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#### Abstract

The net reaction of monomeric $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}\left[\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}=1,3,4-\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{3}\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2}\right)\right]$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ is $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} 2^{-}$ $\mathrm{CeF}, \mathrm{H}_{2}$, and tetrafluorobenzyne. The pentafluorophenylmetallocene, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)$, is formed as an intermediate that decomposes slowly to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ (tetrafluorobenzyne), and the latter is trapped by the solvent $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ as a $[2+4]$ cycloadduct. In $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, the final products are also $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, which are formed from the intermediates $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(2,3,5,6-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}\right)$ and from an unidentified metallocene of cerium and the $[2+4]$ cycloadducts of tetra- and trifluorobenzyne with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$. The hydride, fluoride, and pentafluorophenylmetallocenes are isolated and characterized by X-ray crystallography. DFT(B3PW91) calculations have been used to explore the pathways leading to the observed products of the exergonic reactions. A key step is a $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange reaction which transforms $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ and the cerium hydride into $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$. This reaction starts by an $\eta^{1}-\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ interaction, which serves as a hook. The reaction proceeds via a $\sigma$ bond metathesis where the fluorine ortho to the hook migrates toward H with a relatively low activation energy. All products observed experimentally are accommodated by pathways that involve $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bond cleavages.


## Introduction

The hydrogen for fluorine exchange in fluorocarbons is a thermodynamically favorable reaction that does not occur in absence of a catalyst. ${ }^{1}$ For example, passing a mixture of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ and dihydrogen over $\mathrm{Pd} / \mathrm{C}$ or $\mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}$ at $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ gives a mixture of aromatic hydrofluorocarbons; $\mathrm{Pt} / \mathrm{C}$ at $58 \%$ conversion gives $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ and mixed isomers of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}$ in a 4:3:1 ratio. ${ }^{2}$ The exchange reaction is exothermic when the sum of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ and $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{H}$ bond enthalpies is less than those of $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{F}$ in eq 1 , where the bond dissociation enthalpies are in parentheses in units of $\mathrm{kcal}_{\mathrm{mol}}{ }^{-1}$.

$$
\underset{(154)^{3}}{\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}-\mathrm{F}}+\underset{(105)^{4}}{\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{H}} \rightarrow \underset{(\mathrm{x})}{\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}}+\underset{(135)^{4,5}}{\mathrm{HF}}
$$

Although the bond disruption enthalpy of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}-\mathrm{H}$ is unknown, the reaction will be exothermic if the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bond enthalpy is greater than $125 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, which is reasonable since the bond dissociation energy ( BDE ) of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~F}-\mathrm{H}$ is $126 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} .{ }^{3}$ Thus, the exothermicity of a $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange reaction is driven

[^0]by the large $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{F}$ bond disruption enthalpy, which in general implies that when $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is replaced by $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}$, the reaction will be exothermic when the $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{F}$ bond enthalpy is larger than the $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}$ bond enthalpy by about $30 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. This condition is met by the f-block and early d-transition metals. Lanthanide fluoride bonds are strong; the averaged $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{F}$ bond enthalpy of $\mathrm{CeF}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ is $153 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1},{ }^{6}$ which implies that the $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange will be exothermic, provided that the lanthanidehydride bond enthalpy is less than about $125 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Although the averaged bond enthalpy of $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}$ in $\mathrm{MH}_{3}(\mathrm{~g})$ is unknown, it is unlikely to be greater than $100 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ since the $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H} \operatorname{BDE}$ in $\mathrm{Cp}^{*}{ }_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{*}{ }_{2} \mathrm{LuH}$ is $67 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} .7$ The rate, of course, is unknown.

Lanthanide metals in gas phase will defluorinate fluorocarbons. ${ }^{8}$ For example, $\mathrm{Ce}^{+}(\mathrm{g})$ defluorinates $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ giving $\mathrm{CeF}^{+}{ }_{-}$ (g), the radical $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}{ }^{\circ}, \mathrm{CeF}_{2}{ }^{+}(\mathrm{g})$, and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ (a benzyne). ${ }^{9}$ In
(3) Smart, B. E. In Chemistry of Functional Groups; Patai, S., Rappoport, Z., Eds.; Wiley: New York, 1983; Suppl. D, Chapter 14.
(4) Dasent, W. E. Inorganic Energetics, 2nd ed.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, U.K., 1982; p 103.
(5) Slayden, S. W.; Liebman, J. F.; Mallard, W. G. In Chemistry of Functional Groups. The chemistry of halides, pseudohalides and azides; Patai, S., Rappoport, Z., Eds.; Wiley: Chichester, U.K., 1995; Suppl D2, p 387.
(6) Pankratz, L. B. Thermodynamic Properties of Halides, Bulletin 674, Bureau of Mines, 1984.
(7) Nolan, S. P.; Stern, D.; Hedden, D.; Marks, T. J. Bonding Energetics in Organometallic Chemistry; ACS Symposium Series 428; American Chemical Society: Washington, DC, 1990; pp 159-174.
(8) Mazurek, U.; Schwarz, H. Chem. Commun. 2003, 1321.
addition, the metallocene $\left(\mathrm{Me}_{5} \mathrm{C}_{5}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Yb}$ abstracts a fluorine atom from $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ giving $\left[\left(\mathrm{Me}_{5} \mathrm{C}_{5}\right)_{2} \mathrm{Yb}\right]_{2}(\mu-\mathrm{F}),{ }^{10}$ and $\left(\mathrm{MeC}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right)_{3} \mathrm{UCMe}_{3}$ exchanges the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ with F in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6} .{ }^{11}$ The general subject of intermolecular $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation has been extensively studied and several reviews are available, largely within the framework of oxidative addition reactions. ${ }^{8,12}$ Computational studies have shown that the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation may be exothermic but that a high activation barrier is usually observed with late transitionmetal systems. ${ }^{13}$ In early transition metals, the activation barrier is generally lower and several cases of $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange have been observed. ${ }^{14}$ The reactions of bare metal centers have been analyzed by computational methods, showing that electron transfer as well as oxidative insertion paths are possible. ${ }^{15}$

In this paper, we show that a monomeric metallocene hydride of cerium undergoes $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange with fluoroaromatics and DFT calculations provide details about the relative activation barriers for the reaction pathways.

## Results

General Strategy. The DFT calculations of the possible reaction pathways for $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange are carried out on a monomeric $\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)_{2} \mathrm{MH}\left(\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{MH}\right)$ reactant and a $\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)_{2} \mathrm{MF}$ $\left(\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{MF}\right)$ product in the gas phase. It is essential that the synthetic studies begin and end with a monomeric metallocene hydride and fluoride derivative, respectively, in order that the experimental and calculational results track each other as closely as possible. Since no monomeric metallocene lanthanide hydrides or fluorides are known, synthetic studies were initiated with the goal of making them. In general, the base-free metallocene hydrides are dimeric in the solid state and in solution. ${ }^{16}$ The dimeric cerium hydrides, $\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{Me}_{5}\right)_{4} \mathrm{Ce}_{2}(\mu-\mathrm{H})_{2}$ and $\left[1,3-\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]_{4} \mathrm{Ce}_{2}\left((\mu-\mathrm{H})_{2}\right.$, are known. ${ }^{17,18} \mathrm{~A}$ tiny number of metallocene lanthanide fluorides are known ${ }^{10,19,20}$ and only
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Figure 1. ORTEP diagram of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ ( $50 \%$ probability ellipsoids). The hydrogen atoms on the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ ligands were placed in calculated positions; $\mathrm{H}(59)$, the hydride ligand, was found in the difference Fourier map and refined with isotropic thermal parameters. $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}$ (ave) $=2.81(2) \AA, \mathrm{Ce}-$ Cp (ring centroid) (ave) $=2.53 \AA, \mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}=1.90(5) \AA, \mathrm{Cp}$ (ring centroid) -$\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{Cp}($ ring centroid $)=155^{\circ}, \mathrm{Cp}($ ring centroid $)-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}($ ave $)=101^{\circ}$.
one, $\left[1,3-\left(\mathrm{SiMe}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]_{4} \mathrm{Sm}_{2}(\mu-\mathrm{F})_{2}$, contains symmetrical bridging fluorides. ${ }^{21}$ Our focus is on the metallocene derivatives of cerium since the $4 f^{1}$ electron configuration simplifies the interpretation of their magnetic properties. In addition, one of our long-term interests is comparison of the chemical and physical properties between the 4 f and 5 f block metals with identical radii, that is, $\mathrm{Ce}(\mathrm{III})$ and $\mathrm{U}(\mathrm{III})$. The 1,3 -di-tertbutylcyclopentadienyl ligand yields the dimeric cerium hydride, $\left.\left[1,3-\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]_{4} \mathrm{Ce}_{2}(\mu-\mathrm{H})\right]_{2},{ }^{18}$ suggesting that increasing the number of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}$-groups on the cyclopentadienyl ring will yield a monomeric hydride, a deduction that is correct.

Synthetic Studies. The synthetic sequence begins with the synthesis of the bis (1,3,4-tri-tert-butylcyclopentadienyl) cerium triflate, $\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeOTf}$, then replacing the triflate by a benzyl group; the synthesis details are in the Experimental Section. Addition of dihydrogen to the benzyl derivative in pentane gives the deep purple hydride, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}, \mathrm{mp} 152-155{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, which may be crystallized from pentane. The hydride gives a (M-2)+ molecular ion in the mass spectrum, but the $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}$ stretching frequency could not be identified in the infrared spectrum, even when directly compared with the deuteride (prepared by using $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ rather than $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ ), nor could the $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}$ resonance be observed in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum clearly shows the paramagnetic isotropic shifts for the two types of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}$ groups in a $2: 1$ area ratio and the equivalent ring methyne resonances; the details are given in the Experimental Section. Figure 1 shows an ORTEP diagram of the hydride; important structural parameters are given in the figure caption. The solidstate structure clearly shows that the hydride is a monomer.

