Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2013 September 25; 135(38): . doi:10.1021/ja408003d.

The synthesis of open-shell, bimetallic Mn/Fe trinuclear clusters

Tamara M. Powers[†], Nina Gu[†], Alison R. Fout[‡], Anne M. Baldwin[†], Raúl Hernández Sánchez[†], Denise M. Alfonso[†], Yu-Sheng Chen[§], Shao-Liang Zheng[†], and Theodore A. Betley[†]

Theodore A. Betley: betley@chemistry.harvard.edu

[†]Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, 12 Oxford Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138

[‡]Department of Chemistry, University of Illinois, 600 South Mathews Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801

[§]ChemMatCARS, The University of Chicago, Argonne, IL 60439

Abstract

Concomitant deprotonation and metallation of hexadentate ligand platform ^t_{bs}LH₆ (^t_{bs}LH₆ = 1,3,5-C₆H₉(NHC₆H₄-*o*-NHSiMe₂^tBu)₃) with divalent transition metal starting materials Fe₂(Mes)₄ (Mes = mesityl) or Mn₃(Mes)₆ in the presence of tetrahydrofuran (THF) resulted in isolation of homotrimeric complexes (^t_{bs}L)Fe₃(THF) and (^t_{bs}L)Mn₃(THF) respectively. In the absence of coordinating solvent (THF) the deprotonation and metallation exclusively afforded dinuclear complexes of the type (^t_{bs}LH₂)M₂ (M = Fe or Mn). The resulting dinuclear species were utilized as synthons to prepare bimetallic trinuclear clusters. Treatment of (^t_{bs}LH₂)Fe₂ complex with divalent Mn source (Mn₂(N(SiMe₃)₂)₄) afforded the bimetallic complex (^t_{bs}L)Fe₂Mn(THF) which established the ability of hexamine ligand ^t_{bs}LH₆ to support mixed metal clusters. The substitutional homogeneity of (^t_{bs}L)Fe₂Mn(THF) was determined by ¹H NMR, ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer, and X-ray fluorescence. Anomalous scattering measurements were critical for the unambiguous assignment of the trinuclear core composition. Heating a solution of (^t_{bs}LH₂)Mn₂ with a stoichiometric amount of Fe₂(Mes)₄ (0.5 mol equiv) affords a mixture of both (^t_{bs}L)Mn₂Fe(THF) and (^t_{bs}L)Fe₂Mn(THF) as a result of the thermodynamic preference for heavier metal substitution within the hexa-anilido ligand framework. These results demonstrate for the first time the assembly of mixed metal cluster synthesis in an unbiased ligand platform.

A. Introduction

Metal atom substitution within a polynuclear reaction site can have dramatic effects in the local electronic structure resulting in changes in observed reactivity, substrate binding affinities, and catalytic function. Metal atom substitution as a design principle provides a powerful means for altering reaction chemistry without changing the supporting ligand environment. In biology this is observed where metal substitution in Fe-only nitrogenase to FeMo- and FeV-based nitrogenase results in significant changes in enzymatic activity and chemoselectivity (Figure 1a);¹ whereas substitution of a single Fe center in ribonucleotide reductase (RNR) with Mn changes the mechanism of radical initiation (Figure 1b).² This phenomenon is not limited to biology as alloys are frequently utilized in industrial heterogeneous catalysis, and in some cases demonstrate vastly different catalytic properties and activity relative to the pure metal surface counterparts.³ For example, long chain

Correspondence to: Theodore A. Betley, betley@chemistry.harvard.edu.

Supporting Information Available: Detailed spectroscopic and crystal structure data for all new compounds. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

hydrocarbons are generated industrially by the Fischer-Tropsch process, which utilizes bimetallic surfaces including Fe/Co, Co/Ni and Ni/Fe alloys.^{3g-h} While the utility of metal atom substitution to alter reaction chemistry is clear from biological and heterogeneous catalysis, the exact role that metal substitution plays in these polynuclear reaction sites is difficult to assess. Indeed, a synthetic platform wherein multiple combinations of transition or main group atoms could be substituted into an unbiased ligand framework would help illuminate the underlying factors that lead to desirable chemistry.

For the aforementioned reasons, synthetic, heterometallic clusters have been pursued to probe the effect of metal substitution on cluster reactivity, as well as gain a better understanding of the stability, reactivity, and coordination environment of the individual metal reaction sites.⁷ Four general strategies have been employed to synthesize mixed-metal clusters: (1) self-assembly processes^{4,8} (Figure 1c); (2) reaction of incomplete clusters (e.g. partially formed cubanes) with binary transition metal or alkaline ions^{5,9,10} (Figure 1d); (3) utilization of polynucleating ligand scaffolds that possess different elemental binding affinities to selectively interact with one metal ion in preference to another (Figure 1e);^{6,11} and (4) direct atom metathesis from pre-formed clusters.¹² What has not been demonstrated is the straightforward synthesis of polymetallic clusters featuring direct, close M–M interactions in an unbiased ligand environment.

Our lab has approached the synthesis of metal clusters through the development of a family of hexadentate ligand platforms, which provide a method of structure-function analysis through systematic modification of the steric and electronic environment of the cluster. We have previously reported the synthesis of several homotrinnuclear clusters of Co, Mn, and Fe, supported by hexadentate ligand platforms comprised of *o*-phenylenedianilide-based subunits, whose intracore interactions and molecular spin states vary as a function of ligand architecture.¹³ Adapting our synthetic protocols to yield bi- or trimetallic trinnuclear clusters supported by hexaanilide ligand platforms would provide an alternative avenue by which we can investigate the role M–M interactions play in both cluster electronic structure and reactivity. The synthesis of polynuclear heterometallic clusters supported by polynucleating ligand scaffolds that feature unbiased metalbinding sites has not yet been realized, potentially due to the challenge of controlling the number and sites of metal incorporation.

Recently, we reported the synthesis of cluster (^tbsL)Fe₃(THF) (**1**) (^tbsL⁶⁻ = [1,3,5-C₆H₉(NC₆H₄-*o*-NSiMe₂^tBu)₃]⁶⁻).¹⁴ In the absence of coordinating solvent, we access binuclear metal complexes (^tbsLH₂)M₂, providing a platform by which we can explore the stepwise synthesis of a family of mixed-metal clusters that differ by single metal-site substitutions (Scheme 1). Through this investigation we have sought to address the following questions: (1) Can the hexaanilide ligand (^tbsL⁶⁻) support all metal substitution combinations from Mn₃ to Fe₃ in single metal-substitution steps? (2) Are substitutionally homogeneous clusters formed upon metallation (i.e., same metal occupancy and position within the ligand framework), or does metal atom lability produce statistical distributions of mixed-metal compositions? (3) Can ancillary ligands, such as coordinated solvent molecules (THF in Scheme 1), be used to tune the selectivity of metal substitution reaction?

B. Experimental

Materials and Methods

All manipulations involving metal complexes were carried out using standard Schlenk line or glovebox techniques under a dinitrogen atmosphere. All glassware was oven-dried for a minimum of 10 h and cooled in an evacuated antechamber prior to use in the dry box. Benzene, diethyl ether, hexanes and tetrahydrofuran (THF) were dried and deoxygenated on a Glass Contour System (SG Water USA, Nashua, NH) and stored over 4 Å molecular

sieves (Strem) prior to use. Benzene- d_6 was purchased from Cambridge Isotope Labs and was degassed and stored over 4 Å molecular sieves prior to use. Non-halogenated solvents were typically tested with a purple solution of sodium benzophenone ketyl in THF in order to confirm effective oxygen and moisture removal. $t\text{bsLH}_6$,¹⁴ Fe_2Mes_4 (Mes = 2,4,6- $\text{Me}_3\text{C}_6\text{H}_2$),¹⁵ $\text{Mn}_3(\text{Mes})_6$,¹⁶ and $\text{Mn}_2(\text{NSi}(\text{CH}_3)_3)_4$ ¹⁷ were prepared following published methods. All other reagents were purchased from commercial vendors and used without further purification.

All of the measurements for the metal complexes, except for X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy, were made under anaerobic conditions. Elemental analyses were performed by Complete Analysis Laboratories, Inc., Parsippany, New Jersey. ^1H NMR spectra were recorded on Varian Unity/Inova 500B/600 NMR spectrometers with chemical shifts (δ , ppm) referenced to residual NMR solvent (C_6D_6 , 7.16 ppm). Perpendicular and parallel mode X-band EPR spectra were recorded on Bruker ElexSys E500 EPR (fitted with a cryostat for measurements at 4.3 K). The EPR spectra were referenced to diphenylpicrylhydrazyl (DPPH; $g = 2.0037$).

