Eduardo Peris, Jesse C. Lee Jr. and Robert H. Crabtree\*

Department of Chemistry, Yale University, 225 Prospect St., New Haven CT, USA

Intramolecular N–H···X–Ir (X = H, F) hydrogen bonds are found in a series of metal hydrides.

In a recent study of amide complexation, we found an unexpected example of  $O-H\cdots H-Ir$  hydrogen bonding, where the role of weak base partner was taken by an Ir–H bond.<sup>1</sup> This interaction was confirmed by structural and spectroscopic data, including the J(H,H') of 3 Hz in the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum. Morris<sup>2</sup><sup>*u*</sup> has recently found a similar N–H···H–M species. We wanted to know the generality and strength of this type of bond, to see how it compares with conventional H-bonds.<sup>3</sup>

The pyridines **1a**,**b** react with [IrH<sub>5</sub>(PPh<sub>3</sub>)<sub>2</sub>]<sup>4</sup> at 80 °C in benzene to give 2a,b as colourless complexes in 70-80% yield [eqn. (1)]. The identity of 2a,b follows from the microanalytical and spectral data. In particular, at 253 K in CD<sub>2</sub>Cl<sub>2</sub> (2a), or at 293 K in  $C_6D_6$  (2b),  $H_b$ ,  $H_c$  and  $H_d$  are all inequivalent and show cis J(H,P) couplings of ca. 16 Hz and mutual H,H couplings of ca. 4 Hz. In both cases H-bonds are present, based on the following data: (i) H<sub>a</sub> and H<sub>b</sub> show the expected<sup>1</sup> coupling (ca. 2.5 Hz, † a; 2.8 Hz, b) in the <sup>1</sup>H NMR spectrum; (ii) the  $H_b$  resonance shows a large excess  $T_1$ relaxation relative to  $H_c$  and  $H_d$  [excess rate = 4.0 s<sup>-1</sup> (2b) at the  $T_1$  (min)], which corresponds to an  $H_a \cdots H_b$  distance of 1.80 Å.‡ Morris<sup>2a</sup> estimated a very similar distance in his complex by the same method; 2b-d (iii) the N-H proton resonance at  $\delta$  7.2–7.8 shows a 3 ppm low-field shift from the free ligand value expected3 for a H-bonded ligand. The v(N-H) stretch at 3403 (2a) or 3409 cm<sup>-1</sup> (2b) also shows the expected low-energy shift in the IR spectrum relative to free N-H.

Complex **2a** gave information about the hydrogen-bond strength. The variable-temperature NMR data shows that the signals for the two inequivalent-NH<sub>2</sub> protons coalesce at 253 K, leading to a  $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$  of  $10.8 \pm 0.2$  kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> (1 cal = 4.184J) for rotation about the C-NH<sub>2</sub> bond. This barrier represents the sum of the intrinsic rotation barrier, known<sup>6</sup> to be about 6–7 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>, and the H-bond strength, which must therefore be *ca.* 4.3 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>. The hydrogen-bond in **2** could only be broken with Ph<sub>3</sub>P=O (0.2 mol dm<sup>-3</sup>) as an intermolecular hydrogen-bond acceptor (B component), as judged by disappearance of the  $J(H_a, H_b)$  coupling, but not by addition of the weaker acceptors acetone or ethanol.

Do conventional intramolecular hydrogen-bonds<sup>5</sup> also form in this system? When  $[IrH_2(Me_2CO)_2(PPh_3)_2]BF_4^7$  is treated



with NBu<sub>4</sub>F and pyridine 1a, the new complex formed, 3a, shows N-H···F-Ir hydrogen bonding. The clearest evidence is the large H<sub>a</sub>···F coupling of 63 Hz at 253 K. Low-energy shifts of v(N-H) are also observed as well as the expected 3 ppm low-field shift of the N-H proton resonance. Variabletemperature NMR data show that Ar-NH<sub>2</sub> bond rotation has a barrier of  $11.0 \pm 0.2$  kcal mol<sup>-1</sup> which we associate with an hydrogen-bond strength of *ca*. 4.5 kcal mol<sup>-1</sup>. An N-H···H-Ir hydrogen bonded tautomer, in principle possible in **3a**, was not observed (<2%). This means the F substitution must lower the basicity of the *trans* hydride.

The same type of  $H_a \cdots F$  interaction is observed when we use the phenylaminopyridine complex 1b, eqn. (2). The compound obtained, 3b, shows a large  $H_a \cdots F$  coupling of 65.1 Hz at room temperature. Once again, no N-H…H-Ir tautomer was observed in this new compound.

Conventional hydrogen-bonds of the type A-H···B are strong only when B is N, O or F.<sup>3</sup> Here we have a case where B = Ir-H and we see a bond strength in the range of conventional hydrogen-bonds. We ascribe this to the following special factors: (i) H<sub>a</sub> and H<sub>b</sub> can approach comparatively close (1.8 Å in 2 versus a typical range of 1.5-2.1 Å for H···B in A-H···B complexes because both H<sub>a</sub> and H<sub>b</sub> are small atoms); (ii) unlike the B component in a conventional hydrogen-bond, Ir-H has no lone pairs, repulsion involving which is known to weaken A-H···B; (iii) Ir-H<sub>b</sub> is a polarizable bond and so H<sub>b</sub> may become more  $\delta^-$  in character on the approach of the -NH<sub>a</sub> group.

This work was supported by the NSF and by a Postdoctoral Fellowship from the Spanish Ministerio de Educacion y Ciencia to E. P. We thank Odile Eisenstein for discussions.

Received, 8th August 1994; Com. 4/04854G

## Footnotes

† This signal is broad but decoupling reveals  ${}^{1}J(H_{a},H_{b})$  is present. ‡ We make the usual<sup>2*a*-*d*</sup> assumptions and that the H<sub>a</sub>...H<sub>b</sub> vector rotates with the complex and so C = 1; field = 300 MHz.

## References

- 1 J. Lee, Jr., A. L. Rheingold, B. Müller, P. Pregosin and R. H. Crabtree, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1994, 1021.
- 2 (a) R. Ramachandran and R. H. Morris, J. Am. Chem. Soc., in the press; (b) D. G. Hamilton and R. H. Crabtree, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1988, 110, 4126; (c) K. A. Earl, J. Jia, P. A. Maltby and R. H. Morris, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1991, 113, 2027; (d) P. J. Desrosiers, L. Cai, Z. Lin, R. Richards and J. Halpern, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1991, 113, 4173.
- 3 G. C. Pimentel and A. L. McClellan, *The Hydrogen Bond*, Freeman, San Francisco, CF, 1960; P. A. Kollman and L. C. Allen, *Chem. Rev.*, 1972, **72**, 283.
- 4 R. H. Crabtree, H. Felkin and G. E. Morris, J. Organomet. Chem., 1977, 141, 205.
- 5 T. G. Richmond, Coord. Chem. Rev., 1990, 105, 221.
- 6 F. A. L. Anet and X.-H. Ji, Tetrahedron Lett., 1984, 25, 1419.
- 7 R. H. Crabtree, P. C. Demou, D. Eden, J. M. Milhelcic, C. Parnell, J. M. Quirk and G. E. Morris, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1982, 104, 6994.