction), again in sharp contrast to the result which would be predicted for a radical-like species.

Another test of the second radical mechanism in Scheme 8, as well as any other process which might place the R and H groups from the reacting hydrocarbon on different metal centers in the final product, involves a crossover

experiment.²² In a mixture of deuterated and undeuterated hydrocarbons such as d_{12} -cyclohexane and d_0 -cyclohexane, direct insertion (Scheme 7) should lead only to d_0 - and d_{12} -product. However, to the extent that the radicals in the second mechanism in Scheme 8 escape their solvent cage, some d_1 - and d_{11} -product should be generated. Any other so-called "intermolecular" mechanism which separates R and H before they become attached to the metal will have a similar result.

We were unable to carry out this experiment with labeled and unlabeled cyclohexane, because the sensitive hydridoalkyl complexes decomposed during analysis by conventional electron impact mass spectroscopy. Although good molecular ion peaks could be obtained using field desorption mass spectroscopy, the FDMS peak intensities were not reproducible enough to provide trustworthy estimates of the amount of crossover products which might be present in our reaction mixtures. As an alternative, therefore, we decided to take advantage of the very different chemical shifts in the hydride region of the ^1H -NMR of cyclohexyl and neopentyl hydride complexes 7 and 8. The results which would be expected from concerted and "crossover" mechanisms are illustrated in Scheme 10. To make sure the two hydrocarbons had similar reactivities, dihydride 5 was irradiated in a 1:1 mixture of neopentane and cyclohexane. Figure 1a shows the Me_5C_5 and hydride regions of the NMR spectrum of the solution obtained in this irradiation; integration demonstrated that the cyclohexyl (7) and neopentyl (8) complexes were formed in a ratio of 0.88. After irradiation of dihydride 5 in a 1:1 mixture of neopentane and cyclohexane- d_{12} , inspection of the C_5Me_5 region of the NMR spectrum (Fig. 1(b)) assured us that the two hydrocarbons still had comparable reactivity, although the deuterated cyclohexane reacted a bit more slowly than its undeuterated counterpart—the 7/8 ratio was now 0.64. The hydride

region of the spectrum, however, is substantially different. The neopentyl hydride appears as a strong peak, but the resonance due to hydridocyclohexyl complex 8 has almost completely disappeared. It appears that some (7-8%) cyclohexyl-d₁₁ hydride was formed; however, we can conservatively estimate that at least 90% of the reaction proceeds by a pathway which does not produce crossover. A similar percentage of 7-d₁₁ was found when 5 was irradiated in a 1:5 mixture of neopentane and cyclohexane-d₁₂.

We do not know the source of the small amount of crossover product. It is clearly not due to secondary thermal hydrogen exchange; at room temperature, over a span of two months, there is no measurable exchange of hydride and deuteride between oxidative addition products 7-d₁₂ and 8. It is difficult to conclusively rule out a photochemical hydride exchange, because the photolysis slows considerably during the reaction, presumably because of the generation of small amounts of highly absorbing materials; in any case, to the extent that we can measure it, continued photolysis does not increase the amount of crossover observed. An indication that some type of secondary reaction is possible comes from the irradiation (discussed above) of dihydride 5 in cyclohexane-d₁₂. Although only H₂ is detected early in this reaction (40 min), after longer photolysis (24 hr), detectable amounts of HD and D₂ are produced. This results in a decrease in the isotopic purity of the cyclohexane-d₁₂, which may account for at least some of the d₁₁-product observed in our crossover experiment.

Another interesting piece of information available from the crossover experiment is the isotope effect on C-H insertion. Dividing the cyclohexane/neopentane product (rate) ratio by the cyclohexane-d₁₂/neopentane ratio gives $k_H/k_D = 1.38$ for insertion of Cp'(L)Ir into the six-membered ring substrate. Although in the normal direction, this is relatively small for a

primary isotope effect. Unfortunately, very little isotope effect data on R-H oxidative additions are available for comparison with this result. Chock and Halpern measured the isotope effect for oxidative addition of dihydrogen to Vaska's complex,²³ interestingly, it is also small and normal ($k_H/k_D = 1.22$). A rationalization for this is provided by the prediction of one theoretical calculation that the H_2 addition has a transition state which lies at a very early point (i.e., structurally closer to starting materials than products) along the reaction coordinate.²⁴ If this is also the explanation in our case, reductive elimination may have a somewhat larger isotope effect. Again, data are scarce, but Halpern's measure of 3.3 in the reductive elimination of methane from $cis-(PPh_3)_2Pt(H)(CH_3)$ seems to support this.²⁵ One dihydrogen reductive elimination isotope effect is lower, however (1.51),²⁶ and one appears to be inverse.²⁷ Clearly more isotope effect information needs to be accumulated on such systems before they will be fully understood.

In summary, we cannot yet rule out conclusively the possibility that a mechanism such as (B) in Scheme 8 is operating with (for some unknown reason) very little escape of radicals from the solvent cage. However, two things militate against this: (1) most conventional radical processes show substantial cage/escape rate ratios, and (2) the benzyl/aromatic and cyclopropane/cyclohexane hydrogen insertion ratios are quite different from those one would predict for a radical process. At present, therefore, our results seem to be most consistent with the concerted C-H oxidative addition pathway shown in Scheme 7.

Selectivity of the C-H Activation Reaction. Having reasonable confidence that the C-H activation reaction operates by a concerted three-center oxidative addition mechanism, we decided to examine the selectivity of the

process. Irradiation of $\text{Cp}'(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrH}_2$ (5) in the presence of solvents having different types of C-H bonds allowed the reactive intermediate $\text{Cp}'(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Ir}$ to compete for those bonds. Assuming the products of the insertions are thermally and photochemically stable at low conversion,²⁸ the ratio of the products formed in such an experiment is then directly equal to the ratio of rate constants for insertion into each type of C-H bond. Two types of selectivity experiments were carried out: those involving competition of the intermediate for C-H bonds in different molecules ("intermolecular selectivity") and competition for different types of C-H bonds located in the same molecule ("intramolecular selectivity").

Intermolecular selectivities can be established most readily, because each of the individual oxidative addition products can be independently generated. Each selectivity experiment was carried out using mixtures of two liquid hydrocarbons as solvent. First the dihydride 5 was irradiated in each pure solvent, and the NMR spectrum of the product recorded (due to the difficulty of isolating these materials, isolation was not attempted except in the case of cyclohexane and neopentane, as described earlier). Then the irradiation was carried out in a mixture (usually 1:1) of the two solvents, and the ratio of products measured, usually by repetitive integration of the hydride resonances in the high-field region of the spectrum. The rate ratio was calculated by correcting the product ratio for the number of hydrogens available in each molecule. In this way, the neopentane/cyclohexane rate ratio of 1.14 and cyclopropane/cyclohexane ratio of 2.6, mentioned in the previous section, were obtained. Similarly, we were able to determine the relative rates of attack by $\text{Cp}'\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)$ on one C-H bond in each of the molecules in Table 3, compared to cyclohexane as 1.0. It appears that in rings smaller than cyclohexane the C-H bonds are a bit more accessible steri-

cally; medium-sized rings show a decrease in reactivity reminiscent of that sometimes seen in organic reactions involving these materials. A competition experiment using a cyclohexane/benzene mixture demonstrated the aromatic C-H bonds to be 4.0 times more reactive than the cyclohexyl.