Synthesis

($t\text{bsL}$) $\text{Mn}_3(\text{THF})$ (2)— $t\text{bsLH}_6$ (0.300 g, 0.403 mmol) and $\text{Mn}_3(\text{Mes})_6$ (0.366 g, 0.416 mmol) were each dissolved in 2 mL of benzene. The $\text{Mn}_3(\text{Mes})_6$ solution was then added to the $t\text{bsLH}_6$ solution at 23 °C followed by the addition of THF (1 mL) to the reaction mixture. The reaction was heated in a sealed bomb at 80 °C for 3 h. The volatiles were removed in vacuo, followed by lyophilization from benzene to afford a brown solid. The resulting material was dissolved in hexanes (20 mL) and filtered through Celite on a medium porosity fritted funnel. The filtrate was dried in vacuo to afford the title complex as a reddish-brown solid. The product is ^1H NMR silent. X-ray quality crystals were grown from cold hexanes (−33 °C). Isolated yield: 0.323, (84%). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{46}\text{H}_{74}\text{Mn}_3\text{N}_6\text{OSi}_3$: C 56.60, H 7.64, N 8.61. Found: C 56.47, H 7.65, N 8.53.

($t\text{bsLH}_2$) Fe_2 (3)—Solid $t\text{bsLH}_6$ (0.130 g, 0.174 mmol) was dissolved in 10 mL of benzene. The solution was added to solid $\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4$ (0.129 g, 0.218 mmol) at 23 °C. The mixture was heated in a sealed reaction vessel at 75 °C for 12 h. The volatiles were removed in vacuo, followed by lyophilization from benzene, and the residue was washed with 5 mL of cold hexanes (−33 °C) to afford the title complex as a brown solid. Compound **3** is stable as a solid at −33 °C for at least 2 weeks. X-ray quality crystals were grown from cold hexanes (−33 °C). Isolated yield: 0.092 g, (62%). ^1H NMR (benzene- d_6 , 500 MHz, δ , ppm): 82.9, 52.3, 39.2, 37.7, 32.8, 25.0, 24.4, 23.2, 22.2, 20.1, 19.5, 14.5, 14.2, 12.9, 11.9, −2.31, −5.70, −15.2, −24.7, −32.2, −32.9, −34.0, −40.7; Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{50}\text{H}_{71}\text{Fe}_2\text{LiN}_6\text{Si}_3$: C 59.14, H 8.04, N 9.85. Found: C 59.07, H 7.98, N 9.74; Zero-field ^{57}Fe Mössbauer (90 K) (δ , $|E_Q|$ (mm/s)): component 1 (39%): 0.67, 2.19 ($\Gamma = 0.17$ mm/s); component 2 (61%): 0.68, 1.60 ($\Gamma = 0.28$ mm/s); UV-vis Spectroscopy (THF): 262 nm ($\epsilon = 1.98 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$); 290 nm ($\epsilon = 1.40 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$); 334 nm ($\epsilon = 7.45 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$); 455 nm ($\epsilon = 1.49 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$).

($t\text{bsLH}_2$) Mn_2 (4)—Solid $t\text{bsLH}_6$ (0.160 g, 0.215 mmol) was dissolved in 10 mL of benzene. The solution was added to solid $\text{Mn}_2(\text{N}(\text{SiMe}_3)_2)_4$ (0.192 g, 0.256 mmol) at 23 °C. The reaction was heated in a sealed bomb at 75 °C for 12 h. The volatiles were removed in vacuo, followed by lyophilization from benzene, and the residue was dissolved in 10 mL of hexanes. The hexane solution was filtered through Celite and the volatiles were removed in vacuo to afford the title complex as a tan solid. Complex **4** is ^1H NMR silent. X-ray quality crystals were grown from cold hexanes (−33 °C). Isolated yield: 0.128 g, (70%). Anal. Calcd for $\text{C}_{42}\text{H}_{68}\text{Mn}_2\text{N}_6\text{Si}_3$: C 59.27, H 8.05, N 9.87. Found: C 59.13, H 7.95, N 9.79.

(^tbsL)Fe₂Mn(THF) (5)—Solid (^tbsLH₂)Fe₂ (**3**) (0.060 g, 0.070 mmol) was dissolved in 5 mL of THF. The solution was added to solid Mn₂(N(SiMe₃)₂)₄ (0.026 g, 0.035 mmol) at 23 °C and the resulting mixture was heated at 75 °C for 12 h. The volatiles were removed in vacuo and dissolved in approximately 3 mL of hexanes. The hexanes were removed in vacuo to afford a brown solid. Isolated yield: 0.043 g, (62%). Crystalline material was isolated from a diethyl ether solution at –33 °C. Crystalline yield: 0.023 g (33%). ¹H NMR (benzene-*d*₆, 500 MHz, delta, ppm): 285.4, 262.3, 129.8, 74.27, 52.38, 48.60, 43.15, 37.38, 35.62, 30.43, 24.20, 20.61, 18.13, 10.83, 9.38, 5.82, 5.09, 2.78, 2.07, 1.20, 0.06, –1.07, –1.66, –3.63, –9.47, –12.28, –12.31, –26.74, –33.05, –38.83, –56.99, –82.97; Anal. Calcd for C₄₆H₇₄Fe₂MnN₆OSi₃: C 56.49, H 7.63, N 8.59. Found: C 56.37, H 7.61, N 8.47; Zero-field ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer (90 K) (delta, | *E_Q* (mm/s)): component 1 (48%): 0.35, 1.77 (= 0.20 mm/s); component 2 (52%): 0.58, 1.30 (= 0.22 mm/s).

Reaction of 4 with Fe₂(Mes)₄ (6)—Solid (^tbsLH₂)Mn₂ (**4**) (0.060 g, 0.070 mmol) was dissolved in 5 mL of THF. The solution was added to solid Fe₂(Mes)₄ (0.023 g, 0.039 mmol) at 23 °C. The reaction was heated at 75 °C for 12 h. The volatiles were removed in vacuo and the residue was washed with approximately 1 mL of hexanes. The remaining brown solid was dissolved in diethyl ether (~2 mL). Crystalline material was isolated from the diethyl ether solution at –33 °C. Crystalline yield: 0.010 g, (14%). ¹H NMR (benzene-*d*₆, 500 MHz, delta, ppm): 187.6, 182.6, 129.8, 117.3, 74.33, 55.73, 52.4, 48.62, 47.19, 43.19, 41.73, 37.44, 35.66, 31.75, 30.47, 28.99, 24.26, 21.41, 20.73, 18.17, 10.87, 9.42, 6.73, 5.86, 5.14, 4.30, 3.31, 2.81, 2.40, 2.16, 0.30, 0.10, –1.00, –1.63, –3.61, –5.96, –9.44, –10.03, –11.76, –12.24, –15.79, –20.79, –24.52, –26.72, –32.95, –36.53, –38.80, –56.94, –82.98; Anal. Calcd for C₄₆H₇₄FeMn₂N₆Si₃O: C 56.54, H 7.63, N 8.60. Found: C 56.48, H 7.67, N 8.54; Zero-field ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer (90 K) (delta, | *E_Q* (mm/s)): component 1 (48%): 0.33, 1.85 (= 0.14 mm/s); component 2 (52%): 0.57, 1.31 (= 0.19 mm/s).

