Published in final edited form as:

Inorg Chem. 2010 December 6; 49(23): 11118–11126. doi:10.1021/ic101702b.

Stabilization of 3:1 Site-Differentiated Cubane-Type Clusters in the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ Core Oxidation State by Tertiary Phosphine Ligation: Synthesis, Core Structural Diversity, and $S = \frac{1}{2}$ Ground States

Liang Deng, Amit Majumdar, Wayne Lo, and R. H. Holm

Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Abstract

An extensive series of 3:1 site-differentiated cubane-type clusters $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3 \text{L}]$ ($\text{L} = \text{Cl}^-$, Br^- , I^- , RO^- , RS^- , RSe^-) has been prepared in 40–80% yield by two methods: ligand substitution of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4]^{1+}$ in THF/acetonitrile by reaction with monoanions, and reductive cleavage of ligand substrates (RSSR , RSeSeR , I_2) by the all-ferrous clusters $[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_6]/[\text{Fe}_{16}\text{S}_{16}(\text{PPr}^i_3)_8]$ in THF. These neutral clusters are stable and do not undergo ligand redistribution reactions involving charged species in benzene and THF solutions. X-ray structural studies confirm the cubane stereochemistry but with substantial and variable distortions of the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ core from idealized cubic core geometry. Based on Fe-S bond lengths, seven clusters were found to have compressed tetragonal distortions (4 short and 8 long bonds) and the remaining seven display other types of distortions with different combinations of long, short and intermediate bond lengths. These results further emphasize the facile deformability of this core oxidation state previously observed in $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{SR})_4]^{3-}$ clusters. The $\text{Fe}^{2.25+}$ mean oxidation state was demonstrated from ^{57}Fe isomer shifts and the appearance of two quadrupole doublets arises from the spin-coupled $|9/2, 4, 1/2\rangle$ state. The $S = 1/2$ ground state was further supported by EPR spectra and magnetic susceptibility data.

Introduction

The fundamental chemistry and biomimetic advantages of cubane-type Fe_4S_4 clusters have been substantially expanded by the synthesis of 3:1 site-differentiated clusters in which one iron site is rendered unique by ligand design.¹ The original concept is illustrated by the structure of the cluster $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{LS}_3)\text{Cl}]^{2-}$ in Figure 1.² The semirigid cavitand-like trithiolate ligand LS_3 binds the cluster at three sites, thereby differentiating a fourth site. Ligands at this site are often subject to facile substitution by a wide variety of other ligands to generate an extensive set of 3:1 site-differentiated clusters. Among other properties, this feature makes possible covalent coupling of two clusters or one cluster and another metal-containing entity such as a heme group, allows modulation of redox potentials and examination of the reactivity of coordinated ligands, and enables the $\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4 \rightarrow \text{Fe}_3\text{S}_4$ cluster conversion by removal of the unique iron atom and thereafter formation of MFe_3S_4 clusters by binding of heterometals at the voided site. These and other applications of site-

Correspondence to: R. H. Holm.

Supporting Information Available. X-ray crystallographic files in CIF form for all compounds in Tables 1 and 2. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

differentiated LS_3 clusters have been summarized.^{1,3–5} Since the original report of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{LS}_3)\text{Cl}]^{2-}$ and related clusters, other 3:1 site-differentiated clusters based on different ligand platforms with three thiolate binding sites have been described^{6–12} and one crystallographic structure proof provided.⁶

Clusters derived from the LS_3 ligand system have performed admirably in nearly all respects in the elucidation of site-differentiated Fe_4S_4 chemistry. The continued employment of this ligand does, however, raises several considerations. The ligand is the product of a multistep synthesis² which, although subsequently improved,¹³ is somewhat lengthy. The lower core oxidation states $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+,0}$ are not readily achieved within the LS_3 framework. Reduction of the clusters $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{LS}_3)\text{L}]^{2-}$ to the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ level requires potentials <1.0 V vs. SCE, affording products highly susceptible to oxidation. While several clusters $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{LS}_3)(\text{SR})]^{3-}$ have been obtained in substance,¹⁴ isolation of reduced clusters in pure crystalline form has proven difficult. Clusters in the all-ferrous $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^0$ oxidation state are not accessible in this anionic ligand environment because of their oxidative instability. Solubility of cluster salts is restricted to solvents such as acetonitrile, DMF, and Me_2SO . Clusters formed from other site-differentiating ligands are unlikely to avoid these issues.

Previous research has shown that terminal phosphine or *N*-heterocyclic carbene ligation is effective in stabilization of the reduced states $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+,0}$.^{15–17} In the course of this work, several clusters of the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PR}_3)_3\text{L}]$ type with the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ oxidation state were isolated.¹⁶ These are isoelectronic with $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{P}^t\text{Bu})_3\text{X}]$ (X = halide) prepared by a different method.¹⁸ All of these species are 3:1 site-differentiated clusters prepared without benefit of a ligand designed for that purpose.¹⁸ They offer the potential for investigation of the reactivity of reduced clusters—a matter explored fully only for electron transfer processes—including formation of higher nuclearity reduced clusters by coupling reactions and enhanced oxidation state stability by phosphine/carbene substitution. We report here the first detailed investigation of the synthesis and structures of 3:1 site-differentiated clusters of the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PR}_3)_3\text{L}]$ type.

