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Coordination of 3-Methylindole-Based Tripodal Tetraphosphine Ligands to Iron(+II), Cobalt(+II), and Nickel(+II) and Investigations of their Subsequent Two-Electron Reduction


Abstract: We report the coordination chemistry of indole based tripodal tetraphosphine ligands to iron(II), cobalt(II) and nickel(II). These complexes are formed by simple synthetic protocols and were characterized by a combination of spectroscopic techniques and single-crystal X-ray analysis. The molecular structures as determined by X-ray diffraction show that the geometry of the nickel and cobalt complexes are distorted trigonal bipyramidal. The monocationic iron(II) complexes also have distorted trigonal bipyramidal geometries, but the dicationic analogue has an octahedral geometry. Two-electron reduction of the cobalt(+II) and the nickel(+II) complexes in the presence of N₂ did not lead to the coordination of N₂. In contrast, two-electron reduction of the iron(+II) complexes did lead to coordination of dinitrogen to the iron center. The FeN₂L1H complex has a trigonal bipyramidal geometry, and the N–N bond length of the coordinated dinitrogen ligand is longer than that of free dinitrogen, indicating that coordination to this iron(0) complex results in activation of the N≡N bond.

Introduction

Recent years brought about a renaissance of coordination chemistry of base metals. Their abundance and generally lower toxicity in comparison to noble metals makes them ideal candidates to explore them as new homogeneous catalysts.[1–4] Complexes of base metals with phosphine based ligands are among the many highly active catalysts that can facilitate very challenging reactions ranging from reduction of unsaturated compounds such as alkynes,[5] aldehydes[6] or carboxylic acids and esters[7] to reduction of CO₂.[8–14] In particular, expanding the coordination chemistry of base metals with tripodal, tetradentate ligands is attractive, as complexes of tripodal phosphine ligands with base metal iron and cobalt reveal outstanding activity in (among others) dehydrogenation/hydrogenation of CO₂-based fuels or reduction of N₂.[11,15–19]

We turned our attention to the tripodal, tetradentate tris[1-(diphenylphosphanyl)-3-methyl-1H-indol-2-yl]phosphane ligand (L1H) (Figure 1), which has previously been used in coordination chemistry with Pd,[20] Rh,[21,22] Cu,[22] and Ru,[23,24] showing a remarkable potential to stabilize rare paramagnetic RhII[20] and RuI species,[23] as well as Ru0 dinitrogen complexes.[23,24] These intriguing results triggered us to further explore the coordination behavior of the tripodal indolyl-based ligands with the earth abundant metals iron, cobalt and nickel. Tripodal tetradentate phosphine based complexes using either PPPh₃ = P(CH₂CH₂PPh₂)₃ or PPiPr₃ = [P(CH₂CH₂P(iPr)₂)₃] coordinated to iron(II), cobalt(II) and nickel(II) have been exten-
sively studied. These tripodal ligands generally occupy four coordination sites around a metal center and a trigonal bipyramidal geometry (TBP) is the most commonly observed geometry when the ligand is coordinated to a first row transition metal center. These \([MX(PP)]^+\) complexes are formed by reacting the corresponding MX salt with the ligand in the presence of a non-coordinating anion and can subsequently be reduced leading to the coordination of dinitrogen to the metal center.

In this paper, we first discuss the coordination of tripodal indolyl-based tetraphosphine ligands to the first-row late transition metals iron, cobalt, and nickel. The coordination of tris[1-(diphenylphosphanyl)-3-methyl-1H-indol-2-yl]phosphane (L1H) to these metals is investigated in detail. Single crystal X-ray structure determination of these complexes allowed to study the changes in the coordination geometry of the ligand while stepwise increasing the d-electron count from d⁶ to d⁷ to d⁸ by going from iron(+II) to cobalt(+II) to nickel(+II). Additionally, coordination studies of a variety of 3-methylindole based ligands (L1H, L2H, and L3PP) to iron(+II) and the synthetic challenges involved during coordination of these ligands to iron are reported.

In the second section, the electrochemical and chemical reduction of the above-mentioned complexes is described. Electrochemical reduction is used to evaluate if these complexes are reductively active. We further investigate the capability of these complexes to bind N₂ upon two-electron reduction with KC₈. In addition, we explored whether ligand modification leads to the observed electronic effects in the N=N stretch frequency when the PP₁ ligand is coordinated to iron. Additionally, the changes in the coordination geometry of the iron complexes upon reduction are discussed based on the crystal structures of iron(+I) complexes with ligands L1H, L2H, and L3PP and iron(0) with ligand L1H.

Results and Discussion

Formation of Mono and Binary Cobalt L₁H Complexes

We started our investigations with coordination studies of the tripodal indolyl-based tetraphosphine ligand (L₁H) to cobalt(+II). Stoichiometric amounts of L₁H and CoCl₂·6H₂O in THF did not lead to full consumption of L₁H as judged by in situ ¹³C NMR spectroscopy. Cold Spray Electron Spray Ionization Mass Spectroscopy (CS-ESI-MS) revealed the presence of CoCl₄²⁻ dianion which pointed to the possibility of the formation of a pentacoordinate \([\text{Co}([\text{Cl}]\text{L}_{1\text{H}})\text{CoCl}_3]^{+}\) complex in which a part of the CoCl₂ acts as a chloride scavenger. Formation of tetrachlorido metallates upon coordination of multidentate ligands has been reported for several systems. Therefore, we reacted L₁H with CoCl₂ in a 2:3 stoichiometry to quantitatively form the binary \([\text{Co}([\text{Cl}]\text{L}_{1\text{H}})\text{CoCl}_3]^{+}\) complex 1a. The mononuclear complex could be obtained when the reaction was carried out in the presence of NaBF₄. Layering a dichloromethane solution of \([\text{Co}([\text{Cl}]\text{L}_{1\text{H}})\text{CoCl}_3]^{+}\) with pentane resulted in the formation of single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis (Figure 3). As expected, the binary complex \([\text{Co}([\text{Cl}]\text{L}_{1\text{H}})\text{CoCl}_3]^{+}\) is present in the crystal structure. The two \([\text{Co}([\text{Cl}]\text{L}_{1\text{H}})\text{CoCl}_3]^{+}\) units crystallize as two independent molecules, which possess a very distorted geometry around the metal center, almost in-between a trigonal bipyramidal and square pyramidal geometry (r_{5a₁} = 0.55 and r_{5a₂} = 0.67)[⁴¹] (Table 1). This distortion is a result of the Jahn–Teller effect in combination with the rigidity of the backbone, which was also observed for the rhodium(+II) complex [RhCl₅L₅]PF₆ (r_{5a₁} = 0.55).[²⁰] The four strong-field phosphine ligands favor the formation of low spin complexes, thus, d⁷ complexes tend to form square pyramidal geometries. As the rigidity of the ligand scaffold does not allow such arrangement, a geometry in-between trigonal bipyramidal and a square pyramid is formed. This is different for the iron(+II) and nickel(+II) analogues (vide infra) as these complexes possess intermediate spin d⁶ or low spin d⁸ metals, respectively and thus have a preference for the trigonal bipyramidal geometry with this ligand scaffold.