Attempted synthesis of (^tbsL)Mn₂Fe(py) (7)—Solid Fe₂Mes₄ (0.023 g, 0.039 mmol) was dissolved in 3 mL of benzene at 23 °C. Pyridine (py; ~15 μL) was added to the Fe₂(Mes)₄ solution followed by addition of a solution of (^tbsLH₂)Mn₂ (**4**) (0.060 g, 0.070 mmol) in benzene (2 mL). The resulting mixture was heated at 75 °C for 12 h. The volatiles were removed in vacuo and the residue was washed with approximately 1 mL of hexanes. The remaining brown solid was dissolved in diethyl ether (1–2 mL). Crystalline material was isolated from the diethyl ether solution at –33 °C. Crystalline yield: 0.022 g, (31%). ¹H NMR (benzene-*d*₆, 500 MHz, μ, ppm): 185.5, 172.5, 128.4, 116.0, 72.41, 54.02, 53.20, 48.10, 47.28, 46.54, 42.62, 39.73, 34.18, 31.94, 28.74, 25.63, 23.44, 22.18, 19.90, 18.51, 11.10, 11.10, 9.77, 6.69, 3.23, 2.92, 2.18, 2.12, 0.93, 0.14, –0.27, –1.45, –2.19, –3.87, –6.34, –7.60, –9.99, –11.23, –12.01, –14.10, –17.32, –20.98, –22.31, –23.92, –25.90, –30.86, –35.48, –37.87, –55.08, –81.72; Anal. Calcd for C₄₇H₇₁FeMn₂N₇Si₃: C 57.36, H 7.27, N 9.96. Found: C 57.43, H 7.20, N 9.78; Zero-field ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer (90 K) (μ, | *E_Q* (mm/s)): component 1 (54%): 0.33, 1.85 (= 0.17 mm/s); component 2 (46%): 0.57, 1.24 (= 0.19 mm/s).

B.4. X-Ray Diffraction Techniques—All structures were collected on a Bruker three-circle platform goniometer equipped with an Apex II CCD and an Oxford cryostream cooling device at 100 K. Radiation for the data collection of **2**, **3**, and **4** was from a graphite fine focus sealed tube Mo K (0.71073 Å) source. All other structures were obtained using radiation from a synchrotron source (0.44280 Å or 0.49594 Å). Crystals were mounted on a cryoloop or glass fiber pin using Paratone N oil. Data were collected as a series of φ and/or scans. Data were integrated using SAINT¹⁸ and scaled with either a numerical or multi-scan absorption correction using SADABS.¹⁸ The structures were solved by direct methods or Patterson maps using SHELXS-97 and refined against *F*² on all data by full matrix least

squares with SHELXL-97.¹⁹ All non-hydrogen atoms were refined anisotropically. Hydrogen atoms were placed at idealized positions and refined using a riding model. The isotropic displacement parameters of all hydrogen atoms were fixed to 1.2 times the atoms they are linked to (1.5 times for methyl groups). Further details on particular structures are noted in the Supporting Information.

B.5. Mössbauer Spectroscopy—Zero-field, ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer spectra were measured with a constant acceleration spectrometer (SEE Co, Minneapolis, MN). Crystalline samples were prepared as Paratone-*N* mulls in a glovebox and frozen in liquid nitrogen prior to handling in air. Isomer shifts are quoted relative to Fe metal at 23 °C. Data was processed, simulated, and analyzed using an in-house package for IGOR Pro 6 (Wavemetrics, Lake Oswego, OR).

B.6. X-ray fluorescence—X-ray fluorescence analyses were recorded on a Bruker Tracer III-SD XRF analyzer with no additional filter and data was collected on each sample for at least 10 min. Samples for the calibration curve were prepared by dissolving iron(III) chloride and manganese(II) chloride tetrahydrate in water. The K_α and K_β of pure Fe and Mn were each fit to a Gaussian lineshape. The calibration samples were fit to three Gaussian lineshapes representing the Mn K_α emission, the overlapping Mn K_α and Fe K_α emissions, and the Fe K_α emission. The area of the Mn K_α emission was calculated using the area of the Gaussian fit of the Mn K_α emission and the Mn K_α and K_β ratio of the areas of a pure sample manganese(II)chloride tetrahydrate. Quantification was performed using the sum of the K_α and K_β areas. Fe:Mn ratios in samples were determined from the peak area ratios using the linear fit to the calibration curve (Figure S9).

B.7. Anomalous X-ray Diffraction Techniques—All anomalous x-ray diffraction data were collected at ChemMatCARS at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne National Laboratory (CARS, Center for Advanced Radiation Sources). The data were collected on a Bruker D8 diffractometer equipped with an APEX II CCD at 100 K using Cyrojet (Oxford instrumentation). Anomalous X-ray diffraction data was collected at wavelengths at the elemental absorption K-edges of Mn (6.539 keV) and Fe (7.112 keV). In some cases, data was collected between 30–50 eV above and/or below the Mn and Fe K-edges. Data was integrated using SAINT and scaled with either a numerical or multi-scan absorption correction using SADABS.¹⁸ Structure factors f' and f'' were determined for a given wavelength based on theoretical values²⁰ from the XDISP function in the WINGX²¹ program unless otherwise noted. Anomalous difference Fourier electron density maps at the absorption edges were also generated using SHELXL-97¹⁹ and WINGX,²¹ by fixed refinement of the atomic model generated by the reference dataset (1a or 1b) with the reflection data obtained at the metal absorption edge. The electron density holes measured in $e^-/\text{\AA}^3$ were determined by looking at the 2D electron density maps in MCE.²² The percent occupancies of Fe and Mn at each metal position were refined using SHELXL-97¹⁹ as described by Helliwell *et al.*²³ When refining the metal occupancies near and at the metal absorption edges, the metal positions were fixed using the EXYZ restraint unless otherwise noted.

C. Results

Herein, we present the synthesis of homotrinnuclear (^tbsL)Fe₃(THF) (**1**) and (^tbsL)Mn₃(THF) (**2**), homodinuclear (^tbsLH₂)Fe₂ (**3**) and (^tbsLH₂)Mn₂ (**4**), and the bimetallic trinuclear (^tbsL)Fe₂Mn(THF) (**5**) complexes supported within a hexaanilido ligand. Spectroscopic and structural characterization establishes that these compounds are substitutionally homogenous materials. Synthetic attempts to prepare the analogous (^tbsL)Mn₂Fe(E) complexes (**6** and **7**, which differ by the coordinated solvent molecule, E = THF or py, respectively, Scheme 1)

resulted in a mixture of bimetallic trinuclear complexes. In section C.1. we describe the spectral and structural data of **5** and THF ligated mixed-metal complex **6**, which was used to assign the metal substitution patterns. In section C.2. we present anomalous scattering measurements of all three mixed-metal species (**5**, **6**, and **7**), providing single-site elemental analysis of the metal positions.

C.1. Synthesis and bulk spectroscopic characterization

Metallation of the hexaanilide ligand scaffold 1,3,5-C₆H₉- (NHC₆H₄-*o*-NHSi^tBuMe₂)₃ (^tbsLH₆) was effected using 1.5 equivalents of Fe₂(Mes)₄ or 1 equivalent of Mn₃(Mes)₆; Mes = 2,4,6-Me₃C₆H₂, in the presence of tetrahydrofuran (THF) to yield (^tbsL)Fe₃(THF) (**1**)¹⁴ and (^tbsL)Mn₃(THF) (**2**, 49%), respectively. Crystallographic analysis of single crystals of Mn₃ cluster **2** shows that the three Mn atoms each possess unique coordination environments (Figure 2b), identical to those found in previously reported Fe₃ cluster **1** (Figure 2a). While all three internal alkyl aryl anilides bridge two adjacent metal centers, only one of the peripheral silylanilide ligands bridges Mn1 and Mn2. The remaining two silylanilides are terminally bound to Mn2 and Mn3. The average Mn–Mn distance (3.0730(9) Å) as well as the average Mn–N_{Si} (2.042(2) Å) and Mn–N_{int} (2.0645(2) Å) distances in **2** are longer than the average Fe–Fe (2.577(6) Å), Fe–N_{Si} (1.950(2) Å) and Fe–N_{Int} (2.047(2) Å) distances in **1** (Table 1).

In the absence of coordinating solvent, concomitant deprotonation and metallation of ^tbsLH₆ with Fe₂(Mes)₄ or Mn₂(N(SiMe₃)₂)₄ occurs at 75 °C and results in the formation of dinuclear compounds (^tbsLH₂)Fe₂ (**3**, 62%) and (^tbsLH₂)Mn₂ (**4**, 70%), respectively. Single crystal analysis of complexes **3** and **4** showed that the two metal centers are bridged by one of the three *o*-phenylenedianilide (OPDA) units of the ligand (Figure 2c–d). The remaining two OPDA units are singly deprotonated (protons located in the electron density map) and are bound to one of the two metal centers. The remaining protonated aniline sites create a binding site to support a third divalent metal center. In the case of **3**, one of the silyl aryl nitrogens remains protonated, while the second amine is located in the ligand basal position. The structure of compound **4** was solved with a disorder model, one of which is shown in Figure 2d and features both of the basal amines available for deprotonation. While the M–M separation in Fe₂ complex **3** (2.7086(6) Å) is longer than the M–M distances observed in the homotrinnuclear Fe₃ counterpart **2** (Table 1), the mean Mn–Mn distance increases upon insertion of a third metal center (Mn₂ complex **4**: 2.8560(8) Å; Mn₃ complex **2** (avg): 3.0730(9) Å).