Experimental Section

Preparation of Compounds

All reactions and manipulations were performed under a pure dinitrogen atmosphere using either Schlenk techniques or an inert atmosphere box. Solvents were passed through an Innovative Technology solvent purification system prior to use. Solvent removal steps were performed in vacuo. All new compounds (13 single cubane, 2 double cubane clusters) were identified by ^1H NMR spectroscopy and crystal structure determinations; several compounds were further established by elemental analysis (Kolbe Microanalytical Laboratory, Mulheim, Germany). The compounds are soluble in non-polar or weakly polar solvents such as benzene, toluene, and THF and are extremely air-sensitive and must be handled accordingly.

$[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_6]$ —The following procedure is more efficient than that reported earlier.¹⁶ To a solution of $[\text{FeCl}_2(\text{PPr}^i_3)_2]$ (0.45 g, 1.0 mmol; prepared by the method for $[\text{FeCl}_2(\text{PEt}_3)_2]$ ¹⁹) in THF (10 mL) was added $(\text{Me}_3\text{Si})_2\text{S}$ (0.27 g, 1.5 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred for 2 d, solvent was removed, and the deep brown oily residue was dissolved in THF (5 mL). The solution was filtered. Vapor diffusion of *n*-hexane into the filtrate afforded the product as a brown crystalline solid (0.12 g, 57%) whose ^1H NMR spectrum is identical to that of an authentic sample.¹⁶

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4](\text{BF}_4)$ —To a solution of $[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_6]$ (0.166 g, 0.0997 mmol) and PPr^i_3 (0.048 g, 0.30 mmol) in THF/acetonitrile (1:1 v/v, 5 mL) was added $[\text{Cp}_2\text{Fe}](\text{BF}_4)$ (0.055 g,

0.20 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred overnight and solvent was removed. The deep brown residue was washed with *n*-hexane (10 mL) and dissolved in THF (3 mL). The solution was filtered and *n*-hexane (15 mL) was layered on the brown filtrate. The product was collected as a deep brown crystalline solid (0.15 g, 70%). ^1H NMR (CD_3CN): δ 2.31 (6), 5.08 (1). The cation spectrum is identical to that of the BPh_4^- salt.¹⁶

Site-Differentiated Clusters. 1. Ligand Substitution

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3\text{Cl}]$ —To a solution of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4](\text{BPh}_4)$ (0.13 g, 0.099 mmol) in THF (5 mL) was added a solution of Ph_4PCl (0.038 g, 0.10 mmol) in acetonitrile (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for 1 h, filtered, and solvent removed from the filtrate. The deep brown residue was extracted with a solution of Pr^i_3P (0.10 g, 0.62 mmol) in THF (3 mL), and the extract was filtered. Vapor diffusion of *n*-hexane into the filtrate afforded the product as a deep brown crystalline solid (0.044 g, 52%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.90 (6), 2.88(1).

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3\text{Br}]$ —The preceding method on the same scale was used but with Ph_4PBr as the halide source. The product was obtained as a black-brown crystalline solid (0.050 g, 55%). *Anal.* Calcd. for $\text{C}_{27}\text{H}_{63}\text{BrFe}_4\text{P}_3\text{S}_4$: C, 35.55; H, 6.96; Fe, 24.49. Found: C, 35.53; H, 6.81; Fe, 24.42. ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.91 (6), 2.86 (1).

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3(\text{OSiPh}_3)]$

Method A: To a solution of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4](\text{BPh}_4)$ (0.13 g, 0.099 mmol) in THF (5 mL) was added a solution of NaOSiPh_3 (0.030 g, 0.10 mmol; from Ph_3SiOH and NaH in THF) in acetonitrile (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred overnight, solvent was removed, and the deep brown residue was extracted with a solution of Pr^i_3P (0.10 g, 0.62 mmol) in benzene (5 mL). The extract was filtered and the filtrate was reduced to 3 mL. The product separated as a brown crystalline solid (0.066 g, 60%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.88 (18), 3.07 (3), 7.27 (t, 1), 7.84 (d, 2), 8.75 (br, 2).

Method B: To a solution of $[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_6]$ (0.166 g, 0.010 mmol) and PPr^i_3 (0.10 g, 0.62 mmol) in THF/acetonitrile (1:1 v/v, 5 mL) was added $[\text{Cp}_2\text{Fe}](\text{BF}_4)$ (0.055 g, 0.20 mmol) and NaOSiPh_3 (0.060 g, 0.20 mmol). The reaction mixture was stirred overnight and solvent was removed. Vapor diffusion of *n*-hexane into the reddish-brown filtrate yielded the product as brown crystals (0.044 g, 20%). The ^1H NMR spectrum is identical to that of the product of Method A.

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3(\text{OSiMe}_2\text{Bu}^t)]$ —Method B of the preceding preparation was employed on the same scale with use of $\text{NaOSiMe}_2\text{Bu}^t$. After being stirred overnight, the reaction mixture was reduced to a deep brown residue, which was extracted with a solution of Pr^i_3P (0.10 g, 0.62 mmol) in benzene (5 mL). Removal of solvent from the extract filtrate afforded the product as a brown crystalline solid (0.097 g, 50%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.14 (2), 1.98 (18), 2.61 (3), 3.58 (3).