Intramolecular selectivities presented a more difficult problem. Here we were faced with determining both the identities and relative amounts of products which could not be generated independently. In general the hydridoalkyl complexes are so nonpolar, and so similar to one another in chromatographic properties (including instability in many cases), that preparative separation was not feasible. A possible solution to this problem became apparent during the intermolecular selectivity studies summarized above. As shown in Tables 1 and 4, the ^1H -NMR hydride resonances of the hydridoalkyl products formed from each of the cyclic hydrocarbons appeared at very similar chemical shifts, ranging from δ -18.16 for the metal-bound hydride in the hydridocyclopropyl complex to -18.67 for the hydridocyclohexyl complex. The location of this narrow range differed substantially from the position of the hydride resonance observed for the hydridoneopentyl complex 8, which appeared at -17.67. Insertion into the C-H bond of benzene gave a complex which exhibited a hydride resonance at even lower field (-17.04 ppm). It seems that for some fortunate (but not well understood) reason, the hydride chemical shift appears to be determined by the type of substitution at the carbon atom of the alkyl fragment directly attached to the metal. Thus (in the absence of heteroatoms which provide an added perturbation; cf. Table 2) products formed by insertion into secondary C-H bonds may be distinguished from products formed by insertion into primary C-H bonds and aryl C-H bonds by the characteristic chemical shifts of the metal-bound hydride resonances in the hydridoalkyl products.

This judgment was reinforced by the results of our first intramolecular selectivity experiments, carried out on p-xylene as summarized in the preceding section and illustrated in Scheme 9. Irradiation of dihydride 5 in p-xylene gave two products, as judged by the appearance of only two new doublets in the high-field region of the NMR spectrum. One of these, assigned to benzylic complex 14, appeared at -17.56 ppm, very close to that observed for the neopentyl complex 8 (i.e., in the "primary hydride" region). The other, due to aryl complex 13, appeared at the lower field position of -16.68 (the "aryl hydride" region). The fact that the primary insertion product is benzylic, and the aryl insertion product has an ortho-alkyl substituent, apparently does not greatly perturb the relative positions of these resonances.

In acyclic hydrocarbons, the chemical shift patterns also appear to hold up. Thus, irradiation of dihydride 5 in propane gives a mixture which exhibits two new hydride doublets in the NMR, one in the primary region at -17.81, and the other in the secondary region at -18.51 ppm.; integration and statistical correction gives a primary/secondary rate ratio of 1.51. The situation with higher acyclic hydrocarbons is more complicated. In the case of n-pentane, four new hydride doublets are detected. There is a unique lowest-field hydride signal; although this appears at -17.96, somewhat higher than that in propane, we assign it to the primary insertion product 16 (Scheme 11). The three other resonances appear at -18.50, -18.54 and -18.61 ppm, consistent with their assignment as secondary insertion products. We presume the formation of three complexes is due to the fact that insertion into the hydrogen at C-2 in pentane is capable of generating two diastereomers due to the fact that the iridium is a chiral center, as shown in Scheme 11. Although we cannot assign the identity of each of these very similar

complexes, summation of the secondary integrations and correcting for statistics gives a primary/secondary attack ratio of 2.7.

Unfortunately, in repetitive experiments with n-pentane the measured primary/secondary insertion product ratio was somewhat variable. In preliminary experiments with more highly branched hydrocarbons, we have as yet observed no hydride resonances which could be attributed to attack on tertiary C-H bonds. Heating the mixture of four products formed from n-pentane to 110° for 17 hours converted them completely into the primary product 16, as determined by NMR and shown in Scheme 11. We assume this occurs by reductive elimination/re-addition, rather than reversible β -elimination as seen with, e.g., alkylzirconium complexes,²⁹ since our complexes are coordinatively saturated and PMe_3 dissociation is probably very slow. Thus it is clear that the complex formed by insertion into the primary C-H bond is thermodynamically more stable than the corresponding primary insertion products. In view of the fact that reductive elimination of these very sensitive hydridoalkyl complexes can be induced by a wide range of oxidizing agents and Lewis acids (vide infra), it seems quite possible that some secondary insertion products, and perhaps all tertiary insertion products, might not be stable to our reaction conditions. Therefore, although we feel reasonably confident about the kinetic primary-secondary selectivity in our intermolecular cases and n-propane, some concern should be expressed about the n-pentane value, and no quantitative judgment should be made at this time as to the relative rates of insertion into the different types of C-H bonds in larger, more highly branched hydrocarbons. However, given the fact that primary insertion appears to be preferred over secondary on both a kinetic and thermodynamic basis (presumably at least partially because of the severe steric requirements of the iridium center), it is our

guess that the rate of insertion of $\text{Cp}'\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)$ into tertiary hydrogens is in fact relatively low.

Thermal, photochemical and functionalization reactions of the hydrido-alkyl insertion products. We next sought a method for conversion of the C-H activation products $\text{Cp}'(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Ir}(\text{H})(\text{R})$ into functionalized organic molecules. Our first attempts to reach this goal centered around reactions of the hydridoalkyls with various reagents. As mentioned previously, treatment of cyclohexyl complex 7 or neopentyl 8 with oxidizing or electrophilic reagents resulted in reductive elimination of the hydrocarbon RH. The photolysis of 7 in benzene or neopentane also led to the formation of cyclohexane and 6 or 8, respectively.²⁸ Reductive elimination and subsequent C-H activation can also be induced thermally. Heating 7 in benzene- d_6 or pentane in a sealed tube at 110°C for 24 hrs yielded the corresponding deuterophenyl deuteride (6-d_6) or n-pentyl hydride (13), respectively. This suggests that one forms the same unsaturated iridium intermediate in the thermal and photochemical experiments.

Upon treatment of neopentyl complex 8 with carbon monoxide (0.73 atm) at 60°C for four hr, one begins to see the formation of what is believed to be $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{CO})\text{PMe}_3$ (by IR and NMR) and neopentane. Upon further reaction with CO, this complex disappears and $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{CO})_2$ ³⁰ forms. Carbon dioxide (4.3 atm), on the other hand, is inert towards 8 up to 110° , where the thermal reaction with solvent occurs.

We decided that a possible solution to the functionalization problem might be available by replacement of the hydride ligand with halogen. Bromoform was found to react with the hydridopentyl complex to produce $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{n-pentyl})\text{Br}$, and treatment of this material with deuterated fluorosulfonic acid gave 1-deuteropentane. Treatment of bromocyclohexyl complex 9 with Br_2 in a variety of solvents (benzene, pentane, CCl_4) gave

less than 2% cyclohexyl bromide. By gas chromatographic analysis, using retention times, the major organic products seemed to be cyclohexane and/or cyclohexene and a higher molecular weight material (perhaps cyclohexylcyclohexane). These results indicate that some sort of free radical reaction is occurring.

As shown in Scheme 12, treatment of neopentyl complex 8 with mercuric chloride in benzene was more successful. By $^1\text{H-NMR}$, we observed the clean exchange of the neopentyl group for a Cl atom. This resulted in the formation of a new material, assigned on the basis of its NMR spectrum as neopentylmercuric chloride (δ 1.12 (2H), 0.57 (9H)). Also formed was a precipitate, presumably bromochloro complex 17. The reaction mixture containing the neopentylmercuric chloride was subsequently treated with Br_2 to give neopentyl bromide in >98% NMR yield.³¹ This demonstrates that the saturated hydrocarbon neopentane can be converted in high yield to a metal complex and then to a functionalized organic molecule.

Conclusions and Further Questions

We have succeeded in uncovering the first soluble organotransition metal complex which is capable of undergoing direct oxidative addition to the C-H bonds of saturated hydrocarbons, leading to alkyliridium hydrides in high yield at room temperature. The mechanism of the photolysis of dihydrides 2 and 5 and subsequent reaction with saturated hydrocarbons is believed to occur via (1) the concerted loss of hydrogen to form $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PR}_3)$ and (2) oxidative addition across the C-H bond of the hydrocarbon. This oxidative addition seems to proceed in a concerted fashion via a 3-center transition state such as that shown in Scheme 7. Selectivity studies, demonstrating that insertion into primary and small-ring C-H bonds is preferred, are inconsistent with relative rates expected for radical reactions. It is the most sterically accessible C-H bonds that are most prone to react.

Despite these advances, our understanding of why $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)$ (11) undergoes this reaction is far from complete. We wish to consider two important questions raised by our results.