The fluoride is prepared by allowing $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeCH}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}$ to react with $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{OEt}_{2}$ in pentane, a method used previously. ${ }^{22}$ The fluoride, $\mathrm{mp} 164-167^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, crystallizes from pentane as orange crystals that yield a monomeric molecular ion in the gas-phase
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## Scheme 1




Figure 2. ORTEP diagram of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ ( $50 \%$ probability ellipsoids). All the non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically and the hydrogen atoms were placed in calculated positions. $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}($ ave $)=2.82(2) \AA, \mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{Cp}-$ (ring centroid) (ave) $=2.55 \AA, \mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{F}=2.165(2) \mathrm{A}, \mathrm{Cp}$ (ring centroid) -$\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{Cp}($ ring centroid $)=149^{\circ}, \mathrm{Cp}($ ring centroid $)-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{F}($ ave $)=105(2)^{\circ}$.
mass spectrum. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum at $20{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ shows resonances for the two inequivalent types of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}$ groups in a 2:1 ratio and a single-ring methyne resonance. The fluoride sublimes at $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in a vacuum and crystals suitable for an X-ray study were grown in this way. An ORTEP diagram of the monomeric fluoride is shown in Figure 2 and some bond parameters are given in the figure caption.

The hydride and fluoride derivatives are stable in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ solution for an indefinite period of time. In contrast, the
benzyl derivative though stable at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the solid state, gives a $\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{PhCH}_{3}\right)^{+}$molecular ion in the mass spectrum. In $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ solution, the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ resonances slowly disappear from the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum as the intensity of the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6-x} \mathrm{D}_{x}$ resonances increase relative to an internal standard as the resonances due to PhMe appear. Over the course of a week at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, all the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ resonances disappear. Replacing essentially all of the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ by $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ regenerates $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}$ resonances with chemical shifts different from those of the benzyl derivative. The new resonances have intensities and a coupling pattern (the meta and para resonances appear as doublet and triplet, respectively) consistent with those expected for $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CePh}$. Thus, the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ groups undergo reversible H/D exchange with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$, with formation of a $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ or $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{5}$ species. In $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ solvent, the resonances due to toluene appear after 3 h at $65{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in addition to another set of rather broadened resonances that appears as five equal area resonances and two additional resonances of about one-third their intensity. These observations suggest that this species is the chiral metallacycle $\left.\left.\left[\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{3} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2}\right)\right]\left[\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2}\left(\mathrm{CMe}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)\right] \mathrm{Ce}$, a deduction consistent with the reactions shown in Scheme 1; experimental details are in the Experimental Section. A related metallacyle has been observed by heating $\left(\mathrm{Me}_{5} \mathrm{C}_{5}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CeCH}\left(\mathrm{SiMe}_{3}\right)_{2}$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$, which is a tetramer in the solid state. ${ }^{23}$
On a synthetic scale (ca. 1 g ), warming $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeCH}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}$ in pentane for 12 h gives a deep purple solution, which yields a purple glassy solid that cannot be persuaded to crystallize. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ is identical to that observed in the NMR tube experiment mentioned above. Refluxing a solution of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeCH}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ for 3 days gives a red solution, which yields a red powder whose elemental analysis indicates that the stoichiometry is $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}$. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$
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Figure 3. ORTEP diagram of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)$ ( $50 \%$ probability ellipsoids). All the non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically and the hydrogen atoms were placed in calculated positions. $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}$ (ave) $=2.81$ (5) A, $\mathrm{Ce}-$ Cp (ring centroid) (ave) $=2.54 \AA, \mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}(35)=2.621(4) \AA, \mathrm{Ce} \cdots \mathrm{F}(5)=$ 2.682(2), Cp (ring centroid) $-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{Cp}$ (ring centroid) $=147^{\circ}, \mathrm{Cp}($ ring centroid) $-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}(35)=107(1)^{\circ}, \mathrm{Cp}($ ring centroid $)-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{F}(5)($ ave $)=101(1)^{\circ}$, $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(36)=149.7(3)^{\circ}, \mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(40)=97.5(3)^{\circ}$.
is identical to that observed in the NMR tube experiment described above. Although neither metallacycle nor phenyl derivative is obtained in crystalline form, the sequence of reactions in Scheme 1 is consistent with the formulation given.

Further proof that the metallacycle formulation is correct is derived by dissolving it in a mixture of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and observing a new set of $\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}$-resonances in a 1:2 ratio. On a synthetic scale, dissolving the metallacycle in an excess of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ in pentane yields an orange solution from which orange crystals may be isolated, whose ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum is identical to that observed in the mixing experiment. The crystals decompose rather violently on attempted melting in a sealed melting point capillary at about $125^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; extracting the residue into $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ and examining the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum shows resonances due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$, as well as several unidentified resonances. The thermal behavior is presumably the reason for the incomprehensible mass spectrum. Fortunately, single crystals of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ suitable for X-ray studies are obtained from pentane and an ORTEP diagram is shown in Figure 3. As can been seen, the carbon atom of the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ group $\mathrm{C}(35)$ is located close to the idealized $C_{2}$ axis but the $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}(35)-\mathrm{C}(36,40)$ angles are very anisotropic because of a short $\mathrm{Ce} \cdots \mathrm{F}-\mathrm{C}$ (ortho) contact of 2.682(2) A. A pair of close ortho-F $\cdots \cdot$ Sm contacts of $2.531(8) \AA$ and $2.539(7) \AA$ were found in dimeric $\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{Me}_{5}\right)_{4}$ $\mathrm{Sm}_{2}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)_{2}$ and in monomeric $\left(\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{Me}_{5}\right) \mathrm{Yb}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)(\text { thf })_{3}$ where the ortho-F $\cdots \mathrm{Yb}$ distance is $3.162 \AA .{ }^{24} \mathrm{In}$ solution at $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra are not consistent with the solid-state crystal structure, where the idealized symmetry is $C_{1}$ and all of the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ groups and F atoms are inequivalent. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR absorptions change as a function of temperature and the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ resonance of area 2 decoalesces into two equal area resonances while the other $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ resonance of area 1 has a normal temperature dependence (Figure 4), giving a $\Delta G^{\#}{ }_{\mathrm{TC}}=10 \mathrm{kcal}$ $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. The $25{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum consists of three resonances, two of area 2 and one of area 1 . One of the area 2 resonances is broad ( $\nu_{1 / 2}=480 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), probably because of the
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Figure 4. Plot of chemical shift $(\delta)$ vs $1 / T$ for $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ in $\mathrm{PhMe}-d_{8}$.
ortho-F, and the other two resonances are a doublet and triplet at $\delta-161$ and $\delta-158$ in area ratio $2: 1$, respectively, $J=18$ Hz . Cooling shifts the resonances and the coupling between meta-F, and para-F disappears as the resonances broaden but do not decoalesce to $-50{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The $2: 1$ pattern of the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ resonances changing to a $1: 1: 1$ pattern at low temperature is consistent with a metallocene whose idealized symmetry changes from $C_{2 v}$ to $C_{s}$, where the mirror plane is coplanar with the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ ring. Several physical processes can account for loss of the time-averaged $C_{2}$-axis and mirror plane, two of which are slowing the librational motion of the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$-rings about their pseudo- $C_{5}$ axis and slowing the rocking motion of the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ ring in the mirror plane. If the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ ring rocking is slowed by a $\mathrm{Ce} \cdots \mathrm{F}$ interaction, as observed in the crystal structure, and if the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ rings undergo libration, then the $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ groups will appear as a 1:1:1 pattern and the F nuclei in the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ ring may appear as distinct resonances or as broadened features depending upon how much the chemical shift changes as a function of temperature. In this context, the librational motion of the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ rings in $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ is not slowed, that is, the $2: 1$ pattern is observed at $-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Further studies are needed to define the physical process responsible for the fluxional processes.

Solution NMR Mixing Experiments, H/F Exchange Reactions. $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{6}$. When an excess of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ is added to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ in an NMR tube, the purple color of the hydride instantaneously turns orange and a gas is evolved. Examination of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum shows that the resonances due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2}{ }^{-}$ CeH are absent and new sets of resonances due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, and dihydrogen appear. Over time, the resonances due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ increase in intensity at the expense of those due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$. These events are symbolized by the unbalanced eqs 2 and 3.

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeH}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}+\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}+\mathrm{H}_{2}  \tag{2}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeF}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \tag{3}
\end{gather*}
$$

Examination of the ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum of this mixture shows resonances due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ and an $\mathrm{AA}^{\prime} \mathrm{BB}^{\prime}$ pattern whose chemical shifts and coupling pattern are identical to the DielsAlder adduct $\mathbf{1}, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{D}$, between tetrafluorobenzyne and benzene- $d_{6} .{ }^{25}$ Hydrolysis of the mixture with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and injection into a GCMS gives the $\mathrm{M}^{+}$for $\mathbf{1}, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{D}$. Repeating the experiment, but replacing the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ followed by hydrolysis with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and injection into a GCMS gives $\mathrm{M}^{+}$for 1, $\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{F}$. Thus, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ decomposes by forming $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and tetrafluorobenzyne that is trapped by the solvent

[^5]benzene, a common decomposition pattern of pentafluorophenylmetal compounds. ${ }^{26}$



2

The origin of dihydrogen is less readily explained, though the net reactions symbolized in eq $4 a-d$ may be suggested. Equation 4 a is an intermolecular $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation, 4 c is a $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ activation, and both yield $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, which ultimately yields $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$. Equation 4 b and 4 d destroys the HF that is formed producing $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$. No intermediates are detected, other than $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, and only the reaction in 4 c can be easily tested, since we do not have facilities to deal with anhydrous HF.