$[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4(\text{OSiPh}_3)_2]$ —Vapor diffusion of *n*-hexane into a solution of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3(\text{OSiPh}_3)]$ (0.050 g, 0.045 mmol) in benzene (4 mL) over 2–3 d caused separation of the product as a brown crystalline solid (0.038 g, 45%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.90 (2), 3.06 (br, 12), 6.78 (2), 7.3 (~1), 7.62 (2).

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3(\text{SSiPr}^i_3)]$ —To a solution of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4](\text{BPh}_4)$ (0.13 g, 0.099 mmol) in THF (5 mL) was added a solution of NaSSiPr^i_3 (0.021 g, 0.099 mmol; from Pr^i_3SiSH and NaH in THF) in acetonitrile (5 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred overnight and solvent was removed. The deep brown residue was extracted with a solution of Pr^i_3P (0.10 g, 0.62

mmol) in benzene (7 mL) and the solution was filtered. Reduction of the solution to *ca.* 1 mL caused separation of the product as a brown crystalline solid (0.072 g, 71%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.98 (18), 2.71 (6), 3.40 (3), 4.61 (1). *Anal.* Calcd. for $\text{C}_{36}\text{H}_{84}\text{Fe}_4\text{P}_3\text{S}_5\text{Si}$: C, 42.32; H, 8.29; Fe, 21.86; S, 15.69. Found: C, 41.24; H, 8.10; Fe, 21.30; S, 15.20.

$[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4](\text{SSiPr}^i_3)_2$ —Vapor diffusion of *n*-hexane into a solution of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3(\text{SSiPr}^i_3)]$ (0.050 g, 0.049 mmol) in benzene (2 mL) afforded the product as brown crystals (0.034 g, 80%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 0.64 (6), 1.90 (1), 1.95 (2), 2.98 (12).

2. Reductive Cleavage

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3](\text{SPh})$ —A solution of diphenyldisulfide (4.5 mg, 0.020 mmol) in THF (2 mL) was added to a solution of $[\text{Fe}_{16}\text{S}_{16}(\text{PPr}^i_3)_8]^{16}$ (27 mg, 0.010 mmol) and PPr^i_3 (10 mg, 0.060 mmol) in THF (8 mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for 12 h to give a reddish-brown solution. Volatiles were removed and the residue was extracted with benzene (1 mL) containing PPr^i_3 (20 mg, 0.12 mmol). Vapor diffusion of hexane over 1 d caused separation of the product as black-brown crystals (17 mg, 45%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ -2.70 (1), -1.55 (br, 2), 1.94 (54), 3.10 (9), 13.04 (2). This spectrum is in agreement with an earlier report of this compound prepared by a self-assembly method.¹⁶

The following seven compounds were prepared on the same scale by the same method but with use of the different disulfides, and were isolated as black-brown crystals in the indicated yields.

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3](\text{SC}_6\text{H}_4\text{-}p\text{-Me})$ —bis(*p*-tolyl)disulfide (5.0 mg, 0.020 mmol); 16 mg (42%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): -1.85 (2), 1.94 (54), 3.09 (9), 12.01 (3), 12.94 (2).

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3](\text{SC}_6\text{H}_4\text{-}p\text{-Cl})$ —bis(*p*-chlorophenyl)disulfide (5.8 mg, 0.020 mmol); 20 mg (50%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ -1.79 (2), 1.92 (54), 3.00 (9), 12.92 (2). *Anal.* Calcd. for $\text{C}_{33}\text{H}_{67}\text{ClFe}_4\text{P}_3\text{S}_5$: C, 40.61; H, 6.92; Fe, 22.89; S, 16.43. Found: C, 40.75; H, 6.82; Fe, 22.90; S, 16.22.

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3](\text{SC}_6\text{H}_4\text{-}p\text{-OMe})$ —bis(*p*-methoxyphenyl)disulfide (5.6 mg, 0.020 mmol); 15 mg, (39%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ -1.62 (2), 1.94 (54), 3.13 (9), 4.23 (3), 12.31 (2).

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3](\text{SePh})$ —diphenyldiselenide (6.2 mg, 0.020 mmol); 30 mg (75%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ -2.70 (1), -1.52 (2), 1.94 (54), 3.07 (9), 11.86 (2).

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3](\text{SeC}_6\text{H}_4\text{-}p\text{-Cl})$ —bis(*p*-chlorophenyl)diselenide (7.6 mg, 0.020 mmol); 27 mg (66%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ -1.78 (1), 1.93 (54), 3.00 (9), 11.63 (2). *Anal.* Calcd. for $\text{C}_{33}\text{H}_{67}\text{ClFe}_4\text{P}_3\text{S}_4\text{Se}$: C, 38.75; H, 6.60; Fe, 21.84; S, 12.54. Found: C, 36.12; H, 6.17; Fe, 21.32; S, 12.29.