The ability to access dinuclear species **3** and **4** is key for accessing bimetallic trinuclear species supported by the ligand variant $^{tbs}\text{LH}_6$. Importantly, even upon addition of excess divalent Fe or Mn metallating reagent, we never observe formation of a trinuclear species without the presence of coordinating solvent ($\text{L} = \text{THF}$ or py ; see Scheme 1). The role solvent L plays in metallation and/or stabilization of the product is currently unknown. The coordinating solvent could either facilitate breaking down the dimeric metallating agent (e.g., $\text{M}_2(\text{N}(\text{SiMe}_3)_2)_4$), which may be necessary to generate the trinuclear products, or simply stabilize the resulting trinuclear complex that cannot be supported solely by $^{tbs}\text{L}^{6-}$ in the present oxidation state. If solvent coordination plays a role in stabilizing the trinuclear product, the identity of the coordinating solvent may have an effect on the selectivity of the resulting bimetallic trinuclear clusters.

The synthesis of bimetallic trinuclear cluster $(^{tbs}\text{L})\text{Fe}_2\text{Mn}(\text{THF})$ (**5**) was achieved by treatment of the binuclear Fe complex $(^{tbs}\text{LH}_2)\text{Fe}_2$ (**3**) with 0.5 equivalent of $\text{Mn}_2(\text{N}(\text{SiMe}_3)_2)_4$ in THF at 75 °C (62% isolated yield). Single crystals were obtained from concentrated diethyl ether solutions at –33 °C (33% crystalline yield). The resulting crystalline product has a paramagnetically shifted ^1H NMR spectrum with 32 resonances, consistent with a C_1 -symmetric complex in solution (Figure 3a). C_1 -symmetry is also observed in the solid-state (Figure 2e) where the metal coordination environments in **5** are identical to that of the homotrinnuclear counterparts **1** and **2** (Figure 2a,b). The average M–M distance of **5** (2.7806(6) Å) is intermediate between the average distances observed for the homo-trinuclear Fe and Mn complexes (**1**: 2.5769(6) Å; **2**: 3.0730(9) Å) (Table 1). The metal–ligand bond distances for metal centers M2 (2.058(3) Å) and M3 (1.961(3) Å) in **5** are all shorter than or nearly equal to the respective M–N distances found in Fe_3 cluster **1** (2.059(3) Å and 1.982(3) Å, respectively) and the M1–N bond distances (2.146(3) Å) are close to the metal–ligand bond distances in Mn_3 cluster **2** (2.114(3) Å, see Table 1). These bond metrics would suggest that for compound **5**, M1 = Mn and M2 = M3 = Fe, consistent with a site-isolated insertion of a single Mn into **3**. While traditional X-ray crystallography allowed us to establish connectivity, it cannot be used to distinguish the identity of Mn and Fe centers within the cluster. Thus, we used anomalous scattering measurements to rigorously assign the elemental identity of metal sites within the core (*vide infra*).

We approached the synthesis of a Mn_2Fe -containing cluster in a similar fashion to **5**. ^1H NMR analysis of a solution observed following treatment of $(^t\text{bsLH}_2)\text{Mn}_2$ (**4**) with 0.5 equivalent of Fe_2Mes_4 at 75°C displayed more than twice the number of resonances as were observed for **5** (Figure 3b). All of the resonances that account for **5** appear in the ^1H NMR spectrum of **6**, suggesting the ^1H NMR spectrum of **6** represents a mixture of species, one of which is **5** resulting from Fe-for-Mn substitution. For simplicity, the resulting material from the reaction of Mn_2 **4** with 0.5 equiv $\text{Fe}_2(\text{Mes})_4$ will be referred to as compound **6**.

Crystallization of **6** from cold diethyl ether (-33°C) afforded single crystals that contained a trinuclear species with the same connectivity as observed for homo-trinuclear complexes **1** and **2** and bimetallic trinuclear complex **5**, with an average M–M distance of $2.8629(7)\text{ \AA}$ (Figure 2f, Table 1). Based on metal–ligand bond metrics in **6**, it is not clear whether one or two metal types occupy the metal positions. As in the case of **5**, the M1–N bond distances in trinuclear cluster **6** are consistent with those distances observed in homo-trinuclear Mn_3 cluster **2** (Table 1). Likewise, M3–N bond metrics of **6** suggest that metal position 3 is occupied by Fe (Table 1). However, the M2–N bond lengths for compound **6** do not appear to follow a similar trend and fall between the metal–ligand bond lengths found in the homotrinuclear clusters **1** and **2** (Table 1), making it difficult to assign all the metal atom positions.

EPR spectroscopy was utilized as an additional fingerprint for both the homo and heteronuclear species reported herein. The perpendicular X-band EPR spectra at 4 K for homo-trinuclear Mn_3 cluster **2** and binuclear Mn_2 cluster **4** exhibit substantial hyperfine coupling at $g = 2.01$, due to coupling to the $I = 5/2$ ^{55}Mn nuclei (Figure 4a). Complexes **2** and **4** show spectra exceeding the 16 and 10-line patterns, respectively, expected for hyperfine coupling to equivalent Mn nuclei ($2nI + 1$; $A_{\parallel} = 29\text{--}59\text{ G}$ for **2** at 4 K; $A_{\parallel} = 35\text{--}64\text{ G}$ for **4** at 4 K). The multi-line hyperfine in the spectra for **2** and **4** is attributed to overlapping 6-line hyperfine patterns, a result of non-equivalent Mn environments present in both complexes. The transition centered at $g = 4.43$ (compound **2**) likely corresponds to a spin-allowed transition associated with the $m_s = \pm 3/2$ excited state of Mn ($S = 5/2$) and has been observed in X-band EPR spectrum of previously reported Mn_3 clusters.^{13b,24} A similar transition can be observed for **4** at $g = 4.04$ and features hyperfine coupling to the $I = 5/2$ ^{55}Mn nucleus ($A_{\parallel} = 29\text{--}35\text{ G}$ at 4 K).

Like the Mn_3 (**2**) and Mn_2 (**4**) complexes, compound **6** also exhibits an X-band EPR spectrum at 4 K with hyperfine coupling near $g = 2$ ($A_{\parallel} = 64\text{--}88\text{ G}$ at 4 K) (Figure 4a). Compound **6** exhibits two additional features at $g = 8.91$ ($A_{\parallel} = 53\text{ G}$ at 4 K), likely corresponding to spin-allowed transitions associated with the $m_s = \pm 1/2$ excited state of $S = 5/2$ Mn ion, as well as a spin forbidden transition at $g = 15.43$. While the hyperfine coupling observed in the EPR spectrum of **6** confirms the presence of a $[\text{Mn}_2]$ unit in the resulting crystalline material, it is difficult to ascertain the amount of material that is responsible for the signatures attributed to that unit.²⁶

Zero-field ^{57}Fe Mössbauer was used to determine the number of inequivalent iron sites in bimetallic trinuclear clusters **5** and **6**. Table 2 summarizes the Mössbauer parameters after fitting the spectra of the iron containing compounds **1**, **3**, **5**, and **6**. Mixedmetal compounds **5** and **6** exhibit nearly identical spectra featuring two quadrupole doublets with isomer shifts lower than that of the diiron complex **3** (Table 2). In the case of Fe_2Mn cluster **5**, the Mössbauer spectrum (parameters δ , $|E_Q|$ (mm/s): component 1 (52%) 0.58, 1.30; component 2 (48%) 0.35, 1.77; Figure 4b.1) is consistent with the presence of two inequivalent Fe centers and is demonstrative of a site-isolated insertion of a single Mn center into the Fe_2 complex **3**. Site-isolated insertion of a single Fe into dimanganese compound **4** would result in a Mössbauer spectrum exhibiting a single quadrupole doublet; however, the spectrum of

crystalline **6** features two quadrupole doublets (parameters $|E_Q|$ (mm/s): component 1 (52%) 0.57, 1.31; component 2 (48%) 0.33, 1.85) (Figure 4b.2). While the Mössbauer spectra of cluster **6** could be indicative of a mixture of clusters (e.g. Mn_2Fe and Fe_2Mn), the two quadrupole doublets could also arise from a single compositional species (i.e., Mn_2Fe) where the Fe atom occupies more than one geometrically-distinct site.