The first concerns the need for an electron-rich metal center in oxidative addition reactions of this type. Conventional wisdom has spurred some recent searches for C-H activation systems in this direction; one example is the oxidative additions to weakly activated C-H bonds discovered at du Pont. These reactions employ metal centers such as iron and ruthenium carrying the powerfully electron-donating bis-(dimethylphosphino)ethane (dmpe) group.^{9a,e} Clearly our system also fulfills this criterion—both the cyclopentadienyl ring and phosphorus atom in 11 carry electron-donating methyl groups. However, we cannot yet determine the stringency of the requirement for these groups. An indication that less electron rich systems might function well in this reaction has been provided recently by Graham and Hoyano, who found that

Cp'Ir(CO), generated photochemically from the corresponding dicarbonyl, also undergoes insertion into the C-H bonds of saturated hydrocarbons.³⁰ We should also keep in mind Crabtree's system, referred to in the introduction to this paper, which utilizes a (presumably relatively electrophilic) iridium center carrying a positive charge.^{10a} It may be that some of these systems operate by different mechanisms, but clearly we have much to learn about the relationship between C-H oxidative addition and electron density at the reacting metal center.

The second perplexing question raised by our observations concerns the relationship between the rates of intra- and intermolecular C-H insertion. It is generally understood that when chemically similar intra- and intermolecular reactions are compared, the intramolecular process will proceed at a more rapid rate. Just how much more rapid is a question of some controversy, and one which has been debated in systems ranging from organometallic to enzymatic.³² However, the primary contributor to the rate acceleration associated with intramolecular processes is the entropy gained by pre-association of the reacting fragments. It seems reasonable to account for the relatively large number of intramolecular C-H activation systems which are known on the basis of this favorable entropic situation.

Several organic systems have been studied which provide comparisons of the rates of chemically comparable intra- and intermolecular reactions.³³ In contrast, the literature contains surprisingly few reports of studies in which the intermolecular analog of a known intramolecular C-H activation reaction has been explicitly sought, so that clear-cut rate comparisons can be made. Perhaps some intramolecular C-H activation systems have been examined carefully for small amounts of intermolecular products, and unsuccessful results have simply not been reported.

One system in which a qualitative comparison of intra- and intermolecular C-H activation has been made³⁴ is that shown in Scheme 13. Treatment of bis(pentamethylcyclopentadienyl)zirconium dihydride (18) with deuterium gas results in exchange of all available hydrogens in 18 for deuterium. Evidence has been obtained that 18 is in equilibrium with the intramolecular C-H insertion product 19. Reduction of the substituted analog bis(neopentyl-tetramethylcyclopentadienyl)zirconium dichloride gives complex 21, presumably formed by insertion of the metal center in the reduced zirconocene intermediate into one of the (unactivated) C-H bonds of the neopentyl group attached to the five-membered ring. This material also reacts reversibly with hydrogen gas, leading to dihydride 20. As in the case of the $18 \rightleftharpoons 19$ system, exposure of $20 \rightleftharpoons 21$ to deuterium gas causes exchange of deuterium with all available hydrogens in the molecule.

Exchange of the t-butyl hydrogens in $20 \rightleftharpoons 21$ with deuterium gas is rapid: after exposure to 4 atm of deuterium gas for 1 hr at 70°, the hydrogen atoms in both t-butyl groups were 96% exchanged. A comparison of this qualitative rate with an intermolecular case was obtained by exposing the bis(pentamethylcyclopentadienyl) system $18 \rightleftharpoons 19$ to four atm of H₂ in toluene-d₈. After one week at 70°, the toluene-d₈ showed 54% exchange of its aromatic hydrogens and 71% exchange of its methyl hydrogens. These two experiments were done using different molecules and different temperatures, and precise rate and activation energy data are not available. It is therefore difficult to use this information to obtain a quantitative estimate of the difference between the inter- and intramolecular exchange rates. However, by estimating the half-lives for exchange in the two experiments, and making some crude assumptions about reaction order and entropies of activation, we estimate that the intra/intermolecular C-H activation rate

constant ratio must be at least 10^6 for the zirconium system.

This result is in the conventionally expected direction. However, it is rather large considering the fact intra/intermolecular rate ratios for simple organic systems (so-called "effective molarities", as discussed by Illuminati and Mandolini³³) are more often in the 10^3 - 10^5 range. Whatever the exact rate ratio, however, the zirconium system emphasizes how unusual the iridium system is. In the iridium case intermolecular reaction with saturated hydrocarbons occurs at a rate comparable to that of orthometallation of triphenylphosphine, a reaction which often outstrips other processes available to an unsaturated metal center. Thus when the triphenylphosphine ligand is replaced by the slower-metallating trimethylphosphine, we have been unable to observe any intramolecular oxidative addition at all. Similarly, the methyl groups attached to the Cp ring, which are reactive in the zirconium system, remain uninvolved relative to intermolecular C-H activation in the iridium system. Clearly there are very significant factors besides entropic ones which control these relative reactivities, and our understanding of these factors is quite minimal at present. Extensive further study of this unique system is an essential prerequisite to obtaining such understanding.

Experimental Section

General. All manipulations of oxygen or water sensitive materials were conducted under a pre-scrubbed recirculating atmosphere of nitrogen in a Vacuum Atmospheres HE-553 Dri-Lab with attached MO-40-1 Dri-Train or using standard Schlenk or vacuum line techniques. Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) spectra were recorded on a Varian EM-390 90 MHz spectrometer or a 200 MHz or 250 MHz high field Fourier Transform instrument. Each high field system consisted of a Cryomagnets Inc. magnet, Nicolet Model 1180 data collection system and electronics assembled by Mr. Rudi Nunlist (U. C. Berkeley). All chemical shifts are reported relative to tetramethylsilane. Infrared spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer 283 grating spectrometer using NaCl solution cells.

Gas-liquid chromatography (GC) analyses were performed using a Varian 90P gas chromatograph using a 10' x 1/4" glass column packed with 15% Apiezon L on acid washed Chromosorb W at 150°C. Mass spectroscopic (MS) analyses were conducted on an AEI MS-1 spectrometer interfaced with a Finnegan 2300 Data System. Elemental analyses were performed by the U. C. Berkeley analytical facility. Ultraviolet spectra were recorded on a Hewlett-Packard 8450A UV/Vis spectrophotometer using 1 cm pathlength quartz cells.

Preparative column chromatography was performed on neutral alumina (III) that was degassed before being taken into the dry box. All columns were packed and chromatograms run under air-free conditions. Photolyses were conducted with an Oriel 500W high pressure mercury lamp powered by an Oriel Corporation (model 6128) Universal Lamp Power Supply and mounted in an Oriel focused beam lamp housing. The reaction samples were immersed in a quartz

water or methanol bath that was cooled by a copper coil heat exchanger containing a circulating -10°C ethylene glycol/water mixture. With the heat that was generated by the lamp, the cooling bath was approximately 6°C .

Benzene- h_6 and $-d_6$, tetrahydrofuran- h_8 and $-d_8$, diethyl ether and toluene were purified before use by distillation or vacuum transfer from sodium-benzophenone ketyl. Olefin-free hexane was distilled from *n*-butyllithium. Methylene chloride and CD_2Cl_2 were distilled from calcium hydride under nitrogen. Chloroform and CDCl_3 , carbon tetrachloride, cyclohexane (spectral grade), cyclohexane- d_{12} , pentane (spectral grade), *p*-xylene, cyclopentane and cyclooctane were vacuum transferred from molecular sieves and stored under nitrogen. Acetonitrile was dried over molecular sieves and distilled under nitrogen from P_2O_5 . Neopentane and cyclopropane were used as received. LiEt_3BH (1 M in THF), H_2O_2 (30%), Br_2 , $\text{HBF}_4 \cdot \text{OEt}_2$, and DSO_3F were used as received. HgCl_2 was recrystallized from water and ZnBr_2 was heated at 150°C for eight hours under high vacuum before use. Bromoform was vacuum transferred from molecular sieves. PPh_3 was recrystallized from hexane, and PMe_3 was vacuum transferred before use. $1,^{13}(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PPh}_3)\text{Cl}_2^{35}$ and $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Cl}_2^{15}$ were prepared by literature methods.