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)]$ —iodine (2.5 mg, 0.020 mmol); 13 mg (34%). ^1H NMR (C_6D_6): δ 1.94 (54), 2.91 (9). *Anal.* Calcd. for $\text{C}_{45}\text{H}_{78}\text{Fe}_4\text{IP}_3\text{S}_4$: C, 33.81; H, 6.62; Fe, 23.29; S, 13.37. Found: C, 33.60; H, 6.55; Fe, 23.10; S, 13.20.

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3](\text{SCoCH}_2\text{Ph})$ —bis(phenylacetyl)disulfide (6.0 mg, 0.020 mmol); 16 mg (41%).

In the sections following, clusters are numerically designated according to Chart 1.

X-ray Structure Determinations

The structures of the 16 compounds in Tables 1 and 2 were determined. Diffraction-quality crystals were obtained by hexane diffusion into THF (**4**, **5**) or benzene (**6–19**) solutions. Crystal mounting and data collections were performed as described²⁰ on a Siemens (Bruker) SMART CCD diffractometer using Mo K α radiation. Data reductions were performed with SAINT, which corrects for Lorentz polarization and decay. Space groups were assigned by analysis of symmetry and systematic absences were determined by XPREP and were further checked by PLATON. Structures were solved by direct methods and refined against all data in the 2 θ ranges by full-matrix least-squares on F^2 using SHELXS-97 and SHELXL-97. Hydrogen atoms at idealized positions were included in final refinements. Refinement details and explanations (wherever necessary) are included in the individual CIF files. Crystallographic data and final agreement factors are given in Tables 1 and 2.²¹

Other Physical Measurements

¹H NMR spectra were obtained with a Varian M400 spectrometer. Epr spectra in THF solutions were recorded on a Bruker ELEXSYS-II spectrometer operating at X-band and 4.5 K. ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer spectra were measured with a constant acceleration spectrometer. Data were analyzed with WMOSS software (WEB Research, Edina, MN); isomer shifts are referenced to iron metal at room temperature. Magnetic susceptibility data were collected with a Quantum Design SQUID magnetometer at 1 T and 2–300 K (MIT Center for Materials Science and Engineering).

Results and Discussion

Synthesis of Clusters

The 3:1 site-differentiated clusters of general type [Fe₄S₄(PR₃)₃L], in which R = Pr^{*i*} and L is a variant anionic ligand, are accessible by two procedures, phosphine ligand substitution and reductive cleavage of ligand precursors. Both originate with known all-ferrous precursors, the edge-bridged double cubane **2** or the tetracubane **3**. As shown in Figure 2, cluster **2** is oxidized with two equiv of [Cp₂Fe]⁺ in acetonitrile/THF in the presence of added phosphine to the cationic cubane cluster **1**, isolable as the BF₄[−] or BPh₄[−] salt. Treatment of **1** with one equiv of ligand in reaction 1 yields halide clusters **4** and **5** and silylthiolate clusters **14** and **15**. Alternatively, oxidation of **2** in the presence of ligand in acetonitrile/THF without prior isolation of **1** affords silyloxide clusters **7** and **8** directly. In the reductive cleavage method of Figure 3, two equiv of substrate L₂ and one equiv of tetracubane **3** generate ligand monoanion which is captured by cubane fragments of **3** in reaction 2 (L = I, RS, RSe) to yield clusters **6**, **9–13**, **16**, and **17**.

Certain useful observations follow from these reactions. In ligand substitution with halides, it is desirable to utilize [1](BPh₄) and the Ph₄P⁺ salt of the ligand anion owing to the favorably low solubility of (Ph₄P)(BPh₄) in the reaction medium. Workup procedures are performed in the presence of added phosphine to stabilize the desired single cubane products. These clusters have a propensity to liberate coordinated phosphine in reaction 3, leading to ready isolation of the less soluble edge-bridged double cubane. This behavior

was demonstrated by isolation of double cubanes **18** (45%) and **19** (80%) from benzene/hexane solutions of **7** and **14**, respectively. Previously, cluster **20** had been isolated similarly from THF/ether.¹⁶ The cluster reactant in reductive cleavage of L_2 may be in part **2** inasmuch as this cluster and **3** are in equilibrium in the presence of added phosphine used in the procedure. Clusters **2** and **3** are easily distinguished by ^1H NMR.¹⁶

Reactions 1 and 2 afford oxidatively sensitive single cubanes $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3\text{L}]$ in 40–80% yields as crystalline solids soluble in benzene and THF to form red-brown solutions. Double cubanes are slightly soluble in benzene and quite soluble in THF and dichloromethane to give deep brown solutions. A small number of mixed-ligand anionic clusters $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4\text{L}_{4-n}\text{L}'_n]^{2-}$ have been isolated as salts soluble in polar solvents such as acetonitrile or DMF; others have been generated in solution by ligand substitution. Without recourse to a site-differentiating ligand such as LS_3 ¹ (Figure 1), such species normally equilibrate by ligand exchange to mixtures of clusters, a behavior demonstrated early in the development of iron-sulfur clusters.²² Inasmuch as similar reactions of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3\text{L}]$ would necessarily implicate charged clusters, they are suppressed in low-polarity media, accounting for the stability of the neutral clusters. As examples, the paramagnetically shifted ^1H NMR spectra of clusters **7** and **8** in Figure 4 serve to identify them and demonstrate their stability in benzene.

