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Abstract

The reaction between [1,2,4-(Me₃C)₃C₅H₄]₂CeH, referred to as Cp’₂CeH, and
CH₃X where X is Cl, Br, I, OMe and NMe₂, are described. The reactions fall into
three distinct classes. Class a, where X = Cl, Br and I rapidly form Cp’₂CeX and CH₄
without formation of identifiable intermediates in the 'H NMR spectra. Class b, where
X = OMe proceeds rapidly to Cp’₂Ce(η²-CH₂OMe) and H₂ and then to Cp’₂CeOMe
and CH₄. The methoxymethyl derivative is sufficiently stable to be isolated and
characterized and it is rapidly converted to Cp’₂CeOMe in presence of BPh₃. Class c,
where X = NMe₂ does not result in formation of Cp’₂CeNMe₂, but deuterium labeling
experiments show that H for D exchange occurs in NMe₂. Density functional
calculations DFT(B3PW91) on the reaction of (C₅H₅)₂CeH, referred to as Cp₂CeH,
and CH$_3$X show that the barrier for α-CH activation, resulting in formation of Cp$_2$Ce(η$^2$-CH$_2$X), proceeds with a relatively low activation barrier (∆G$^\ddagger$) but the subsequent ejection of CH$_3$ and trapping by H$_2$ has a higher barrier; the height of the second barrier lies in the order F, Cl, Br, I < OMe << NMe$_2$, consistent with the experimental studies. The DFT calculations also show that the two-step reaction, which proceeds through a carbenoid intermediate, has a lower barrier than a direct one-step σ bond metathesis mechanism. The reaction of Cp$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe and BPh$_3$ is calculated to be a low barrier process and the ylide, CH$_2$($^+$)BPh$_3$($^-$), is a transition state and not an intermediate.

**Introduction**

The reaction between CH$_3$F and [1,2,4-(Me$_3$C)$_3$C$_5$H$_2$]$_2$CeH, referred to as Cp’$_2$CeH in this article, to give CH$_4$ and Cp’$_2$CeF has been described recently.$^1$ The net reaction involves a Ce-H for C-F exchange that is strongly exoergic; ∆G for the model system (C$_5$H$_5$)$_2$CeH and CH$_3$F in gas phase was calculated by DFT methods to be -77 kcal mol$^{-1}$. Although the C-F BDE in CH$_3$F is 108 kcal mol$^{-1}$,$^2$ the Ce-F bond is considerably stronger, the average Ce-F bond enthalpy of CeF$_3$(g) is 153 kcal mol$^{-1}$,$^3$ and the net reaction is exothermic. The mechanism of the exchange reaction does not proceed by a σ-bond metathesis transition state as shown by calculational and experimental studies. The calculated activation energy in the model system for a σ-bond metathesis is 31 kcal mol$^{-1}$ relative to the reactants, too high for a reaction that is rapid and irreversible at 20°C. The high energy barrier originates from the methyl group occupying the β-site in the 4c-4e metathesis transition state I, resulting in a five coordinate carbon atom that is high in energy. Calculations showed that an activation energy of only 18 kcal mol$^{-1}$ was required when an α-CH activation occurs in
transition state II. In transition state II, the product, CH$_4$, was derived from trapping of the CH$_2$ fragment by dihydrogen. Thus the lower activation energy pathway suggested by the calculation is a stepwise or indirect process that proceeds by way of carbenoid fragment III. The indirect $\alpha$-CH activation pathway discovered in the calculational studies was supported by experimental studies, such as trapping the CH$_2$ fragment with cyclohexene. Accordingly, the carbenoid pathway for the reaction between CH$_3$F and Cp’$_2$CeH was placed on a firm foundation, but the question of generality was not addressed in the original article.

\[ \text{[Ce]CH}_3 \quad \text{[Ce]} \quad \text{[Ce]} - \text{CH}_2 \]

In this article, the results of the reaction between CH$_3$X, X = Cl, Br, I, OMe, NMe$_2$ and Cp’$_2$CeH are described from a calculational and experimental perspective with the general result that the carbenoid pathway is followed for these simple substituted methane derivatives.

**Results**

**General Experimental Studies**

The experimental methodology that was used in the earlier article is used in the present one. The time evolution of the reaction between Cp’$_2$CeH and the MeX derivatives is followed by $^1$H NMR spectroscopy in either C$_6$D$_6$ or C$_6$D$_{12}$ at 20°C. Since the reactant and product metallocenes are paramagnetic, the Me$_3$C-resonances on the 1,2,4-(Me$_3$C)$_3$C$_5$H$_2$ rings are a convenient probe to assay the extent, relative rates, and cleanliness of the net reactions; the ring methyne-resonances are often not
observed. After the reactions are complete, hydrolysis (H₂O) and GCMS analysis of the hydrosylate is used to identify the organic products in each experiment. As described in the earlier article, the reactions between the metallacycle, [1,2,4-(Me₃C)₃Ce₂] [(Me₃C)₂C₅H₂(CH₃)₆CH₂]Ce, 1, abbreviated Cp’[(Me₃C)₂C₅H₂(CH₃)₆CH₂]Ce or simply as metallacycle, 1, with the MeX derivatives are followed by ¹H NMR spectroscopy and the identity of the organic products is determined by GCMS after hydrolysis.

In the reactions of 1, dihydrogen is not present and cannot serve as a trap for the methylene fragment and therefore intermediates may be observed in the ¹H NMR spectra. In addition, added trapping reagents that do not react with 1 may be employed. The cerium containing products Cp’₂CeX are prepared independently, isolated and characterized as outlined in the Experimental Section or in the text.

**Reaction of Cp’₂CeH or metallacycle, 1, with CH₃X, X = Cl, Br, and I**

The reaction between Cp’₂CeH and CH₃X, X = Cl, Br, and I, are rapid and clean at 20°C, as only resonances due to Cp’₂CeX and CH₄ are observed in the ¹H NMR spectrum, eq 1.

\[
\text{Cp’₂CeH} + \text{CH₃X} \rightarrow \text{Cp’₂CeX} + \text{CH₄} \quad X = \text{Cl, Br, I} \tag{1}
\]
Thus, the net reactions of all of the methylhalides are similar. The reaction between the methylhalides and the metallacycle is slightly more complicated. The reaction with CH₃Cl is clean, since the resonances in the ¹H NMR spectrum due to metallacycle, 1, in C₆D₁₂ disappear within approximately 15 minutes and a new set of Me₃C-resonances, referred to as QCl, appear at δ -1.36 and δ -8.54 in ratio of 2:1, in addition to resonances due to Cp’₂, CeCl, and the metalloocene. Over time, the resonances due to QCl disappear and resonances due to Cp’₂, CeCl increase in intensity. After approximatively three days, the conversion is complete; since the solubility of Cp’₂, CeCl is low in these solvents, mass balance cannot be obtained by integration of the NMR spectrum. When the reaction is complete, hydrolysis of the mixture and analysis of the hydrolysate by GCMS shows the presence of Cp’H and Cp”H where Cp” represents the isomers of 1,2-(Me₃C)-4-(Me₂EtC)C₃H₃ as observed in the reaction with CH₃F.¹ Thus the net reaction between the metallacycle, 1, with CH₃F and CH₃Cl give similar final products, but intermediate, Qₓ, is not detected.¹ As in the reaction of CH₃F, a CH-bond of a Me₃C group in the Cp’-ring acts as a trap of the CH₂ fragment, eq 2.

Since the final products in the case of CH₃F and CH₃Cl are similar, both reactions presumably follow similar mechanisms, viz., the generation of a carbenoid intermediate, Qₓ, followed by ejection of CH₂ and trapping by H₂ in the case of
Cp’₂CeH or the CH bond of a Me₃C-group in the Cp’-ring when H₂ is absent. The only difference between the CH₃F and CH₃Cl reactions is that QCl builds up in the latter reaction and QF does not.

The reaction of CH₃Br and CH₃I with the metallacycle, 1, is similar to that of CH₃Cl, eq 2. In the case of CH₃Br, the resonances attributed to QBr appear at δ -1.36 and δ -8.16 in a ratio of 2:1. Exposure of the metallacycle, 1, to CD₂Br in toluene and examining the organic products, after hydrolysis, by GCMS shows the presence of Cp’H and Cp”H-d₂. This result shows that QBr eliminates CD₂, which is trapped by the Me₃C-groups on the Cp’-ring. No deuterium is detected in solvent toluene and therefore the intramolecular trapping of CD₂ is more efficient than is intermolecular trapping by the solvent CH bonds.

In the CH₃I reaction, two resonances in a 2:1 ratio due to Q₁ at δ -1.3 and δ -7.8 appear within 10 minutes of mixing. After approximately 3 hours resonances due to Cp’₂CeI form and the ratio of Q₁: Cp’₂CeI is 6:1. After 5 days at 20°C, Q₁ disappears and only those resonances due to Cp’₂CeI remain. In all three reactions, the resonances attributed to Qₓ have similar chemical shifts which implies that the Me₃C-groups on the Cp’-rings are in a similar geometrical arrangement; a postulated structure is shown in eq 2 for all three intermediates. This deduction is developed in more detail in the next section.

Reaction of Cp’₂CeH and metallacycle, 1, with CH₃OMe.

Mixing Cp’₂CeH and CH₃OMe in C₆D₆ in an NMR tube results in disappearance of the resonances due to Cp’₂CeH within 15 minutes and appearance of two new sets of Me₃C-resonances at δ -1.11 and δ -10.9 (2:1), Q₁OMe, and δ -2.38 and δ -4.43 (2:1), Q'₁OMe. After two days at 20°C an additional set of resonances appears due
to Cp’₂CeOMe. The ratio of Q₉OMe : Q’₉OMe : Cp’₂CeOMe is 40: 50: 1. Heating at 60°C for 27 days increases the quantity of Cp’₂CeOMe since the ratio is now 3:1:7, eq 3, which only shows the cerium containing compounds that are identified.

\[
\text{Cp’₂CeH} + \text{CH₃OMe} \rightarrow \text{Q₉OMe} \text{ and Q’₉OMe} + \text{H₂} \rightarrow \text{Cp’₂CeOMe} + \text{CH₄} \quad (3)
\]

The identity of Q₉OMe is presumably similar to that of Qₓ, x = Cl, Br, I since the pattern of the chemical shifts of the MeₓC-resonances is similar. The identity of Q’₉OMe remains unknown, though it might be a MeₓO adduct of either Q₉OMe and Cp’₂CeH, since evaporation to dryness and dissolution in C₆D₆ results in resonances only due to Q₉OMe and Cp’₂CeH.