CS-ESI mass spectroscopy analysis showed the presence of the \([\text{Co}([\text{Cl}]\text{L}_{1\text{H}})\text{CoCl}_3]^{+}\) cation in both [Co(Cl)L₁H]BF₄ (1b) and [Co(Cl)L₁H][CoCl₄] (1a) samples (see experimental section). Similar to findings reported by Braunstein and co-workers the \([\text{Co}([\text{Cl}]\text{L}_{1\text{H}})\text{CoCl}_3]^{+}\) fragment could be detected in the [Co(Cl)L₁H][CoCl₄] sample, indicating formation of the proposed binary complex.[²⁹,⁴⁰] Both the cationic and anionic cobalt complexes are paramagnetic. EPR analysis of the [Co(Cl)L₁H]BF₄ (1b) and [Co(Cl)L₁H][CoCl₄] (1a) complexes in THF at 20 K are indicative for an S = 1/2 system with the cobalt(+II) ion being in a low-spin configuration (Figure 2). Small hyperfine couplings (presumably with cobalt and the phosphine atoms) are also noticeable. In addition, the spectrum of [Co(Cl)L₁H][CoCl₄] shows an extra signal (700–2500 G) corresponding to the high spin tetrachlorido cobaltate anion, which is absent in the [Co(Cl)L₁H]BF₄.

Layering a dichloromethane solution of [Co(Cl)L₁H][CoCl₄] with pentane resulted in the formation of single crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis (Figure 3). As expected, the binary complex [Co(Cl)L₁H][CoCl₄] 1a is present in the crystal structure. The two [Co(Cl)L₁H]⁺ units crystallize as two independent molecules, which possess a very distorted geometry around the metal center, almost in-between a trigonal bipyramidal and square pyramidal geometry (r_{5a₁} = 0.55 and r_{5a₂} = 0.67)[⁴¹] (Table 1). This distortion is a result of the Jahn–Teller effect in combination with the rigidity of the backbone, which was also observed for the rhodium(+II) complex [RhCl₅L₅]PF₆ (r_{5a₁} = 0.55).[²⁰] The four strong-field phosphine ligands favor the formation of low spin complexes, thus, d⁷ complexes tend to form square pyramidal geometries. As the rigidity of the ligand scaffold does not allow such arrangement, a geometry in-between trigonal bipyramidal and a square pyramid is formed. This is different for the iron(+II) and nickel(+II) analogues (vide infra) as these complexes possess intermediate spin d⁶ or low spin d⁸ metals, respectively and thus have a preference for the trigonal bipyramidal geometry with this ligand scaffold.
Figure 3. Displacement ellipsoid plot of [Co(Cl)L1H2][CoCl4] (1a) (50% probability ellipsoids) (CCDC 1579207). Dichloromethane solvent molecules, phenyl rings and hydrogen atoms have been omitted for clarity.

Table 1. Selected bond lengths and angles of the [Co(Cl)L1H2][CoCl4] (1a) and [Ni(Cl)L1H2][NiCl4] (2a) complexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bond/Angle</th>
<th>(1a)</th>
<th>(1a)</th>
<th>(2a)</th>
<th>(2a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Co(Cl)L1H2][CoCl4]</td>
<td>[Co(Cl)L1H2]+ #1</td>
<td>[Co(Cl)L1H2]+ #2</td>
<td>[Ni(Cl)L1H2][NiCl4]</td>
<td>[Ni(Cl)L1H2][NiCl4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1–Cl1</td>
<td>2.2422(11)</td>
<td>2.2691(11)</td>
<td>2.187(10)</td>
<td>2.256(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–Cl1</td>
<td>2.2590(11)</td>
<td>2.2652(11)</td>
<td>2.243(10)</td>
<td>2.254(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–Cl2</td>
<td>2.2673(11)</td>
<td>2.2550(11)</td>
<td>2.310(10)</td>
<td>2.277(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–Cl3</td>
<td>2.1432(11)</td>
<td>2.1434(11)</td>
<td>2.1321(10)</td>
<td>2.1290(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–Cl4</td>
<td>2.2401(11)</td>
<td>2.2382(11)</td>
<td>2.2345(10)</td>
<td>2.2323(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1–M1–P2</td>
<td>140.74(4)</td>
<td>137.07(4)</td>
<td>131.39(4)</td>
<td>126.51(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1–M1–P3</td>
<td>110.35(4)</td>
<td>109.62(4)</td>
<td>116.25(4)</td>
<td>116.47(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2–M1–P3</td>
<td>107.23(4)</td>
<td>111.72(4)</td>
<td>111.39(4)</td>
<td>116.06(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1–M1–P4</td>
<td>85.89(4)</td>
<td>85.26(4)</td>
<td>86.56(4)</td>
<td>86.74(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2–M1–P4</td>
<td>85.28(4)</td>
<td>86.23(4)</td>
<td>86.30(4)</td>
<td>86.34(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3–M1–P4</td>
<td>86.71(4)</td>
<td>86.38(4)</td>
<td>87.54(4)</td>
<td>87.23(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl1–M1–P4</td>
<td>173.63(5)</td>
<td>177.33(4)</td>
<td>173.23(4)</td>
<td>177.94(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formation of Mono and Binary Nickel L1H Complexes**