Structures of Clusters

The cubane formulation of clusters $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)_3\text{L}]$ has been verified by the structures of clusters prepared by both methods and provided in Figures 5 and 6. Mean values of Fe-L bond lengths and Fe-S and Fe-Fe distances of the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ cores of these structures are collected in Table 3. Full sets of structural data are available elsewhere.²¹ Individual bond distances and angles are unexceptional. The most significant structural aspect is the range of core distortions from the highest idealized core geometry, taken as T_d inasmuch as no weak field mixed-valence Fe_4S_4 cluster ever manifests localized Fe^{3+} or Fe^{2+} sites. Such species are always electronically delocalized. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, eight core distortion patterns are recognizable from Fe-S distances, which are designated as short (s), long (l), and intermediate (i) with color coding. These distances are sorted *within* in each structure rather than over the entire set with statistically defined limits, resulting in a qualitative description of distortions. The most prevalent of these is the 4s + 8l pattern observed for seven clusters (Table 3). The differences in mean values of 0.060–0.078 Å emphasize the extent of distortion, which takes the form of compressed tetragonal Fe_4S_4 core geometry that ideally conforms to an improper S_4 axis passing through the midpoints of the opposite Fe_2S_2 core faces. Other distortion patterns, although less pronounced, are 9s + 3l and 6s + 6l. The remaining cases can be described in terms of s + i + l combinations (Table 4). Despite the nature of the ligand set, there are no cases of a strict trigonal distortion, although cluster **7** (6s + 3i + 3l) approaches that situation.

The detailed structures of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{3+,2+,1+}$ core structures in proteins and synthetic compounds and interpretations of distortions continues as a matter of current significance.^{23,23} The purpose of the scheme presented here is to emphasize once again the deformability, or “plasticity”, of the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ core. This property is dramatized by the occurrence of two very differently distorted cores, 8s + 4l and 1s + 11l, in the asymmetric unit of cluster **17**. Core deformability has also been revealed by structural investigations of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{SR})_4]^{3-}$ clusters in which the terminal ligands are identical.^{1,24–26} Over a dozen different distortions from cubic core symmetry have now been observed, including both

elongated and compressed tetragonal structures and others, including some of those found here, for which there is no simple geometric description. Distortions are evidently produced by non-bonded interactions in the solid state and appear to reflect a soft potential surface with competing energy minima. By way of comparison, $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{2+}$ clusters also exhibit distortions from T_d idealized core geometry, the most frequently encountered of which is compressed tetragonal ($4s + 8l$).¹ It has been suggested that this structure is trapped by lattice effects in both proteins and crystalline analogue complexes and may revert to T_d symmetry in solution.²³ It remains of much interest to see what distortion(s) would be adopted by $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ clusters in proteins. Unfortunately, no X-ray structures of reduced proteins are currently available.

Ground State Properties

Adequate characterization of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ clusters requires specification of ground state spin inasmuch as values of $S = 1/2$ to $7/2$ have been observed for synthetic and protein-bound species. Among the former, examples of pure $S = 1/2$ and $3/2$ as well as spin-admixed $S = 1/2 + 3/2$ states have been reported.^{24–28} Data for representative clusters **5** and **14** are summarized in Figure 7.. Magnetic susceptibilities adhere to the Curie-Weiss law $\chi^M = C/(T - \theta)$ at 2–15 K with Curie constants $C = 0.475$ and 0.430 emuK/mol, close to the theoretical value of $C = 0.375$ emu K/mol for $S = 1/2$. The negative deviations of susceptibility above *ca.* 100 K are due to occupancy of higher spin states. EPR spectra of **14** and **15** in THF at 4.5 K are essentially axial and are consistent with $S = 1/2$. (The spectrum of the related cluster $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PBU}'_3)_3\text{Cl}]$ at 32 K is rhombic but corresponds to $S = 1/2$.¹⁸).

Lastly, the Mössbauer spectra of polycrystalline **14** and **16** consist of two quadrupole doublets in a 1:1 intensity ratio. The isomer shifts of the two clusters conform to those of the $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$ state. From the linear relationship between isomer shift and (mean) oxidation state for tetrahedral FeS_4 sites at 4.2 K,¹ $\delta = 0.59$ mm/s for a $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{SR})_4]^{3-}$ cluster. For FeS_4L sites, the isomer shifts decrease in the order $\text{L} = \text{RS}^- > \text{R}_3\text{P}^{29}$ such that values for $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PR}_3)_4]^{1+}$ are 0.46–0.51 mm/s, a lowering of 0.02–0.03 mm/s for each phosphine introduced. Subtraction of the effect of three phosphines from $\delta = 0.59$ mm/s gives 0.50 and 0.54 mm/s, in reasonable agreement with experimental values of 0.51 and 0.52 mm/s for thiolate-bound **14**. The same argument applies to **16**, confirming the mean oxidation state $\text{Fe}^{2.25+}$. The appearance of two quadrupole doublet accords with the prevailing theory of spin-coupling of $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4]^{1+}$.^{30,31} A $\text{Fe}^{2+} \text{Fe}^{2+}$ pair ($S' = 4$) and a resonance delocalized $\text{Fe}^{2+}\text{Fe}^{3+}$ pair ($S' = 9/2$) are ferromagnetically coupled with the indicated spins, accounting for the two doublets. These pairs are antiferromagnetically coupled to produce the state $|9/2, 4, 1/2\rangle$ with $S = 1/2$ cluster spin.