The reaction of CH₃OMe with metallacycle, 1, is rather more straightforward since mixing the two reactants results in appearance of resonances due to Q₉OMe within 20 minutes at 20°C. Evaporation of the solution to dryness, dissolution in C₆D₁₂ followed by heating the mixture to 60°C for a day, then cooling to 20°C and examining the ¹H NMR spectrum shows resonances due to Q₉OMe and metallacycle, 1, in a 11:1 ratio; heating to 60°C for three days does not alter the ratio of Q₉OMe:1 from 11:1. Thus, Q₉OMe has an appreciable lifetime in absence of H₂ and should be isolable, see below. In addition, Q₉OMe and the metallacycle are in equilibrium, eq 4.

\[
\text{Metallacycle, 1} + \text{CH₃OMe} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Q₉OMe} \quad (4)
\]

The equilibrium, illustrated by eq 4, is substantiated by exposing the perdeuterometallacycle, 1-d₅₃ to CH₃OMe in C₆D₁₂. The ¹H NMR spectrum shows resonances due to the C(CD₃₃H₃₃)₃ groups and Q₉OMe after 30 minutes at 20°C. The relative amounts change little over two days. The ²H NMR spectrum also shows
resonances due to the C(CD$_3$)$_3$ groups forming over this period of time. Heating to 60°C for three days results in appearance of resonances due to Me$_2$O-d$_1$, which appear as a 1:1:1 pattern in the $^1$H NMR spectrum at $\delta_H = 3.16$ and $J_{HH} = 1.2$ Hz. The $^1$H NMR spectrum also shows resonances due to H for D exchange in the Me$_3$C groups on the Cp’ rings. After three days at 60°C, the deuterium is preferentially located at the unique Me$_3$C group, but heating the mixture at 60°C for 81 days results in a $^1$H NMR spectrum in which a single hydrogen atom is statistically distributed into the three Me$_3$C groups, see Experimental Section for details. The labeling study shows that insertion of the CH bond of CH$_3$OMe into the metallacycle Ce-C bond is rapid but elimination of CH$_2$DOMe is slow, which rationalizes why Q$_{OMe}$ is an isolable compound.

On a synthetic scale, addition of an excess of dimethylether to a solution of Cp’$_2$CeH in pentane results in a color change from purple to red. Concentrating and cooling the solution gives red crystals of Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe in 37% yield. The methoxymethyl derivative turns deep purple on heating in a sealed tube at 135°C and then melts at 210-213°C. No molecular ion is observed in the mass spectrum but the fragment with highest m/e is [M-CH$_2$OMe]$^+$; a similar fragmentation pattern is observed for Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$Ph, i.e., [M-CH$_2$Ph]$^+$. The $^1$H NMR spectrum of Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe at 20°C shows the Me$_3$C-resonances in a 1:2 ratio, though the resonance of area 2 is broadened, and the OMe resonance is a singlet; the methylene resonance and the ring-methyne resonances are not observed. The variable temperature $^1$H NMR spectrum for the Me$_3$C-groups is shown as a $\delta$ vs $T^{-1}$ plot in Figure 1. The methoxymethyl group resonance is a curve and therefore does not follow Curie law.
Figure 1. $\delta$ vs. 1/T plot for Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OCH$_3$ showing the Me$_3$C resonances on the Cp’ rings and the OMe resonance.

The observation that all of the Me$_3$C-groups are chemically inequivalent at temperatures below about -30°C is rare in Cp’$_2$M(X)(Y) metallocene derivatives. Generally, the two Cp’-rings are free to oscillate about their pseudo $C_5$ axes generating a molecule with averaged $C_{2v}$ symmetry and the CMe$_3$ groups are observed in a 1:2 ratio. As the temperature is lowered the time averaged mirror plane and the $C_2$ axes are removed and the CMe$_3$ groups appear in a 1:1:1 ratio. The inequivalence of all six Me$_3$C-groups was observed in one metallocene, *viz.*, Cp’$_2$UN(Me)C(Ph)C(Ph)$_6$.

In Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe, the molecule can have averaged $C_{2v}$ symmetry if the CH$_2$OMe is monodentate and $C_1$ symmetry if bidentate, accounting for the 1:2 and 1:1:1 pattern, respectively. The inequivalence of all six CMe$_3$ groups means that the molecule has $C_1$ symmetry at the temperature below -30°C, $\Delta G^\ddagger(\text{Tc}=250\,\text{K}) = 10.6$ kcal mol$^{-1}$; the Cp’ rings cannot be freely rotating, and the $\eta^2$-CH$_2$OMe group must be responsible. The ORTEP in Figure 2 shows that the Ce($\eta^1$-CH$_2$OMe) fragment is not planar. Perhaps the orientation of the methyl group, C(36), is sufficient to prevent the Cp’ group from oscillating resulting in a molecule with $C_1$ symmetry at low temperature.
Figure 2 shows an ORTEP of Cp’₂Ce(η²-CH₂OMe); important bond distances and angles are given in the Figure Caption. There is a disorder in the crystal that results from superposition of the two orientations of the individual molecules in a 94:6 distribution, see Experimental Section and Supporting Information for details. The bond distances and angles in the Cp’₂Ce fragment are similar to those previously reported for this fragment.⁴a,5,7 The Ce(η²-CH₂OMe) fragment is not planar since the dihedral angle formed by intersection of the planes defined by CeO(1)C(35) and O(1)C(35)C(36) is 164°. The Ce-C(35) distance of 2.488(4) Å is shorter than that found in (C₅Me₅)₂Ce[CH(SiMe₃)₂], 2.535 Å,⁸ and (C₅Me₅)₂CeCH₂Ph, 2.596(5) Å.⁹ The Ce-O distance of 2.406(2) Å is shorter than the Ce-O distance in Cp’₂CeO₂S(O)(CF₃), where the four independent Ce-O distances in the two individual molecules in the unit cell average to 2.601±0.008 Å¹⁰ but longer than that in (C₅Me₅)CeO[2,6-(Me₅C)₂C₆H₃]₂ where the Ce-O distance is 2.253 ± 0.002 Å,¹¹ or in the cis and trans enediolate isomers of Cp’₂CeOCH=CHOCeCp’₂ where the Ce-O distances are 2.171 ± 0.001 Å and 2.118(3) Å, respectively.⁴a
Figure 2. ORTEP of [1,2,4-(Me,C),C,H],CeCH,OMe, 50% probability ellipsoids.

The non-hydrogen atoms are refined anisotropically and the hydrogen atoms (not shown) are included in calculated positions but not refined: Ce-C_{ave} = 2.84 ± 0.05 Å, range = 2.778(3) to 2.926(3) Å, Ce-C(ring centroid) = 2.57 Å, Cp'(ring centroid)-Ce-Cp'(ring centroid) = 147°, Ce-C(35) = 2.488(4) Å, Ce-O = 2.406(2) Å, C(35)-O = 1.466(4) Å, C(36)-O = 1.414 (4) Å, Ce-O-C(35) = 75.7(2)°, Ce-C(35)-O = 69.5(2)°, C(36)-O-C(35) = 117.2(3)°, C(36)-O-Ce = 160.3(2)°.

Two other structural comparisons are particularly revealing relative to the electronic structure of the methoxymethylene fragment. In organic molecules containing the Me-OC(sp^3) fragment, the average C-O distance is 1.416 Å,¹² which is identical to the C(36)-O(1) distance in the methoxymethyl derivative; the C(35)-O(1) distance of 1.466(4) Å is 0.05 Å longer. Further, the C-O bond in the H,C-OR group lengthens by 0.12 Å when it is deprotonated at the α-carbon atom as shown by calculations on the hypothetical gas phase molecule LiCH,OH relative to CH,OH.¹³ The lengthening of the C-O bond is interpreted as arising from increased carbene character in the methylene carbon of the CH,OH anion. In another comparison, the crystal structure of the methoxymethyl complex, Cp,Zr(Cl)(η^2-CH,OMe), shows that the CH, O distance of 1.414(6)Å is shorter than that of the CH, O distance of 1.449(6) Å.¹⁴ The crystal structure of the benzoxymethyl complex, Cp,Zr(Cl)(η^2-CH,OCH,Ph), shows that the CH, O distance is 1.455(8) Å and close to that of the O-C(benzyl) distance which is 1.456(7) Å.¹⁵ These distances are therefore rather different from those in Cp',Ce(η^2-CH,OMe), Figure 1. In addition, the oxygen atom in Cp,Zr(Cl)(η^2-CH,OMe) is out of the plane defined by the ZrC₂ atoms by 0.51 Å, resulting in the authors description of the Zr(η^2-CH,OMe) fragment as an “intramolecularly stabilized onium ylide”. This description is strengthened by noting
that the oxygen atom in [Me₃O][AsF₆] is decidedly pyramidal since the angles around oxygen sum to 340°.¹⁶

**Reaction of Cp’₂CeH and metallacycle, 1, with CH₃NMe₂.**

Unlike the reactions illustrated in eqs 1 and 3, addition of trimethylamine to a C₆D₆ solution of Cp’₂CeH does not perturb the chemical shift of the Me₃C-resonances at 20°C in the ¹H NMR spectrum. However, mixing trimethylamine with metallacycle, 1, in C₆D₁₂ results in appearance of a new set of Me₃C-resonances in 1:1:1 ratio, though the resonances due to the amine cannot be identified with confidence and a structure analogous to Qₓ, X = NMe₂, seems to be a reasonable postulate. After one hour, the ratio of the metallacycle, 1, to QₙMe₂ is 1:3 and this ratio changes to 1:6 after a day at 20°C. Heating to 60°C from 2 to 15 days then cooling to room temperature establishes the thermodynamic ratio as 1:1:3. Further support for an equilibrium is obtained by heating metallacycle, 1-d₅₃, with CH₃NMe₂ in C₆D₁₂. After one day at 60°C, resonances in the ¹H NMR spectrum due to metallacycle, 1, increase in intensity at the expense of those in the ²H NMR spectrum. In addition, a triplet is observed in the ²H NMR spectrum due to CH₂DNMe₂, δ = 2.12, J_CD = 2Hz. Heating the sample for 33 days at 60°C results in an increase in the paramagnetic resonances due to the C(CD₃)₂(CD₂H) group of the Cp’-rings and their corresponding decrease in the ²H NMR spectrum. The ²H NMR resonance due to trimethylamine-d₅ increases in intensity and complexity and the ¹³C {¹H} NMR spectrum contains a resonance as a 1:1:1 pattern at δ = 46.59 and J_CD = 20 Hz, in addition to a singlet at δ 46.90 due to CH₂DNMe₂ and CH₃NMe₂, respectively, after 33 days at 60°C. The H for D exchange experiment supports an equilibrium similar to that shown in eq 4, for QₙMe₂. Thus, H
for D exchange in CH$_3$NMe$_2$ occurs implicating the formation of Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$NMe$_2$, but no resonance due to methane nor Cp’$_2$CeNMe are observed.