The spectroscopic data discussed thus far for Fe_2Mn cluster **5** is consistent with isolation of a substitutionally homogenous material ($^{\text{tbs}}\text{L}$) $\text{Fe}_2\text{Mn}(\text{THF})$. However, the data associated with compound **6** is less clear and could either be attributed to a mixture of compositions or a homogeneous material where the Fe is located in multiple metal positions. Combustion analysis on crystalline **6** is consistent with ($^{\text{tbs}}\text{L}$) $\text{Mn}_2\text{Fe}(\text{THF})$ and ($^{\text{tbs}}\text{L}$) $\text{Fe}_2\text{Mn}(\text{THF})$ within the error of the experiment. Therefore, X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy was used as a means of bulk elemental analysis of the metal composition in the crystalline material. X-ray fluorescence spectra of mixed-metal compounds **5** and **6** exhibited both Fe K and Mn K emission lines, where the Fe K and the Mn K overlap (Figure 4c). The superposition of the Fe K and Mn K emission lines for clusters **5** resulted in Fe:Mn ratios of 2.3:1 (70% Fe content) and 1.8:1 (64% Fe content) from the two samples collected (Figure 4c), which are consistent with what would be expected for a substitutionally homogeneous Fe_2Mn cluster. However, this is not the case for species **6**, which was found to have a Fe:Mn ratio lower than expected (1:1.3 and 1:1.2 from the two samples collected, 45% and 47% Fe content respectively) (Figure 4c), indicating **6** contains > 33% iron.

Therefore, we used anomalous scattering to determine the relative metal occupancies at the three unique sites within the mixed-metal clusters. To better understand the role ancillary ligands (coordinated solvent molecule, Scheme 1 *vide supra*) play in the selectivity of the metal substitution reaction, we conducted the synthesis of Mn_2Fe cluster in the presence of pyridine (py) (**7**, *vide supra*)²⁴ and grew crystals of the material for anomalous scattering experiments.

C.3. Anomalous X-ray scattering

While conventional single-crystal X-ray diffraction provides information regarding the identity and connectivity of the atoms, this method cannot distinguish between two metals of nearly the same atomic number. Anomalous X-ray scattering is a technique that allows for differentiation between metal atoms with similar atomic weights.²⁷ At an incident radiation wavelength close to the absorption edge of a metal center, the atomic scattering factors for elements with similar atomic numbers become more distinct. The atomic scattering factor for a given element is expressed by:

$$f = f^o + f' + i f''$$

where f^o is the scattering factor of the unperturbed atom (proportional to the atomic number of the element), and f' and f'' are the real and imaginary components, respectively, of the anomalous scattering term, which vary as a function of the X-ray wavelength energy.²⁷ Normal single crystal X-ray diffraction data is collected at a wavelength of incident X-rays away from the absorption edges of the constituent elements, where $f \approx f^o$. At energies close to the absorption edge of an atom M, the anomalous dispersion terms become more significant in the overall atomic scattering factor (f) of that atom, which affects the diffraction intensity associated with M. This method has been used to differentiate metal centers in solid-state materials by both powder²⁸ and single-crystal diffraction,^{23,29} as well as being utilized in protein crystallography.³⁰ We have employed anomalous X-ray scattering as a method for site-specific elemental analysis to elucidate the elemental

composition at each of the three metal-binding sites in our trinuclear complexes. Table 3 summarizes the synchrotron datasets measured at different wavelengths. The real (f) and imaginary (f') components of anomalous scattering are theoretical values for pure Fe and Mn metal.²⁰ While the anomalous scattering terms will vary with charge and coordination environment, theoretical values of pure metals have been used in the past with success at accurately determining metal occupancies at mixed-metal sites.²³ In all cases, a reference dataset was collected away from any metal absorption edges (dataset 1a or 1b). Compound **5** was measured at the absorption edge of Mn and Fe (dataset 3 and 6 respectively). Additional datasets were collected above and/or below the absorption edge for compounds **6** and **7**.

Electron density difference maps provide a means to visualize the anomalous scattering data obtained at the absorption edges. Dispersive difference Fourier 2D maps of the tri-metal plane were generated for compounds **5**, **6**, and **7** at both the Mn and Fe absorption edges (Figure 5). Dispersive difference maps at the Mn absorption edge were generated using the coefficients $F_{\text{Mnf}} - F_{\text{ref}}$, where F_{Mnf} is dataset 3 and F_{ref} is one of the two reference datasets 1a or 1b, which was previously refined with all Fe metal centers. Likewise, the coefficients $F_{\text{Fef}} - F_{\text{ref}}$ (F_{Fef} = dataset 6, reference structure previously refined with all Mn metal centers) were used to create the difference maps at the Fe absorption edge. The difference map at the Mn absorption edge (dataset 3) of (^{tb}L)Fe₂Mn(THF) **5** (Figure 5a) features an electron density hole at M1 ($-3.78 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$), indicating incorporation of Mn into that binding site. At the Fe absorption edge (dataset 6) of compound **5** the difference map shows deep electron density holes at positions M2 and M3 with energies $-5.31 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$ and $-4.58 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$ respectively, indicative of Fe incorporation into those metal sites (Figure 5b). The difference in electron density at M2 and M3 could either be a result of slight atomic movements/changes in unit cell size upon irradiation of X-rays at different wavelengths (the 2D plane at the Fe absorption edge may not contain the absolute centers, location of lowest electron density, of all three metals) or the difference may indicate that the two metal positions are not equivalently occupied with Fe.²³ Free refinement of the data at the Mn absorption edge results in statistically equivalent occupancies at positions M2 and M3 (M2, 95.9(5)%; M3, 96.2(6)%), which supports equivalent Fe occupancy at M2 and M3 (Table S7). The anomalous difference Fourier 2D maps of the tri-metal plane of compound **5** in conjunction with the free-refinement of the metal centers at the metal absorption edges is demonstrative of site-isolated insertion of a single divalent Mn center into the cluster (M1) which is bound to the solvent molecule THF.

Electron density difference maps of **6** and **7** (Figure 5c–e) are consistent with M1 fully occupied by Mn and M3 fully occupied by Fe, showing deep electron density holes at the Mn and Fe absorption edges, respectively, at those metal sites (at Mn absorption edge of **6**: M1 = $-3.62 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$; **7**: M1 = $-6.99 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$; at Fe absorption edge of **6**: M3 = $-5.03 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$; **7**: M3 = $-3.71 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$). The data suggest M2 in both **6** and **7** is a compositional mixture, occupied by both Fe and Mn, as indicated by the observation of weaker negative electron density at both absorption edges (at Mn absorption edge of **7**: $-3.08 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$; at Fe absorption edge of **6**: M2 = $-0.07 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$; **7**: $-0.71 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^3$).

Anomalous structure refinements of **5**, **6**, and **7** were conducted using the SHELX program package.¹⁹ A disorder model was utilized to determine the extent of compositional mixing at position M2 in **6** and **7**. The results of the disorder refinements at various wavelengths for compounds **6** and **7** are summarized in Table 4. While the disorder refinement indicates that both Fe and Mn occupy position M2 in **6** and **7** in nearly a 1:1 ratio, the disorder model did not produce consistent results at the different wavelengths, due to variability associated with the anomalous dispersion terms (*vide supra*).^{23,29}

To assess the relative errors in percent occupancy associated with the anomalous dispersion terms, the values of f and f' were varied for compound **6** and the percent occupancies at the different metal sites were calculated.²⁸ We found that datasets 3, 4, 6, and 7 showed high errors associated with varying f and f' values (Table S9). The f and f' values at the absorption edges (datasets 3 and 6) are most sensitive to variation in energy and are therefore difficult to approximate at the absorption edge.²⁹ The dataset after the highest absorption edge (Fe, dataset 7) is less accurate because the f' values for the two metal centers are closest at this energy, lowering the f value and making it more difficult to discern between the two metal centers.²³ Similarly, the dataset following the Mn absorption edge (dataset 4) is less accurate because the Mn f' is highest at this energy, also lowering the f value. Therefore, only datasets 2 and 5 were utilized to determine the percent occupancies of the metal positions in **6**, while dataset 5 was used to determine the percent occupancies of the metal positions in **7**.