With synthetic methods developed, solution solubility and stability conditions examined, and structural and ground state electronic properties revealed, we are in a favorable position to investigate site-specific reactivity, especially the potential of preparing higher nuclearity clusters. Such studies are in progress.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by NIH Grant GM-28856. We thank Dr. R. Weber (Bruker BioSpin, Billerica, MA) for access to EPR equipment. This work made use of the MRSEC Shared Experimental Facilities at MIT, supported by the National Science Foundation under award number DMR-08-19762.

References

1. Rao PV, Holm RH. *Chem Rev* 2004;104:527–559. [PubMed: 14871134]
2. Stack TDP, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc* 1988;110:2484–2494.
3. Holm, RH. Iron-Sulfur Clusters. In: Que, L., Jr; Tolman, WA., editors. *Bio-coordination Chemistry*. Elsevier; Oxford: 2004. p. 61-90.
4. Holm RH. *Pure Appl Chem* 1998;70:931–938.
5. Holm RH, Ciurli S, Weigel JA. *Progr Inorg Chem* 1990;38:1–74.
6. Walsdorff C, Saak W, Pohl S. *J Chem Soc, Dalton Trans* 1997:1857–1861.
7. Walsdorff C, Saak W, Haase D, Pohl S. *J Chem Soc Chem Commun* 1997:1931–1932.
8. Evans DJ, Garcia G, Leigh GJ, Newton MS, Santana MD. *J Chem Soc Dalton Trans* 1992:3229–3234.
9. van Strijdonck GPF, van Haare JAEH, van der Linden JGM, Steggerda JJ, Nolte RJM. *Inorg Chem* 1994;33:999–1000.
10. van Strijdonck GPF, van Haare JAEH, Hönen PJM, van den Schoor RCGM, Feiters MC, van der Linden JGM, Steggerda JJ, Nolte RJM. *J Chem Soc, Dalton Trans* 1997:449–461.
11. van Strijdonck GPF, ten Have PTJH, Feiters MC, van der Linden JGM, Steggerda JJ, Nolte RJM. *Chem Ber* 1997;130:1151–1157.
12. Whitener MA, Peng G, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem* 1991;30:2411–2417.
13. Stack TDP, Weigel JA, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem* 1990;29:3745–3760.
14. Daley CJA, Holm RH. *J Inorg Biochem* 2003;97:287–298. [PubMed: 14511891]
15. Goh C, Segal BM, Huang J, Long JR, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc* 1996;118:11844–11853.
16. Zhou HC, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem* 2003;42:11–21. [PubMed: 12513073]
17. Deng L, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc* 2008;130:9878–9886. [PubMed: 18593124]
18. Tyson MA, Demadis KD, Coucouvanis D. *Inorg Chem* 1995;34:4519–4520.
19. Booth G, Chatt J. *J Chem Soc* 1962:2099–2106.
20. Groysman S, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem* 2007;46:4090–4102. [PubMed: 17432849]
21. See paragraph at the end of this article for Supporting Information available.
22. Que L Jr, Bobrik MA, Ibers JA, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc* 1974;96:4168–4178. [PubMed: 4854592]
23. Fee JA, Castagnetto JM, Case DA, Noodleman L, Stout CD, Torres RD. *J Biol Inorg Chem* 2003;8:519–526. [PubMed: 12632271]
24. Carney MJ, Papaefthymiou GC, Spartalian K, Frankel RB, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc* 1988;110:6084–6095.
25. Carney MJ, Papaefthymiou GC, Frankel RB, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem* 1989;28:1497–1503.
26. Yu S-B, Papaefthymiou GC, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem* 1991;30:3476–3485.
27. Laskowski EJ, Frankel RB, Gillum WO, Papaefthymiou GC, Renaud J, Ibers JA, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc* 1978;100:5322–5337.
28. Carney MJ, Holm RH, Papaefthymiou GC, Frankel RB. *J Am Chem Soc* 1986;108:3519–3521.
29. Hauser C, Bill E, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem* 2002;41:1615–1624. [PubMed: 11896732]
30. Noodleman L. *Inorg Chem* 1991;30:246–256.
31. Mouesca JM, Noodleman L, Case DA, Lamotte B. *Inorg Chem* 1995;34:4347–4359.

Figure 1. Structure of the 3:1 site-differentiated cluster $[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{LS}_3)\text{Cl}]^{2-}$ ($\text{LS}_3 = 1,3,5\text{-tris}((4,6\text{-dimethyl-3-mercaptophenyl-thio})\text{-}2,4,6\text{-tris}(p\text{-tolylthio})\text{benzene}(3\text{-}))$). The ligand is in the *aaabaa* conformation with one substituent below the plane of the central benzene ring.

Figure 2.
Schematic depiction of the synthesis of clusters by phosphine ligand substitution of **1**.

Figure 3. Schematic depiction of the synthesis of clusters by reductive cleavage of ligand precursors.