Similar to the cobalt system, the coordination of nickel(II) chloride hexahydrate to L1H resulted in the formation of either the [Ni(Cl)L1H2][NiCl4] (2a) or the [Ni(Cl)L1H2]BF4 (2b) complexes, depending on the use of NaBF4 during the synthesis (Figure 1). As expected for the pentacoordinate d8 complexes with strong-field phosphorus ligands, the [Ni(Cl)L1H+] cations are diamagnetic, and thus NMR analysis of the complexes was possible. The identical 31P NMR spectra of Ni(Cl)L1H2BF4 (1b) and [Ni(Cl)L1H2][NiCl4] (1a) show one doublet (δ = 61.06 ppm) and one quartet (δ = 25.91 ppm), indicating a C3-symmetrical trigonal bipyramidal geometry in solution (on the NMR time scale). C3-symmetrical diamagnetic complexes of tripodal tetradentate phosphines coordinated to nickel have been previously reported,[29,42,43] and trigonal bipyramidal geometry was also reported for the d6 [Ru(NH3)L1H][23] and the [Pd(Cl)(L1H)][Cl][22] complexes. Interestingly, whereas the coordination of nickel to L1H results in the formation of the binary [Ni(Cl)L1H2][NiCl4] complex 2a, the palladium complex does not form the tetrachloridopalladate, but one of the chloride anions remains non-coordinating.[20] In accordance with the NMR spectroscopic data, CSI mass spectrometry analysis showed the presence of the
[Ni(Cl)L1H]+ ion in both [Ni(Cl)L1H]BF4 (2b) and [Ni(Cl)L1H]2-
[NiCl4] (2a) (see experimental section). Slow diffusion of hexane to
dichloromethane solution of [Ni(Cl)L1H][NiCl4] resulted in
the formation of crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis
(Figure 4).

The crystal structure shows the presence of the binary
[Ni(Cl)L1H]2[NiCl4] complex 2a where the two [Ni(Cl)L1H]+ units
feature a distorted trigonal bipyramidal geometry around the metal
center (r5#1 = 0.70 and r3#2 = 0.86) (Table 1). The geometry
is less distorted than the geometry of the cobalt analogues (vide supra), but more distorted than the geometry of the iron
analogue, which is likely a result of the smaller atomic
radius of the nickel atom compared to iron (vide infra). The
largest angle P1–Ni–P2 is 131.39(4)° for one of the independent
structures and 126.51(4)° for the other, which is still close to the
ideal 120° angle for the TBP geometry.

**Formation of Iron PP3 Complexes**

The above results show that the coordination of the tetra-
dentate indolyl phosphate ligand L1H to d6 nickel(+II) and d7
coombalt(II) chlorides results in formation of (highly distorted
in the case of cobalt) trigonal bipyramidal complexes of the type
[Mn(Cl)L1H]+ and that in the absence of non-coordinating BF4−
anion, binary tetrachlorido metallate complexes are formed. We
next turned our attention to iron, and the results of these inves-
tigations are described in the following section. Whereas in the
case of nickel and cobalt the L1H ligand complexes are penta-
coordinate, complexation of this ligand to d6 iron(+II) could in
principle result in formation of a hexacoordinate 18 VE complex,
as was observed for iron’s heavier analogue ruthenium,[23,24] or
alternatively in the formation of a pentacoordinate 16 VE com-
plex. Thus, we decided to study the coordination chemistry of
iron in more detail, including the use of other tripodal indolyl
phosphate ligands. The reaction of FeCl2 with L1H and NaBF4
in THF in a 1:1:1 stoichiometry led to full conversion of the
ligand according to the absence of its 31P NMR signal, and the
formation of a purple, paramagnetic complex as judged by the
presence of broad peaks in the 1H NMR spectrum in the region
between 16.3 and 9.1 ppm. The paramagnetic behavior hinted
at the formation of a five-coordinate species. CS-ESI mass spec-
trometry analysis in both positive and negative modes shows the
presence of both the [Fe(Cl)L1H]+ complex and the BF4−
counterion respectively, which is in accordance with a five-coor-
dinate geometry around the metal center, supported by one
non-coordinating anion. These data thus indicate that the syn-
thesized compound is a pentacoordinate iron complex
[Fe(Cl)L1H]BF4 (3b). DFT calculations suggest that the lowest
energy state of the [Fe(Cl)L1H]+ cation is an intermediate spin,
paramagnetic trigonal bipyramidal complex,[45] iron(+II) (d6)
complexes with TBP geometry that are paramagnetic are not
uncommon.[19,28,30,45,46] Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction
were obtained by layering a dichloromethane solution of
[Fe(Cl)L1H]BF4 (3b) with pentane.

As anticipated, the crystal structure shows a trigonal bi-
pyramidal geometry around the metal center (Figure 5). The

**Figure 5. Displacement ellipsoid plot of [Fe(Cl)L1H]BF4 (3b) (50 % probability
ellipsoids) (CCDC 1579209). Dichloromethane solvent molecule and hydrogen
atoms and the BF4−-counterion have been omitted for clarity.**

| Table 2. Selected bond lengths and angles of the [Fe(Cl)L1H]BF4 and
[Fe(Cl)L3H]+[FeCl4] complexes. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Fe(Cl)L1H]+</td>
<td>[Fe(Cl)L3H]+ #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Fe(Cl)L1H]+/ #2</td>
<td>[Fe(Cl)L3H]+ #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–P1</td>
<td>2.2721(9)</td>
<td>2.3542(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–P2</td>
<td>2.2765(10)</td>
<td>2.3851(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–P3</td>
<td>2.2748(9)</td>
<td>2.4021(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–P4</td>
<td>2.1952(8)</td>
<td>2.1729(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1–Cl1</td>
<td>2.2145(8)</td>
<td>2.2136(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1–M1–P2</td>
<td>120.51(4)</td>
<td>120.23(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1–M1–P3</td>
<td>118.37(3)</td>
<td>117.95(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2–M1–P3</td>
<td>117.52(4)</td>
<td>117.63(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1–M1–P4</td>
<td>117.30(4)</td>
<td>116.23(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2–M1–P4</td>
<td>117.63(4)</td>
<td>117.30(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3–M1–P4</td>
<td>117.63(4)</td>
<td>117.63(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1–M1–P1</td>
<td>178.58(4)</td>
<td>177.63(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1–M1–P2</td>
<td>178.58(4)</td>
<td>177.63(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |
|                  | [Fe(Cl)L3H]+     |