**Reactions of Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe with BPh$_3$**

It is clear that H$_2$ is not able to trap efficiently the CH$_2$ fragment in Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe. Cyclohexene is not able to trap the CH$_2$ fragment, since norcarane is not formed when the two reagents are mixed, in contrast to the reaction of the metallacycle, 1, with CH$_3$F. Thus, another trap that is compatible with the metallocene is needed. Triphenylboron, and indeed BX$_3$ compounds in general, react with diazomethane, CH$_2$N$_2$, with formation of polymethylene, a reaction described by Meerwein eighty years ago; a review of this reaction is available. The specific reaction between BPh$_3$ and CH$_2$N$_2$ yields polymeric material and (Ph$_3$)$_2$B(CH$_2$Ph)$_x$, since on reaction with hydrogen peroxide, PhOH and PhCH$_2$OH are formed. Two related reactions should be mentioned; reaction of Ph$_3$PCH$_2$ and BPh$_3$ yields a 1:1 adduct that gives (PhCH$_2$)$_2$B, Ph$_3$BPPh$_3$ and PPh$_3$ on heating to 205°C and the nitrogenylide Me$_3$NCH$_2$LiBr, and BPh$_3$ gives PhCH$_2$OH and PhOH on alkaline hydrogen peroxide hydrolysis. More recently, the adduct between BPh$_3$ and Me$_2$S(O)(CH$_2$) is isolated and after heating and oxidation, PhCH$_2$OH and PhOH are obtained. Thus, BPh$_3$ appears to be an efficient trap for the CH$_2$ fragment, presumably by forming a Lewis acid-base adduct that subsequently rearranges to a benzylboron compound. Although the perfluoro derivative, (C$_6$F$_5$)$_3$B, is a stronger Lewis acid it is not compatible with Cp’$_2$CeH. The utility of BPh$_3$ as a trap for CH$_2$ in Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe is outlined next.

Mixing Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe with BPh$_3$ in an NMR tube in C$_6$D$_6$ at 20°C results in disappearance of the resonances due to the methoxymethyl derivative and appearance
of resonances due to Cp’₂CeOMe within 10 minutes. Although resonances that may be attributed to an arylboron derivative are apparent in the spectrum, their identification is not clear cut; the $^{11}$B NMR spectrum offers no help since the quantity of (Ph$_3$-)B(CH$_2$Ph)$_x$ is small and the paramagnetism of the cerium compound is likely to shift the broadened resonance. However, hydrolysis of the solution with alkaline hydrogen peroxide and examination of the hydrolysate by GCMS conclusively shows that PhCH$_2$OH and PhOH, in addition to Cp’H, are formed. Thus BPh$_3$ is able to abstract the CH$_2$ group resulting in the net reaction shown in eq 5.

$$\text{Cp’}_2\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe} + \text{BPh}_3 \rightarrow \text{Cp’}_2\text{CeOMe} + \text{Ph}_2\text{BCH}_2\text{Ph} \quad (5)$$

In the reaction illustrated in eq 5, BPh$_3$ is a better trap for CH$_2$ than H$_2$ since the methoxymethyl derivative is formed in presence of H$_2$, eq 3. This observation begets the question of which reagent is a better trap for a CH$_2$ group when the postulated compound Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$X, Q$_X$, is neither detected nor isolated, i.e., the reaction shown in eq 1. This is an important question since the only experimental evidence for formation of Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$F is derived from experiments in which H$_2$ is absent, i.e., eq 2. The success of this type of experiment requires that BPh$_3$ does not react irreversibly with Cp’$_2$CeH.

An NMR tube experiment shows that mixing BPh$_3$ and Cp’$_2$CeH in C$_6$D$_6$ results in a rapid color change from purple to yellow and disappearance of the resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeH. On a synthetic scale, addition of Cp’$_2$CeH and BPh$_3$ in toluene at room temperature results in the appearance of a yellow solution and yellow crystals form on standing overnight. The crystals are due to formation of a 1:1 adduct, whose crystal structure is shown in the ORTEP in Figure 3. Some bond distances and angles are given in the Figure Caption.
Figure 3. ORTEP of [1,2,4-(Me₃C)₃C₅H₂]₂Ce(H)(BPh₃), 50% probability ellipsoids except for H(80). All non- hydrogen atoms are refined anisotropically and all hydrogen atoms, except H(80), are placed in calculated positions and not refined. H(80) is located in the difference Fourier map and refined isotropically. Some bond distances and angles are: Ce-C(Cp’)ave = 2.82 ± 0.09 Å, Ce-Cp’(centroid)ave = 2.54 Å, Cp’(centroid)-Ce-Cp’(centroid) = 136°, Ce-H(80) = 2.37(3) Å, Ce-B = 3.423(3) Å, B-H(80) = 1.26(3) Å, Ce-H(80)-B = 139(1)°.

A comparison between the geometrical parameters in Cp’₂CeH, the adduct with BPh₃, and BPh₃, is shown in Table 1. The cyclopentadienyl ring carbon atoms are nearly eclipsed in the starting hydride and the Cp’(centroid)-Ce-Cp’(centroid) angle is 155°. The refined position of the hydride atom lies off the $C_2$-axis of the metallocene. When BPh₃ interacts with the hydride, the Cp’(centroid)-Ce-Cp’(centroid) angle closes to 136°, the cyclopentadienyl-ring carbons on the Cp’-rings are now staggered, but the Cp’(centroid)-Ce distances are essentially equal in the two structures. The HBPh₃ group does not lie on the $C_2$-axis of the complex, but it
is oblique to the Cp’₂Ce fragment with a Ce-H(80)-B angle of 139(1)°. This orientation forces the BPh₃ group close to the Cp’₂Ce fragment with a Ce⁻⁻⁻B distance of 3.423(3) Å. The Ce-H distance in the complex increases to 2.35 Å from 1.90 Å in the BPh₃-free complex and the H-B distance is 1.26 Å. The refined H-B distance seems reasonable since an equivalent distance of 1.34 Å is found in (C₅H₅)₂V(H)(B(C₆F₅)₃), where the V-H-B angle is 153°.²⁴ The H-B distance tends to be longer by about 0.2 Å when the HBR₃ group is inner sphere rather than outer sphere since, for example, the H-B distance in [(C₅H₅)₂V(CO)]₂[HB(C₆F₅)₃] is 1.14(2) Å²⁵ and 1.06(6) Å in [(C₅Me₅)₂ZrH][HB(C₆F₅)₃].²⁶ The B-C distance lengthens by 0.05 Å on complex formation and the C-B-C angles contract from 120° in planar BPh₃, in which the phenyl groups are orientated as the blades of a propeller, to 111.8 ± 3.2° (ave.) in the complex. However, the C-B-C angles are unequal in the adduct: they range from 107.0(2)° for C(35)-B-C(47) to 114.3(3)° and 114.0(3)° for the other two angles at boron. The geometrical parameters in Cp’₂Ce(H)(BPh₃) are consistent with the view that the Ce-H-BPh₃ interaction is a 3 center-2 electron bond and the obtuse Ce-H-B angle implies a closed 3-center interaction in the solid state, i.e., there is electron density shared between the Ce and B atoms.²⁷

Table 1. Comparison of Bond Lengths and Angles in Cp’₂CeH, Cp’₂Ce(H)(BPh₃) and BPh₃.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cp’₂CeH</th>
<th>Cp’₂Ce(H)(BPh₃)</th>
<th>BPh₃³⁻</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ce-C(Cp’)_ave, Å</td>
<td>2.81 ± 0.02</td>
<td>2.82 ± 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce-C(Cp’) range, Å</td>
<td>2.757(7) to 2.840(6)</td>
<td>2.713(3) to 2.933(3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce-Cp’(centroid)_ave, Å</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Orientation\textsuperscript{b} & Eclipsed & staggered \\
Cp'(centroid)-Ce-Cp'(centroid), ° & 155 & 136 \\
B-C, Å & 1.631 ± 0.008 & 1.580 ± 0.005 \\
C-B-C, ° & 111.8 ± 3.2 & 120 \\

\textsuperscript{a} For averaged values, the deviation is the average deviation from the mean.

\textsuperscript{b} The relative orientation of the carbon atoms in the Cp’-rings.


In C\textsubscript{6}D\textsubscript{6} solution the interaction persists, since at 20°C, the resonances due to Cp’\textsubscript{2}Ce(H)(BPh\textsubscript{3}) and those due to added BPh\textsubscript{3} are observed as separate resonances. The variable temperature \textsuperscript{1}H NMR spectra of Cp’\textsubscript{2}Ce(H)(BPh\textsubscript{3}) are shown as a δ vs 1/T plot in Figure 4. At temperatures below 332K (1/T ≅ 0.003) separate resonances are observed for free and coordinated BPh\textsubscript{3}, the para-H resonances are easily distinguished in the adduct and free BPh\textsubscript{3}. Below that temperature the Me\textsubscript{3}C-groups on the Cp’-rings appear in a 1:1:1 ratio consistent with a complex with C\textsubscript{s} symmetry. At higher temperatures, two of the Me\textsubscript{3}C-resonances coalesce, due to the equilibrium illustrated by eq 6, that averages the BPh\textsubscript{3} environments. Thus, at temperatures above T = 330K, some BPh\textsubscript{3} is present in solution and may function as a trapping reagent.

![Graph](image-url)
Accordingly, mixing \(\text{Cp}'_2\text{Ce}(\text{H})(\text{BPh}_3)\) with CH\(_3\)F results in formation of \(\text{Cp}'_2\text{CeF}\) and free BPh\(_3\). The conversion is only about 20% after 10 minutes and therefore the rate of reaction decreases in the adduct. In a separate experiment, the resonances due to \(\text{Cp}'_2\text{CeF}\) are not perturbed in presence of BPh\(_3\) at 20°C. Similarly, addition of CH\(_3\)Br to \(\text{Cp}'_2(\text{H})(\text{BPh}_3)\) in C\(_6\)D\(_6\) results in formation of \(\text{Cp}'_2\text{CeBr}\). Hydrolysis of the solution with alkaline hydrogen peroxide and examination by GCMS shows that only phenol is formed. Hence, at the concentrations used, BPh\(_3\) does not compete with dihydrogen for the CH\(_2\)-fragment.

As shown in an earlier article,\(^5\) metallacycle, \(1\text{-d}_{53}\), is readily prepared by exposing \(1\text{-d}_0\) to C\(_6\)D\(_6\) solvent. The reverse reaction, viz., metallacycle, \(1\text{-d}_{53}\) in presence of C\(_6\)H\(_6\) gives \(1\text{-d}_0\) and C\(_6\)H\(_6\)d\(_6\) implies that aryl CH-bonds in BPh\(_3\) will undergo exchange of H for D with \(1\text{-d}_{53}\). This expectation is fulfilled, since mixing \(1\text{-d}_{53}\) with BPh\(_3\) in an NMR tube in C\(_6\)D\(_{12}\) at 20°C results in a decrease in intensity of the resonances due to the (CD\(_3\))\(_3\)C-groups in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum and an increase in intensity of the resonances of the para-H and meta-H sites; those on the ortho-H sites are not affected. After 2 days at 60°C, the ratio o-H:m-H:p-H is 2.0:0.4:0.09 and after 11 days at 60°C the ratio is 2.0:0.12:0.025.