Using the results of the disorder model at datasets 2 and 5, we found the average percent occupancies of Fe for compound **6** to be: M1 = 5(3), M2 = 56(4), and M3 = 100 (Table 4). While the disorder model predicts that a small amount of inclusion of Mn has occurred at M1, based on the fact that no negative electron density hole was observed at that position in the electron density map at the Fe absorption edge and that the zero-field ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer spectrum contains only two quadrupole doublets, we have assigned M1 as a fully occupied Mn site, resulting in a 1.3:1 mixture of (t^{bs}L)Fe₂Mn(THF):(t^{bs}L)Mn₂Fe(THF) based on crystal structure analysis. Compound **7** has a similar composition to **6**, with Fe percent occupancies of M1 = 0, M2 = 41(3), and M3 = 100 (dataset 5) resulting in a 1:1.4 mixture of (t^{bs}L)Fe₂Mn(py):(t^{bs}L)Mn₂Fe(py) based on anomalous crystal structure analysis.

D. Discussion

Substitution of metal centers to generate hetero-polynuclear species has been used as a method of accomplishing changes in both reactivity and electronic structure of polynuclear clusters. Through this study we aimed to adapt our synthetic approach to include bimetallic trinuclear species, which would allow us to investigate changes in M–M interactions upon metal substitution in a stepwise fashion. Utilizing homo-dinuclear compounds as synthons, we targeted the synthesis of mixed Fe/Mn clusters supported within a hexaanilide-based ligand platform (Scheme 1, *vide supra*). Our strategy resulted in the synthesis of a discrete Fe₂Mn complex (t^{bs}L)Fe₂Mn(THF) (**5**) (Scheme 2). Spectroscopic techniques including ¹H NMR, Mössbauer, and X-ray crystallography were all consistent with isolation of a substitutionally homogeneous material, while X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy of the bulk crystalline material established that the Fe:Mn content was 2:1. Encouraged by this result, we attempted to access a similar Mn₂Fe cluster in an analogous fashion. Unlike **5**, each of the spectroscopies employed indicate an over-substitution of iron into the cluster. X-ray fluorescence spectroscopy of compound **6** indicated more Fe incorporation into the crystalline material than expected (46±1% Fe content). Both ⁵⁷Fe Mössbauer spectroscopy as well as ¹H NMR of **6** was also consistent with a mixture of Fe₂Mn and Mn₂Fe species, containing two quadrupole doublets in the Mössbauer and more than double the number of resonances in the ¹H NMR (including all of the resonances) observed for Fe₂Mn cluster **5**.

While traditional X-ray crystallography established connectivity within the bimetallic trinuclear clusters, anomalous X-ray scattering was employed to differentiate the elemental compositions within the clusters. Anomalous X-ray scattering corroborates both bond metrics obtained by single crystal X-ray analysis of Fe₂Mn cluster (**5**) as well as the spectroscopic data obtained for **5**, indicating site-isolated Mn insertion into the diiron synthon **3** with Mn bound to the THF molecule (Scheme 2).

Both electron density difference maps and data refinement obtained from anomalous scattering measurements confirmed the presence of a mixture of the two species (^{tbs}L)Fe₂Mn(E) and (^{tbs}L)Mn₂Fe(E) (where E = THF or py) in the crystal structure of **6** and **7**. In both **6** and **7**, M1 is fully occupied by Mn and M3 is fully occupied by Fe, while the only mixed-metal site in the solid-state was determined to be M2 (**6**: 56(4)% Fe; **7**: 41(3)% Fe) (Scheme 2).

Ligand or metal lability allows for the Mn atoms to be displaced by divalent Fe centers. Monitoring the reaction of Mn₂ **4** with 0.5 equivalent Fe₂Mes₄ by ¹H NMR spectroscopy, we see immediate formation of the resonances associated with Fe₂Mn and Mn₂Fe. By ¹H NMR, we observe that upon addition of 1–2 equivalents of Fe₂Mes₄ to Mn₂ complex **4**, we see the disappearance of the peaks associated with Mn₂Fe cluster to yield a paramagnetic ¹H NMR that predominantly contains the resonances associated with Fe₂Mn cluster **5** (Figure S10). The ability to isolate Fe₂Mn complex **5** likely results due to a slight thermodynamic preference over the Mn₂Fe species under the reaction conditions employed. Metal atom exchange has been previously observed in trinuclear clusters supported by hexaamide based ligand platforms to generate mixed Fe/Co systems at room temperature.¹²

Although we present the Fe and Mn ions with an unbiased ligand scaffold comprised of three OPDA subunits, each metal site has a unique coordination environment in the solid-state as observed crystallographically. The results herein demonstrate that the differences in coordination environment at each metal position of these clusters have an effect on whether Fe or Mn preferentially binds in each unique pocket. In all three mixedmetal complexes, Fe (d^6) fully occupies the M3 position, which is 3-coordinate, bound to two internal alkyl aryl anilides and one peripheral anilide ligand moiety. Mn has a lower d -electron count (d^5) relative to Fe and prefers the 4-coordinate positions M1 and M2. The ligated solvent appears to have little to no effect on the ratio of metal occupancy within the clusters, as evidenced by the nearly equivalent Fe:Mn ratios for **6** and **7**, as well as the unique Mn position (M1) binds exogenous solvent in both species.

E. Conclusions

The polynucleating ligand platform $^{tbs}LH_6$ was selected as the template for the synthesis of bimetallic trinuclear clusters. By accessing the dinuclear metal species ($^{tbs}LH_2$)M₂ (M = Fe, Mn), we envisioned the synthesis of discrete metal platforms from Mn₃ to Fe₃ in single metal-substitution steps. While the ligand $^{tbs}LH_6$ presents each metal center with an identical binding pocket comprised of an OPDA, the resulting trinuclear clusters exhibit C₁-symmetry in solution and the solid-state, indicating each metal within the cluster possesses a unique coordination environment. The asymmetric binding of the ligand about the trinuclear core permits the unambiguous assignment of each metal binding sites through a suite of spectroscopic techniques. The thermodynamic bimetallic trinuclear product (^{tbs}L)Fe₂Mn(THF) was accessed cleanly as a substitutionally homogenous material, where the Mn insertion is site-isolated. During attempts at the synthesis of Mn₂Fe clusters (**6** and **7**), we observe both the formation of the kinetic product (^{tbs}L)Mn₂Fe(THF) as well as the thermodynamic product, (^{tbs}L)Fe₂Mn(THF), immediately following mixing ($^{tbs}LH_2$)Mn₂ with Fe₂(Mes)₄. This initial study has provided a direct synthetic approach to access bimetallic trinuclear clusters supported by the sterically hindered hexaanilide ligand platform $^{tbs}LH_6$. Research is currently underway to extend this methodology to include other redox-active and redox-inactive metal atoms into polynuclear clusters and to investigate changes in both ensemble electronic structures as well as reactivity profiles.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Harvard University, NIH (GM 098395), DOE (DE-SC0008313) for financial support, Prof. R. H. Holm for the generous use of his Mossbauer spectrometer, the George W. Merck Fellowship (T.A.B), the Novartis Graduate Fellowship in Chemical Sciences for Minorities and Women and the Marie Hong fellowship (T.M.P.), the NIH Ruth L. Kirschstein NRSA fellowship (A.R.F.), and the CONACTY and Fundación México en Harvard A. C. (R.H.S.). ChemMatCARS Sector 15 is principally supported by the National Science Foundation/Department of Energy under grant number NSF/CHE- 0822838. Use of the Advanced Photon Source was supported by the U. S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357.