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeH}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}+\mathrm{HF}  \tag{4a}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}+\mathrm{HF} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeF}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}  \tag{4b}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}+\mathrm{H}_{2}  \tag{4c}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeH}+\mathrm{HF} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeF}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \tag{4d}
\end{gather*}
$$

Neither dihydroanthracene nor addition of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{D}_{2}$ alters the reaction, and no anthracene or hydrogenated products are detected. However, changing the solvent from $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ removes the trap for tetrafluorobenzyne, and the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$-ring is now the trap. $\mathrm{In}^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{D}_{12}, \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ decomposes to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and a new organic product over 12 h at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Hydrolysis with $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ or $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and injection into the GCMS shows one major fluorinated organic compound with $\mathrm{M}^{+}=382$ along with $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}$ or $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$. This organic product is likely to be $2, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{F}$, the $[2+4]$ cycloaddition product of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$, and the substituted cyclopentadienyl ring. The ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum consists of an $\mathrm{AA}^{\prime} \mathrm{BB}^{\prime}$ pattern similar to that found in $\mathbf{1}$, and the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum shows two $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ resonances in a $2: 1$ ratio. Other isomers of 2 could be formed, since low intensity absorptions are visible in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra, but $\mathbf{2}$ is the major isomer formed. When deutero metallocene, $\left\{\left[\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{3}\right]_{3} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2}\right\}_{2^{-}}$ $\mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, is allowed to decompose in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and the residue hydrolyzed with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and analyzed by GCMS, the $\mathrm{M}^{+}$at 410 is observed, implying that the source of the "other" hydrogen is a ring $-\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$. Close inspection of the ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum resulting from decomposition of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ shows that the $2, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{F}$ is also present to the extent of about $10 \%$, suggesting that the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$-ring can compete with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ as a trap for tetrafluorobenzyne. Cyclopentadiene and its anion are capable of trapping benzyne ${ }^{27}$ and furan and other dienes trap tetrafluorobenzyne ${ }^{28}$ so the suggestion that $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ traps tetrafluorobenzyne is not without precedent.

[^6]$\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{5} \mathbf{H}$. Adding an excess of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ in an NMR tube changes the purple solution to an orange one with liberation of a gas. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum shows resonances due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, and two new sets of paramagnetic resonances in a ratio of $6: 2: 4: 1$, assuming the resonances are all due to $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ groups and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. Integration of the initial and final $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ resonances relative to an internal standard shows that the conversion is quantitative. Over time, all of the resonances disappear, except those due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$, which is the only cerium containing metallocene at the end of the reaction. The second most abundant set of resonances is identical to those formed by addition of the metallacycle to 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene (Scheme 1) in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ implying that its identity is $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(2,3,5,6-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}\right)$. When the latter solution is evaporated to dryness, dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$, and heated to 65 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h , resonances due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ form. The liberated $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{3} \mathrm{H}$ is trapped by the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ ring, since the ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum shows a new $\operatorname{ABCX}(\mathbf{2}, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{H})$ pattern as well as resonances in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectrum due to $2, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{H}$. Hydrolysis with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and injection into a GCMS gives a $\mathrm{M}^{+}$due to $2, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{H}$. When the trifluorobenzyne is trapped with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$, the NMR spectra and GCMS are consistent with $\mathbf{1}, \mathrm{X}=\mathrm{D}, \mathrm{Y}=\mathrm{H} .{ }^{29}$ The remaining set of new resonances in the original reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ is due to an unknown cerium-containing product. This set of resonances forms exclusively when a solution of the metallacycle is added to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(2,3,5,6-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}\right)$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$, suggesting that the unknown compound is $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}$ -$\left(1,4-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right) \mathrm{CeCp}^{\prime}{ }_{2}$. Hydrolysis with $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ gives $1,2,4,5$-tetrafluorobenzene as the only substance detected by ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectroscopy consistent with this deduction. The net reactions that account for the products conclusively identified in the NMR experiments may be written in eq $5 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{f}$.
\[

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeH}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}+\mathrm{H}_{2}  \tag{5a}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeH}^{2}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{HF}  \tag{5b}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{2} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{H}_{2}  \tag{5c}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}+\mathrm{HF} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}  \tag{5d}\\
\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{HF} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeF}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{2}  \tag{5e}\\
\mathrm{Cpp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeH}+\mathrm{HF} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeF}+\mathrm{H}_{2} \tag{5f}
\end{gather*}
$$
\]

The reaction symbolized in 5 a and 5 b are intermolecular $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activations, respectively, while those in the remaining equations result from secondary reactions. Since the reactions between $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6-x} \mathrm{H}_{x}(x=0,1)$ are rapid and the only intermediate that is detected is either $\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ or $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2}{ }^{-}$ $\mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}$, only the net reaction symbolized by eqs 4 and 5 can be written with confidence. The mechanism of the $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ chemical exchange in $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ is unknown from the experiments described. In the next section, DFT calculations provide guidance about the relative thermodynamic quantities and kinetic barriers for the $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange processes.

## Computational Studies

Reactant, Intermediate, and Product. The reaction pathways that could account for the observed products of the reaction

[^7]between $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$, modeled by $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}, \mathbf{3}$, and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ were analyzed with DFT calculations with methodology that has been successful for the reaction of metallocene hydrides with $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{CH}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{CF}_{4}$ for the entire family of lanthanide elements. ${ }^{30-34}$ These studies show no dependence of the nature of the lanthanide on the geometry of the metallocene except that due to the lanthanide contraction. They also show a minor dependence of the activation barrier of about $1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ depending on the specific metal chosen. Therefore, the choice of using lanthanum, which lies to the immediate left of cerium and thus has a similar ionic radius, will not affect the calculated differences in energy to any significant extent. The numerical values calculated for La can be transferred to the case of Ce with an expected change of less than $1-2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Modeling of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ by $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ is a more severe approximation because of the large difference in steric size between these cyclopentadienyl ligands, especially when some significant geometrical reorganization can occur. ${ }^{34-36}$ For this reason, two key structures were calculated with the QM/MM methodology using ONIOM (B3PW91:UFF). Calculated free energies, $G$, estimated at 298.15 K , are given in $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ with respect to separated reactants $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$. The entropy calculated in gas phase is exaggerated by around $50 \%$ with respect to what it is in the condensed phase at least for the particular case of a reaction in water. ${ }^{37}$ Neglecting the translational part of the entropy as suggested by Sakaki could lead to an underestimation of the energy barriers for a bimolecular process. ${ }^{38}$ Calculating the change in energy $\Delta E$ and in free energy $\Delta G$ for the model reactions gives similar conclusions and free energies are used throughout this paper.

Initially, the calculated geometries of reactant $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}, \mathbf{3}$, and product $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}, 4$, and an intermediate $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, $\mathbf{5}$, were optimized and compared to the solid-state structures of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} 2^{-}$ $\mathrm{CeH}, \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$, and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ (Figure 5). In 3, the $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}$ bond length of $2.14 \AA$ is reasonably close to the $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}$ distance of $1.9 \AA$, given the uncertainty of this datum. The Cp (centroid) La distance of $2.56 \AA$ is close to the experimental values of 2.55 and $2.51 \AA$. The smaller Cp (centroid) $-\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{Cp}$ (centroid) angle of $134^{\circ}$ relative to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ (centroid) $-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ (centroid) angle of $155^{\circ}$ is clearly due to the smaller size of $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ relative to $1,3,4-\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{3} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2}$. Similar trends were noted when comparing $\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{Me}_{5} \mathrm{C}_{5}$ lanthanides derivatives. ${ }^{34-36}$ In 4, the $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{F}$ distance of $2.18 \AA$ is slightly longer than the experimental $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{F}$ distance of $2.165(2) \AA$. The Cp (centroid)-La distance of 2.58 $\AA$ differs slightly from the experimental values in the Ce metallocene to ring distance of 2.57 and $2.53 \AA$, but the calculated Cp (centroid) $-\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{Cp}$ (centroid) angle of $131^{\circ}$ is again much smaller than the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ (centroid) $-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ (centroid) angle of $149^{\circ}$. In the metallocene-pentafluorophenyl complex, 5 , the bidentate nature of the interaction between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ and the metal is reproduced with $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{F}$ distances equal to 2.61
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$\mathbf{C p}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right) \quad \mathbf{5}$

Figure 5. Optimized geometry (distance in $\AA$, angles in degrees) of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2^{-}}$ $\mathrm{LaH}, \mathbf{3}, \mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}, \mathbf{4}$, and $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right), \mathbf{5}$; small white circle $=\mathrm{H}$, medium white circle $=C$, large size white circle $=\mathrm{La}$, medium black circle $=\mathrm{F}$.
and $2.78 \AA$, respectively, compared to the experimental $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{F}$ distances of $2.621(4)$ and 2.682(2) $\AA$. As before, the ring (centroid)-metal distances are comparable, $2.55 \AA$ for Cp compared to $2.54 \AA$ for $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$, but the angle between the two rings is smaller with $\mathrm{Cp}\left(132^{\circ}\right)$ than with $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(147^{\circ}\right)$. The $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ (centroid) $-\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ (centroid) angle gets smaller on going from H to F ( $155^{\circ}$ and $149^{\circ}$, respectively); a smaller variation in the same direction is found in the calculated systems ( $134^{\circ}$ for the hydride compared to $131^{\circ}$ for the fluoride) because the Cp(centroid) $-\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{Cp}$ (centroid) angle is already very small.