**Other reactions of \(\text{Cp}'_2\text{Ce}(\eta^2\text{-CH}_2\text{OMe}), \text{Q}_{\text{OMe}}\).**

Several additional reactions of the methoxymethyl derivative are summarized in the Scheme and outlined in this section. Exposure of \(\text{Cp}'_2\text{Ce}(\eta^2\text{-CH}_2\text{OMe})\) to D\(_2\)
results in deuterium being detected in two positions; the Me₃C-groups of the Cp’-ring and the Ce-D sites, i.e., (Cp’)(Cp’-d₁)CeD, as shown by the intensity changes in the ¹H and ²D NMR spectra. In addition, some deuterium accumulates in Me₂O. These results are consistent with the equilibrium illustrated in eq 4 and in the Scheme.

Scheme

The methoxymethyl derivative reacts with MeX, X = F or Br, as shown in the Scheme. In the case of MeBr, resonances due to QΟMe, Cp’₂CeBr, Cp’₂CeOMe and QBr are observed after 1 day at 20°C in a ratio of 8:8:1:2 along with Me₂O. After 4 days, only resonances due to Cp’₂CeBr and Me₂O are observed. In a separate experiment, Cp’₂OMe is not converted to Cp’₂CeBr by MeBr, which shows that the disappearance of the small amount of Cp’₂CeOMe is not due to reaction with MeBr. Methylfluoride also reacts with Cp’₂Ce(η²-CH₂OMe) but the rate is slower that that of MeBr. After 2 days at 20°C, only resonances due to Cp’₂CeCH₂OMe and Cp’₂CeF are observed, but
heating for 1 day at 60°C, resonances due to Cp’₂CeOMe appear. In a separate experiment, Cp’₂CeOMe and MeF do not react. After 9 days at 60°C, the relative ratio of Cp’₂CeF and Cp’₂CeOMe is 1.5:1 and the resonances due to Cp’₂Ce(η²-CH₂OMe) are gone. This result is also consistent with the equilibrium reaction shown in the Scheme.

**Computational studies**

The metallocene used in the experimental studies, Cp’₂CeH was modeled by (C₅H₅)₂CeH, symbolized as [Ce]H, as in earlier articles.¹,4a,⁵ The results obtained with CH₃F are incorporated into this article for completeness. The free energy profiles for the reaction of CH₃X with [Ce]H to form [Ce]X and CH₄ are shown in Figure 5; the activation barrier is defined as the difference in free energy between the reactant and the transition state and symbolized as ΔG‡.

The metathesis pathway with a transition state shown as I in the Introduction, has an activation barrier of 31.1 kcal mol⁻¹ for CH₃F.¹ The calculated activation barriers are 30.4 kcal mol⁻¹ for CH₃I and 43.5 kcal mol⁻¹ for CH₃OMe. These two systems are representative of the series of CH₃X species discussed in this article and the metathesis pathway is unlikely to be followed. The pathway that proceeds via a transition state of type II and on to intermediate III was proposed in the case of CH₃F and this pathway is explored as an alternative pathway below. The activation energy for the CH activation steps in the five reactions is similar but the activation energy for trapping of CH₂ and formation of Cp₂CeX is strongly dependent on the identity of X, Figure 5.
Figure 5. Free energy profiles, in kcal mol$^{-1}$, for the reaction of Cp$_2$CeH, [Ce]H, and CH$_3$X to form [Ce]X and CH$_4$ (X = F, Cl, Br, I, OMe, NMe$_2$). The adduct between CH$_3$X and [Ce]H is not shown.

The reaction begins by coordination of CH$_3$X to [Ce]H by a lone pair on X. Coordination just compensates the loss of translational entropy in the system and the free energy of the adducts is similar to that of the separated reactants; for this reason the adducts are not shown on Figure 5. From the adduct, the hydrogen atom transfers as a proton from the methyl group to the hydride as described for the CH$_3$F reaction. At the transition state, the carbon atom, the hydrogen atom that is leaving the methyl group, and the hydrogen atom attached to Cp$_2$Ce are essentially co-linear as shown in Figure 6a for X = OMe where the H·H·C angle is 170°. The transfer of the proton
results in the formation of H₂ and [Ce](η²-CH₂X) in which the carbon and X atom of the CH₂X group are bonded to the cerium atom. The transition state for the insertion of CH₂ into H₂ for X = OMe is shown in Figure 6b.

Figure 6. Transition states for the formation of CH₄ and [Ce]OMe from CH₃OMe and [Ce]H. (a) elimination of H₂ with a H⁻H⁻C angle of 170°, (b) addition of H₂ to the η²-CH₂OMe group with formation of [Ce]OMe.

The activation barrier (ΔG‡) for the proton transfer reactions is similar for all X: the lowest value of 13.8 kcal mol⁻¹ is obtained for X = OMe, the highest value of 18 kcal mol⁻¹ is obtained for F and values for X = Cl, Br, I and NMe₂ are in between at about 15 kcal mol⁻¹. The values do not follow the experimental gas phase proton dissociation enthalpies for CH₃X, since the values as a function of X, in kcal mol⁻¹ are NMe₂ (> 406), OMe (407), Cl (396), Br (393), I (391). Thus, the activation barrier is not just determined by the acidity of the α-CH bond, even though the relative acidity is the primary reason for the higher activation energy when H₂ and CH₄ are compared, and the identity of X plays a role in determining the barrier. The free energy of formation of [Ce](η²-CH₂X) is only mildly influenced by X with the heavier halides
and the methoxy group being slightly more stable than the reactant and the fluoride and NMe₂ slightly less; therefore the reactants, [Ce]H and CH₂X, and [Ce](η²-CH₂X) are essentially isoenergetic.

The activation barriers for insertion of CH₂ into H₂ vary over a large range of values. For the halides, Cl, Br and I, the activation barriers are about 24 kcal mol⁻¹. A significantly higher activation barrier of 39 kcal mol⁻¹ is calculated for X = OMe and the barrier is even higher, 56 kcal mol⁻¹, for X = NMe₂. The formation of [Ce]X and CH₄ is strongly exoergic for all of the X substituents but the nature of X influences the value of ΔG of the reaction which decreases in the order F, Cl, Br, I > OMe >> NMe₂. Figure 5 shows a clear relationship between the activation energies for insertion of CH₂ into H₂ and the change in free energy of reaction since the highest activation barriers are associated with the lowest thermodynamic driving force. The proton transfer step is a low activation barrier process for all CH₂X reactants but the insertion of CH₂ into dihydrogen proceeds with a higher barrier and is therefore rate determining.

The carbon atom that is part of the three-membered ring, [Ce](η²-CH₂X), is a carbenoid, since it shows reactions associated with a carbene, for example, insertion into H₂, as well as that of an alkyl group, for example, as a proton acceptor, see Scheme. However, the identity of X plays an role in the height of the activation barrier since the CH₂ group is a carbenoid and not a free carbene, which inserts into H₂ without an energy barrier. The values of the activation energy become progressively higher as X changes from F to OMe and to NMe₂. In the latter example, a calculated activation barrier of 56 kcal mol⁻¹ is prohibitively high consistent with the experimental observation that [Ce]NMe₂ does not form from CH₃NMe₂, even though
the net reaction is exoergic by \(-33\) kcal mol\(^{-1}\). In the case of \([\text{Ce}(\eta^2-\text{CH}_2\text{OMe})]\) going to \([\text{Ce}(\text{OMe})]\) and \(\text{CH}_4\), the calculated activation barrier of 39 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) seems too high for an experimental reaction that occurs, albeit slowly at 20°C, but consistent with the experimental fact that \(\text{Cp'}_2\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe}\) is an isolable compound. Similarly, an activation barrier of 24 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) when \(X = \text{F}\), also seems excessive for a net reaction that is rapid at 20°C.

*Figure 7.* Optimized structure of \([\text{Ce}(\eta^2-\text{CH}_2\text{OMe})]\).

The calculated structures of \(\text{Ce}(\eta^2-\text{CH}_2X)\) when \(X\) is a halide are very similar to those for \(X = \text{F}\).\(^1\) Descending the halide series results in longer \(C-X\) bonds and an increase in the Ce-C-X angle that varies from 71° for \(F\) to 86° for \(I\). For \(X = \text{OMe}\), the Ce-C-O angle is close to that for \(X = \text{F}\) while for \(X = \text{NMe}_2\), the Ce-C-N angle is 76°, midway between that for \(F\) (71°) and for \(X = \text{Cl}\) (80°). An important aspect of the calculated structure, which is not obtained from the crystal structure of \(\text{Cp'}_2\text{CH}_2\text{OMe}\), is the position of the two hydrogen atoms on the methylene group, *Figure 7*. This geometrical parameter is related to the hybridization at the carbon atom and therefore to the carbenoid character in the \(\text{CH}_2X\) group. For all \(X\), the two hydrogen atoms are oriented in such a way that the Ce-C axis is essentially in the plane defined by carbon and the two hydrogen atoms. The H-C-H angle is close to 120° for all \(X\). These results show that the hybridization of carbon is \(sp^2\) and that the C-X bond is
essentially constructed from a p-orbital on the carbon atom. Similar geometrical features have been found in the calculated structures of LiCH₂X (X = F, Cl, Br, I, OH, OMe, NH₃).³¹ Thus changing X does not change the orientation of the CH₂ relative to the Ce-C bond nor the H-C-H angle, but changing X changes the Ce-C-X angle, which is the smallest for F (71°) and largest for I (86°). This difference is a consequence of the increasing C-X bond length down the halide column.

The distortion of [Ce](η²-CH₂X) on going to the transition state as H₂ traps the CH₂ fragment is influenced by X as shown in Table 2. The distortions are very similar in the case of Cl, Br, and I; the Ce-C distance increases by around 0.1 Å, the C-X distance increases by about 0.5 Å, while the Ce-X distance decreases by around 0.1 Å. Different and larger distortions are found for X = F, OMe and NMe₂. In the case of F, the Ce-C distance increases by almost 0.4 Å, four times that found for the heavier halide, while the increase in the C-F distance of 0.47 Å is marginally smaller than that for the other halides. The Ce-F bond does not shorten much on going from [Ce](η²-CH₂F) to the transition state. In the case of OMe and NMe₂, the Ce-C distance increases as found for the heavy halides, but the C-X bond increases more (0.66 Å and 0.8 Å for OMe and NMe₂ respectively). Another difference between the halides and the OMe or NMe₂ cases is the H⁻H distance at the transition state; the H⁻H distance is 0.80 Å for all of the halides but it increases from 0.83 to 0.88 Å when X is OMe or NMe₂, respectively.