References

1. (a) Burgess BK, Lowe DJ. *Chem Rev.* 1996; 96:2983–3012. [PubMed: 11848849] (b) Howard JB, Rees DC. *Chem Rev.* 1996; 96:2965–2982. [PubMed: 11848848] (c) Dos Santos PC, Igarashi RY, Lee J-I, Hoffman BM, Seefeldt LC, Dean DR. *Acc Chem Res.* 2005; 38:208–214. [PubMed: 15766240] (d) Hoffman BM, Lukoyanov D, Dean DR, Seefeldt LC. *Acc Chem Res.* 2009; 42:609–619. [PubMed: 19267458] (e) Eady RR. *Chem Rev.* 1996; 96:3013–3030. [PubMed: 11848850] (f) Hu Y, Lee CC, Ribbe MW. *Dalton Trans.* 2012; 41:1118–1127. [PubMed: 22101422]
2. (a) Jiang W, Yun D, Saleh L, Barr EW, Xing G, Hoffart LM, Maslak M-A, Krebs C, Bollinger M Jr. *Science.* 2007; 316:1188–1191. [PubMed: 17525338] (b) Younker JM, Krest CM, Jiang W, Krebs C, Bollinger JM Jr, Green MT. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008; 130:15022–1527. [PubMed: 18937466] (c) Bollinger JM Jr, Jiang W, Green MT, Krebs C. *Curr Opinion Struct Biol.* 2008; 18:650–657.
3. (a) Sinfelt, JH. *Discoveries, Concepts, and Applications.* Wiley; New York: 1983. Bimetallic Catalysts. (b) Sinfelt JH. *Acc Chem Res.* 1977; 10:15–20. (c) Ponec V. *Appl Catal. A.* 2001; 222:31–45. (d) Thomas JM, Raja R, Johnson BFG, Hermans S, Jones MD, Khimyak T. *Ind Eng Chem Res.* 2003; 42:1563–1570. (e) Gladys MJ, Inderwildi OR, Karakatsani S, Fiorin V, Held G. *J Phys Chem C.* 2008; 112:6422–6429. (f) Santo VD, Gallo A, Naldoni A, Guidotti M, Psaro R. *Catal Today.* 2012; 197:190–205. (g) Calderone VR, Shiju NR, Ferré DC, Rothenberg G. *Green Chem.* 2011; 13:1950–2216. (h) Arai H, Mitsuishi K, Seiyama T. *Chem Lett.* 1984:1291–1294.
4. (a) Clegg W, Elsegood MRJ, Errington J, Havelock J. *J Chem Soc, Dalton Trans.* 1996:681–690. (b) Wei Y, Lu M, Cheung CF-c, Barnes CL, Peng Z. *Inorg Chem.* 2001; 40:5489–5490. [PubMed: 11599945]
5. (a) Ciurli S, Ross PK, Scott MJ, Yu SB, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1992; 114:5415–5423. (b) Zhou J, Scott MJ, Hu Z, Peng G, Münck E, Holm RH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1992; 114:10843–10854.
6. Slaughter LM, Wolczanski PT. *Chem Commun.* 1997:2109–2110.
7. (a) Hung SYW, Wong WT. *Chem Commun.* 1997:2099–2100. (b) Adams RD, Barnard TS, Li Z, Wu W, Yamamoto JH. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1994; 116:9103–9113.
8. Tulskey EG, Long JR. *Inorg Chem.* 2001; 40:6990–7002. [PubMed: 11754281]
9. (a) Holm RH. *Adv Inorg Chem.* 1992; 38:1–71. (b) Johnson MK, Duderstadt RE, Duin EC. *Adv Inorg Chem.* 1999; 47:1–82. (c) Hernandez-Molina R, Sokolov MN, Sykes AG. *Acc Chem Res.* 2001; 34:223–230. [PubMed: 11263880]
10. (a) Clerac R, Cotton FA, Dunbar KR, Murillo CA, Wang X. *Inorg Chem.* 2001; 40:420–426. [PubMed: 11209597] (b) Nippe M, Berry JF. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2007; 129:12684–12685. [PubMed: 17900125]
11. (a) Pilkington NH, Robson R. *Aust J Chem.* 1970; 23:2225–2236. (b) Beissel T, Birkelback F, Bill E, Glaser T, Kesting F, Krebs C, Weyhermüller T, Wieghardt K, Butzlaff C, Trautwein AX. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1996; 118:12376–12390. (c) Glaser T, Kesting F, Beissel T, Bill E, Weyhermüller T, Klauke W, Wieghardt K. *Inorg Chem.* 1999; 38:722. [PubMed: 11670840] (d) Akilne S, Taniguchi T, Nabeshima T. *Inorg Chem.* 2008; 47:3255–3264. [PubMed: 18370377] (e) Akilne S, Taniguchi T, Nabeshima T. *Inorg Chem.* 2008; 47:3255–3264. [PubMed: 18370377] (f) Greenwood BP, Forman SI, Rowe GT, Chen CH, Foxman BM, Thomas CM. *Inorg Chem.* 2009;

- 48:6251–6260. [PubMed: 19499941] (g) Rudd PA, Liu S, Gagliardi L, Young VG Jr, Lu CC. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:20724–20727. [PubMed: 22122804]
12. Eames EV, Hernández Sánchez R, Betley TA. *Inorg Chem.* 2013; 52:5006–5012. [PubMed: 23642178]
13. (a) Zhao Q, Betley TA. *Angew Chem, Int Ed.* 2011; 50:709–712.(b) Fout AR, Zhao Q, Xiao DJ, Betley TA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:16750–16753. [PubMed: 21942370] (c) Eames EV, Harris TD, Betley TA. *Chem Sci.* 2012; 3:407–415.(d) Eames EV, Betley TA. *Inorg Chem.* 2012; 51:10274–10278. [PubMed: 22988949]
14. (a) Powers TM, Fout AR, Zhao SL, Betley TA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2011; 133:3336–3338. [PubMed: 21332160] (b) Powers TM, Betley TA. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2013; 135:12289–12296. [PubMed: 23865953]
15. Klose A, Solari E, Floriani C, Chiesi-Villa A, Rizzoli C, Re N. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1994; 116:9123–9135.
16. Solari E, Musso F, Gallo E, Floriani C, Re N, Chiesi-Villa A, Rizzoli C. *Organometallics.* 1995; 14:2265–2276.
17. Bradley DC, Hursthouse MB, Malik KMA, Moseler R. *Transition Met Chem.* 1978; 3:253.
18. Bruker AXS. Apex II. Bruker AXS; Madison, Wisconsin: 2009.
19. Sheldrick GM. *Acta Cryst.* 2010; D66:479–485.
20. Real (f) and imaginary (f') components were obtained from Kissel L, Pratt RH. *Acta Cryst.* 1990; A46:170–175., unless otherwise noted.
21. Farrugia LJ. *J Appl Cryst.* 1999; 32:837–838.
22. Rohlicek J, Husak M. *J Appl Cryst.* 2007; 40:600–601.
23. Helliwell M, Helliwell JR, Kaucic V, Logar NZ, Teat SJ, Warren JE, Dodson EJ. *Acta Cryst.* 2010; B66:345–357.
24. Fout AR, Xiao DJ, Zhao Q, Harris TD, King ER, Eames EV, Zheng SL, Betley TA. *Inorg Chem.* 2012; 51:10290–10299. [PubMed: 22991939]
25. While mixed-metal py ligated cluster 7 is not discussed in section C.1., it has been fully characterized by the spectroscopic methods described herein and exhibits similar spectroscopic features compared to THF ligated mixed-metal cluster 6 (see experimental section).
26. Murphy, DM. EPR (Electron Paramagnetic Resonance) Spectroscopy of Polycrystalline Oxide Systems. In: Jackson, SD.; Hargreaves, JSJ., editors. *Metal Oxide Catalysis*. Wiley-VCH; Weinheim: 2009.
27. Waseda, Y. *Anomalous X-ray Scattering for Materials Characterization: Atomic-Scale Structure Determination*. Springer; Berlin: 2002.
28. (a) Battle PD, Blundell SJ, Coldea AI, Cussen EJ, Rosseinsky MJ, Singleton J, Spring LE, Vente JF. *J Mater Chem.* 2001; 11:160–167.(b) Zhang Y, Wilkinson AP, Nolas GS, Lee PL, Hodges JP. *J Appl Cryst.* 2003; 36:1182–1189.(c) Zhang Y, Wilkinson AP, Lee PL, Shastri SD, Shu D, Chung DY, Kanatzidis MG. *J Appl Cryst.* 2005; 38:433–441.
29. (a) Wulf R. *Acta Cryst.* 1990; A46:681–688.(b) Freedman DE, Han TH, Prodi A, Müller P, Huang QZ, Chen YS, Webb SM, Lee YS, McQueen TM, Nocera DG. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2010; 132:16185–16190. [PubMed: 20964423] (c) Zhang X, Huang D, Chen YS, Holm RH. *Inorg Chem.* 2012; 51:11017–11029. [PubMed: 23030366] (d) Zall CM, Clouston LJ, Young VG Jr, Ding K, Kim HJ, Zhrebetskyy D, Chen YS, Bill E, Gagliardi L, Lu CC. *Inorg Chem.* 2013; 52:9216–9228. [PubMed: 23902538]
30. Dauter, M.; Dauter, Z. Phase Determination Using Halide Ions. In: Doublié, S., editor. *Macromolecular Crystallography Protocols: Volume 2: Structure Determination*. Vol. 364. Humana Press; New Jersey: 2007. p. 149
31. Klabunde, KJ. *Free Atoms, Clusters, and Nanoscale Particles*. Academic Press, Inc; San Diego: 1994.