Direct H/F Exchange. The first mechanism for H/F exchange tested by computational methods is to allow a fluorine atom in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ to approach the metallocene hydride and then to allow a $\mathrm{LaH} \cdots \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\right)$ and a $\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{F}$ interaction to develop, that is, a $\sigma$ bond metathesis transition state. ${ }^{31,32,34,39,40}$ The transition state will look like 6 and involve a carbon at the $\beta$ position of the kite-shaped transition state. This transition state looks attractive since the geometry around each atom is acceptable; in particular, the geometry of the carbon in the $\beta$ position is pseudotetrahedral. Indeed, a molecular orbital calculation has suggested such a transition state ${ }^{41}$ for which there is no experimental evidence. ${ }^{40}$ Such a transition state looks like a planar cyclohexadienyl fragment with the positively charged metal center bonded to H and F. Despite considerable effort, no such transition state could be located on the potential energy surface for either $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$. The kite-shaped transition state geometry is clearly energetically unfavorable with carbon at the $\beta$ position even when it is not hypervalent. One can speculate that the absence of such a transition state could be due to an electronic charge
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Figure 6. Two views of the optimized geometries (distances in $\AA$ ) of the structures associated with H transfer to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$. The value in parentheses is the number of imaginary frequencies, 0 for a minimum, 1 for a transition state.
distribution poorly adapted for good stabilization. It is reasonable to assume that considerable density would be accumulated in the $\pi$ system of the ring. However, the metal, which would be located nearby the $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-\mathrm{F}$ bonds, would be far from the part that should carry the negative charge and thus would have no stabilizing influence. This point of view is further supported by the location of a minimum for a structure with the metal bonded to the $\pi$ system of the cyclohexadienyl ring as discussed in the following section.


6
Hydride Addition to the Arene. An alternative mechanism is one in which the metallocene hydride adds to the sixmembered ring since the electronegative fluorine makes the aromatic ring more of an electrophile. The result is adduct, 7, in which the aromatic ring is perpendicular to the plane bisecting the $\mathrm{Cp}-\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{Cp}$ angle (Figure 6) and a $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ (centroid) -La distance of $3.29 \AA$. The free energy of this $\pi$ adduct 7 is 10.6 kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$ above the separated reactants. From this adduct, a
transition state, 8, $16.4 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ above the separated reactants is reached. This transition state places the hydrogen only 1.96 $\AA$ from the ring carbon atom that is not yet significantly rehybridized, as the carbon atom is part of an essentially planar $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ ring. This transition state then connects to a cyclohexadienyl adduct, 9 , with the metal bonded almost equally to the five carbons of the pentadienyl fragment $(2.9-3.0 \AA)$ and 3.51 $\AA$ from the rehybridized carbon. The $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bond is almost in the plane of the benzene ring while the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ bond is almost perpendicular to it. The $\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{sp}^{3}\right)-\mathrm{F}$ bond $(1.435 \AA)$ is longer than that calculated in $\mathrm{CH}_{3} \mathrm{~F}(1.382 \AA)$, consistent with some delocalization of the $\pi$ density into the $\sigma^{*}{ }_{\mathrm{CF}}$ orbital. Structure 9 is calculated to be $16.1 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ below the reactants. However, no path could be located that allows the $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}$ fragment to abstract a fluorine. Migration of the metal fragment to a position between H and F is not possible since a transition state or a minimum of type $\mathbf{6}$ could not be located. Dissociation into separated metallocene ion and cyclohexadienyl anion is a most unlikely event, especially in a nonpolar solvent such as benzene. Therefore, the path $\mathbf{7 \rightarrow 8} \boldsymbol{8}$ can only account for hydride transfer between the metal and the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ ring. A reversible hydride transfer related to the calculated one has been observed in $\left[(\mathrm{Ar} * \mathrm{~N}=)(\mathrm{Ar} * \mathrm{NH}) \mathrm{Ta}(\mathrm{H})\left(\mathrm{OSO}_{2} \mathrm{CF}_{3}\right)\right](\mathrm{Ar} * \mathrm{~N}=2,6-$ $\left.\left(2,4,6 \mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~N}\right) .{ }^{42}$ The bulkiness of the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ ring also disfavors the transfer of the hydride since it requires the fluoroarene to be perpendicular to the plane bisecting the $\mathrm{Cp}-$ $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{Cp}$ angle in the adduct 7 , transition-state $\mathbf{8}$, and cyclohexadienyl adduct 9 . To evaluate the destabilizing effect of the tertbutyl substituent, the adduct between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ was calculated with the ONIOM method (Figure 7). The bulky $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ groups prevent the close approach of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ to the metal as illustrated by the shortest distance $\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}\right)$ that increases from 3.48 to $5.15 \AA$ upon replacing Cp by $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$. In addition, whereas the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ is approximately parallel to the $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}$ direction with $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}$, this is not the case with the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ ligand. As a result, the attractive interaction between $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ and the metallocene hydride has decreased by $10.6 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1} .{ }^{43}$ This pathway is disfavored by steric hindrance and involves a nonproductive hydride transfer and is therefore not considered further.

F/H Exchange via HF Formation. Alternative pathways therefore had to be developed and explored by calculations. Figure 7 shows that $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ can slide between the two cyclopentadienyl rings to point a fluorine atom toward the metal center even in the presence of the bulky tert-butyl groups. Thus, the free energy of the $\sigma$ adduct of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}, \mathbf{1 0}$, is 8.2 kcal $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ below the separated reactants. The $\mathrm{CMe}_{3}$ groups destabilize the $\sigma$ adduct by only $6.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$, that is, by less than for the $\pi$ adduct. ${ }^{43}$ In addition, the calculated La $\cdots \mathrm{F}$ distance increases only moderately (from 2.746 to $3.084 \AA$ ) when replacing Cp by $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$. The stability of the $\sigma$ adduct illustrated by a free energy of dissociation of $8.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ is significant and shows that a fluoroarene can bind to an electrophilic metal center by using a fluorine lone pair, a coordination mode observed for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ with a cationic zirconocene. ${ }^{44}$ The calculated La $\cdots \mathrm{F}$ distance in $\mathbf{1 0}$ is also similar
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Figure 7. Space-filling and ball-and-sticks representation of the optimized geometries of the $\pi$ and $\sigma$ adducts of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ by the ONIOM (B3PW91:UFF) method. The distance given corresponds to the shortest one.


Figure 8. Free-energy profile $\Delta G\left(\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right.$ at 298.15 K$)$ for the reaction of $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{H}$ exchange via HF formation.
to that calculated in $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ illustrating the significant binding interaction.

Figure 8 shows the free-energy profile for the $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange between $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ starting with structure $\mathbf{1 0}$, which is without direct participation of the arene $\pi$ orbitals, and Figure 9 shows the structures of all extrema. In $\mathbf{1 0}, \mathrm{F}(1)$ is only 1.84 $\AA$ from the hydride. A transition state, $\mathbf{1 1}$, in which the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}(1)$ bond is cleaved, is located $29.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ above separated reactants. From 11, a rotation of the $\mathrm{F} \cdots \mathrm{H}$ atom pair in the plane
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Figure 9. Optimized geometries of the extrema for the $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{H}$ exchange reaction via HF formation. The free energies are in $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Large white circle $=\mathrm{La}$, middle size white circle $=\mathrm{C}$, small white circle $=\mathrm{H}$, black circle $=\mathrm{F}$. In parentheses, the number of imaginary frequencies, 0 for a minimum, 1 for a transition state.
bisecting the $\mathrm{Cp}-\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{Cp}$ angle forms $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)(\mathrm{FH}), \mathbf{1 2}$, $61.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ below reactants. In $\mathbf{1 2}$, the $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ group is bonded to La via C and $\mathrm{F}(2)$ as in $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}, 5$, but the $\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{F}(2)$ distance is significantly longer because FH remains in the coordination sphere of the metal. This F-H adduct transforms, almost without activation energy via transition-state 13, into $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{F}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ with a total gain of free energy of 90.5 $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ relative to reactants. This last step, which is formally a $\sigma$ bond metathesis since it involves an interchange between the $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds, is perhaps better viewed as a proton transfer from $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{F}$ to the negatively charged $\sigma$ aryl group. During the proton transfer, the carbon of the fluoroarene moves away from the metal ( 2.67 and $2.78 \AA$ in $\mathbf{1 2}$ and $\mathbf{1 3}$, respectively), but this is compensated by a shortening of the $\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{F}(2)$ bond ( 3.08 and $2.70 \AA$, respectively). This clearly emphasizes the key role of $F(2)$ serving as a hook between the $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}$ fragment and the arene so as to keep them in close proximity and lower the total free energy.