Table 2. All bond distances are in Å. The first row of each cell gives the distances in the ground state (gs) of the three-membered ring and the second row gives the distances in the transition states (ts) for insertion of CH₂ into H₂. a) The changes in the
bond lengths are given as $\Delta$(Ce-C), $\Delta$(C-X) and $\Delta$(Ce-X) where a positive number is an elongation of the bond from the reactant to the transition state. b) The C–H distance given is the shorter of the two C–H distances at the transition state. c) The H–H distance is given at the transition state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th align="right">Ce-C</th>
<th align="right">C-X</th>
<th align="right">Ce-X</th>
<th align="right">$\Delta$(Ce-C)$^a$</th>
<th align="right">$\Delta$(C-X)$^a$</th>
<th align="right">$\Delta$(Ce-X)$^a$</th>
<th align="right">C–H$^b$</th>
<th align="right">H–H$^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td align="right">2.476</td>
<td align="right">1.510</td>
<td align="right">2.505</td>
<td align="right">+0.374</td>
<td align="right">+0.466</td>
<td align="right">-0.06</td>
<td align="right">1.516</td>
<td align="right">0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td align="right">2.850</td>
<td align="right">1.976</td>
<td align="right">2.445</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right">1.516</td>
<td align="right">0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td align="right">2.547</td>
<td align="right">1.897</td>
<td align="right">2.904</td>
<td align="right">+0.099</td>
<td align="right">+0.524</td>
<td align="right">-0.122</td>
<td align="right">1.485</td>
<td align="right">0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td align="right">2.646</td>
<td align="right">2.421</td>
<td align="right">2.782</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right">1.485</td>
<td align="right">0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br</td>
<td align="right">2.554</td>
<td align="right">2.045</td>
<td align="right">3.07</td>
<td align="right">+0.101</td>
<td align="right">+0.530</td>
<td align="right">-0.119</td>
<td align="right">1.465</td>
<td align="right">0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td align="right">2.655</td>
<td align="right">2.575</td>
<td align="right">2.951</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right">1.465</td>
<td align="right">0.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td align="right">2.559</td>
<td align="right">2.277</td>
<td align="right">3.300</td>
<td align="right">+0.105</td>
<td align="right">+0.516</td>
<td align="right">-0.111</td>
<td align="right">1.452</td>
<td align="right">0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td align="right">2.664</td>
<td align="right">2.793</td>
<td align="right">3.189</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right">1.452</td>
<td align="right">0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMe</td>
<td align="right">2.510</td>
<td align="right">1.461</td>
<td align="right">2.445</td>
<td align="right">+0.107</td>
<td align="right">+0.656</td>
<td align="right">-0.187</td>
<td align="right">1.407</td>
<td align="right">0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td align="right">2.617</td>
<td align="right">2.117</td>
<td align="right">2.258</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right">1.407</td>
<td align="right">0.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMe$_2$</td>
<td align="right">2.508</td>
<td align="right">1.490</td>
<td align="right">2.587</td>
<td align="right">+0.118</td>
<td align="right">+0.814</td>
<td align="right">-0.175</td>
<td align="right">-</td>
<td align="right">-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gs</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td align="right">2.626</td>
<td align="right">2.304</td>
<td align="right">2.412</td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right"></td>
<td align="right">1.314</td>
<td align="right">0.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reaction of [Ce](\eta^2-\text{CH}_2\text{OMe}) with BPh$_3$**

The free energy profile for the reaction of [Ce](\eta^2-\text{CH}_2\text{OMe}) with BPh$_3$ is shown in Figure 8; the structure of the intermediate and the transition state are shown in the Supporting Information. The reaction begins by coordination of BPh$_3$ to the methylene group of [Ce](\eta^2-\text{CH}_2\text{OMe}) yielding a complex where the methylene group is bonded to boron not cerium. Thus, BPh$_3$ successfully competes with [Ce] for
the density at the carbenoid carbon. However, this complex has a free energy of 15.7 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) higher than the separated species [Ce](\(\eta^2\)-CH\(_2\)OMe) and BPh\(_3\) and the difference is mostly due to loss in translational entropy since the energy, \(E\), of the adduct between [Ce](\(\eta^2\)-CH\(_2\)OMe) and BPh\(_3\) is equal to that of the separated species. From this adduct, [Ce]OMe and Ph\(_2\)BCH\(_2\)Ph are formed in a concerted step with an activation barrier of 29 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) relative to separated reactants [Ce]H, CH\(_3\)OMe and BPh\(_3\). This activation barrier is lower than that of 39 kcal mol\(^{-1}\) for the insertion of the methylene group into H\(_2\) showing that BPh\(_3\) is a more efficient trap of the methylene group than is H\(_2\), a result that is supported by experiment. At the transition state, the C-O bond length of 2.07 Å shows that the bond is essentially cleaved. The ylide Ph\(_3\)B\((\overset{\delta\alpha}{\text{CH}})\) is not an intermediate; the geometry of the transition state shows that one phenyl group is bending over the B-CH\(_2\) bond with a C-B-C(phenyl) angle of 79° for one of the phenyl group and 115° for the two other angles. Insertion of the CH\(_2\) group into the B-C bond is therefore concerted with the C-O bond cleavage. The net reaction for [Ce](\(\eta^2\)-CH\(_2\)OMe) and BPh\(_3\) forming [Ce]OMe and Ph\(_2\)BCH\(_2\)Ph is exoergic by 41 kcal mol\(^{-1}\).
Figure 8. The free energy profile, in kcal mol$^{-1}$, for the reaction of [Ce]H, CH$_3$OMe, and BPh$_3$. The free energy profile for the reaction of [Ce]H and CH$_3$OMe, Figure 5, is added for comparison.

Discussion

The reactions between Cp’$_2$CeH and CH$_3$X compounds fall into three distinct classes, depending on the identity of X. When X is a halide, F, Cl, Br or I, class a, the net reaction is a simple H for X exchange that proceeds rapidly without any intermediates detected by $^1$H NMR spectroscopy. Class b is when X is OMe, as the reaction with Cp’$_2$CeH gives the H for CH$_2$OMe exchange product, Cp’$_2$Ce(η)$_2$-.
CH₂OMe), as an isolable compound and H₂. The ¹H NMR chemical shifts of the Me₃C-groups at 20°C have similar values as those observed in the reaction between the metallacycle, 1, with CH₃X, X = Cl, Br, and I, consistent with the postulate that all of these reactions proceed through a common intermediate Qₓ, eq 2 and 3. Since the reaction with metallacycle, 1, does not generate H₂, the intermediates Qₓ are detected, which implies that the barrier for conversion of Qₓ to Cp’₂CeX and CH₄ in presence of H₂, is lower when X is Cl, Br, I than when X is OMe. Class c is the reaction with CH₃NMe₂. No net reaction is observed but deuterium labeling experiments show that H for D exchange occurs in trimethylamine, implying that intermediate QₐNMe₂ forms and that Cp’₂CeH and QₐNMe₂ are in equilibrium. This implies that the H for D exchange proceeds with a low barrier but that the conversion of QₐNMe₂ to Cp’₂CeNMe₂ has an impossibly high barrier. The reactions between Cp’₂CeH and CH₃X proceed by a low barrier intermolecular α−CH activation followed by ejection of the CH₂ fragment and capture by H₂, a higher barrier process whose value is strongly correlated with the identity of X. The latter barriers define the classes a, b or c.

The net reaction of Cp’₂CeH and CH₃X, eq 1, is thermodynamically favorable since the experimentally determined or estimated changes in the enthalpy are exothermic for the reaction shown in eq 7.³²

\[
(C₅Me₅)₂SmH + MeX \rightarrow (C₅Me₅)₂SmX + MeH \quad (7)
\]

ΔH (kcal mol⁻¹): X = Cl, -66; Br, -65; I, -64; OMe, -48; NMe₂, -22.

Although the experimental values are only available for the samarium metallocenes, the trends in ΔH should be similar when the metal is a lanthanide in general, and when the metal is cerium in the present article. As shown in the experimental and calculational results described in this article, even though the net reaction is
thermodynamically favorable for all X, the reactions are under kinetic control. The calculated potential energy surfaces for the gas phase reaction between Cp₂CeH and MeX parallel and therefore illuminate the experimental reactions between Cp’₂CeH and MeX. The calculated free energy profiles show that the net reaction is exoergic, in agreement with experiments, and that a σ-bond metathesis transition state has a higher activation barrier.

A mechanism that is calculated to proceed by a lower energy pathway for X = a halide, is a two-step process in which the first step is a α-CH activation that forms Qₓ and H₂, followed by trapping of CH₂ by H₂, that proceeds with a higher activation barrier, its height defining the classification as either a, b, or c. Since the rate controlling elementary step is the conversion of Qₓ into the products, the structure and bonding in Qₓ is of paramount importance. Accordingly, the structure is calculated for all of the X’s studied and calibrated with the experimental geometry observed in Cp’₂Ce(η²-CH₂OMe). In general Qₓ, Cp’₂Ce(η¹-CH₂OMe), is a three-membered ring in which the carbon atom is sp²-hybridized and therefore the CH₂ fragment is a carbenoid. The bonding between the carbene and M⁻X, when M is electropositive and X is electronegative, is maximized when the σ-lone pair of the carbene interacts with M and the empty 2p orbital of the carbene interacts with X; this is the basis of Bent’s rule. At the transition state, the C-X bond lengthens as the Ce-X bond forms. The orientation of the CH₂ group is such that the carbon p-orbital points toward dihydrogen. The activation barrier for trapping of CH₂ by H₂ parallels the free energy of reaction. When X is a halide, the change in the C-X bond distance going from [Ce][η²-CH₂X) to the transition state is similar for all halides but larger when X is OMe and NMe₂. In addition, the H⁻⁻H distance in the transition state is longer when X is OMe and NMe₂. Thus, the transition state for trapping of CH₂ by H₂ is higher in
energy when $X$ is OMe and NMe$_2$, which in turn implies that the CH$_2$ fragment in [Ce][η$^2$-CH$_2$X] is closer to a free carbene when $X$ is a halide.

**Conclusion**

At first glance, the reactions illustrated in eq 1 are simple H for $X$ metathesis reactions. The reactions, however, are deceptively simple since the mechanism deduced by DFT calculations and trapping experiments is not a one-step, synchronous $\sigma$-bond metathesis, but a two-step process in which a relatively rapid $\alpha$-CH activation results in formation of H$_2$ and Cp$_2$Ce(η$^2$-CH$_2$X), in which the CH$_2$ fragment is a carbenoid. The reactivity patterns are therefore correlated with how closely the carbenoid fragment resembles a free carbene fragment, on one hand, and a methyl group on the other: the closer the resemblance to CH$_2$, the lower the barrier. The calculational and experimental studies outlined in this and an earlier article$^1$ show that the mechanisms of the H for $X$ exchange reaction between Cp$^*$CeH and CH$_3$X is a two-step pathway, and this is a general reactivity pattern. The reactants, CH$_3$X, studied in these articles have only $\alpha$-CH bonds and therefore the question of selectivity does not arise. It will be of interest to examine CH$_3$CH$_2$X reactants in which the choice between $\alpha$- and $\beta$-CH activation processes are available; this selectivity issue will be addressed in another article.