**Figure 6.** 1H NMR spectrum of the reaction mixture of FeCl2, L1H in
the presence of NaBF4 (Figure 6) to form complexes 4b, 5, 6, and 7, respectively.
The new ligand L3H was prepared by reacting the lithium salt
of tris-2-(3-methylindolyl)phosphine (vide supra) with diisopropyl chloro-
phosphine. Coordination of ligands other than L1H in presence of NaBF4 did
not provide the monometallic complex [Fe(Cl)L]BF4 quantitatively as indicated by the presence of free
ligand in the filtrate in the 31P NMR spectrum. The addition of excess NaBF4 to the purple to pink reaction mixtures nor the
addition of alcohol as a co-solvent increases the yields of the
product significantly.[19,27,46] Nevertheless, the CS-ESI mass spectrometry analysis of these reaction mixtures in the positive
mode shows the presence of the [Fe(Cl)L]+ cation, which indicates
that the ligand does coordinate to the iron center. Analy-

Subsequently, we explored the coordination of FeCl2 to the
PP3 ligands L1CF3, L1OMe, L2H, and L3H in the presence of
NaBF4 (Figure 6) to form complexes 4, 5, 6, and 7, respectively.
The new ligand L3H was prepared by reacting the lithium salt
of tris-2-(3-methylindolyl)phosphine (vide supra) with diisopropyl chloro-
phosphine. Coordination of ligands other than L1H to iron in presence of NaBF4 did not provide the monometallic complex
[Fe(Cl)L]BF4 quantitatively as indicated by the presence of free
ligand in the filtrate in the 31P NMR spectrum. The addition of excess NaBF4 to the purple to pink reaction mixtures nor the
addition of alcohol as a co-solvent increases the yields of the
product significantly.[19,27,46] Nevertheless, the CS-ESI mass spectrometry analysis of these reaction mixtures in the positive
mode shows the presence of the [Fe(Cl)L]+ cation, which indicates
that the ligand does coordinate to the iron center. Analy-

---

**Figure 4.** Formation of crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis.
sis in the negative mode showed the presence of the expected \( \text{BF}_4^- \) anion but also the presence of the \( \text{FeCl}_3^- \) and \( \text{FeCl}_4^- \) anions. These tetrachlorido ferrates are likely formed from the iron precursor, as was observed for the cobalt and nickel analogues, which is the reason that the reactions do not go to full conversion. When the purple reaction mixture from the reaction of \( \text{L}^3\text{Pr} \) with \( \text{FeCl}_2 \) in the presence of \( \text{NaBF}_4 \) was dissolved in dichloromethane and layered with pentane, crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis formed. The crystal structure indeed contains the (oxidized) tetrachlorido ferrate anion \([\text{FeCl}_4]^-\) (likely formed in situ by a reaction of \([\text{FeCl}_4]^2-\) with traces of oxygen) as counterion, resulting in the binary \([\text{Fe(Cl)L}^3\text{Pr}]\text{[FeCl}_4]^-\) complex 7 (Figure 7).

Figure 6. Synthesis of \( \text{L}^3\text{Pr} \) and coordination of \( \text{L}^1\text{CF}_3, \text{L}^1\text{OMe, L}^3\text{Pr} \) and \( \text{L}^2H \) to \( \text{FeCl}_2 \) in the presence of \( \text{NaBF}_4 \).

[Fe(Cl)L\text{L}^3\text{Pr}]\text{[FeCl}_4]^- (7) crystallizes as two independent molecules (next to the tetrachlorido ferrate) with almost identical bond angles and distances. They both have a trigonal bipyramidal geometry (\( t_{5a} = 0.95 \) and \( t_{5b} = 0.98 \) (Table 1))\(^{[41]}\). The \( \text{P}_1-\text{Fe}_1, \text{P}_2-\text{Fe}_1 \) and \( \text{P}_3-\text{Fe}_1 \) bond lengths are elongated compared to the \([\text{Fe(Cl)L}^1\text{H}]+\) unit, which is likely a result of the more electron-donating diisopropylphosphine groups. The other angles and distances are comparable to the \([\text{Fe(Cl)L}^1\text{H}]+\) unit and values reported in literature\(^{[19,28,46]}\).

The presence of tetrachlorido ferrates as counterions is undesired as iron chlorides could interfere during the follow-up redox chemistry. Therefore, a method previously described by Beller was used\(^{[11]}\) that involved the coordination of \( \text{L}^1\text{H} \) to \( \text{Fe(BF}_4)_2 \) (Figure 8).

Stirring of stoichiometric amounts of \( \text{L}^1\text{H} \) and \( \text{Fe(BF}_4)_2 \) in 1:1 (v/v) THF/toluene mixture at 70 °C for three days led to precipi-
tation of a purple powder in significant amounts. Full conversion was, however, not reached as indicated by the presence of free ligand in the $^{31}$P NMR spectrum of the supernatant. The exact structure of this highly oxygen sensitive purple solid could not be determined due to its paramagnetism and poor solubility in D$_2$O/THF. However, dissolution of the purple solid in acetonitrile caused an immediate color change from purple to orange. This orange solution was diamagnetic as evidenced by $^{31}$P NMR spectroscopy, which indicates that the coordination environment around the metal center has changed. The $^{31}$P NMR spectrum shows a similar splitting pattern as previously reported for the octahedral Ru(Cl)$_2$L$_1^{14+}$ complex.[23] The integral-ratio of $^1$ (δ = 116.77 ppm, dt):2 (δ = 97.59 ppm, t):1 (δ = 56.18 ppm, dt) confirms formation of an octahedral geometry around the metal center. Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis were grown by slow diffusion of methanol to an acetonitrile solution of the iron orange complex. The crystal structure features two independent [FeL$_1^{18+}$]$^+$ units, which indeed show both an octahedral geometry around the metal center of the [Fe(MeCN)$_2$]L$_1^{18+}$(BF$_4$)$_2$ complex 8 (Figure 9). The two cis sites in this complex are occupied by two acetonitrile ligands. The P1–Fe1–P2 [163.17(3)°], P3–Fe1–N4 [177.49(7)°], and the P4–Fe1–N5 angle [175.49(7)°] are all close to the theoretical 180° angle for an ideal octahedral geometry. The P1–Fe1 bond [2.3795(8) Å] is slightly longer than the other $\text{P}_4$–Fe bonds [2.2576(8) Å and 2.2494(8) Å], and the axial acetonitrile ligand (N5–C66–C67), seems to bend in the direction of the P1–Fe1 bond.

Attempts to synthesize iron(+II) complexes with ligands L$_1^{18+}$ and L$_1^\text{OMe}$, provided only very low yield of the targeted compounds and therefore this method could unfortunately not be used for the coordination of iron to the other PP$_3$ ligands.