Figure 1.

Bimetallic metalloenzymes: (a) FeMoco^{I} and (b) $\text{Fe}^{\text{III}}\text{Mn}^{\text{IV}}$ of ribonucleotide reductase;^{2b} and bimetallic compounds accessed by (c) selfassembly methods (e.g. polyoxometalates),⁴ (d) reaction of incomplete cuboidal Fe_3S_4 clusters,⁵ and (e) polynucleating ligands that have different elemental binding affinities.⁶

Figure 2.

Solid-state structures for (a) $(\text{tbsL})\text{Fe}_3(\text{THF})$ (**1**), (b) $(\text{tbsL})\text{Mn}_3(\text{THF})$ (**2**), (c) $(\text{tbsLH}_2)\text{Fe}_2$ (**3**), (d) $(\text{tbsLH}_2)\text{Mn}_2$ (**4**) with the thermal ellipsoids set at 50% probability level (hydrogen atoms and solvent molecules omitted for clarity; Fe orange, Mn orchid, N blue, O red, C grey, H white, Si pink). Solid state structures for bimetallic trinuclear compounds (e) $(\text{tbsL})\text{M}_3(\text{THF})$ (**5**), and (f) $(\text{tbsL})\text{M}_3(\text{THF})$ (**6**) with the thermal ellipsoids set at 50% probability level. The identity of the metal centers could not be determined using traditional X-ray crystallographic methods and therefore all metal centers depicted as light blue.

Figure 3. Paramagnetic ¹H NMR of (a) (tbsL)Fe₂Mn(THF) (**5**, red) and (b) complex **6** (blue).

Figure 4.

(a) EPR of crystalline $(^{tbs}L)Mn_3(THF)$ (**2**) (orange), $(^{tbs}L)Mn_2$ (**4**) (green), and bimetallic trinuclear compound (**6**) (blue). (b) Zero-field ^{57}Fe Mössbauer spectra obtained at 90 K of compounds **5** and **6**. Simulation yields the following parameters [δ , $|E_Q|$ (mm/s)] for **5**: component 1 (blue 52%) 0.58, 1.30; component 2 (green 48%) 0.35, 1.77; for **6**: component 1 (blue, 52%) 0.57, 1.31; component 2 (green, 48%) 0.33, 1.85. (c) X-ray fluorescence spectra of $(^{tbs}L)Fe_2Mn(THF)$ (**5**) (red) and complex **6** (green).

Figure 5. Anomalous difference Fourier maps at the Mn and Fe absorption edges of compounds (*tb*^sL)Fe₂Mn(THF) (**5**) (a, b), **6** (c, d), and **7** (e, f). Maps (a), (c), and (e) were calculated with dataset 3 (at the Mn absorption edge) and maps (b), (d), and (f) were calculated with dataset 6 (at the Fe absorption edge).

Scheme 1.
Synthesis of bimetallic trinuclear clusters.

Scheme 2.

Results of bimetallic trinuclear syntheses summarized. Fe:Mn content in **6** and **7** based on anomalous scattering experiments.

Table 1Select metal–metal and metal–ligand bond lengths for compounds **1**, **2**, **5**, and **6**.

Bond	1	2	5	6
M1–M2	2.6129(5)	2.8785(7)	2.7247(5)	2.7681(6)
M2–M3	2.6118(5)	3.2213(7)	2.8687(5)	3.0176(6)
M1–M3	2.5061(5)	3.1191(7)	2.7485(5)	2.8030(6)
<i>avg.</i>	<i>2.5769(6)</i>	<i>3.0730(9)</i>	<i>2.7806(6)</i>	<i>2.8629(7)</i>
M1–N1	2.126(2)	2.116(3)	2.148(2)	2.123(2)
M1–N3	2.016(2)	2.077(3)	2.121(2)	2.126(2)
M1–N4	2.081(2)	2.148(3)	2.170(2)	2.158(2)
<i>avg.</i>	<i>2.074(3)</i>	<i>2.114(4)</i>	<i>2.146(3)</i>	<i>2.136(3)</i>
M2–N1	2.047(2)	2.109(3)	2.047(2)	2.079(2)
M2–N2	2.091(2)	2.162(2)	2.108(2)	2.123(2)
M2–N4	2.149(2)	2.202(3)	2.122(2)	2.171(2)
M2–N5	1.950(2)	2.098(3)	1.956(2)	1.985(2)
<i>avg.</i>	<i>2.059(3)</i>	<i>2.143(4)</i>	<i>2.058(3)</i>	<i>2.090(3)</i>
M3–N2	1.955(2)	2.000(3)	1.945(2)	1.935(2)
M3–N3	2.053(2)	2.098(3)	2.018(2)	2.019(2)
M3–N6	1.938(2)	1.976(3)	1.920(2)	1.920(2)
<i>avg.</i>	<i>1.982(3)</i>	<i>2.025(4)</i>	<i>1.961(3)</i>	<i>1.958(3)</i>

Table 2Zero-field ^{57}Fe Mössbauer Parameters for Fe containing compounds

Compound		(mm/s)	E_Q (mm/s)	%
$(^{\text{tbs}}\text{L})\text{Fe}_3(\text{THF})$	(1)	0.89	1.69	24
		0.49	1.51	35
		0.50	1.89	41
$(^{\text{tbs}}\text{L})\text{Fe}_2$	(3)	0.67	2.18	39
		0.68	1.57	61
$(^{\text{tbs}}\text{L})\text{Fe}_2\text{Mn}(\text{THF})$	(5)	0.35	1.77	48
		0.58	1.30	52
$(^{\text{tbs}}\text{L})\text{Mn}_x\text{Fe}_{3-x}(\text{THF})$	(6)	0.33	1.85	48
		0.57	1.31	52

Table 3

Synchrotron datasets measured at different wavelengths: anomalous dispersion terms f' and f'' are for pure Fe^0 and Mn^0 metal²⁰

Data-set	λ (Å)	Energy (KeV)	$\text{Fe } f', f''$ (e ⁻)	$\text{Mn } f', f''$ (e ⁻)	$ f'' $
1a	0.44280	28.000	0.220, 0.350	0.200, 0.300	0.070
1b	0.49594	25.000	0.255, 0.434	0.234, 0.373	0.082
2	1.91068	6.489	-2.166, 0.552	-4.594, 0.469	2.511
3	1.89607	6.539	-2.241, 0.544	-9.901, 0.462	7.742
4	1.88169	6.589	-2.324, 0.537	-4.486, 3.904	1.205
5a	1.75565	7.062	-4.646, 0.474	-1.731, 3.452	5.893
5b	1.75070	7.082	-5.183, 0.471	-1.686, 3.437	6.463
6	1.74331	7.112	-9.812, 0.468	-1.622, 3.414	11.14
7	1.73114	7.162	-4.547, 3.896	-1.522, 3.377	2.506

^a $|f''| = ||f'(\text{Mn})+f'(\text{Fe})|-|f'(\text{Fe})+f'(\text{Fe})||$

Table 4

Refined Fe occupancies (%) with *SHELXL* for **6** and **7**.

Metal site	Data-set 2	Data-set 3	Data-set 4	Data-set 5	Data-set 6	Data-set 7
Compound 6						
			5a			
M1	0 [*]	6(2)	0 [*]	10(3)	5(2)	29(7)
M2	53(3)	59(1)	54(3)	58(3)	44(2)	84(7)
M3	100 ^{**}	100(1)	100 ^{**}	100 ^{**}	66(2)	100 ^{**}
Compound 7						
			5b			
M1		15(2)		0 [*]	12(3)	
M2		41(3)		41(3)	36(3)	
M3		100 ^{**}		100 ^{**}	81(3)	

^{*} Disorder model results in >100% occupancy Mn at M1, therefore refined as 100% Mn.

^{**} Disorder model results in >100% occupancy Fe at M3, therefore refined as 100% Fe.