Photochemical Experiments. A typical analytical photolysis was carried out as follows. Dihydride **5** (10.0 mg, 2.47×10^{-5} mol) and the substrate (usually a liquid saturated hydrocarbon used as a solvent (0.60 mL)) were added to a 5 mm NMR tube in the dry box. After capping the tube, it was removed from the dry box, and the cap was secured with parafilm. The tube was immersed in a water-filled quartz dewar in front of the focused photolysis beam. In some cases the reaction was monitored periodically by examining the hydride region in the NMR; in others, the analysis was performed after irradiation for five hrs. After irradiation, the reaction

mixture was taken back into the dry box where the solvent was removed in vacuo. The residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 and added to a new NMR tube to record the NMR spectrum.

Exceptions to this general scheme occurred when the hydrocarbon was gaseous at room temperature (cyclopropane and neopentane), and when larger-scale preparative experiments were performed. For example, the NMR tube scale reaction with neopentane was carried out utilizing an NMR tube fused to a 14/20 ground glass joint, which was loaded with 5 in the dry box. The tube was capped with a vacuum stopcock and taken from the dry box to a vacuum line where the dihydride was degassed and neopentane added by vacuum transfer at -196°C . The tube was sealed and irradiated for five hours. After photolysis, the tube was broken open in the dry box, and the same procedures for removing the solvent and preparing the sample in benzene- d_6 were followed.

With cyclopropane and other large scale preparative reactions, glass bombs equipped with built-in vacuum stopcocks were used as the reaction vessels. After irradiation, the hydrocarbons were removed by vacuum transfer before attempting to isolate the products. Isolation procedures for larger-scale experiments are described below.

$(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrH}_2(5)$. $(\text{C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrCl}_2^{15}$ (0.39 g, 0.81 mmol) was slurried in diethyl ether (15 ml) in the drybox. Dropwise addition of LiEt_3BH (2.42 ml, 2.42 mmol) to the stirring slurry resulted in a gradual clearing of the reaction mixture. The solution was stirred three hours, then filtered through alumina III packed into a 15 ml fritted funnel. The alumina was washed with diethyl ether and the resulting filtrate concentrated under vacuum. The resulting crude product was chromatographed in the drybox on silica with hexane followed by ether. The ethereal fractions containing product were identified by the cloudiness imparted to the solution; removal

of solvent from the combined fractions gave pure 5 as a pale yellow oil (0.25 g, 0.62 mmol, 76%) which occasionally crystallized (m.p. 43-44) on standing. ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 2.12 (dt $J_{\text{P-H}}=1.9$ Hz, $J_{\text{H-H}}=0.7$ Hz, C_5Me_5), 1.33 (d $J=10.0$ Hz, PMe_3), -17.38 (d $J=32.2$ Hz, IrH_2). ^{13}C NMR (C_6D_6): δ 91.26 (d $J=2.4$ Hz, C_5Me_5), 11.69 (s, C_5Me_5), 24.00 (d $J=37.8$ Hz, PMe_3). IR (C_6H_{12}): 2099 cm^{-1} ($\nu_{\text{Ir-H}}$). MS: m/e 406, 404 (parent isotope and M-H_2), 402 (M-H_2). UV (C_6H_{12}): $\lambda_{\text{max}}=259$ ($\epsilon=1.6 \times 10^3$). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{13}\text{H}_{26}\text{IrP}$: C, 38.50; H, 6.46. Found: C, 38.50; H, 6.37.

$(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PPh}_3)\text{H}_2$ (2). Dihydride 2 was prepared in a similar manner. After column chromatography on alumina (III) with benzene eluent, the solvent was removed in vacuo and 2 was recrystallized once from ether. It was obtained in 42% yield as an air-sensitive pale tan solid, m.p. 171 $^\circ$. ^1H NMR: δ 1.90 (broad d $J=1.00$ Hz, C_5Me_5), 7.04 and 7.70 (m, PPh_3), -16.47 (d $J=31.7$ Hz, IrH_2). IR (C_6H_6): 2110 cm^{-1} ($\nu_{\text{Ir-H}}$). UV (C_6H_{12}): $\lambda_{\text{max}}=288$ ($\epsilon=750$). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{28}\text{H}_{32}\text{IrP}$: C, 56.83; H, 5.45. Found: C, 56.44; H, 5.43.

$(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PPh}_3)(\text{C}_6\text{H}_5)\text{H}$ (3). Dihydride 2 (120 mg, 0.0203 mmol) and benzene (10 mL) were placed in a glass bomb that contained a stir bar. After removing the reaction mixture from the dry box, it was cooled to -196 $^\circ\text{C}$ and evacuated on the vacuum line. The solution was irradiated for 8.5 hr. The solvent was removed in vacuo, and the residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 . NMR analysis showed that the two organometallic products were 3 and 4 in a 47:53 ratio. The benzene- d_6 was removed in vacuo, and the residue was taken back up in a minimal amount of benzene and chromatographed on alumina (III) in the dry box with benzene eluent. The benzene was removed from the first fraction in vacuo and the solid was recrystallized once from ether to give 38 mg (28% yield) of a colorless solid, m.p. 215 $^\circ$. ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.60 (dd $J=1.8, 0.8$, C_5Me_5), 7.00 (m, PPh_3 m- and p- H), 7.47 (m, PPh_3 o- H), 6.92 (m,

Ph m- and p- H), 7.61 (m, Ph o- H), -16.36 (d J=36.7, IrH). IR (C_6D_6): 2110 cm^{-1} (ν_{Ir-H}). Anal: Calcd for $C_{34}H_{36}IrP$: C, 61.15; H, 5.43. Found: C, 60.86; H, 5.36. Product 4 [1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.84 (d J=1.8 Hz, C_5Me_5), 6.72, 7.06, 7.53, 7.98 (m, 1H each, C_6H_4), 6.97, 7.28 (m, 6H and 4H each, PPh_2), -13.09 (d J=26.7 Hz, IrH)] decomposed on the column.

Irradiation of 5 in cyclohexane. ($\eta^5-C_5Me_5$)Ir(PMe_3)(C_6H_{11})H (7) was prepared following the procedure described for the preparation of 3, with 5 (177 mg, 3.63×10^{-4} mol) and cyclohexane (5.0 mL) using a glass bomb for a vessel. The solution was irradiated for 58 hr. After the irradiation, the cyclohexane was removed in vacuo, and the residue was taken up in cyclohexane and chromatographed on alumina (III) in the dry box with 4% THF/cyclohexane eluent. The solution was forced through quickly with pressure from a hand held bulb. The first fraction was collected, and the solvent was removed in vacuo leaving an oily pale yellow/brown material, which could not be recrystallized successfully. The cyclohexyliridium hydride was isolated in 39% yield and was pure by NMR. For 1H and ^{13}C NMR spectra, see Table 1. IR (C_6H_{12}): 2100 cm^{-1} (ν_{Ir-H}). Electron impact mass spectrometry gave only a very small parent ion due to reductive elimination. FDMS: 488, 486. Anal. Calcd for $C_{19}H_{36}IrP$: C, 46.79; H, 7.44. Found: C, 47.58; H, 7.67.

To obtain complete characterization, the compound was converted to the corresponding bromide derivative 9. Cyclohexyl hydride 7 (22 mg, 4.5×10^{-5} mol) was taken up in pentane (2 mL) in a two necked 5 mL pear shaped flask in the dry box. The two necks were topped with a vacuum stopcock and a septum. The flask was removed from the dry box, and $CHBr_3$ (5.0 μL , 5.78×10^{-5} mol) was added by syringe. The solvent was removed in vacuo, and the solid was recrystallized once from toluene/pentane, giving 23 mg (90% yield) of yellow/orange crystals, m.p. 159 $^{\circ}$. 1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.52 (d J=1.9 Hz, C_5Me_5), 1.23

(d J=9.9 Hz, PMe_3), 3.32, 2.70, 1.96, 1.84, 1.63 (broad, C_6H_{11}). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{19}\text{H}_{35}\text{IrPBr}$: C, 40.28; H, 6.31. Found: C, 40.61; H, 5.98.