Reduction of the Cobalt, Nickel and Iron Complexes in Presence of N$_2$

Having the new iron, cobalt and nickel complexes in hand, we decided to investigate their reduction in the presence of dinitrogen. In analogy to ruthenium,[23,24] the iron complexes may bind N$_2$ upon two-electron reduction to form the respective pentacoordinate 18 VE iron(0) complexes. However, for the cobalt and nickel complexes the coordination of dinitrogen would likely require dissociation of one of the ligand arms for the complexes to adhere to the 18 VE rule. To evaluate whether the formation of dinitrogen complexes upon reduction of these complexes is possible, we conducted cyclic voltammetry (CV) studies and in situ reduction of the new complexes in the presence of N$_2$.

Reduction of [Co(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$]BF$_4$

In order to gain insight in the reduction potentials needed for the cobalt complexes to form the hypothetical Co$^0$L$_1^{18+}$N$_2$ complex, the [Co(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$]BF$_4$ (1b) complex was analyzed electrochemically. The CV of this cobalt complex shows one reversible redox couple ($E^{1/2}$ = –0.56 V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$), below which Co$^0$ complex [Co(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$]BF$_4$ is reduced to Co$^+$ complex [Co(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$] (see the Supporting Information). This value is slightly more negative than for the reversible Rh$^0$/Rh$^+$ couple of the rhodium [Rh(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$]BF$_4$ analogue ($E^{1/2}$ = –0.4 V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$),[20] and comparable to the reversible Co$^0$/Co$^+$ couple of the [Co(PPh$_3$)$_2$(CH$_3$CN)]BF$_4$ complex ($E^{1/2}$ = –0.54 V).[48] Scanning to lower potentials resulted in two non-reversible reduction peaks at very similar potentials ($E$ = –2.3 and –2.4 V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$). Likely, one of these peaks corresponds to the reduction of Co$^+$ to Co$^0$, which could lead to binding of the dinitrogen to the cobalt center. Consequently, we also tried to reduce the [Co(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$]BF$_4$ (1b) complex chemically. The chemical reduction of the [Co(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$]BF$_4$ complex with 2 equiv. of KC$_8$ in the presence of N$_2$ was monitored by IR spectroscopy. The IR spectra did not show a signal corresponding to the dinitrogen stretch frequency typical for an N$_2$ coordination complex. In addition, in situ analysis of the reaction mixture by $^{31}$P NMR spectroscopy showed signals indicative of ligand decomposition. Ligand decomposition may be responsible for the second reduction peak observed in the CV ($E$ = –2.4 V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$). The inability of the complex to form N$_2$ coordinated complexes may be related to the strong coordination of the ligand, inhibiting the dissociation of one of the phosphine arms when it is bound to cobalt(0).

Reduction of [Ni(Cl)L$_1^{18+}$]BF$_4$

We also investigated the reduction potentials of the nickel complex using electrochemistry (see the Supporting Information).
Similar as for the cobalt analogue, the CV of 2b shows one reversible reduction-oxidation peak at $E_{1/2}^0 = -1.0$ V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$ V. In addition, two non-reversible reduction peaks were observed ($E = -2.0$ V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$ and $E = -2.5$ V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$). CV measurements of $[\text{Ni(PPPh}_3\text{)}(\text{CH}_2\text{CN})]\text{BF}_4$ showed only one reversible redox couple ($E_{1/2}^0 = -1.03$ V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$; likely the Ni$^{II}$/Ni$^{I}$ couple) and one non-reversible peak, ($E_{1/2}^0 = -1.28$ V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$; likely the Ni$^{I}$/Ni$^{0}$ couple). The chemical reduction of our $[\text{NiL}_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ (2b) complex with two equivalents of KC$_8$ resulted in formation of a yellow precipitate. Unfortunately, we were unable to measure $^3$P NMR or infrared spectra of this yellow precipitate, as the complex is insoluble in both THF and benzene. The filtrate of the reaction mixture did not show any IR signal corresponding to an N$_2$ ligand bound to nickel. Comparable to the cobalt analogue, this result likely indicates that the ligand does not facilitate dinitrogen coordination when bound to nickel(0).

Reduction of $[\text{Fe(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$

Next, we investigated whether it was possible to reduce the $[\text{Fe(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ (3) complex electrochemically. The cyclic voltammogram (see Figure S19) of $[\text{Fe(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ (3) in THF shows two reversible redox couples, one at $E_{1/2}^0 = -0.38$ V vs. Ag/AgCl (–1.9 V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$), corresponding to the Fe$^{III}$/Fe$^{II}$ and Fe$^{II}$/Fe$^{I}$ couple respectively. The latter Fe$^{II}$/Fe$^{I}$ reduction potential is much lower than the earlier mentioned paramagnetic $[\text{Co(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ (1b) complex with two equivalents of KC$_8$ showed only one reversible redox couple ($E_{1/2}^0 = -1.0$ V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$; likely the Ni$^{II}$/Ni$^{I}$ couple) and one non-reversible peak, ($E_{1/2}^0 = -2.5$ V vs. Fc/Fc$^+$). CV of $[\text{Ni(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ (2b) complex with two equivalents of KC$_8$ in the presence of N$_2$ led to the formation of the Fe(N$_2$)$\text{L}_1\text{H}$ (9) complex as indicated by the N$_2$ stretch frequency observed in the IR spectrum (Figure 10 and Table 3). Encouraged by this result we also attempted to reduce the other iron complexes with KC$_8$.

Table 3. Reduction potentials of $[\text{M(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ complexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>$E^0$ M$^{II}$/M$^0$</th>
<th>$E^0$ M$^{I}$/M$^0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$[\text{Co(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ (1b)</td>
<td>–0.56 V</td>
<td>–1.00 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$[\text{Ni(Cl)}L_1\text{H}]\text{BF}_4$ (2b)</td>
<td>–0.96 V</td>
<td>–1.90 V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reduction of Other Iron(II)CIPP$_3$ Complexes

The in situ formed iron(0)N$_2$P$_3$ complexes, prepared by two-electron reduction of the corresponding iron(II) complexes with KC$_8$, all showed coordination of dinitrogen to the iron metal center as indicated by infrared spectroscopy measurements (Table 4). The Fe(N$_2$)$_2$L$_2$ complex 12 has the highest IR stretch frequency ($\nu_{N_2} = 2068$ cm$^{-1}$) and Fe(N$_2$)$_3$L$_3$ has the lowest IR stretch frequency ($\nu_{N_2} = 2018$ cm$^{-1}$) in the infrared spectrum.