We have thus identified a pathway that transforms $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ into $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, with one high but still accessible energy barrier associated with the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ bond cleavage. At transition-state 11, the carbon that loses its fluorine is not yet bonded to $\mathrm{La}(3.7 \AA)$, while the hydride is $(\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}=$ $2.4 \AA$ ), and $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{F}(1)$, and H are aligned. The alignment of C, $\mathrm{F}(1)$, and H allows the carbon to maintain some bonding interaction with F . The distance $\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{F}(1)(2.52 \AA)$ is rather short suggesting some bonding interaction. A remarkable aspect of this transition state is the reorganization of electronic charge that occurs on the way to $\mathbf{1 2}$. In the reactant, $\mathbf{1 0}$, the polarity of the $\sigma$ bonds is $\mathrm{C}(1)^{\delta+}-\mathrm{F}(1)^{\delta-}$ and $\mathrm{La}^{\delta+}-\mathrm{H}^{\delta-}$ but in the product, 12, the polarity is $\mathrm{C}(1)^{\delta-}-\mathrm{La}^{\delta+}$ and $\mathrm{F}(1)^{\delta-}-\mathrm{H}^{\delta+}$. Stated in another way, $\mathrm{F}(1)$ and La exchange partners, which demands that $\mathrm{C}(1)$ and H must also exchange their charges! In the initial adduct, $\mathbf{1 0}$, the charge distribution is not very favorable because


Figure 10. NBO charges on selected atoms in (a) the reactant 10 and in (b) the transition-state 11.
the negatively charged $\mathrm{F}(1)$ is relatively close to the hydride that also carries a negative charge and $\mathrm{C}(1)$ carries a positive charge. At this point, the change in NBO charges from the reactant $\mathbf{1 0}$ to the transition-state $\mathbf{1 1}$ shows the magnitude of the electron reshuffling (Figure 10). The relatively large positive charge at the metal remains almost constant from reactant $(+2.34)$ to the transition state $(+2.41)$ as do the charges on $\mathrm{C}(2)$ and $\mathrm{F}(2)$. Hence, all of the changes in the electron density occur between the hydride and the $\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{F}(1)$ bond that is cleaved. In the reactant, the hydride is strongly negatively charged ( -0.64 ) while the charge on carbon is +0.31 and the fluorine is -0.29 . The larger charge on the hydride relative to that on $F(1)$ and even on $F(2)$ illustrates the strong nucleophilic character of the hydride ligand. At the transition state, the hydride charge is only -0.11 while the charge on $\mathrm{F}(1)$ increases to -0.51 and the carbon charge decreases to nearly zero. The 0.5 electron density lost by the hydride is distributed to the carbon ( $0.3 \mathrm{e}^{-}$gained) and to the fluorine ( $0.2 \mathrm{e}^{-}$gained). This is consistent with a net transfer of density from the nucleophilic hydride to the $\sigma^{*} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ weakening the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ bond. This electron flow is necessary to form the final product as the hydride becomes protonic to bind to the fluoride. In this reorganization, the $\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{F}(1)$ and $\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{C}$ interactions develop. The electron redistribution is the reason for the high-energy barrier, ${ }^{45}$ and any interaction that hinders the charge redistribution will raise the barrier.

The large thermodynamic driving force in the reaction is already apparent in the formation of $\mathbf{1 2}$ and is mostly associated with the formation of HF. However, formation of $\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ bond also plays a role. The calculated $\Delta G$ of $+22 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ for the isodesmic reaction 6 illustrates this point.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

The $\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{C}$ bond energy increases with F substitution on the arene but the energy of the $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}$ bond increases even more especially when there is a strong ionic character in the $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}$ bond, ${ }^{46}$ which is the case for lanthanide species. There is thus an energy preference for the reactant side in eq 6.

Reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathbf{L a H}$ with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathbf{H}$. In $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$, all pathways necessarily involve a $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation step, which is not the case for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, where there is a choice between $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation. A path essentially identical to that calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ with an almost identical energy pattern (difference of about 1 $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ in the free-energy profiles and essentially identical geometries for the extrema) is found for the reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2}-$
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Figure 11. Free-energy profile ( $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ at 298.15 K ) for the reaction $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}+\mathrm{H}_{2}$.

LaH with $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ where the $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{H}$ exchange occurs at the position para to the existing $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bond. This forms 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene and $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{F}$. However, we did not look at the energy profile for F/H exchange at the ortho or meta position with respect to the existing $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bond, since there is no experimental evidence for these two isomers.

The free-energy profile is shown in Figure 11 and the geometry of the extrema is shown in Figure 12. The pathway involving $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ activation starts with the formation of an adduct $\mathbf{1 4}$, in which an ortho F is coordinated to La and where the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bond points toward the hydride. This leads to the formation of a $\sigma$ complex between $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, which has a geometry identical to $\mathbf{1 0}$. From $\mathbf{1 4}$, a transfer of hydrogen from carbon-forming $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)$ occurs in a moderately exergonic step $\left(\Delta G=-15.5 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right.$ below separated reactants), with a small activation barrier $\left(\Delta G^{\#}=8.2 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}\right.$ above 14) as it crosses the transition-state 15. The transition state is clearly a proton transfer from $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}-\mathrm{H}$ to the hydride as shown by the alignment of the carbon, the transferring H , and the hydride. At the transition state, the carbon is not yet bonded to $\mathrm{La}(\mathrm{La} \cdots \mathrm{C}=3.04 \AA)$. The transition-state 15 leads to a dihydrogen complex, $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right), \mathbf{1 6}$, where $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ hardly perturbes the geometry of free $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)$. Dihydrogen loss from 16 occurs without change in free energy. From $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-$ $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right), \mathbf{5}, \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation occurs with a significant activation barrier ( $23.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ above separated reactants and 38.6 kcal $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ above $\left.\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)\right)$. The transition-state $\mathbf{1 7}$ produces $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}$. The overall transformation is exergonic compared to isolated $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ even if trapping of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ by $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right.$ in the experiments) is not included in the modeling. However, the last elementary step $\left(\mathbf{5} \rightarrow \mathbf{1 7} \rightarrow \mathrm{Cp}_{2^{-}}\right.$ $\left.\mathrm{LaF}+\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right)$ is endergonic in the absence of trapping. When the trapping reaction is included, the free energy of the final species is $-53.0 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ compared to the path initiated by the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ cleavage. The transition-state $\mathbf{1 7}$ for formation of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{F}$ shows an unusual orientation of the tetrafluorobenzyne ligand. Unlike all other ligands in this study, it does not lie in the plane bisecting the $\mathrm{Cp}-\mathrm{La}-\mathrm{Cp}$ angle but is significantly twisted out of it. This could be associated with a need for the very strongly electron deficient fluorinated benzyne to interact with the electron density of the Cp ring.

Interpretation of Experiments from Calculations. The experiments described show that the net $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange reaction that results in formation of a $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{F}$ bond from a $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}$ bond is exothermic and rapid. The first resonances detected on mixing $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ in the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra are due to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. The dihydrogen is derived from the reaction of the metallocene hydride and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ confirmed by independent experiment, which implies that the net rate constants for
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Figure 12. Optimized geometries of the extrema for the reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ via successive $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation for formation of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}$, $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$, and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. The structures of reactant $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$, and products $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}-\mathrm{F}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ are not shown. The free energies are in kcal mol ${ }^{-1}$. Large white circle $=\mathrm{La}$, middle size white circle $=\mathrm{C}$, small white circle $=\mathrm{H}$, black circle $=\mathrm{F}$. In parentheses, the number of imaginary frequencies, 0 for a minimum, 1 for a transition state.
formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ from $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ are comparable since $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ are formed in comparable amounts even though the individual rate constants for intermolecular $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation are different. Calculations show comparable energy barriers for the ratedetermining steps, which in both cases is cleavage of the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ bond, although by different mechanisms. The calculated barriers of the reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ indicate that the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation barrier is about 4 times that for $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ activation. The calculated barrier for intramolecular $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ cleavage in going from $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ to $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ is comparable to that of the intermolecular $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ cleavage in the reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$. Once $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ is formed, two pathways are available for further reaction; in the presence of HF , a barrierless path to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, or in absence of HF , a high barrier path to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and tetrafluorobenzyne. The latter is then trapped by $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ or by $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ in a [2+4] cycloaddition that is WoodwardHoffmann allowed. The slow rate for elimination of tetrafluorobenzyne is consistent with experiment, since $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ is an isolable compound and it decomposes to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and the Diels-Alder adduct, which is spectroscopically detected.

The calculated pathways provide a qualitative rational for the observed products of the reaction between $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$. The $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ can only react via $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ cleavage and the calculations show that $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ and the cerium fluoride complex, which is observed, are formed in a step that has a significant but presumably accessible barrier. As soon as $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ is formed, it can easily react via the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ bond to form $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ complex and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, both of which are observed. The reverse reaction is not thermodynamically favored in agreement with experiment. The decomposition of the aryl complex to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ and the cerium fluoride requires a high barrier, in agreement with the isolation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)$ and observation of its slow elimination of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}$ that is trapped, which lowers the net free energy of the reaction. Figures 8 and 11 show that HF and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ are produced during the reaction but experimentally only $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is observed. This is no contradiction. The bonding between $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ and the metal center is extremely weak (the calculations give no variation in $\Delta G$ upon loss of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ ), so $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is released as soon as it forms. The reaction of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ with the metallocene aryls is not expected to produce the metallocene hydride and the arene since this reaction is thermodynamically unfavorable. For
example, the transformation of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ into $\mathrm{Cp}_{2}-$ $\mathrm{LaC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is exergonic by $14.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. In $1,2,4,5-$ tetrafluorobenzene, the reaction is even more exergonic $(\Delta G$ $=-21.9 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ ). Liberation of $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ is thus expected and observed. In contrast, HF is more strongly bound and release of HF is energetically unfavorable. For example, the loss of HF from $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{La}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right)(\mathrm{HF})$ is endergonic by $18 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$. Further, the addition of HF across the metal-carbon occurs with a low activation barrier so the HF formed is rapidly consumed to make $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}$ and an arene with one less fluorine. Finally, the reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and HF leads first to $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}(\mathrm{FH}) 1.5$ $\mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ below separated reactants, which transforms into $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaF}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ by going over a transition state that is 10.3 kcal $\mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ above the separated reactants. The final compounds $\mathrm{Cp}_{2^{-}}$ LaF and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ are $62.8 \mathrm{kcal} \mathrm{mol}^{-1}$ below $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and HF . Therefore, any HF that is formed is consumed in production of the metal fluoride.