To obtain an overall yield for the direct formation of 9 from 5, dihydride 5 (30.2 mg, 7.45×10^{-5} mol) was irradiated in cyclohexane (0.72 mL) following the aforementioned procedure for a photochemical experiment in an NMR tube. After five hr, the cyclohexane was removed in vacuo, and the reaction mixture was taken up in benzene- d_6 ; by NMR, 53% of 5 was converted to cyclohexyl hydride 7. Bromoform (10 μL , 1.16×10^{-4} mol) was added to the reaction solution by syringe. After two hours, the solution was chromatographed on a small alumina column with benzene/ether eluent. The first fraction was collected, the solvent was removed in vacuo and the remaining solid was recrystallized once from toluene/hexane giving 16.1 mg of 9. It was obtained in 44% overall yield (83% yield, corrected for unreacted 5).

The remaining orange band was washed off the column with THF. After removing the solvent in vacuo, the orange solid was recrystallized from toluene/ether to give $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Br}_2$, m.p. 214. ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.39 (d J=2.2 Hz, C_5Me_5), 1.41 (d J=10.9 Hz, PMe_3). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{13}\text{H}_{24}\text{IrPBr}_2$: C, 27.72; H, 4.29. Found: C, 27.97; H, 4.38.

Reactions of 7.

a) With Bromine. 7 (5.0 mg, 1.0×10^{-5} mol) was added to an NMR tube in the dry box. Benzene- d_6 (0.5 mL) was added, and a septum was used to cap the tube. After removing the tube from the dry box, Br_2 (1.0 μL , 1.9×10^{-5} mol) was added by syringe. By ^1H NMR, cyclohexane (δ 1.39 ppm) was the major organic product.

b) With Zinc Bromide. 7 (5.0 mg, 1.0×10^{-5} mol) was added to an NMR tube in the dry box. CD_2Cl_2 (0.5 mL) and ZnBr_2 (2.0 mg, 8.9×10^{-6} mol) were added to the tube, and an instant color change from pale yellow to dark

yellow occurred. By ^1H NMR, cyclohexane (δ 1.40 ppm) was the major organic product.

c) With Hydrogen Peroxide. **7** (5.0 mg, 1.0×10^{-5} mol) was added to an NMR tube in the dry box. Benzene- d_6 (0.5 mL) was added, and after removing the tube from the dry box, H_2O_2 (30%, 10 μL) was added. By ^1H NMR, cyclohexane (δ 1.39 ppm) was the major organic product.

d) With Tetrafluoroboric Acid. **7** (3.0 mg, 6.1×10^{-6} mol) was added to an NMR tube in the dry box. Benzene- d_6 (0.5 mL) and the $\text{HBF}_4 \cdot \text{OEt}_2$ (1.0 mL) were added, respectively. By ^1H NMR, cyclohexane (δ 1.39 ppm) was the major organic product.

e) Irradiation. **7** (3.0 mg, 6.1×10^{-6} mol) was added to an NMR tube in the dry box. Benzene (0.6 mL) was added to the tube, after which the tube was capped and sealed with parafilm. The reaction mixture was photolyzed for 12 hrs. The tube was returned to the dry box and the solvent was removed in vacuo. The residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 ; NMR analysis showed the product to be **6**.

f) Thermal decomposition. 1) Benzene- d_6 . **7** (3.0 mg, 6.1×10^{-6} mol) was added to an NMR tube fused to a ground glass joint in the dry box. Benzene- d_6 (0.6 mL) was added, and the tube was subsequently topped with a vacuum stopcock. The tube was removed from the dry box, immersed in liquid nitrogen, evacuated and sealed. After 43 hrs at 60°C , no reaction occurred, but after 22 hrs at 110°C , NMR analysis showed that 44% of **7** had been converted to **6-d₆** and cyclohexane.

2) Pentane. The same procedure as with benzene- d_6 was carried out with pentane (0.55 mL). After heating the solution in a sealed tube at 110°C for 52 hrs, the tube was broken open in the dry box, the solvent was removed and the residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 . By NMR, the only new products were

17 (88% yield) and cyclohexane.

Irradiation of 5 in neopentane. $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{CH}_2\text{CMe}_3)\text{H}$ (8) was prepared as described for 7 using a glass bomb for a vessel. Column chromatography on alumina (III) resulted only in decomposition. A second preparation was attempted using the same procedure with 5 (127 mg, 3.13×10^{-4} mol) and neopentane (5.0 mL). After the NMR spectrum was taken, the benzene- d_6 was removed in vacuo and the residue was taken up in pentane. The solution was cooled to -40°C and filtered. The filtrate was collected, the solvent was removed in vacuo and the resulting yellow oil was collected. We have been unable to crystallize the compound. For ^1H and ^{13}C NMR spectra, see Table 1. IR (C_6H_{12}): 2106 cm^{-1} ($\nu_{\text{Ir-H}}$).

To obtain complete characterization, the compound was converted to the corresponding bromide derivative (10). In a third experiment, 5 (26.5 mg, 6.53×10^{-5} mol) and neopentane (0.71 mL) were irradiated for five hr in a sealed NMR tube. Following the same procedures as for the synthesis of 9, the reaction mixture was taken up in benzene- d_6 ; by NMR, 61% of 5 was converted to neopentyl hydride 8. Bromoform (10 μL , 1.16×10^{-4} mol) was added to the solution by syringe. After two hr, the solution was chromatographed on a small alumina (III) column with benzene/ether eluent. The first fraction was collected, the solvent was removed in vacuo and the orange solid was recrystallized once from toluene/hexane giving 14.1 mg 10. It was obtained in 46% overall yield (75% yield, corrected for unreacted 5), m.p. 163. ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.42 (d $J=1.9$ Hz, C_5Me_5), 1.26 (d $J=10.2$ Hz, Pme_3), 1.46 (s, CMe_3), 2.20 and 1.52 (d $J=12.2$ Hz, CH_2). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{18}\text{H}_{35}\text{IrPBr}$: C, 38.98; H, 6.36. Found: C, 38.79; H, 6.23.

Irradiation of 5 in pentane. Dihydride 5 (20.3 mg, 5.00×10^{-5} mol) was irradiated following the procedures for a photochemical experiment in an NMR tube in pentane (0.51 mL). After irradiating for 5 hr, the solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 . As indicated in the text, the major product was the primary hydride 16; in most cases ca. 30% secondary hydrides were also observed by $^1\text{H-NMR}$. IR (pentane): 2101 cm^{-1} ($\nu_{\text{Ir-H}}$). Bromoform (10 μL , 1.16×10^{-4} mol) was added to the solution by syringe. After two hr, the solution was chromatographed on a small alumina (III) column with benzene/ether eluent. The first fraction was collected, the solvent was removed in vacuo and the solid was recrystallized twice from hexamethyldisiloxane giving 9.0 mg of $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Ir}(\text{n-C}_5\text{H}_{11})\text{Br}$. It was obtained as yellow/orange crystals in 38% over-all yield (76% yield, corrected for unreacted 5), m.p. 127° . $^1\text{H NMR}$ (C_6D_6): δ 1.52 (d $J=1.9$ Hz, C_5Me_5), 1.29 (d $J=10.1$ Hz, PMe_3), 2.62, 1.20-1.85 (broad, n-pentyl). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{18}\text{H}_{35}\text{IrPBr}$: C, 38.98; H, 6.36. Found: C, 39.34; H, 5.98.