Table 4. N$_2$ stretch frequencies of the FeN$_2$L complexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>$\nu_{N_2}$ cm$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fe(N$_2$)$_2$L$_2$ (9)</td>
<td>2055 and 2036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(N$_2$)$_2$L$_2$ (10)</td>
<td>2051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(N$_2$)$_3$L$_3$ (11)</td>
<td>2040 and 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(N$_2$)$_3$L$_3$ (12)</td>
<td>2068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe(N$_2$)$_3$L$_3$ (13)</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, the extent of activation of N$_2$ by iron complexes with the 3-methylenode based tetraphosphine ligands L$_1\text{H}$, L$_1\text{CF}_3$, L$_1\text{OMe}$ and L$_1\text{H}$ is higher than for the analogous ruthenium complexes.[24] The increase of the electron donating capacity of the substituents of the equatorially coordinated phosphines when going from L$_1\text{CF}_3$ to L$_3\text{PF}_3$ results in a clear shift of the N$_2$ stretch frequency to lower wavenumbers. The weakest activation of the N$_2$ ligand is observed in the case of the connectivity isomer L$_2$, which features a more $\sigma$-acidic pivotal phosphine (trans to the N$_2$). This is in line with the studies of the influence of $\pi$- acidity of the donors trans to molybdenum-coordinated N$_2$ by Tucek et al. who reported that when going from purely $\sigma$-donating N-donor to a slightly $\pi$-acidic P-donor the N$_2$ stretch frequency shifts to higher wavenumbers.[49] The effect of the trans-effect of nitrogen vs. phosphorus in terms of N$_2$ activation is also apparent when comparing the IR data for Fe$^{II}$(N$_2$)[N(CH$_3$)CH$_2$P(Pr)$_2$]$_2$ ($\nu_{N_2} = 1967$ cm$^{-1}$) vs. Fe$^{II}$(N$_2$)-[P(CH$_3$)CH$_2$P(Pr)$_2$]$_2$ ($\nu_{N_2} = 1985$ cm$^{-1}$) as reported by the groups of George and Zubieta[50] and Field,[19] respectively.
Compared to the iron complexes with tripodal tetradentate ligands used by the group of Peters for N₂ reduction to ammonia or hydrazine,[51–53] the dinitrogen complexes reported in this work reveal higher stretch frequencies of the N₂ ligand. For instance, the dinitrogen complexes of iron(0) with ligands featuring three diisopropyl phosphine donors connected via a phenylene linker to the pivotal B, C– and Si– coordination centers Fe₀(BPᵢᵢPr₃)N₂,[52] [Fe₀(CPᵢᵢPr₃)N₂]–,[53] [Fe₀(SiPᵢᵢPr₃)N₂]–[52] reveal υN₂ = 2011 cm⁻¹, 1870 cm⁻¹ and 1891 cm⁻¹ respectively. Since ligands CPᵢᵢPr₃ and SiPᵢᵢPr₃ are anionic, the extent of π-back donation to the N₂ moiety in their respective iron complexes is obviously higher than in the case of the L₃ᵢPr complex. However, the overall donating capability of BPᵢᵢPr₃ (which is the most effective tripodal system for N₂ activation[15]) to iron is similar to L₃ᵢPr. The major difference between BPᵢᵢPr₃ and the 3-methylindolyl-based ligand systems presented in this work is the capability of BPᵢᵢPr₃ to accommodate a negatively charged [Fe⁻(N₂)L]− complex upon one electron reduction of the neutral Fe(N₂)L, resulting in further weakening of the N–N bond (υN₂ = 1905 cm⁻¹), and rendering this complex an active catalyst for ammonia formation. The stabilization of such Fe¹ species is possible thanks to the incorporation of the σ-acidic boron atom in the BPᵢᵢPr₃ ligand. Unfortunately, the addition of one extra equivalent of KC₈ to Fe₀(N₂)PP₃ led to the detection of decomposed ligand in the 3¹P NMR spectra. In addition, no new bands corresponding to the N₂ stretch frequency were detected in the infrared spectrum. The resulting reaction mixtures proved to be EPR silent. This led us to conclude that such putative negatively charged complexes are too unstable to be detected, or perhaps not formed at all.

All of the reaction mixtures that were prepared for the in situ analysis of the N₂ stretch frequency with infrared spectroscopy were set for crystallization by slow diffusion evaporation with pentane. In the case of Fe(Cl)L₁H (14), Fe(Cl)L₂H (15) and Fe(Cl)L₃ᵢPr (16), crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction were obtained for some of these batches (Figure 11). In all three cases, analysis of the crystal structure showed the presence of the Fe(Cl) complex, indicating that the reduction reactions intended to form Fe(N₂)L did not go to completion, and besides the desired iron(0) species also iron(+I) complexes are formed. As expected for a d⁷ metal complexes, all three iron(+I) complexes feature a distorted trigonal bipyramidal geometry around the metal center due to the Jahn–Teller effect: Fe(Cl)L₁H (τ₅ = 0.75), Fe(Cl)L₂H (τ₅ = 0.69) and Fe(Cl)L₃ᵢPr (τ₅ = 0.75) (Table 5).

Upon addition of a slight excess of KC₈ to the [Fe(Cl)L₁H]BF₄ complex, a more intense absorption of the N₂ moiety was observed in the IR spectrum. When this red reaction mixture was set for crystallization by layering with pentane, crystals of Fe(N₂)L₁H complex formed that were suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis (Figure 11). The crystal structure of Fe(N₂)L₁H reveals a nearly ideal trigonal bipyramidal geometry around the metal center (τ₅ = 0.95).[41] The structure is more symmetrical than the iron(+II) and ruthenium(0)[23] analogues, but structurally comparable to the known Fe(N₂)(PPᵢᵢPr₃) (υN₂ = 1985 cm⁻¹) complex.[19] The N–N bond length of FeN₂L₁H is slightly shorter [1.118(5) Å] than in FeN₂(PPᵢᵢPr₃) [1.1279(16) Å], which is in accordance with a less activated N₂ moiety in Fe(N₂)L₁H. These experiments therefore show that electronic variation in the ligands that coordinate to the iron metal have a clear effect on the activation of N₂ bound to Fe.
cobalt(+II) and nickel(+II) complexes in the presence of N2 likely a result of the smaller atomic radius of the nickel atom. The nickel complex is more distorted than that of iron, which is distorted as a result of the Jahn–Teller effect. The geometry of a bipyramidal geometry, where the cobalt complex is the most distorted. The crystal structures obtained give clear insight in the coordination of dinitrogen to the metal.