## Epilogue

The calculations provide a reasonable framework to guide our understanding of the hills and valleys that the strongly exergonic $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange reaction must traverse, without oxidative addition, reductive elimination sequences. The key points that emerge are (i) the activation barrier for $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{H}$ activation is lower than for $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ activation but the final product distribution is not determined by the relative barriers of these two processes. The calculated pathways show that the energy barriers for $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ cleavage from $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ and for the reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2} \mathrm{LaH}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ are comparable. (ii) The $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{H}$ exchange occurs by initial coordination of the fluoroarene by the fluorine lone pairs in a $\sigma$ type complex. The $\pi$ orbitals of the arene are not directly involved in the F/H exchange. (iii) The formal bond metathesis that occurs between $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}$ and $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{F}$ to form $\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}$ and $\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{H}$ requires a strong electronic rearrangement at the transition state. During this process, the hydrogen atom in $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}$ that initially is hydridic becomes protonic, while the carbon that loses the F atom is initially positively charged and then neutral and then carbanionic. The electron flow that is associated with this electronic reorganization is different from that occurring in a typical $\sigma$ bond metathesis and is the principal reason for the high barrier. (iv) Throughout the exchange reaction, the lone pair on the ortho-F is hooked to the electropositive metal center maintaining the translational entropy nearly constant. (v) The net result is that the thermodynamic favorable state is reached in a formal $\mathrm{H} / \mathrm{F}$ exchange.

## Experimental Details

General. All manipulations were performed under an inert atmosphere using standard Schenk and drybox techniques. All solvents were dried and distilled from sodium or sodium benzophenone ketyl. Fluoroand hydrofluorobenzenes were dried and vacuum transferred from calcium hydride. Infrared spectra were recorded on a Perkin-Elmer 283 spectrometer as Nujol mulls between CsI plates. NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker AMX-300 or AMX-400 spectrometers at $19^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in the solvent specified. ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR chemical shifts are referenced to $\mathrm{CFCl}_{3}$ at 0 ppm . J-Young NMR tubes were used for all NMR tube experiments. Melting points were measured on a Thomas-Hoover melting point apparatus in sealed capillaries. Electron impact mass spectrometry and elemental analyses were performed by the microanalytical facility at the University of California, Berkeley. Samples for GC-MS were prepared from NMR reaction samples by adding a drop of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ or $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$, agitating, and allowing the sample to stand closed for

10 min . The samples were then dried over magnesium sulfate, filtered, and diluted 10 fold with hexane. A $1-\mu \mathrm{L}$ sample was injected into an HP6890 GC system with a J\&W DB-XLB universal nonpolar column, attached to an HP5973 mass selective detector. The principle elution peaks consisted of free $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}$ and the fluorobenzyne to benzene cycloaddition products. The abbreviation $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}$ is used for the $1,3,4$-tri-tert-butylcyclopentadienyl ligand.
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e O T f} \cdot \mathbf{0 . 5}$ Hexane. Cerium triflate ${ }^{47}(15.0 \mathrm{~g}, 25.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ and $\mathrm{Cp}_{2}^{\prime} \mathrm{Mg}^{48}(12.0 \mathrm{~g}, 24.5 \mathrm{mmol})$ were stirred at reflux in a mixture of pyridine ( 10 mL ) and toluene for 24 h . The dark brown suspension was taken to dryness under reduced pressure. The residue was extracted with hexane $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The volume of the solution was reduced until precipitation occurred, warmed to dissolve the precipitate, and then cooled to $-15{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The large brown crystals were recrystallized five times from hexane, until the crystals obtained were bright yellow in color. Yield, $11 \mathrm{~g}(14 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \%)$. MP $300-302{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{D}_{8}\right): \delta 4.16\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=75 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.25(\mathrm{~m}$, hexane), $0.88(\mathrm{t}$, hexane, the integrated intensity of these two absorptions indicated about 0.5 hexane per metallocene), $-5.36\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=60 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-13.66(18 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\nu_{1 / 2}=60 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$. IR: $1340(\mathrm{~s}), 1240(\mathrm{~m}), 1220(\mathrm{~m}), 1210(\mathrm{~m}), 1190(\mathrm{~m})$, 1180(m), 1170(w), 1020(s), 960(w), 830(m), 780(w), 690(w), 680(w), 640(s), $600(\mathrm{w}), 550(\mathrm{w}), 520(\mathrm{w}), 450(\mathrm{w}), 370(\mathrm{w}) \mathrm{cm}^{-1} . \mathrm{MS}(\mathrm{M})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ (calcd, found) $755(100,100) 756(41,40) 757(26,25) 758(8,8)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{58} \mathrm{CeF}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~S}+0.5$ hexane: C, 57.1; H, 8.20. Found C, 57.2; H, 8.32.
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e C H}_{2} \mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{H}_{5}$. The triflate, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeOTf} \cdot 0.5$ hexane $(4.0 \mathrm{~g}, 5.0$ mmol), was dissolved in 30 mL of diethyl ether and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{MgCl}$ ( $6.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.75 \mathrm{M}$ in diethyl ether, 5.0 mmol ) was added via syringe. The solution immediately changed from yellow to red and became cloudy within 5 min . After 5 min , the solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the red solid was extracted into 20 mL of pentane. The volume of the solution was reduced to 10 mL and cooled to -15 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, giving red blocks. Yield, $2.1 \mathrm{~g}(3.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 60 \%)$. MP $111-113$ ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right): \delta 13.25\left(2 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=245 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.29\left(2 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=\right.$ $20 \mathrm{~Hz}), 2.47\left(1 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=14 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-0.53\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=190 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-1.80$ $\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=195 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-13.19\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=45 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-32.62\left(2 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}\right.$ $=280 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ). IR: $1590(\mathrm{~s}), 1490(\mathrm{~s}), 1370(\mathrm{~s}), 1360(\mathrm{~s}), 1240(\mathrm{~s}), 1220(\mathrm{~m})$, 1210(w), 1170(w), 1160(w), 1030(w), 1000(m), 960(w), 930(m), 890(w), $860(\mathrm{w}), 820(\mathrm{~m}), 810(\mathrm{~s}), 790(\mathrm{~m}), 730(\mathrm{~s}), 720(\mathrm{w}), 700(\mathrm{~m}), 690-$ (m), $680(\mathrm{~m}), 510(\mathrm{w}), 440(\mathrm{w}), 360(\mathrm{w}) \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{41} \mathrm{H}_{65^{-}}$ Ce: C, 70.5; H, 9.39. Found C, 70.3; H, 9.32. MS: no (M) ${ }^{+}$was observed but $\left(\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{PhCH}_{3}\right)^{+}$was found $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ (calcd, found) $605(100,100)$ $606(39,43) 607(17,21) 608(6,6)$.
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e H}$. The benzyl, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeCH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 1.4 \mathrm{mmol})$, was dissolved in 10 mL of pentane. The headspace in the Schlenk tube was evacuated and replaced with $\mathrm{H}_{2}(1 \mathrm{~atm})$. The red solution turned purple over 30 min . After 2 h , the volume of the solution was reduced until precipitation occurred and then warmed to dissolve the precipitate. Cooling to $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ yielded purple crystals. Yield, $0.76 \mathrm{~g}(1.2 \mathrm{mmol}$, $85 \%)$. MP $152-155{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right): \delta 31.86\left(4 \mathrm{H}, \nu_{1 / 2}=220\right.$ $\mathrm{Hz}),-3.44\left(36 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=45 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-12.45\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=45 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$. Neither the resonances nor the stretching frequencies of $\mathrm{Ce}-\mathrm{H}$ were conclusively identified. IR: $2160(\mathrm{~m}), 1360(\mathrm{~s}), 1250(\mathrm{~s}), 1200(\mathrm{~s}), 1170(\mathrm{~m})$, 1020(s), 1000(s), $960(\mathrm{~m}), 930(\mathrm{w}), 920(\mathrm{w}), 870(\mathrm{w}), 840(\mathrm{w}), 810(\mathrm{~s}), 800-$ (m), 790(w), $780(\mathrm{w}), 680(\mathrm{~s}), 670(\mathrm{~s}), 600(\mathrm{~m}), 520(\mathrm{~s}), 480(\mathrm{w}), 440(\mathrm{~m})$, $360(\mathrm{~s}) \mathrm{cm}^{-1}$. MS: no (M) ${ }^{+}$was observed but $(\mathrm{M}-2)^{+}$was found $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ (calcd, found) $605(100,100) 606(39,43) 607(17,21) 608(6,6)$. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{59} \mathrm{Ce}: \mathrm{C}, 67.2 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.78$. Found C, $67.5 ; \mathrm{H}, 10.11$.
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e F}$. The benzyl, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeCH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}(1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 1.4 \mathrm{mmol})$, was dissolved in 10 mL of pentane and $\mathrm{BF}_{3} \cdot \mathrm{OEt}_{2}(0.09 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.032 \mathrm{~g}, 0.23$ mmol ) was added via syringe. The red solution immediately turned orange. The solution volume was reduced until precipitation occurred and then warmed to dissolve the precipitate. Cooling to $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ yielded