Figure 4. ^1H NMR spectra of representative clusters **7** (left) and **8** in C_6D_6 . Signal assignments are indicated.

Figure 5.

Structures of single cubanes (**4**, **5**, **7**, **8**, **14**, **15**) prepared by phosphine ligand substitution and double cubanes (**18**, **19**) obtained by phosphine dissociation from single cubanes. Both types are shown with 50 % probability ellipsoids and partial atom numbering schemes. Double cubanes have crystallographically imposed centrosymmetry.

Figure 6. Structures of single cubanes (**6**, **9–13**, **16**, **17**) prepared by reductive cleavage showing 50 % probability ellipsoids and partial atom labelling schemes.

Figure 7.

(a) Temperature dependence of the reciprocal molar susceptibility at $H = 1\text{ T}$; inset: Curie plot at 2–15 K with Curie and Weiss constants indicated. (b) X-band EPR spectra at 4.5 K in THF; apparent g -values are indicated ($g_{av} = 2.03$). (c) Zero-field Mössbauer spectra with isomer shifts (δ) and quadrupole splitting (ΔE) indicated.

$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)]^{1+}$	1 ¹⁶
$[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_6]$	2 ^{15,16}
$[\text{Fe}_{16}\text{S}_{16}(\text{PPr}^i_3)_8]$	3 ¹⁶
$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)\text{X}]$	X = Cl ⁻ 4 , Br ⁻ 5 , I ⁻ 6
$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)(\text{OR})]$	R = SiPh ₃ 7 , SiMe ₂ Bu ^t 8
$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)(\text{SR})]$	R = Ph ¹⁶ 9 , C ₆ H ₄ - <i>p</i> -Me 10 , C ₆ H ₄ - <i>p</i> -OMe 11 C ₆ H ₄ - <i>p</i> -Cl 12 , COCH ₂ Ph 13 SiPr ⁱ ₃ 14 , SiPh ₃ 15
$[\text{Fe}_4\text{S}_4(\text{PPr}^i_3)(\text{SeR})]$	R = Ph 16 , C ₆ H ₄ - <i>p</i> -Cl 17
$[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4(\text{OSiPh}_3)_2]$	18
$[\text{Fe}_8\text{S}_8(\text{PPr}^i_3)_4(\text{SR})_2]$	R = Si(PPr ⁱ ₃) ₃ 19 , SiPh ₃ ¹⁶ 20

Chart 1.

Designation of Clusters

Table 1

Crystallographic Data for [Fe₄S₄]¹⁺ complexes (**4** – **11**) at 100 K^a

complexes	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
formula	C ₂₇ H ₆₃ ClFe ₄ P ₃ S ₄	C ₂₇ H ₆₃ BrFe ₄ P ₃ S ₄	C ₂₇ H ₆₃ Fe ₄ IP ₃ S ₄	C ₄₅ H ₇₈ Fe ₄ OP ₃ S ₄ Si	C ₃₃ H ₇₈ Fe ₄ OP ₃ S ₄ Si	C ₃₃ H ₆₈ Fe ₄ P ₃ S ₅	C ₃₄ H ₇₀ Fe ₄ P ₃ S ₅	C ₃₄ H ₇₀ Fe ₄ OP ₃ S ₅
formula weight	867.77	912.26	959.26	1107.76	963.62	941.53	955.55	971.56
crystal system	monoclinic	monoclinic	monoclinic	trigonal	triclinic	monoclinic	monoclinic	monoclinic
space group	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> – <i>3</i> <i>c</i> / <i>1</i>	<i>P</i> – <i>1</i>	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>n</i>
Z	4	4	4	4	2	4	4	4
<i>a</i> , Å	10.7153(11)	15.5180(5)	15.757(2)	16.1863(7)	12.0082(4)	16.426 (3)	16.809 (5)	19.3706 (7)
<i>b</i> , Å	22.869(2)	13.3790(4)	13.5181(17)	16.1863(7)	12.0826(4)	13.714 (3)	13.094 (4)	11.2553 (4)
<i>c</i> , Å	16.6553(17)	18.8744(6)	18.911(2)	25.7751(18)	19.6232(7)	19.960 (4)	19.838 (5)	21.7355 (8)
<i>α</i> , deg	90.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	88.265(2)	90.00	90.00	90.00
<i>β</i> , deg	102.720(2)	97.874(2)	97.816(2)	90.00	76.221(2)	100.182(5)	92.556 (5)	110.238 (1)
<i>γ</i> , deg	90.00	90.00	90.00	120.00	62.209(2)	90.00	90.00	90.00
<i>V</i> , Å ³	3981.1(7)	3881.7(2)	3990.9(9)	5848.3(5)	2435.41(14)	4425.6 (14)	4362 (2)	4446.3 (3)
<i>d</i> _{calc} , g/cm ³	1.403	1.561	1.597	1.258	1.314	1.413	1.450	1.451
<i>μ</i> , mm ^{−1}	1.841	2.851	2.546	1.247	1.485	1.652	1.677	1.648
2θ range, deg	4.34–52.50	4.40–51.92	4.34–51.60	5.02 – 56.5	4.56 – 56.74	4.62–50.86	4.39–42.67	4.36–51.87
<i>R</i> ₁ ^b / <i>wR</i> ₂ ^c	0.0488 (0.1174)	0.0312 (0.0760)	0.0657 (0.1763)	0.0239 (0.0755)	0.0296 (0.0788)	0.0473 (0.0961)	0.1225 (0.3102)	0.0287 (0.0716)
GOF (<i>F</i> ²)	1.056	1.063	1.171	1.206	1.035	0.986	1.139	1.071

^aMo Kα radiation (λ = 0.71073 Å).