Conclusions

In conclusion, we have shown that the coordination of iron(+II), cobalt(+II) and nickel(+II) to several tripodal 3-methylindole phosphine based ligands results in the formation of the corresponding cationic metal(+II) complexes. All of the complexes featuring the bulky chlorido ligand are five coordinate, with a geometry of trigonal bipyramidal. An electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) study of Fe(N2)Cl[PCy3]2 and Fe(N2)Cl[PCy3](CF3)2 reveals two distinct EPR spectra for Fe(N2)Cl[PCy3]2. The spectrum of Fe(N2)Cl[PCy3](CF3)2 is more complex, with two sets of lines. These results indicate that Fe(N2)Cl[PCy3]2 undergoes a dinitrogen reduction reaction, while Fe(N2)Cl[PCy3](CF3)2 does not.

Experimental Section

General Methods: All reactions were carried out under an atmosphere of nitrogen using standard Schlenk techniques or in the glovebox. Reagents were purchased from commercial suppliers and used without further purification. THF, pentane, hexane and Et2O were distilled from sodium benzophenone ketyl, CH2Cl2 was distilled from CaH2 under nitrogen. NMR spectra [1H, 31P, and 13C(1H, 31P)] were measured on a Bruker DRX 500, Bruker AV 400, Bruker DRX 300 or on a Bruker AV 300 spectrometer. IR spectra (ATR mode) were recorded with a Bruker Alpha-p FT-IR spectrometer. High resolution mass spectra were recorded on a JEOL AccuTOF LC, JMS-T100LP mass spectrometer using cold electron-spray ionization (CSI) at –40 °C. L1H and L2H were measured on a Bruker FT-IR spectrometer. High resolution mass spectra were recorded on a Bruker DRX 300, Bruker AV 300 spectrometer. IR spectra (ATR mode) were recorded with a Bruker Alpha-p FT-IR spectrometer. High resolution mass spectra were recorded on a JEOL AccuTOF LC, JMS-T100LP mass spectrometer using cold electron-spray ionization (CSI) at –40 °C.

Table 5. Selected bond lengths and angles of the FeClL1H (14), FeClL2H (15), FeClL3Pr (16) and FeN2L1H (9) complexes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex</th>
<th>Fe1–P1</th>
<th>Fe1–P2</th>
<th>Fe1–P3</th>
<th>Fe1–P4</th>
<th>Fe1–Cl1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FeClL1H (14)</td>
<td>2.221(9)</td>
<td>2.205(9)</td>
<td>2.197(9)</td>
<td>2.113(9)</td>
<td>2.300(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeClL2H (15)</td>
<td>2.577(9)</td>
<td>2.231(7)</td>
<td>2.237(2)</td>
<td>2.048(7)</td>
<td>2.286(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeClL3Pr (16)</td>
<td>3.439(9)</td>
<td>2.448(9)</td>
<td>2.563(9)</td>
<td>2.095(8)</td>
<td>2.302(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeN2L1H (9)</td>
<td>1.818(4)</td>
<td>1.118(5)</td>
<td>1.302(3)</td>
<td>0.852(3)</td>
<td>1.173(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tris-2-(3-methyl-N-diisopropylphosphinooindolyl)phosphine (L3\textsuperscript{Pr}):

Tris-2-(3-methylindo)phosphine (1.02 g; 2.42 mmol; 1.0 equiv.) was dissolved in THF (50 mL) and cooled to –78 °C. To this was added nBuLi (2.5 m in hexanes; 2.9 mL; 7.38 mmol; 3.0 equiv.) dropwise and stirred for 1 h resulting in a yellow solution. Subsequently, chlorodisopropylphosphine (1.2 mL; 7.38 mmol; 3.0 equiv.) was added dropwise and the mixture was stirred for 3 d allowing the reaction mixture to warm to room temperature. The yellow solution was evaporated to dryness, and the thus formed solid was washed with C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{6} (3 × 10 mL). The combined C\textsubscript{6}H\textsubscript{6}/C\textsubscript{2}H\textsubscript{5}OH solutions were filtered through basic alumina and evaporated in vacuo. The formed solid was washed with Et\textsubscript{2}O (3 × 1 mL), yielding the product in pure form as a white powder (0.83 g; 45 % yield).

\textsuperscript{1}H\textsuperscript{(31P)} NMR (300 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): \(\delta = 7.51\) (d, \(J = 16.4\) Hz, 3 H), 7.49 (d, \(J = 15.8\) Hz, 3 H), 7.21 (m, 6 H), 2.92–2.61 (m, 6 H), 1.90 (s, 9 H), 1.24 (d, \(J = 6.9\) Hz, 9 H), 1.11 (d, \(J = 7.0\) Hz, 9 H), 0.88 (d, \(J = 6.8\) Hz, 9 H), 0.46 (d, \(J = 6.9\) Hz, 9 H) ppm. \textsuperscript{31P} NMR (121 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): \(\delta = 63.35\) (d, \(J = 168.7\) Hz, 3 P), –77.94 (q, \(J = 168.8\) Hz, 1 P) ppm.

\textsuperscript{13}C{\textsuperscript{1}H,\textsuperscript{31P}} NMR (75 MHz, CDCl\textsubscript{3}): \(\delta = 140.90, 137.14, 133.30, 123.64, 122.19, 119.51, 119.98, 119.28, 27.19, 26.51, 21.85, 21.31, 20.18, 19.44, 10.03\) ppm.

Mass Analysis (CS-E5I) [NiCl\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{Pr}]: found: 1066.2097 calcd.: 1066.2054; BF\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{−}: found: 87.0049 calcd.: 87.0029.

(Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}H\textsuperscript{Pr})\textsubscript{2}(BF\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2} (1a): Compound L1\textsuperscript{H} (103.4 mg; 0.11 mmol; 2.0 equiv.) and CoCl\textsubscript{2}6H\textsubscript{2}O (43.6 mg; 0.16 mmol; 3.0 equiv.) were suspended in THF (10 mL) and stirred overnight. Pentane was added until all of the complex had precipitated. This brown solution was filtered off, washed with pentane and dried in vacuo yielding the complex as a brown solid. Yield: 108.4 mg (0.046 mmol, 87.4 %). Layering of a dichloromethane solution of [Co(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}H\textsuperscript{Pr}] with pentane resulted in crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis. Mass Analysis (CS-E5I) [CoCl\textsubscript{2}(L\textsubscript{1}H\textsuperscript{Pr})]: found: 1067.2092 calcd.: 1067.2054; [(Co(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}H\textsuperscript{Pr})\textsubscript{2}]: found: 2302.2782 calcd.: 2302.2751; [CoCl\textsubscript{2}]: found: 163.8409 calcd.: 163.8398.