Reactions of Alkyliridium Bromides.

a) With Bromine. The NMR tube solution of 9 (prepared in situ by the reaction of 7 (5.0 mg, 1.2×10^{-5} mol) and bromoform (15 μL , 1.7×10^{-4} mol) in benzene- d_6 (0.5 mL)) was removed from the dry box and bromine (15 μL , 2.9×10^{-4} mol) was added by syringe. By NMR, very little information, except for the resonances for $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)\text{Br}_2$, could be gathered due to spectrum broadening. The volatile products were vacuum transferred into a 5 mL pear shaped flask from which they were sampled by GC. By retention times, only a trace (<2%) of cyclohexyl bromide was detected. Similar results were obtained in CCl_4 and pentane, except that in pentane a higher molecular weight product was detected by GC.

b) With DSO_3F . A solution containing 5 (8.5 mg, 2.1×10^{-5} mol) and pentane (0.59 mL) was photolyzed in an NMR tube for 5.2 hr. The solvent was removed in vacuo and replaced with benzene- d_6 . Bromoform (3.0 μL) was added by syringe. To this solution, DSO_3F was added by syringe. The volatiles were vacuum transferred, and an NMR analysis revealed the pentane to be $\text{CH}_3(\text{CH}_2)_2\text{CH}_2\text{D}$ (integration: $\text{CH}_3/\text{CH}_2 = 0.86$).

c) With HgCl_2 . 10 (5.0 mg, 1.2×10^{-5} mol) and benzene- d_6 (0.55 mL) were added to an NMR tube. HgCl_2 (10.2 mg, 3.76×10^{-5} mol) and toluene (6.0 μL) as an internal standard were added. A yellow precipitate (presumably $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)(\text{PMe}_3)\text{IrBrCl}$) started to form within one min. After two hrs, the NMR tube was removed from the dry box and centrifuged. The ^1H NMR spectrum showed two new resonances at δ 1.12 (2H) and 0.57 (9H) for neopentylmercuric chloride (as compared to an authentic sample). Br_2 (3 μL) was added to the reaction mixture. After 24 hrs, the resonances for neopentylmercuric chloride had disappeared, and new resonances for neopentylbromide (as compared to an authentic sample) at δ 0.79 (9H) and 2.87 (2H) had grown in (yield > 98%). This assignment was corroborated by a comparison of GC retention time of the organic product with that of neopentyl bromide.

Competition Experiments. To gather ^1H NMR data for the cycloalkyl-hydrido-iridium complexes, the irradiation of 5 in the appropriate cycloalkane was carried out. In a typical experiment, 5 (7.9 mg, 1.95×10^{-5} mol) was added to an NMR tube in the dry box. Cyclopentane (0.60 mL) was added by syringe. The tube was capped, removed from the dry box and sealed with parafilm. The reaction mixture was irradiated for five hours, the solvent was removed in vacuo and the remaining residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 (0.55 mL) for ^1H NMR analysis. For NMR data, see Table 4.

The other cycloalkane irradiations were carried out in similar fashion; amounts of reagents and exceptions to the general procedure are given below: cyclooctane (5, 8.2 mg, 2.02×10^{-5} mol; cyclooctane, 0.50 mL); cyclopropane (5, 12.5 mg, 3.08×10^{-5} mol; cyclopropane, 3.0 mL) using a glass bomb as a reaction vessel. In the cyclooctane reaction, we observe a second hydride (doublet at $\delta -17.88$, $J = 37.2$ Hz) which is unidentified.

A representative competition experiment was carried out as follows: 5 (11.1 mg, 2.74×10^{-5} mol) was added to an NMR tube in the dry box. Cyclohexane (240 μ L, 2.22×10^{-3} mol) and then cyclopentane (250 μ L, 2.66×10^{-3} mol) were added by syringe. The tube was capped, removed from the dry box and sealed with parafilm. The reaction mixture was irradiated for five hrs. The solvent was then removed from the reaction mixture in vacuo and the remaining residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 (0.55 mL) for ^1H NMR analysis.

Crossover Experiments. 5 (11.0 mg, 2.71×10^{-5} mol) was loaded into an NMR tube fused to a ground glass joint and topped with a vacuum stopcock. Using a bulb with known volume (141 mL), cyclohexane- d_{12} (321.5 torr, 2.44×10^{-3} mol) and then neopentane (401.5 torr, 3.05×10^{-3} mol) were expanded into the evacuated bulb and subsequently condensed in the NMR tube. The tube was sealed, and the reaction mixture was photolyzed for 5 hrs. Afterwards, the tube was taken back into the dry box, the solvent was removed in vacuo and the residue was taken up in benzene- d_6 (0.55 mL). The amount of crossover product (7- d_{11}) was then determined by ^1H NMR by examining the hydride region of the spectrum. The crossover product accounted for seven percent of the product hydrides and deuterides. Upon examining the C_5Me_5 region of the spectrum, the ratio of 8 to all the isotopic isomers of 7 was 1.56.

In the photolysis of 5 (11.0 mg, 2.71×10^{-5} mol) in cyclohexane (320.2 torr, 2.45×10^{-3} mol) and neopentane (400.2 torr, 3.04×10^{-3} mol) carried

out under the same conditions and with the same procedures as above, the ratio of 8 to 7 was 1.14. Therefore, the isotope effect k_H/k_D is = 1.38.

A second crossover experiment was run under the same conditions as above but with 5 (10.5 mg, 2.59×10^{-5} mol), cyclohexane- d_{12} (160.9 torr, 4.47×10^{-3} mol) and neopentane (32.2 torr, 8.95×10^{-4} mol) using a 516 mL bulb. In this case, the crossover product 7- d_{11} accounted for eight percent of the hydride and deuteride products.

5 (14.8 mg, 3.64×10^{-5} mol) and cyclohexane- d_{12} (1.0 mL) were added to a glass bomb in the dry box. After removing the bomb from the dry box, the reaction mixture was put through three freeze/pump/thaw cycles and then photolyzed for 40 min. The hydrogen evolved was collected by Toepler pumping through two liquid nitrogen traps. A mass spectral analysis showed >99.9% of the hydrogen was H_2 .

A similar photolysis of 5 (13.2 mg, 3.25×10^{-5} mol) in cyclohexane- d_{12} (0.8 mL) for 24 hrs led to some exchanged hydrogen by mass spectral analysis. 20% of the hydrogen gas was HD and 1.7% D_2 .

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by the Director, Office of Energy Research, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Chemical Sciences Division of the U. S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098. We are grateful to Mr. Thomas Gilbert and Mr. J. Michael Buchanan for improvements in the preparation of iridium dihydride 5, and to Professors Richard Andersen and Earl Muetterties for helpful discussions. We acknowledge a generous gift of iridium chloride from the Johnson-Matthey Corporation, and thank Professor John E. Bercaw for helpful discussions and for allowing us to quote his results prior to publication.