^b $R_1 = \sum ||F_0| - |F_c|| / \sum |F_0|$.

^c $wR_2 = \{ \sum [w(F_0^2 - F_c^2)^2] / \sum [w(F_0^2)^2] \}^{1/2}$

Table 2

Crystallographic Data for [Fe₄S₄]¹⁺ complexes (12–19) at 100 K^a

complexes	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
formula	C ₃₃ H ₆₇ ClFe ₄ P ₃ S ₅	C ₃₃ H ₇₀ Fe ₄ OP ₃ S ₅	C ₃₆ H ₈₄ Fe ₄ P ₃ S ₅ Si	C ₄₅ H ₇₈ Fe ₄ P ₃ S ₅ Si	C ₃₃ H ₆₈ Fe ₄ P ₃ S ₄ Se	C ₃₃ H ₆₇ Fe ₄ P ₃ S ₄ SeCl	C ₇₂ H ₁₁₄ Fe ₈ O ₂ P ₄ S ₈ Si	C ₅₄ H ₁₂₆ Fe ₈ P ₄ S ₁₀ Si ₂
formula weight	975.98	983.57	1021.73	1123.83	988.42	1022.85	1895.05	1723.11
crystal system	monoclinic	triclinic	triclinic	monoclinic	triclinic	monoclinic	monoclinic	triclinic
space group	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> -1	<i>P</i> -1	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> -1	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>n</i>	<i>P</i> ₂ / <i>1</i> / <i>c</i>	<i>P</i> -1
Z	4	2	2	4	2	4	2	2
<i>a</i> , Å	14.096 (2)	11.220 (2)	10.890 (3)	19.805 (4)	11.1659 (13)	24.168 (4)	11.2573 (14)	13.383 (12)
<i>b</i> , Å	19.807 (3)	13.240 (2)	13.723 (4)	10.671 (3)	11.3089 (13)	17.033 (3)	28.095 (4)	13.635 (12)
<i>c</i> , Å	17.396 (3)	17.784 (3)	18.892 (6)	27.592 (6)	17.666 (2)	24.185 (4)	14.5028 (18)	14.548 (13)
<i>α</i> , deg	90.00	98.113 (3)	99.753 (5)	90.00	85.122 (2)	90.00	90.00	62.452 (12)
<i>β</i> , deg	112.598 (2)	102.382 (3)	103.788 (4)	109.978 (4)	88.949 (2)	113.507 (3)	106.781 (2)	65.944 (13)
<i>γ</i> , deg	90.00	114.675 (2)	106.327 (4)	90.00	79.238 (2)	90.00	90.00	62.296 (12)
<i>V</i> , Å ³	4484.1 (12)	2264.2 (7)	2545.3 (14)	5480 (2)	2183.6 (4)	9130 (3)	4391.5 (9)	2020 (3)
<i>d</i> _{calc} , g/cm ³	1.446	1.443	1.333	1.362	1.503	1.489	1.433	1.417
<i>μ</i> , mm ⁻¹	1.690	1.619	1.464	1.367	2.459	2.412	1.612	1.792
2θ range, deg	4.82–51.48	4.516–51.46	4.58–55.68	4.36–48.42	4.38–51.73	4.38–50.46	4.98–46.48	5.36–56.46
<i>R</i> ₁ ^b / <i>wR</i> ₂ ^c	0.0348 (0.0786)	0.0395 (0.1019)	0.0729 (0.1753)	0.0440 (0.1001)	0.0653 (0.1840)	0.0696 (0.1752)	0.0381 (0.0606)	0.0363 (0.0880)
GOF (<i>F</i> ²)	1.081	1.054	1.020	1.010	1.039	1.026	0.758	1.029

^aMo Kα radiation (λ = 0.71073 Å).

^b $R_1 = \sum |F_0| - |F_c| / \sum |F_0|$.

^c $wR_2 = \{ \sum [w(F_0^2 - F_c^2)^2] / \sum [w(F_0^2)^2] \}^{1/2}$

SCoCH ₂ Ph	SePh	I	Br

SSiPh ₃	SC ₆ H ₄ Me	SSiPh ₃	SSiPr ₃	SeC ₆ H ₄ Cl ^d
4s 2.211 (6) 2i 2.249 (7) 6i 2.270 (10)	4s 2.233 (16) 3i 2.290 (2) 5i 2.320 (14)	3s 2.235 (5) 6i 2.284 (8) 3i 2.323 (12)	8s 2.288 (8) 4i 2.321 (13)	
2.66 (1) 2.233 (6)	2.70 (4) 2.287 (1)	2.70 (3) 2.285 (2)	2.69 (2) 2.369 (2)	