EPR analysis of the complex was performed in THF at 20 K.

[Co(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}H\textsuperscript{Pr}][CoCl\textsubscript{4}] (1b): Compound L1\textsuperscript{H} (115.3 mg; 0.12 mmol; 1.0 equiv.), NaBF\textsubscript{4} (11.3 mg; 0.10 mmol; 1.0 equiv.) and CoCl\textsubscript{2}6H\textsubscript{2}O (113 mg; 0.12 mmol; 1.0 equiv.) were suspended in THF (10 mL) and stirred overnight. The brown precipitate was filtered off, washed with CH\textsubscript{3}OH and dried in vacuo yielding the complex as a brown solid. Yield: 110.3 mg (0.095 mmol, 92.8 %). Mass Analysis (CS-E5I) [CoCl\textsubscript{2}(L\textsubscript{1}H\textsuperscript{Pr})]: found: 1067.2092 calcd.: 1067.2054; BF\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{−}: found: 87.0012 calcd.: 87.0029.

[Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{3}H\textsuperscript{Pr}][Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}OMe\textsuperscript{Pr}]

(7): Compound L3\textsuperscript{Pr} (0.523 g; 0.58 mmol; 2.0 equiv.), NaBF\textsubscript{4} (119 mg; 1.0 equiv.), and FeCl\textsubscript{3} (0.18 g; 1.2 mmol; 2.0 equiv.) were suspended in THF (10 mL) and stirred for three days. The reaction mixture was evaporated to dryness, washed with pentane (5 × 10 mL) and evaporated in vacuo to remove the residual CH\textsubscript{3}Cl. After washing with Et\textsubscript{2}O and drying in vacuo the solid was obtained as a paramagnetic purple powder. Yield: not determined. Crystals were prepared by layering a dichloromethane solution with pentane at 5 °C. Mass analysis showed that the product was a mixture of [Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{3}H\textsuperscript{Pr}][Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}OMe\textsuperscript{Pr}] and FeCl\textsubscript{4}, but the exact ratio could not be determined. Mass Analysis (CS-E5I) [Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{3}H\textsuperscript{Pr}]: found: 860.2963 calcd.: 860.3012. BF\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{−}: found: 87.0049; [FeCl\textsubscript{4}]: found: 160.8455; [FeCl\textsubscript{3}]: 197.8139.

Reactions of L\textsuperscript{1}OMe, L1CF\textsubscript{3} and LPH \textit{with FeCl\textsubscript{3}} were performed in a similar way as [Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{3}H\textsuperscript{Pr}][Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}OMe\textsuperscript{Pr}]. Leading to complexes 4, 5, 6 and 7 as mixtures of the [Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{3}H\textsuperscript{Pr}] with unknown amounts of BF\textsubscript{4} and FeCl\textsubscript{4}. These mixtures were used as such for the reduction to the FeN\textsubscript{2}L complex and the in situ analysis of the N\textsubscript{2} stretch frequency using infrared spectroscopy.

Reaction of L\textsubscript{1}OH \textit{with Fe(BF\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2}}: Compound L1\textsuperscript{H} (488 mg, 0.5 mmol) and Fe(BF\textsubscript{4})\textsubscript{2}2H\textsubscript{2}O (168 mg, 0.5 mmol) were suspended in 20 mL 1:1 (v/v) THF/toluene and heated at 70 °C for three days. The purple precipitate was filtered off, washed and dried in vacuo yielding 369.2 mg of a purple solid. When the purple solid was dissolved in acetonitrile, a color change to orange was observed, yielding [Fe(MeCN)L\textsubscript{1}OMe\textsuperscript{Pr}][Fe(Cl)L\textsubscript{1}OMe\textsuperscript{Pr}].
[Fe(MeCN)₅L₁H][BF₄]₂ (8): A solution of the purple powder obtained in the previous procedure in acetonitrile was set for crystallization by slow diffusion evaporation of methanol at 5 °C resulting in the formation of crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis. ¹H NMR (300 MHz, CD₃CN): δ = broad peaks as a result of paramagnetic impurities: 7.80, 7.42, 7.39, 7.16, 6.85, 6.57, 6.37, 5.92, 3.00, 2.70, 2.60, 1.93. ¹³C NMR (121 MHz, CD₃CN): δ = 116.77 (q), 97.59 (t, J = 44.2 Hz), 56.18 (q) ppm. The ¹³C-NMR spectrum could not be obtained in pure form. ¹⁹F NMR (282 MHz, CD₃CN): δ = 151.10 ppm. Mass analysis (CSI) [FeL₁⁺H⁺]: found: 514.6169, calcld.: 514.6192. [FeL₁⁺H⁺]: found: 1048.2362 calcld.: 1048.2369; BF₄⁻: found: 87.0049, calcld.: 87.0029.

Standard Procedure for the Reduction of the Complexes with KC₈: 20 mg of the complex was suspended with 2–5 equiv of KC₈ in 2 mL of THF in the glovebox and stirred for 2–3 h. The solution was filtered and part of the solution was used for in situ infrared spectroscopy, the rest of the solution was set for crystallization by evaporation of pentane vapors to the THF solution. Crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction analysis formed for complexes FeCl₅(L₁)(4), FeCl₂(C₂H₅)(15), FeCl₃(H)(16) and Fe₅N₂L₁H(9). Crystals of Fe₅N₂L₁H(9) were obtained by layering of the THF solution with pentane.

CCDC 1579207 (for 1a), 1579208 (for 2a), 1579209 (for 3b), 1579210 (for 7), 1579211 (for 8), 1579212 (for 14), 1579213 (for 15), 1579214 (for 16), and 1579215 (for 9) contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data can be obtained free of charge from The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre.
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[28] The DFT [BP86, SV(P)] calculated energy of the pentet state (HS) and the singlet state (LS) are higher in energy than the triplet state (IS) by 24 kcal/mol and 7.7 kcal/mol respectively.
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