[^12]an orange powder. Yield, $0.44 \mathrm{~g}(0.70 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%)$. MP $164-167^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right): \delta 20.00\left(4 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=70 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-2.50\left(36 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=10\right.$ $\mathrm{Hz}),-6.81\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$. IR: 2380(w), 2280(w), 2180(w), 1630(w), 1590(w), 1350(s), 1270(w), 1260(m), 1240(s), 1200(s), 1170(s), $1110(\mathrm{~m}), 1090(\mathrm{~m}), 1020(\mathrm{~m}), 1000(\mathrm{~s}), 960(\mathrm{~s}), 930(\mathrm{w}), 920(\mathrm{w}), 870-$ (w), 810(s), 780(m), 700(m), 690(m), 680(s), $640(\mathrm{w}) \mathrm{cm}^{-1} . \mathrm{MS}(\mathrm{M})^{+}$ $m / z=($ calcd, found $) 625(100,100), 626(39,40) 627(20,20) 628(6$, 5). Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{58} \mathrm{CeF}$ : C, $65.2 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.34$. Found C, 65.3 ; H , 9.46.
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathbf{M e}_{3} \mathbf{C}\right)_{2} \mathbf{C}_{5} \mathbf{H}_{2} \mathbf{C}\left(\mathbf{M e}_{2}\right) \mathbf{C H}_{2}\right) \mathbf{C e} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right) \quad(0.7 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0$ $\mathrm{mmol})$ was heated in pentane $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ for 12 h . The red solution turned deep purple. The solvent was removed yielding a glassy solid. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right) \delta 35.83\left(1 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=200 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 33.71\left(1 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=158 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 16.24$ $\left(3 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=30 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.97\left(3 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=50 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-3.40\left(9 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=50\right.$ $\mathrm{Hz}),-5.63\left(9 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=45 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-7.56\left(9 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=50 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-10.10$ $\left(9 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=10 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-16.13\left(9 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=45 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-29.25\left(1 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=\right.$ 110 Hz ).
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e C}_{6} \mathbf{H}_{5} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)(1 \mathrm{~g}, 1.4 \mathrm{mmol})$ was heated at reflux in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}(20 \mathrm{~mL})$ for 3 days. The solution turned a deeper red and a small amount of yellow precipitate formed. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure and pentane $(15 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added. The solution was filtered, the volume was reduced to 10 mL , and the solution was cooled to $-15{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, giving a deep red powder. Yield, $123 \mathrm{mg}(0.2 \mathrm{mmol}$, $14 \%) .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right): \delta 7.88(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}), 6.12(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}),-1.73\left(36 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}\right.$ $=8 \mathrm{~Hz}),-10.48\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=11 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$; the ortho proton resonance was not observed. Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{40} \mathrm{H}_{63} \mathrm{Ce}$ : C, 70.2; H, 9.28. Found C, 70.1; H, 9.31.
$\left\{\left[\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{3}\right]_{3} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathbf{H}_{2}\right\}\left\{\left[\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{3}\right]_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathbf{H}_{2}\left[\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{2} \mathrm{CD}_{2}\right]\right\} \mathrm{Ce}$. The benzyl, $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeCH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}$, was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ in an NMR tube. The sample was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After 6 days, the solution was taken to dryness. Fresh $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ was added, and the sample was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for another 6 days. The solution was taken to dryness, and the deep red solid residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$. The sample was heated for 1 day at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to generate the metallacycle. To determine the degree of deuteration of the Cp '-rings, a drop of degassed $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added. GC MS analysis showed a mixture of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}-d_{28}, \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}-d_{27}$, and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}-d_{26}$ in a $40: 8: 1$ ratio, $(\mathrm{M})^{+} m / z$ (calcd, found) $260(1,1) 261(18,18) 262(100,100) 263$ $(19,17) 264(2,2)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\left\{\left[\mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{CD}_{3}\right)_{3}\right]_{3} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2}\right\}_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$. A drop of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ was added to the solution of the perdeuterated metallacyle. The deep purple solution rapidly turned orange. The ${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum showed resonances consistent with $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$, and the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ spectrum showed only traces of undeuterated tert-butyl resonances. The solution was taken to dryness to remove excess $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, and the orange residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$. The sample was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 day and then hydrolyzed with a drop of degassed $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. The ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum indicated the formation of a new fluorinecontaining species whose spectrum was not perturbed by the addition of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. Analysis by GCMS showed one major component in addition to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}-d_{28}$, with $(\mathrm{M})^{+} m / z 410$. This is believed to be the symmetric isomer of the $[2+4]$ cycloaddition of tetrafluorobenzyne and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}$ $d_{28}, \mathbf{2}$. Characterization of cycloaddition product: ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right) \delta$ $-145.46(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}),-158.78(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})$. GC MS analysis suggests a mixture of 2- $d_{28}$ and $2-d_{27}$ in a $3: 1$ ratio, $(\mathrm{M})^{+} m / z$ (calcd, found) $409(34,32)$ $410(100,100) 411(25,33)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{H}_{6} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and the solution was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h yielding $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$. The solution was taken to dryness and the solid residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$. The sample was heated at $60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 days and then taken to dryness and the solid residue dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR showed resonances characteristic of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}$ and the integrated intensities indicated quantitative conversion.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ in $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{D}_{12}$. $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and the solution was heated at $60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h yielding $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$ -

Ce. The tube was cooled in a liquid nitrogen 2-propanol bath, and the headspace was evacuated and replaced with $\mathrm{CF}_{3} \mathrm{H}(1 \mathrm{~atm})$. The tube was warmed to $19{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and agitated. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR showed resonances whose integrated intensities indicated quantitative formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} 2^{-}$ CeH .
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e}\left(\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{5}\right) . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}(0.6 \mathrm{~g} .1 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in pentane $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}(0.18 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{mmol})$ was added via syringe. The purple solution immediately turned orange. The solution volume was reduced to 5 mL and the solution was cooled to $-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, yielding orange crystals. The low yield was due to the high solubility of the compound. Yield: $0.15 \mathrm{~g}(0.19 \mathrm{mmol}), 19 \% .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right) \delta-1.77\left(36 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=190 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-10.29\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=55 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right) \delta-157.64(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{t}, J=18 \mathrm{~Hz}),-160.97(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~d}, J=$ $18 \mathrm{~Hz}),-210.4\left(2 \mathrm{~F}, v_{1 / 2}=482 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$. The solid material decomposed rapidly above $135^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, which precludes analysis by EI-MS.
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e}\left(\mathbf{p}-\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{4} \mathbf{H}\right) . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and the solution was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h yielding $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\right.$ $\left.\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$. Three drops of 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene (an excess) were added to a clean NMR tube and the solution of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\right.$ $\left.\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$ was slowly added with agitation. The solution turned from purple to orange. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra showed that $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} 2^{-}$ $\mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}\right)$ formed quantitatively. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right) \delta 3.20\left(1 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}\right.$ $=18 \mathrm{~Hz}),-1.84\left(36 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=130 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-9.80\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=50 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right)-140.57\left(2 \mathrm{~F}, v_{1 / 2}=30 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-241.5\left(2 \mathrm{~F}, v_{1 / 2}=410\right.$ Hz ).
$\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e}\left(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{4}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{4}\right) \mathbf{C e C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2}$. Two NMR tubes containing equal amounts of concentrated solutions of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ were heated at $60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h yielding solutions of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$ Ce. Three drops of 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene (an excess) were added to a clean NMR tube and one of the solutions of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\right.$ $\left.\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$ was slowly added with agitation. The orange solution was taken to dryness to remove excess 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene, and the second solution of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$ was added. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ $\operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right)-1.98\left(36 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=200 \mathrm{~Hz}\right),-9.15\left(18 \mathrm{H}, v_{1 / 2}=65 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right)-217.06(2 \mathrm{~F}$, broad s). After 10 min , a yellow precipitate began to form. The solution was stored at room temperature for 1 day and then filtered. The insoluble yellow precipitate was suspended in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ and heated at $60{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 day, yielding a clear yellow/orange solution. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR revealed resonances consistent with $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$.

Decomposition of $\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e}\left(\mathbf{1}, 4-\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{4}\right) \mathbf{C e C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2}$ with $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}(1,4-$ $\left.\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right) \mathrm{CeCp}^{\prime} 2$ was suspended in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ in an NMR tube, and a drop of degassed $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ was added. The tube was agitated vigorously and then allowed to stand for 10 min . The solution was dried over $\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}$ and filtered. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR showed the presence of $1,2,4,5-$ tetrafluorobenzene.