**Experimental Section**

**General**

All manipulations were performed under an inert atmosphere using standard Schlenk and dry box techniques. All solvents were dried and distilled from sodium or
sodium benzophenoneketyl. Anhydrous methylchloride, methylbromide, dimethylether, and trimethylamine were used without further purification. Methyliodide was obtained commercially and purified by distillation onto activated 4 Å molecular sieves. Triphenylboron was obtained commercially and purified by sublimation under dynamic vacuum. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker AV-300 or AV-400 spectrometers at 20°C in the solvent specified. J-Young NMR tubes were used for all NMR tube experiments. Electron impact mass spectrometry and elemental analyses were performed by the microanalytical facility at the University of California, Berkeley. The abbreviation Cp’ is used for the 1,2,4-tri-tert-butylcyclopentadienyl ligand. Unless otherwise specified, samples for GC-MS were prepared by adding a drop of nitrogen-purged H₂O, agitating, and allowing the samples to stand closed for 10 min. The samples were then dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and diluted ten-fold with pentane. A 1 µL sample was injected into a HP6890 GC system with a J&W DB-XLB universal non-polar column, attached to an HP5973 Mass Selective Detector. For samples hydrolyzed with basic hydrogen peroxide, a 3N aqueous NaOH solution was sparged for 10 minutes with nitrogen, and a drop was added to the sample under nitrogen flush. The sample was closed, agitated, and allowed to stand for 10 minutes, after which time a drop of 30% aqueous H₂O₂ was added, the sample was closed briefly, agitated, then opened and allowed to stand for five minutes. The organic and aqueous layers were separated, and the aqueous layer was extracted twice with diethylether. The combined organic layers were then analyzed by GC MS as before.

\[ \text{Cp'}_2\text{CeCHOMe}: \text{Cp'}_2\text{CeH}_5 \] (0.5g, 0.82 mmol) was dissolved in pentane (10 mL). The headspace was evacuated and replaced with dimethylether (1 atm). The solution color changed from purple to red as it was stirred over the course of one hour. The
volume of the solution was reduced to 5 mL under reduced pressure, and the solution was cooled to \(-15^\circ\text{C}\), yielding red crystals. Yield, 0.20 g (0.31 mmol, 37\%). MP 210-213\(^\circ\text{C}\) (sample turned deep purple at 135\(^\circ\text{C}\), melted at 210-213\(^\circ\text{C}\)). \(^1\)H NMR (C\(_6\)D\(_6\), 300MHz): \(\delta\) 35.38 (4H, \(\nu_{1/2} = 260\) Hz), 26.10 (3H, \(\nu_{1/2} = 140\) Hz), -1.11 (36H, \(\nu_{1/2} = 730\) Hz), -10.90 (18H, \(\nu_{1/2} = 15\) Hz); the \(\text{CH}_2\) resonance in the \(\text{CH}_2\)OMe ligand was not observed. MS: no (M)^+ was observed but (M-CH\(_2\)OMe)^+ was found \(m/z\) (calc, found) 605 (100, 100) 606 (39, 52) 607 (17, 22) 608 (6, 10). Anal. Calcd. for C\(_{36}\)H\(_{63}\)CeO: C, 66.32; H, 9.74. Found C, 66.41; H, 10.03. Full crystallographic details are included as Supporting Information. Triclinic cell space group P1(bar): a = 10.4888(5) Å, b = 10.9920(5) Å, c = 15.9639(7) Å, \(\alpha = 99.137(1)\)\(^\circ\), \(\beta = 104.458(1)\)\(^\circ\), \(\gamma = 95.703(1)\)\(^\circ\), \(V = 1740.9(1)\) Å\(^3\).

\(\text{Cp}’\text{CeBr}\): \(\text{Cp}’\text{CeOTf}\) (0.25 g, 0.31 mmol) was dissolved in pentane (10 mL) and Me\(_3\)SiBr (120 µL, 0.91 mmol) was added \textit{via} syringe. The solution was stirred for one day, then taken to dryness under reduced pressure. The yellow solid was dissolved in pentane and filtered. The yellow solution was concentrated until precipitation occurred, warmed to dissolve the precipitate, then cooled to \(-15^\circ\text{C}\), yielding a yellow powder. Yield, 0.095 g (0.13 mmol, 42\%). MP 266-270\(^\circ\text{C}\). \(^1\)H NMR (C\(_6\)D\(_6\), 300MHz): \(\delta\) -2.46 (36H, \(\nu_{1/2} = 550\) Hz), -14.03 (18H, \(\nu_{1/2} = 170\) Hz). MS (M)^+ \(m/z\) (calc, found) 685 (86, 85) 686 (32, 30) 687 (100, 100) 688 (36, 31) 689 (17, 13). Anal. Calcd. for C\(_{34}\)H\(_{58}\)CeBr: C, 59.46; H, 8.51. Found C, 59.61; H, 8.36.

\(\text{Cp}’\text{CeI}\): \(\text{CeI}_3\) • 3 THF\(^{34}\) (18.1 g, 25.0 mmol) and \(\text{Cp}’\text{Mg}\)\(^{35}\) (12.0 g, 24.0 mmol) were stirred at reflux in a mixture of pyridine (10 mL) and toluene (100 mL) for 24 hours. The orange-brown suspension was taken to dryness under reduced pressure. The solid residue was loaded into an extraction thimble (dried at 120\(^\circ\text{C}\) for three days) and extracted with pentane (200 mL) in a Soxhlet extractor for three days. After
12 hours, an orange precipitate appeared in the solvent flask. The extraction was stopped and the flask containing the precipitate was cooled to −15°C, yielding dirty orange powder. The suspension was filtered, and the flask containing the mother liquor was reattached to the extraction apparatus. The extraction was continued until the solution around the extraction thimble was colorless. Recrystallization of the combined orange powder from toluene (100 mL) yielded small, opaque, bright orange crystals. Yield, 10.2 g (14 mmol, 56%). MP 309-311°C. 1H NMR (C6D6, 300MHz): δ 3.20 (18H, ν1/2 = 430 Hz), -8.03 (18H, ν1/2 = 430 Hz), -15.14 (18H, ν1/2 = 220 Hz). MS (M)+ m/z (calc, found) 733 (100, 100) 734 (37, 37) 735 (19, 19) 736 (6,5). Anal. Calcd. for C34H58CeI: C, 55.65; H, 7.96. Found C, 55.76; H, 8.17.

Cp′₂CeHBPh3: Cp′₂CeHβ (0.5 g, 0.72 mmol) and BPh3 (0.2 g, 0.82 mmol) were dissolved in toluene (10 mL). The clear yellow solution was allowed to stand at 19°C overnight, resulting in yellow crystals. The 1H NMR spectrum of the crystals in C6D6 indicated the presence of toluene of crystallization. Yield, 0.50 g (0.53 mmol, 74%). MP 202-205°C. 1H NMR (C7D8, 300MHz): δ 5.35 (18H, ν1/2 = 100 Hz), 4.99 (3H, ν1/2 = 25 Hz), 4.08 (6H, ν1/2 = 30 Hz), -2.42 (6H, ν1/2 = 100 Hz), -6.68 (18H, ν1/2 = 70 Hz), -14.514 (18H, ν1/2 = 200 Hz). Anal. Calcd. for C59H82BCe: C, 75.21; H, 8.77. Found C, 74.88; H, 8.67. Full crystallographic details are included as Supporting Information. Monoclinic cell space group P2₁/n: a = 10.6158(5) Å, b = 22.808(1) Å, c = 20.588(1) Å, β = 100.579(1) °, V = 4900.3(4) Å³. The crystal used for structural determination was grown in a C8D8 solution in an NMR tube, and the asymmetric unit contained half a molecule of C8D12.

**NMR tube reaction of CH₃Br or CH₃I and Cp′₂CeH in cyclohexane-d₁₂.**

Cp′₂CeH was dissolved in cyclohexane-d₁₂ in an NMR tube. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, and the head space was evacuated. In the case of
CH₃Br, 1 atm of the gas was added, while in the case of CH₃I, an excess of the liquid was added via vacuum transfer followed by N₂ (1 atm). In both cases, upon warming to 19°C, the solution immediately turned yellow and a yellow precipitate formed. The 'H NMR spectra contained only resonances due to CH₄ and either Cp’₂CeBr or Cp’₂CeI.

**NMR tube reaction of dimethylether and Cp’₂CeH in cyclohexane-d₁₂.**

Cp’₂CeH was dissolved in cyclohexane-d₁₂ in an NMR tube. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated and replaced with dimethylether (1 atm). The tube was warmed to 19°C, and the purple solution rapidly turned red. After 15 minutes, resonances due to Cp’₂CeH had disappeared from the 'H NMR spectrum. Resonances due to Cp’₂CeCH₂OMe and a new pair of paramagnetic resonances [¹H NMR (C₆D₁₂) δ -2.38 (36H, ν₁/₂ = 15 Hz), -4.43 (18H, ν₁/₂ = 15 Hz)] had appeared. The ratio of Cp’₂CeCH₂OMe and the unknown species, Q’OMe, was approximately 1.3:1. After two days, resonances due to Cp’₂CeOMe had appeared in the spectrum; the ratio of Cp’₂CeOMe, Cp’₂CeCH₂OMe, and Q’OMe was approximately 1:40:48. The sample was heated at 60°C. After one day, the ratio of the three species was 1:6:5, after 12 days 2.5:2:1, and after 27 days 7:3:1.

**NMR tube reaction of trimethylamine and Cp’₂CeH in cyclohexane-d₁₂.**

Cp’₂CeH was dissolved in cyclohexane-d₁₂, the sample was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with anhydrous trimethylamine (1 atm). The tube was warmed to 19°C and allowed to stand. After 2 days, the 'H NMR spectrum contained only paramagnetic resonances due to Cp’₂CeH. The sample was heated at 60°C for 19 days, after which time the 'H NMR spectrum was unchanged.
NMR tube reaction of CH$_3$Cl, CH$_3$Br, or CH$_3$I and

Cp’[\((\text{Me}_3\text{C})_2\text{C}_5\text{H}_2\text{C}(\text{Me}_2)\text{CH}_2\text{Ce}\) in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$.