References and Notes

- 1) (a) Parshall, G. W. "Catalysis," Kemball, C., ed., Chem. Soc. Specialist Report, 1977, 1, 335. (b) Shilov, A.E.; Shteinman, A. A. Coord. Chem. Rev. 1977, 24, 97. (c) Webster, D. E. Adv. Organomet. Chem. 1977, 15, 147. (d) Parshall, G. W., "Homogeneous Catalysis," Wiley-Interscience, N. Y., 1980, p. 179ff. (e) Collman, J. P.; Hegedus, L. S. "Principles and Applications of Organotransition Metal Chemistry," University Science Books, Mill Valley, CA, 1980, p. 222ff; (f) Halpern, J. Disc. Faraday Soc. 46, 7 (1968).
- 2) (a) Walling, C. "Free Radicals in Solution," Wiley, N. Y., 1957. (b) Huyser, E. S. "Free Radical Chain Reactions," Wiley, N. Y., 1970. (c) Pryor, W. A. "Free Radicals," McGraw-Hill, N. Y., 1966.
- 3) (a) Beckwith, A. L. J.; Duong, T. J. C. S. Chem. Comm. 1978, 413. (b) Cohen, Z.; Keinan, E.; Mazur, Y.; Haim Varkony, T. J. Org. Chem. 1975, 40, 2141, and references cited there. (c) Deno, N. C.; Jedziniak, E. J.; Messer, L. A.; Meyer, M. D.; Stroud, S. G.; Tomezsko, E. S. Tetrahedron, 1977, 33, 2503.
- 4) (a) Gol'dshleger, N. F.; Tyabin, M. B.; Shilov, A. E.; Shteinman, A. A. Zh. Fiz. Khim. 1969, 43, 2174. (b) Hodges, R. J.; Webster, D. E.; Wells, P. B. J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Comm. 1971, 462.
- 5) (a) Kochi, J. K., in Kochi, J. K., "Free Radicals", Wiley-Interscience, N. Y., 1973, Ch. 11. (b) Howard, J. A., in Kochi, J. K., "Free Radicals", Vol. II, Wiley-Interscience, N. Y., 1973, Ch. 12.
- 6) (a) Groves, J. T. Adv. Inorg. Biochem. 1979, 1, 119. (b) Groves, J. T.; Nemo, T. E.; Myers, R. S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 1032. (c) Groves, J. T.; Van Der Puy, M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1976, 98, 5290. (d) Chang, C. K.; Kuo, M.-S. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 3413. (e) Groves, J. T.; Kruper, W. J., Jr. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 7613. (f) Hill, C. L.; Schardt, B. C. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1980, 102, 6374; Sofranko, J. A.; Eisenberg, R.; Kampmeier, J. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1980, 102, 1163.
- 7) For examples, see (a) Foley, P.; Whitesides, G. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 2732. (b) Clark, H. C.; Goel, A. B.; Goel, S. Inorg. Chem. 1979, 18, 2803. (c) Simpson, S. J.; Turner, H. W.; Andersen, R. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 7728. (d) Empsall, H. D.; Hyde, E. M.; Markham, R.; McDonald, W. S.; Norton, M. C.; Shaw, B. L.; Weeks, B. J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. 1977, 589. (e) Al-Salem, N. A.; McDonald, W. S.; Markham, R.; Norton, M. C.; Shaw, B. L. J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans 1980, 59, and references cited there. (f) Andersen, R. A.; Jones, R. A.; Wilkinson, J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. 1978, 446. (g) Simpson, S. J.; Turner, H. W.; Andersen, R. A. Inorg. Chem. 1981, 20, 2991. (h) Chappell, S. D.; Cole-Hamilton, D. J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. 1980, 238. (i) Tulip, T. H.; Thorn, D. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981, 103, 2448. (j) Adams, R. D.; Selegue, J. P. Inorg. Chem. 1980, 19, 1795. (k) Werner, H.; Werner, R. J. Organomet. Chem. 1981, 209, C60.

- 8) (a) Hale, L. F.; Armentrout, P. B.; Beauchamp, J. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981, 103, 962. (b) Allison, J.; Freas, R. B.; Ridge, D. P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 1332. (c) Ozin, G. A.; McIntosh, D. F.; Mitchell, S. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981, 102, 1574. (d) Breckenridge, W. H.; Renlund, A. M. J. Phys. Chem. 1979, 83, 303. (e) Remick, R. J.; Asunta, T. A.; Skell, P. S.; J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 1320.
- 9) (a) Parshall, G. W. Accts. Chem. Res. 1975, 8, 113. (b) Berry, M.; Elmitt, K.; Green, M. L. H. J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. 1979, 1950. (c) Green, M. L. H.; Berry, M.; Couldwell, C.; Prout, K. Nouv. J. Chim. 1977, 1, 187. (d) Berry, M.; Elmitt, K.; Green, M. L. H. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans. 1971, 1508. (e) Ittel, S. D.; Tolman, C. A.; Krusic, P. J.; English, A. D.; Jesson, P. J. Inorg. Chem. 1978, 17, 3432. (f) Ittel, S. D.; Tolman, C. A.; English, A. D.; Jesson, P. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1976, 98, 6073; 1978, 100, 7577. (g) Bradley, M. G.; Roberts, D. A.; Geoffroy, G. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981, 103, 379. (h) Rausch, M.D.; Gastingier, R.G.; Gardner, S.A.; Brown, R.K.; Wood, J.S. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1977, 99, 7870.
- 10) (a) Crabtree, R. H.; Mihelcic, J. M.; Quirk, J. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 7738. (b) Crabtree, R. H.; Mellea, M. F.; Mihelcic, J. M.; Quirk, J. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 107.
- 11) Baudry, D.; Ephritikine, M.; Felkin, H. J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Commun. 1980, 1243.
- 12) Janowicz, A. H.; Bergman, R. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 352.
- 13) Kang, J. W.; Moseley, K.; Maitlis, P. M. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1969, 91, 5970.
- 14) (a) Geoffrey, G. L.; Wrighton, M. S. "Organometallic Photochemistry"; Academic Press: New York, 1979. (b) Pierantozzi, R.; Geoffrey, G. L. Inorg. Chem. 1980, 19, 1821 and references cited there.
- 15) Following submission of the preliminary communication, an alternative preparation of complex 5 was reported: Isobe, K.; Bailey, P. M.; Maitlis, P. M. J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans., 1981, 2003.
- 16) Although this system seems to avoid it, intramolecular C-H activation in coordinated Me_3P ligands is known: see, for example, (a) Chiu, K. W.; Wong, W.-K.; Wilkinson, G. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun. 1981, 451. (b) Rathke, J. W.; Muetterties, E. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1975, 97, 3272. (c) Al-Jibori, S.; Crocker, C.; McDonald, W. S.; Shaw, B. L. J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans. 1981, 1572 and references cited there.
- 17) The qualitative behavior of these photolytic reactions is reproducible, but they are relatively inefficient, and the buildup of small amounts of unidentified absorbing materials tends to make the rates decrease as the reaction proceeds. This has prevented us from carrying several of them to completion, and has also discouraged attempts to measure quantum yields. As a result of these factors, the C-H activation reactions require a relatively intense light source and in some cases extended reaction times (these typically ranged from 5 to 25 hr, depending on the substrate). Photolyses were carried out by irradiating carefully degassed solutions of the air-sensitive dihydride in sealed or tightly

capped pyrex NMR tubes, using a focused-beam Oriel photolysis apparatus equipped with a 450 watt mercury lamp. Careful adjustment of the beam was required to achieve substantial conversion of the dihydride to product.

- 18) See, for example: (a) Labinger, J. A.; Braus, R. J.; Dolphin, D.; Osborn, J. A. J. C. S. Chem. Comm. 1970, 612. (b) Jensen, F. R.; Knickel, B. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1971, 93, 6339. (c) Pearson, R. G.; Muir, W. R. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1970, 92, 5519. (d) Lau, K. S. Y.; Fries, R. W.; Stille, J. K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1974, 96, 4983. (e) Labinger, J. A.; Osborn, J. A. Inorg. Chem. 1980, 19, 3230.
- 19) This was established by carrying out the photolysis to low conversion (approx. 40 min; ca. 10% conversion), so that the isotopic labeling in the primary product of the reaction could be clearly identified. After prolonged photolysis (5 hr), some HD and D₂ begin to appear in the reaction mixture, presumably due to secondary photoreactions of the product.
- 20) Pryor, W. A.; Tang, F. Y.; Tang, R. H.; Church, D. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1982, 104, 2885, and references cited there.
- 21) Baghal-Vayjooee, M. H.; Benson, S. W. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1979, 101, 2838.
- 22) Bergman, R. G. Accts. Chem. Res. 1980, 13, 113.
- 23) Chock, P. B.; Halpern, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1966, 88, 3511.
- 24) Kitaura, K.; Obara, S.; Morokuma, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1981, 103, 2891.
- 25) Abis, L.; Sen, A.; Halpern, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1978, 100, 2915.
- 26) Mays, M. J.; Simpson, R. N. F.; Stefanini, F. P. J. Chem. Soc. A. 1970, 3000.
- 27) Howarth, O. W.; McAteer, C. H.; Moore, P.; Morris, G. E. J. C. S. Chem. Comm. 1982, 745.
- 28) Isolation of the hydridoalkyl complexes and resubjection to irradiation shows that they do in fact undergo photoinduced reductive elimination. However, if this were occurring to a significant extent during the irradiation of dihydride 5, dependence of the product distribution on the extent of conversion should be observed, because at early conversion the dihydride is present in sufficient concentration to absorb most of the incident light, and this becomes less true as reaction proceeds. However, the ratio of products formed, as measured by integration of their hydride resonances in the NMR, does not change substantially throughout the irradiation. It appears that the absorbing impurity referred to in ref. 17, which retards the decomposition of dihydride 5 as the reaction proceeds, apparently also serves to prevent photochemical decomposition of the hydridoalkyl products.
- 29) Schwartz, J.; Labinger, J. A. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. (Engl.) 1976, 15, 333.