Reaction of $\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{M g}$ and $\mathbf{B r M g C} \mathbf{6}_{\mathbf{6}} \mathbf{F}_{5} \cdot \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{M g}(0.35 \mathrm{~g}, 0.71 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in cyclohexane $(5 \mathrm{~mL})$ and $\mathrm{BrMgC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}(1.6 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.22 \mathrm{M}$ in diethyl ether, 0.35 mmol ) was added. ${ }^{49}$ The cloudy solution was stirred at reflux for 12 h , by which time the solution had turned bright pink. A drop of degassed water was added to an aliquot of the solution ( 1 mL ). The complicated ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectrum contained six major signals, which appeared to correspond to two fluorine-containing compounds in a $1: 1.5$ ratio. GC MS analysis showed two primary components in addition to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$, one with $(\mathrm{M})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 382$ and one with $(\mathrm{M}-57)^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 325$, in a $1: 1.5$ ratio. These are believed to be the two isomers of the $[2+4]$ cycloaddition product of tetrafluorobenzyne and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$, one symmetric and the other asymmetric, with the asymmetric isomer readily eliminating a $t$-Bu group. Characterization of symmetric isomer: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $4.19(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.10(36 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.45(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}),{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta-145.32(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{D}),-158.65(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}) . \mathrm{GC}$ MS $(\mathrm{M})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ (calcd, found) $382(100,100) 383(26,26) 384(3,3)$. Asymmetric isomer: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) 3.99(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 2.04(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.92(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.45(18 \mathrm{H}$, s), ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta-130.98(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}),-147.20(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}),-157.33$

[^13]$(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}),-158.90(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})$. GC MS (M-57) ${ }^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ (calcd, found) 325 $(100,100) 326(21,23) 327(2,2)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{5}$ in $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{D}_{12} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and the solution was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra indicated the formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and a new fluorine-containing species whose spectrum was not perturbed by the addition of a drop of $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. GC MS analysis showed four primary components in addition to $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$, one with $(\mathrm{M})^{+} m / z 382$ and three with (M-57) ${ }^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z} 325$, in a 13:5:1:2 ratio. These are believed to be isomers of the $[2+4]$ cycloaddition product of tetrafluorobenzyne and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$, one symmetric and the others asymmetric, with the asymmetric isomers readily eliminating a $t$ - Bu group. Characterization of the symmetric isomer: ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right) 4.23(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.22(36 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 0.61$ $(18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}),{ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}\right) \delta-145.37(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}),-158.72(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}) . \mathrm{GC}$ MS $(\mathrm{M})^{+} m / z$ (calcd, found) $382(100,100) 383(26,28) 384(3,3)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{5}$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathbf{H}_{6} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$ and the solution was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra indicated the formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$, the symmetric $[4+2]$ cycloaddition product of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$ and tetrafluorobenzyne, and $5,6,7,8$-tetrafluoro-1,4-dihydro-1,4-methanonaphthalene- $d_{0}$, the cycloaddition product of tetrafluorobenzyne to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}($ Fruchier697). The latter two products were present in a 1:20 ratio. Characterization of 5,6,7,8-tetrafluoro-1,4-dihydro-1,4-methanonaphthalene- $d_{0}:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 6.45(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) 4.77(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}){ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\delta-149.33(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})$, $-161.91(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})$. GC MS $(\mathrm{M})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ (calcd, found) $226(100,100) 227$ $(13,12)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{5}$ in $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{D}_{6} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeC}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ and the solution was heated at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra indicated the formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$, the symmetric $[4+2]$ cycloaddition product of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime} \mathrm{H}$ and tetrafluorobenzyne, and 5,6,7,8-tetrafluoro-1,4-dihydro-1,4-methanonaphthalene- $d_{6}$, the cycloaddition product of tetrafluorobenzyne to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}{ }^{25}$ The latter two products were present in a $1: 10$ ratio. Characterization of $5,6,7,8$ -tetrafluoro-1,4-dihydro-1,4-methanonaphthalene- $d_{6}$ : ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right)$ $\delta-149.32(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}),-161.96(2 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})$. GC MS (M) ${ }^{+} m / z$ (calcd, found) $232(100,100) 233(14,13)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e}\left(\mathbf{p}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{4} \mathbf{H}\right)$ in $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{H}_{6} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}-$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and the solution was heated at 60 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h yielding $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$. Three drops of 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene were added to a clean NMR tube and the solution of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$ was slowly added with agitation. The solution turned from purple to orange. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra were consistent with quantitative formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}-$ ( $p-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}$ ). The solution was taken to dryness to remove excess $1,2,4,5-$ tetrafluorobenzene and the solid residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6}$. The sample was heated to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The solution was taken to dryness and dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra indicated the formation of $\mathrm{Cp}_{2}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and 5,7,8-trifluoro-1,4,6-trihydro-1,4-methanon-aphthalene- $d_{0}$, the cycloaddition product of 2,3,5-trifluorobenzyne to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6} .{ }^{29}$ Characterization of $5,7,8$-trifluoro-1,4,6-trihydro-1,4-metha-nonaphthalene- $d_{0}:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR $\delta 6.40(4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) 6.08(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}) 4.89(2 \mathrm{H}$, m) ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\delta-126.74(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})-139.48(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})-152.68(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})$. GC-MS $(\mathrm{M})^{+} \mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}(\mathrm{calcd}$, found) $208(100,100) 209(13,13)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathbf{1}, 4-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathbf{H}\right)$ in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}-$ $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right)$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{12}$ and the solution was heated at 60 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h yielding $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$. Three drops of 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene were added to a clean NMR tube and the solution of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}\left(\left(\mathrm{Me}_{3} \mathrm{C}\right)_{2} \mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{C}\left(\mathrm{Me}_{2}\right) \mathrm{CH}_{2}\right) \mathrm{Ce}$ was slowly added with agitation. The solution turned from purple to orange. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra were consistent with quantitative formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}-$ $\left(1,4-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}\right)$. The solution was taken to dryness to remove excess 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene and the solid residue was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$. The sample was heated to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 12 h . The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra indicated the formation of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and $5,7,8$-trifluoro-1,4,6-trihydro1,4 -methanonaphthalene- $d_{6}$, the cycloaddition product of $2,3,5$-trifluorobenzyne to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6} .{ }^{29}$ Characterization of $5,7,8$-trifluoro-1,4,6-trihydro-

1,4-methanonaphthalene- $d_{6}:{ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \operatorname{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right) \delta 6.06(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}){ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR $\delta-126.74(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})-139.48(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m})-152.68(1 \mathrm{~F}, \mathrm{~m}) . \mathrm{GC}-\mathrm{MS}(\mathrm{M})^{+}$ $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{z}$ (calcd, found) $214(100,100) 215(14,14)$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e H}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{F}_{6}$ in $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathbf{D}_{6}$. $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ and a drop of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{6}$ was added. The solution immediately turned from purple to orange and gas bubbles were evolved. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra showed resonances indicative of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right), \mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$, and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$. The cerium-containing species were present in a 3:2 ratio and accounted quantitatively for all of the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ starting material. The sample was stored at room temperature for 7 days. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra showed resonances indicative of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}$ and $5,6,7,8$-tetrafluoro-1,4-dihydro-1,4-methanonaphthalene $-d_{6}$, the $[2+4]$ cycloaddition product of tetrafluorobenzyne and $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$.

NMR Tube Reaction of $\mathbf{C p}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathbf{C e H}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathbf{H}$ in $\mathbf{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6} . \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ was dissolved in $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ and a drop of $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5} \mathrm{H}$ was added. The solution immediately turned from purple to orange and gas bubbles were evolved. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra showed resonances indicative of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}, \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{5}\right), \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{H}\right), \mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ce}\left(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{~F}_{4}\right) \mathrm{CeCp}^{\prime}{ }_{2}$, and 1,2,4,5-tetrafluorobenzene. The cerium-containing species were present in a 3.5:2.5:1:4 ratio and accounted quantitatively for all of the $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeH}$ starting material. The sample was stored at room temperature for 7 days. The ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}$ NMR spectra showed resonances indicative of $\mathrm{Cp}^{\prime}{ }_{2} \mathrm{CeF}, 5,6,7,8$-tetrafluoro-1,4-dihydro-1,4-methanon-aphthalene- $d_{6}$, and 5,7,8-trifluoro-1,4,6-trihydro-1,4-methanonaphtha-lene- $d_{0}$, the [2+4] cycloaddition products of tetrafluorobenzyne and 2,3,5-trifluorobenzyne to $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$, respectively.

## Computational Details

The Stuttgart-Dresden-Bonn relativistic large effective core potential (RECP) ${ }^{50}$ has been used to represent the inner shells of La. The associated basis set augmented by an f polarization function $(\alpha=1.000)$ has been used to represent the valence orbitals. F has also been represented by an RECP ${ }^{51}$ with the associated basis set augmented by two contracted d polarization Gaussian functions ( $\alpha_{1}=3.3505-$ $\left.(0.357851), \alpha_{2}=0.9924(0.795561)\right) .{ }^{52} \mathrm{C}$ and H have been represented by an all-electron $6-31 \mathrm{G}(\mathrm{d}, \mathrm{p})$ basis set. ${ }^{53}$ The two-layer ONIOM calculations were carried out at the B3PW91:UFF level. ${ }^{54}$ Calculations have been carried out at the DFT(B3PW91) level ${ }^{55}$ with Gaussian $98 .{ }^{56}$ The nature of the extrema (minimum or transition state) has been established with analytical frequency calculations and the intrinsic reaction coordinate (IRC) has been followed to confirm that 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 for $T=298.15$ K. Following the tradition, we report geometrical parameters

[^14]with an accuracy of $10^{-3} \AA$ and angles with an accuracy of $10^{-1}$ degrees although we often discuss the geometrical parameters with lesser accuracy because of the many approximations made in the modeling and in the level of calculation.
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