Cp’$_2$Ce(CH$_2$C$_6$H$_5$) was dissolved in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$ and heated at 60°C for 12 hours, yielding a solution of Cp’[\((\text{Me}_3\text{C})_2\text{C}_5\text{H}_2\text{C}(\text{Me}_2)\text{CH}_2\text{Ce}\]. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with CH$_3$Cl (1 atm), CH$_3$Br (1 atm), or an excess of CH$_3$I via vacuum transfer followed by N$_2$ (1 atm). The tube was warmed to 19°C and allowed to stand.

In the case of CH$_3$Cl, after 10 min, the purple solution had turned red. Resonances due to the starting material had disappeared from the $^1$H NMR spectrum, and a pair of resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeCl$^{4\alpha}$ and two new paramagnetic resonances in a 2:1 ratio, Q$_{\text{Cl}}$, had appeared. $^1$H NMR (C$_6$D$_{12}$) -1.36 ($\nu_{1/2} = 25$ Hz), -8.54 ($\nu_{1/2} = 10$ Hz). The ratio of Q$_{\text{Cl}}$ to Cp’$_2$CeCl was 4:1. After 1 hour, the ratio was 1:2, and after 2 hours, the solution was orange and the ratio was 1:5. After 3 days, the solution had turned yellow, yellow crystals had formed, and only resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeCl remained in the spectrum.

In the case of CH$_3$Br, after 10 min, the purple solution had turned deep orange-brown, and two new paramagnetic resonances in a 2:1 ratio, Q$_{\text{Br}}$, had appeared in the $^1$H NMR spectrum. After 30 minutes, only the new resonances remained in the spectrum, $^1$H NMR (C$_6$D$_{12}$) -1.36 ($\nu_{1/2} = 15$ Hz), -8.16 ($\nu_{1/2} = 10$ Hz). After 7 hours, resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeBr had appeared in the spectrum; the ratio of Q$_{\text{Br}}$ to Cp’$_2$CeBr was 1:2, after 3 days, yellow crystals had formed, and only resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeBr remained.
In the case of CH$_3$I, after 15 min, the purple solution had turned redder, and two new paramagnetic resonances in a 2:1 ratio, Q$_t$, had appeared in the $^1$H NMR spectrum. After 40 minutes, the solution was red-orange, and only the new resonances remained in the spectrum. $^1$H NMR (C$_6$D$_{12}$) $\delta$ -1.29 ($\nu_{1/2}$ = 260 Hz), -7.82 ($\nu_{1/2}$ = 10 Hz). After 3 hours, resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeI had appeared; the ratio of the Q$_t$ to Cp’$_2$CeI was 6:1, after five days, only resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeI remained.

In all cases, GCMS analysis of the hydrolyzate showed one principle component in addition to Cp’H, with (M)$^+$ m/z 248 (Cp’H). Resonances due to Cp”Cp’CeCl, Cp”Cp’CeBr, and Cp”Cp’CeI could not be unequivocally assigned; presumably the line widths are broad and the chemical shift differences relative to the resonances of Cp’$_2$CeCl, Cp’$_2$CeBr, and Cp’$_2$CeI are small, unlike in the case of Cp’Cp’CeF where the line widths are narrow.$^{4a}$ The hydrolysis experiments provided unequivocal evidence for the presence of Cp’H.

**NMR tube reaction of dimethylether and Cp’[(Me$_3$C)$_2$C$_5$H$_2$C(Me$_2$)CH$_2$]Ce in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$**

Cp’$_2$Ce(CH$_2$C$_6$H$_5$) was dissolved in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$ and heated at 60°C for 12 hours, yielding a solution of Cp’[(Me$_3$C)$_2$C$_5$H$_2$C(Me$_2$)CH$_2$]Ce. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with dimethylether (1 atm). The tube was warmed to 19°C, and the deep purple solution rapidly turned red. After 20 minutes, the only paramagnetic resonances in the $^1$H NMR spectrum were those of Cp’$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe. The sample was taken to dryness, and the red solid was dissolved in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$. No new paramagnetic resonances appeared in the $^1$H NMR spectrum. The sample was heated at 60°C, and after one day, resonances due to Cp’[(Me$_3$C)$_2$C$_5$H$_2$C(Me$_2$)CH$_2$]Ce had appeared in the $^1$H NMR.
spectrum; the ratio of Cp’CeCH₂OMe to Cp’[(Me₃C)₂C₅H₂C(Me₂)CH₂]Ce was approximately 11:1. After three days, the ratio was unchanged. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and the sample was warmed to 19°C. This freeze-pump-thaw procedure was performed two more times, and the headspace was refilled with N₂ (1 atm). The sample was heated for three days at 60°C. The ratio of Cp’CeCH₂OMe to Cp’[(Me₃C)₂C₅H₂C(Me₂)CH₂]Ce in the ¹H NMR spectrum remained approximately 11:1.

NMR tube reaction of trimethylamine and Cp’[(Me₃C)₂C₅H₂C(Me₂)CH₂]Ce in cyclohexane-d₁₂.

Cp’Ce(CH₂C₆H₅) was dissolved in cyclohexane-d₁₂ and heated at 60°C for 12 hours, yielding a solution of Cp’[(Me₃C)₂C₅H₂C(Me₂)CH₂]Ce. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with anhydrous trimethylamine (1 atm). The tube was warmed to 19°C and allowed to stand. After 1 hour, the ¹H NMR spectrum contained three new Me₃C- resonances in a 1:1:1 ratio, ¹H NMR (C₆D₁₂) 6.43 (18H, ν₁/₂ = 90 Hz), -2.47 (18H, ν₁/₂ = 40 Hz), -13.60 (18H, ν₁/₂ = 40 Hz), Q_NMe₂; resonances due to the CH₂NMe₂ ligand were not observed. The ratio of the new species to Cp’[(Me₃C)₂C₅H₂C(Me₂)CH₂]Ce was 1:1.3. After 3.5 hours, the ratio was 3:1, and after one day, it was 6:1. The sample was heated at 60°C for 2 days, and the ratio was 1.3:1; the ratios did not change upon heating the sample for an additional 15 days.

NMR tube reaction of dimethylether or trimethylamine and (Cp’-d₂⁷){[C(CD₃)₃]₂C₅H₂[C(CD₃)₂CD₂]}Ce in cyclohexane-d₁₂.

Cp’Ce(CH₂Ph) was dissolved in C₆D₆ and heated at 60°C for 4 days to perdeuterate the ring t-butyl groups. The sample was taken to dryness and the solid residue was
redissolved in fresh C$_6$D$_6$. The sample was heated for an additional 7 days, then taken to dryness and the solid residue was redissolved in C$_6$D$_{12}$. The sample was heated at 60°C for 1 day, yielding a solution of (Cp’-d$_{27}$)[C(CD$_3$)$_3$]$_2$H$_2$[C(CD$_3$)$_2$CD$_2$]Ce. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with dimethylether or trimethylamine (1 atm).

In the case of dimethylether, the tube was warmed to 19°C, and the deep purple solution rapidly turned red. After 30 minutes, the only paramagnetic resonances in the $^1$H NMR spectrum were those of the Cp’-ring C-H and the OMe group of (Cp’-d$_{27}$)$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe. The $^2$H NMR spectrum contained resonances due to the Cp’-ring t-butyl groups of (Cp’-d$_{27}$)$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe. The $^{13}$C NMR spectrum contained a single resonance corresponding to dimethylether. After two days, the spectra were unchanged. The sample was heated at 60°C. After three days, a 1:1:1 pattern (3.16 ppm, $J_{HD} = 1.2$ Hz) had appeared in the $^1$H NMR spectrum just upfield of the signal for dimethylether (3.18 ppm). Resonances due to the Cp’-ring t-butyl groups of (Cp’-d$_{27}$)$_2$CeCH$_2$OMe had also appeared in the $^1$H NMR spectrum; the ratio of the integrated intensities of the t-butyl resonances at -1.11 and -10.90 ppm was 1:7. The ratio of the corresponding peaks in the $^2$H NMR spectrum was 3:1, and a broadened triplet (3.20 ppm, $J_{HD} = 1.5$ Hz) corresponding to partially deuterated dimethylether had also appeared. The ratio of the resonance at -10.90 ppm to the dimethylether resonance was 1:1. In the $^{13}$C NMR spectrum, a 1:1:1 pattern (59.95 ppm, $J_{CD} = 21$ Hz) had appeared just upfield of the signal for dimethylether (60.25 ppm). After seven days, the ratio of the integrated intensities of the resonances at -1.11 and -10.90 ppm in the $^1$H NMR and $^2$H NMR spectra were virtually unchanged, but the ratio of the resonance at -10.90 ppm to the dimethylether resonance in the $^2$H NMR spectrum was 1:4. After 18 days, the ratio of the resonances at -1.11 and -10.90 ppm was 1:2.5
in the \(^1\)H NMR spectrum and 12:1 in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum, and the ratio of the resonance at -10.90 ppm to the dimethylether resonance in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum was 1:13. After 81 days, the ratio of the resonances at -1.11 and -10.90 ppm was 1:1 in the \(^1\)H NMR spectrum and 2:1 in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum, and the ratio of the resonance at -10.90 ppm to the dimethylether resonance in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum was 1:14.

In the case of trimethylamine, the sample was heated at 60°C. After one day, resonances due to partially protiated \((\text{Cp}^{+}\cdot\text{d}_{27})\{[\text{C}(\text{CD}_3)_2\text{C}_5\text{H}_2][\text{C}(\text{CD}_3)_2\text{CD}_2]\}\text{Ce}\) and Q\(_{\text{NMe}_2}\) had appeared in both the \(^1\)H and \(^2\)H NMR spectra. In addition, a triplet (2.12 ppm, 2 Hz) corresponding to \(\text{NMe}_3\cdot\text{d}_1\) had appeared in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum. The sample was heated at 60°C for 33 days. The intensity of the paramagnetic resonances in the \(^1\)H NMR spectrum had increased substantially, and the corresponding resonances in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum had diminished. A broad resonance presumably corresponding to partially deuterated trimethylamine (2.08 ppm, \(\nu_{1/2} = 46\) Hz) had appeared just upfield of the resonance of trimethylamine (2.10 ppm). The signal was too broadened to discern HD coupling. The multiplet corresponding to partially deuterated trimethylamine in the \(^2\)H NMR spectrum had increased in intensity and complexity. The \(^{13}\)C NMR spectrum included a resonance for trimethylamine (46.90 ppm) and a 1:1:1 pattern slightly upfield corresponding to partially deuterated trimethylamine (46.59 ppm, \(J_{\text{CD}} = 20\) Hz).

**NMR tube reaction of D\(_2\) and \text{Cp}^{+}\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe} in cyclohexane-d_{12}**.