- 30) Hoyano, J. K.; Graham, W. A. G. J. Am. Chem. Soc. **1982**, 104, 3723.
- 31) Jensen, F. R.; Rickborn, B., "Electrophilic Substitution of Organo-mercurials", McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968; Makarova, L. G.; Nesmeyanov, A. N., "The Organic Compounds of Mercury", North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 1967.
- 32) See, for example, Page, M. I.; Jencks, W. P. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **1971**, 68, 1678.
- 33) For an excellent discussion of the factors which control the relative rates of chemically similar intra- and intermolecular reactions, see Illuminati, G.; Mandolini, L. Accts. Chem. Res. **1981**, 14, 95.
- 34) Bercaw, J. E.; Erwin, D. K., private communication; Erwin, D. K., Ph. D. Thesis, California Institute of Technology, 1979.
- 35) Booth, B. L.; Haszeldine, R. N.; Hill, M. J. Organomet. Chem. **1969**, 16, 491.

Table 1. ^1H and ^{13}C NMR spectra for $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{C}_6\text{H}_{11})\text{H}$ (7) and $(\eta^5\text{-C}_5\text{Me}_5)\text{Ir}(\text{PMe}_3)(\text{CH}_2\text{CMe}_3)\text{H}$ (8).^a

^1H spectra	7	8
C_5Me_5	1.87 dd (1.8, 0.7)	1.82 dd (1.7, 0.7)
PMe_3	1.24 d (9.5)	1.21 d (9.6)
Ir-H	-18.67 d (37.0)	-17.67 d (37.1)
Ir-R	1.50-2.30 broad	1.28 s (CMe_3) 1.5 m (CH_2)
^{13}C spectra		
C_5Me_5	92.36 d (3.4)	92.00 d (3.4)
$\text{C}_5(\text{CH}_3)_5$	10.75 s	10.62 s
$\text{P}(\text{CH}_3)_3$	19.69 d (35.7)	19.68 d (36.7)
Ir-R	3.27 d (7.1) $\alpha\text{-C}$ 44.58 d (4) $\beta\text{-C}$ 43.96 d (2) $\beta\text{-C}$ 32.85 s $\gamma\text{-C}$ 32.92 s $\gamma\text{-C}$ 28.33 s $\delta\text{-C}$	6.20 d (7.1) CH_2 33.83 s (CH_3) ₃ 35.71 s $\text{C}(\text{CH}_3)_3$

^aAll spectra recorded in C_6D_6 , coupling constants in Hz.

Table 2. ^1H NMR shifts for the alkyl hydrides produced upon irradiation of 5 in "non-saturated hydrocarbon" organic solvents.^a

<u>Substrate</u>	<u>$\text{C}_5\text{Me}_5(\text{J})^{\text{b}}$</u>	<u>$\text{PMe}_3(\text{J})^{\text{c}}$</u>	<u>$\text{IrH}(\text{J})^{\text{d}}$</u>
acetonitrile	1.72(1.3) ^e	1.22(10.1)	-17.23(36.5)
tetramethylsilane ^f	1.80(1.9) ^e	1.17(9.8)	-17.08(38.4)
tetrahydrofuran	1.80 ^g	1.42(10.3)	-16.64(34)
	1.87	1.34(10.3)	-17.09(34)
	1.94	1.15(10.2)	-17.65(36)
		1.14(9.5)	-18.07(36)

^a C_6D_6 . ^bdoublet of doublets, coupling in Hz. ^cdoublet, coupling in Hz. ^ddoublet, coupling in Hz. ^eunable to detect the smaller coupling. ^ftrimethylsilyl resonance is a singlet at δ 0.35. ^goverlapping peaks prevent the assignment of all the C_5Me_5 resonances and accurate measurement of the coupling constants.

Table 3. Relative rates of reaction of $(C_5Me_5)Ir(PMe_3)$ with Hydrocarbons.^a

<u>Hydrocarbon</u>	<u>Relative Rate</u>
Benzene	4.0
Cyclopropane	2.65
Neopentane	1.14
Cyclohexane	1.0
Cyclodecane	0.23
Cyclooctane	0.09



^aIn each case, mixtures of two hydrocarbons were used as solvent, as described in the text. Relative rates listed are ratios of the two products, corrected for the number of hydrogens available in each hydrocarbon.

Table 4. $^1\text{H-NMR}$ Chemical Shifts in Metal Hydride Region for Hydridoalkyl Products Formed in C-H Activation Reactions.^a









<u>Hydrocarbon</u>	<u>Chemical Shift (ppm)</u>	<u>Coupling Constant (Hz)</u>
Cyclopropane	-18.16	34.4
Cyclopentane	-18.16	33.9
Cyclohexane	-18.67	37.0
Cyclooctane	-18.64	36.6
Cyclodecane	-18.50	37.2
Neopentane	-17.67	37.1
p-Xylene: benzyl	-17.56	38.6
aryl	-16.68	39.0
Benzene	-17.04	36.8
Propane: primary	-17.81	37.0
secondary	-18.51	36.5
n-Pentane: primary	-17.96	38.0
secondary	-18.50	39.5
	-18.54	38.0
	-18.61	38.9

^aChemical shifts are recorded relative to tetramethylsilane, in the indicated hydrocarbon as solvent. Data from competition experiments carried out in binary solvent mixtures demonstrated that the effect of changing solvents on chemical shift is very small.



Scheme 1




Scheme 2




Scheme 3









Scheme 4



Scheme 5




Scheme 6



6


Scheme 7



2 ($\text{R}' = \text{Ph}$)


5 ($\text{R}' = \text{Me}$)

11



7 ($\text{R} = \text{C}_6\text{H}_{11}$, $\text{R}' = \text{Me}$)




8 ($\text{R} = \text{CH}_2^t\text{-Bu}$,
 $\text{R}' = \text{Me}$)






12

Scheme 8


(A)








(B)




Scheme 9




Scheme 10



Scheme II



Scheme 12



17

Scheme 13









Figure Caption

Fig. 1. (a) ^1H -NMR spectrum (200 MHz) of mixture obtained upon photolysis of dihydride 5 in a 1:1 mixture of neopentane and cyclohexane. (b) ^1H -NMR spectrum of mixture obtained upon photolysis of dihydride 5 in 1:1 mixture of neopentane and cyclohexane- d_{12} . In each case, the lower part of the drawing illustrates the hydride region; inset shows C_5Me_5 region of the spectrum. Peak assignments are indicated on the drawing.

(a)



(b)



This report was done with support from the Department of Energy. Any conclusions or opinions expressed in this report represent solely those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of The Regents of the University of California, the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory or the Department of Energy.

Reference to a company or product name does not imply approval or recommendation of the product by the University of California or the U.S. Department of Energy to the exclusion of others that may be suitable.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION DEPARTMENT
LAWRENCE BERKELEY LABORATORY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720