\text{Cp}^{+}\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe} was dissolved in cyclohexane-d\(_{12}\) in an NMR tube. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with D\(_2\) (1 atm). The tube was warmed to 19°C and allowed to stand. After
15 minutes, resonances due to Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeOMe and Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeD had appeared in the \textsuperscript{1}H NMR spectrum. The \textsuperscript{2}H NMR spectrum contained resonances due to CH\textsubscript{2}DOCH\textsubscript{3}. The ratio of Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeOMe, Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe, and Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeD in the \textsuperscript{1}H NMR spectrum was approximately 1:7:8. After two days, the ratio was approximately 1:1:7. After 9 days, resonances due to Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe had disappeared from the spectrum, and the ratio of Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeOMe and Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeD was approximately 1:5. No resonances for methane were observed. The \textsuperscript{2}H NMR spectrum contained resonances due to CH\textsubscript{2}DOCH\textsubscript{3} and deuterium incorporation into the Cp’-ring \textit{t}-butyl groups of Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeD.

**NMR tube reaction of CH\textsubscript{3}Br and Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe in benzene-d\textsubscript{6}**

Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe was dissolved in benzene-d\textsubscript{6} in an NMR tube. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with CH\textsubscript{3}Br (1 atm). The red solution was warmed to 19°C and allowed to stand. After one day, resonances due to dimethylether, Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeBr, Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeOMe, and Q\textsubscript{Br}, had appeared in the \textsuperscript{1}H NMR spectrum; the ratio of Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe, Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeBr, Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeOMe, and Q\textsubscript{Br} was 8:8:1:2. After 4 days, the solution had turned yellow, and only resonances due to Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeBr and dimethylether remained in the spectrum.

**NMR tube reaction of CH\textsubscript{3}F and Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe in benzene-d\textsubscript{6}**

Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe was dissolved in benzene-d\textsubscript{6} in an NMR tube. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with CH\textsubscript{3}F (1 atm). The red solution was warmed to 19°C and allowed to stand. After one day, resonances due to dimethylether and Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeF had appeared in the \textsuperscript{1}H NMR spectrum; the ratio of Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeCH\textsubscript{2}OMe to Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeF was approximately 30:1. After 2 days, the ratio was 18:1. The sample was warmed to 60°C, and after one day, the red solution had become more orange, and resonances due to Cp’\textsubscript{2}CeOMe had appeared;
the ratio of \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe}, \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeF}, \) and \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeOMe} \) was approximately 6.5:2.5:1. After five days, the ratio was 1:4:2, after nine days, only resonances due to \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeF}, \) and \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeOMe} \) remained in a 1.5:1 ratio.

**NMR tube reaction of BPh\(_3\) and \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe} \) in benzene-d\(_6\).**

\( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe} \) was dissolved in \( \text{C}_6\text{D}_6 \) in an NMR tube and less than an equimolar amount of BPh\(_3\) was added. After 10 minutes, the only paramagnetic resonances in the \(^1\text{H}\) NMR spectrum were those due to \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeOMe} \). Integration relative to the solvent residual proton peak indicated that the conversion of \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeCH}_2\text{OMe} \) to \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeOMe} \) was quantitative. The sample was hydrolyzed with basic hydrogen peroxide, and GC MS analysis of the combined organic layers showed that the sample contained a fraction with (M)+ \( m/z \) 108 (\( \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{CH}_2\text{OH} \)) and a smaller fraction with (M)+ \( m/z \) 122 (\( \text{C}_6\text{H}_5(\text{CH}_2)_2\text{OH} \)) in addition to \( \text{Cp}'\text{H} \). No fraction corresponding to \( \text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{OH} \) was observed.

**NMR tube reaction of BPh\(_3\) and \( \text{Q}_1 \) in benzene-d\(_6\).**

\( \text{Cp}'_2\text{Ce(CH}_2\text{C}_6\text{H}_5) \) was dissolved in cyclohexane-d\(_{12}\) and heated at 60°C for 12 hours, yielding a solution of \( \text{Cp}'[(\text{Me}_3\text{C})_2\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{C}(\text{Me}_2)\text{CH}_2]\text{Ce} \). The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and an excess of \( \text{CH}_3\text{I} \) was added by vacuum transfer. The tube was warmed to 19°C, the headspace was refilled with \( \text{N}_2 \) (1 atm), and the sample was allowed to stand. After 40 minutes, the solution was red-orange, and only resonances of \( \text{Q}_1 \) remained in the spectrum. A less than an equimolar amount of BPh\(_3\) was added, the sample was agitated and allowed to stand. The resonances due to \( \text{Q}_1 \) disappeared and those of \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeI} \) appeared over the course of 1 hour. Integration relative to the solvent residual proton peak indicated that the conversion of \( \text{Q}_1 \) to \( \text{Cp}'_2\text{CeI} \) was quantitative. The sample was
hydrolyzed with basic hydrogen peroxide, and GC MS analysis showed that the sample contained a fraction with (M)$^+$ $m/z$ 108 ($C_6H_5CH_2OH$) and a smaller fraction with (M)$^+$ $m/z$ 122 ($C_6H_5(CH_2)_2OH$) in addition to Cp'H. No fraction corresponding to $C_6H_5OH$ was observed.

**NMR tube reaction of CH$_3$F and Cp’$_2$CeHBPh$_3$ in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$.**

Cp’$_2$CeH was dissolved in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$, and a slight excess of BPh$_3$ was added. The purple solution immediately turned yellow, and the $^1$H NMR spectrum contained only resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeHBPh$_3$. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with CH$_3$F (1 atm). The sample was warmed to 19°C, and the solution color became slightly more orange. After 10 minutes, the resonances due to free BPh$_3$ had grown substantially in the $^1$H NMR spectrum, and the only significant paramagnetic resonances were those of Cp’$_2$CeF. Integration relative to the solvent residual proton peak indicated that the conversion of Cp’$_2$CeH to Cp’$_2$CeF was approximately 20%.

In a separate experiment, Cp’$_2$CeF and an excess of BPh$_3$ were dissolved in benzene-d$_6$ in an NMR tube. The $^1$H NMR spectrum contained only resonances due to the two individual components with no perturbation to their chemical shifts or line shapes. The orange solution was heated at 60°C. After three days, the $^1$H NMR spectrum had not changed.

**NMR tube reaction of CH$_3$Br and Cp’$_2$CeHBPh$_3$ in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$.**

Cp’$_2$CeH was dissolved in cyclohexane-d$_{12}$, and a slight excess of BPh$_3$ was added. The purple solution immediately turned yellow, and the $^1$H NMR spectrum contained only resonances due to Cp’$_2$CeHBPh$_3$. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen
isopropanol bath, the head space was evacuated, and replaced with CH$_3$Br (1 atm).

The sample was warmed to 19°C, and the solution color became more orange. After
10 minutes, the resonances due to free BPh$_3$ had grown substantially in the $^1$H NMR
spectrum, and the only significant paramagnetic resonances were those of Cp’$_2$CeBr.
Integration relative to the solvent residual proton peak indicated that the conversion of
Cp’$_2$CeH to Cp’$_2$CeBr was essentially quantitative. The sample was hydrolyzed with
basic hydrogen peroxide, and GC MS analysis of the combined organic layers showed
a fraction with (M)$^+$ $m/z$ 94 corresponding to C$_6$H$_5$OH in addition to Cp’H. No
fractions with (M)$^+$ $m/z$ 108 (C$_6$H$_5$CH$_2$OH) nor (M)$^+$ $m/z$ 122 (C$_6$H$_5$(CH$_2$)$_2$OH) were
observed.

**Computational details**

The Stuttgart-Dresden-Bonn Relativistic large Effective Core Potential (RECP)$^{36a}$
was used to represent the inner shells of Ce. The associated basis set$^{36a}$ augmented by
an f polarization function ($\alpha$ = 1.000) was used to represent the valence orbitals.$^{36b}$ F
was also represented by an RECP$^{37a}$ with the associated basis set of the type
(4s5p/2s3p)$^{37a}$ augmented by two contracted d polarisation gaussian functions ($\alpha_1$ =
3.3505(0.357851), $\alpha_2$ = 0.9924(0.795561)).$^{37b}$ The atoms Cl, Br, and I were
represented by an RECP$^{37c}$ with the associated basis set of the type (4s5p/2s3p)$^{37c}$
augmented by a single d polarization gaussian function with exponent of 0.643, 0.550
and 0.730 respectively.$^{37b}$ The atoms C, O, and H were represented by an all-electron
6-31G(d, p) basis set.$^{38}$ Calculations were carried out at the DFT(B3PW91) level$^{39}$
with Gaussian 03.$^{40}$ The nature of the extrema (minimum or transition state) was
established with analytical frequencies calculations and the intrinsic reaction
coordinate (IRC) was followed to confirm that the transition states connect to
reactants and products. The zero point energy (ZPE) and entropic contribution have been estimated within the harmonic potential approximation. The Gibbs free energy, $G$, was calculated at $T = 298.15\text{K}$. Using gas phase calculations for evaluating the entropic contribution to reactions in solution is an approximation; in particular, the translational degrees of freedom are exaggerated.\textsuperscript{41} However, the trends are properly calculated especially for a similar set of molecules as is the case here. This is supported by the observation that using $E$ in place of $G$ gives similar profiles and similar ranking as a function of $X$ as shown in the Supporting Information. Thus, the trends in $G$ are reliable even though the absolute values are not. The NBO analysis\textsuperscript{42} was carried out replacing Ce by La because of the technical requirement to have an even number of f electrons for the calculations; these values are included in the Supporting Information for the inquisitive reader. Since the solvent used in the experimental studies was a hydrocarbon, such as cyclohexane or benzene, no large solvent effect on the reactants and products is expected. Consequently, no solvation effects were introduced in the computational studies.
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The two distances are inverted compared to the distances in Cp’₂Ce(η²-CH₂OMe) and expectation. However, all of the heavy atoms in the crystal structure of the zirconium compound are refined isotropically in the CCDC, resulting in considerable uncertainty
in the distances. The calculated structure of \( \text{Cp}_2\text{Zr}(\eta^2-\text{CH}_2\text{OMe}) \) yields \( \text{Zr-CH}_2 = 2.249 \, \text{Å} \), \( \text{CH}_2-\text{O} = 1.444 \, \text{Å} \), \( \text{Zr-O} = 2.328 \, \text{Å} \), which differ somewhat from the corresponding experimental values of 2.271(5), 1.414(6) and 2.204(3) Å, however, the oxygen is pyramidal as found in the X-ray crystal structure. The calculated distances are therefore in accord with the experimental values for \( \text{Cp'}_2\text{Ce}((\eta^2-\text{CH}_2\text{OMe}) \).


A one-step or two-step pathway for the H for X exchange reactions: that is the question.

\[ [\text{Ce}] \text{H} + \text{HCH}_2X \rightarrow [\text{Ce}]X + \text{H}_2\text{CH}_2 \]

\[ X = \text{Cl, Br, I, OMe, NMMe}_2 \]

\[ [\text{Ce}] = \text{Cp}_2\text{Ce} \]