literature. Surprisingly enough, however, no comparable stoichiometric N₂ reduction has been reported yet for complexes of iron, which is such a prominent constituent of both enzymatic and heterogeneous N₂reduction catalysts.⁶ A number of complexes have been found which contain N₂ coordinated to an iron atom,⁷⁻⁹ but these complexes do not appear to be susceptible to reductive cleavage of the N \equiv N bond. In this communication we describe conditions for a clean, stoichiometric reduction of N₂ to NH₃ by iron compounds.

Whereas reaction systems derived from alkali naphthalides (Napht⁻) and several titanium, vanadium, or chromium compounds bring about efficient reduction of N₂,^{2,3} we find that the potential of Napht⁻ \rightleftharpoons Napht⁰ $+ e^{-}$ is not quite reducing enough to promote this reaction efficiently in the presence of the corresponding iron compounds. Observed yields do not exceed ca. 0.5 mmol of NH₃ per mmol of FeCl₃ employed, even in the presence of a 25-fold excess of lithium naphthalide, and they are drastically diminished by the addition of free naphthalene (for experimental conditions see footnote 10). In keeping with this view, a large increase in N₂ reduction is observed when the more strongly reducing naphthalene dianion¹¹ (Napht²⁻) is used as a reductant. With 8 mmol of Napht²⁻ per mmol of FeCl₃ (so that no free napth⁰ is formed and the potential of the final reaction mixture is still governed by the equilibrium Napht²⁻ \rightleftharpoons Napth⁻ + e⁻) a yield of 0.82 mmol of NH₃/mmol of Fe is observed (Figure 1a). Stoichiometric yields (0.98 mmol of NH₃/mmol of Fe) are obtained when 2,6-dimethylnaphthalene dianion (DMNpht²⁻) is employed as a reductant instead of Napht²⁻. The electron-releasing methyl substituents undoubtedly make the aromatic dianion even more reducing.

The same stoichiometric yields are obtained with reaction systems containing naphthalene, if the concentration of Napht²⁻ is kept at the attainable maximum by an excess of metallic lithium (20 mmol per mmol of FeCl₃).¹² For this reduction four naphthalene moieties per iron appear to be required in the critical reaction step, as indicated by the sharp drop-off of reaction yields when less than 4 mmol of naphthalene/mmol of FeCl₃ is present in the reaction mixture (Figure 1b).

(6) A. Sacco and M. Aresta, Chem. Commun., 1223 (1968).

(7) C. H. Campbell, A. R. Dias, M. L. H. Green, T. Saito, and M. G. Swanwick, J. Organometal. Chem., 14, 349 (1968).

(8) G. M. Bancroft, M. J. Mays, and B. E. Prater, Chem. Commun., 585 (1969).

(9) In reaction systems containing iron compounds and reductants such as Grignard reagents or lithium alkyl compounds, N_2 reduction has been observed, but these reactions yielded only on the order of 0.1 mmol of NH₃/mmol of iron complex: M. L. Khidekel and Y. B. Grebenschchikov, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Khim.*, 761 (1965). These low reduction yields and the concomitant dominance of side reactions would render mechanistic studies quite difficult.

(10) The reactions are carried out in tetrahydrofuran at 60° (see also the legend for Figure 1). Yields of NH₃, determined by hydrolysis and Kjeldahl distillation, initially increase with time, but level off after about 4 hr. The rate and extent of N₂ reduction are independent of N₂ pressure in the range of 30-100 atm; at atmospheric pressure, it is diminished to roughly one-third. N₂ reductions proceed also at room temperature; substantially longer times are required for completion, however.

(11) J. Smid, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 87, 655 (1965).

(12) The possibility that the known reaction, $6Li + N_2 \rightarrow 2Li_3N$, is responsible for the observed N₂ reduction can be excluded. In the absence of FeCl₃, otherwise identical reaction systems yield only 0.02-0.03 mmol of NH₃, compared to 0.99 mmol in the presence of 1 mmol of FeCl₃.



Figure 1. Requirements for iron-induced N₂ reduction: (a) dependence of NH₃ yields on the ratio of dilithium naphthalene/ FeCl₃ employed, (b) effect of total naphthalene concentration (expressed as mmol of Napht_{total}/mmol of Fe) on the extent of N₂ reduction in the presence of 20 mmol of Li metal/mmol of FeCl₃. Experimental conditions are as follows. (a) A 0.05 *M* solution of FeCl₃ in THF (10 ml) was added, under Ar, to varying amounts of a solution of dilithium naphthalide in THF (0.16 *M* in naphthalene, 0.27 *M* in Li). The reaction flask was placed in an autoclave and heated, under 1600 psi of N₂, to 60° for 4 hr. NH₃ yields were determined by hydrolysis, removal of THF and naphthalene, and subsequent Kjeldahl distillation. (b) Metallic lithium (69 mg) was added to the reaction mixture under argon; otherwise the procedure is identical with the one given above.

The iron-containing N_2 reduction systems described above differ from related systems containing titanium, vanadium, or chromium compounds in that the reaction yields do not approach a limiting value of 2 mmol of NH₃/mmol of metal (see, *e.g.*, ref 3), but clearly have 1 mmol of NH₃/mmol of metal as their limit. This feature, as well as the considerably more negative potential required here to induce the reduction of N₂, will hopefully find its explanation in a more detailed mechanistic study of this reaction.

Of particular interest is the question of which kind of N_2 complexes are intermediates in this reaction and why interaction with the metal renders the N_2 molecule so much more susceptible to reduction in these species than in any of the known iron- N_2 complexes.

Acknowledgment. This investigation has been supported in part by a grant from the Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate Studies, The University of Michigan.

Larry G. Bell, Hans H. Brintzinger Department of Chemistry, The University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104 Received January 20, 1970

Unusual Coordination in a Cobalt(II) Complex with the Tripod Ligand Tris(2-diphenylphosphinoethyl)amine Sir:

The ligand tris(2-diphenylphosphinoethyl)amine, $(Ph_2PCH_2CH_2)_3N$, (NP_3) , which contains both highspin and low-spin stabilizing donor atoms (potential donor set 1N and 3P), has been used in order to obtain five-coordinate Ni(II) and Co(II) complexes



Figure 1. A sketch of the coordination in [Co(NP₃)Cl]PF₆.

with formula $[M(NP_3)X]Y$, where X = Cl, Br, I, or NCS; Y = X, BF₄, PF₆, or BPh₄.¹

The nickel complexes are all diamagnetic and trigonalbipyramidal coordination has been found for [Ni(NP₃)-I]I.²

The cobalt complexes with X = Cl or Br are all high spin; low-spin complexes are only found when X = I or NCS. The low-spin [Co(NP₃)I]I is square pyramidal, with a phosphorus atom in the apical position.³

We have now determined the structure of the highspin complex [Co(NP₃)Cl]PF₆. Crystals of this compound are monoclinic, space group $P2_1/c$; a = 21.685(13), b = 14.248 (15), c = 17.715 (15) Å, $\beta = 130.13$ (7)°, $D_c = 1.417$ g cm⁻³, Z = 4, $D_m = 1.39$ g cm⁻³. Multiple-film equiinclination Weissenberg data have been collected, using Fe K α radiation. The structure has been solved by standard heavy-atom techniques and refined by full-matrix least squares with anisotropic temperature factors for all atoms except carbon, to an R value of 7.5% over 2025 observed reflections.

The metal atom is surrounded by a set of four ligands, one chlorine and three phosphorus atoms, with metalligand distances in the normal range. A fifth ligand (N) lies at a distance of 2.675 Å from the metal. The arrangement of the four closest donor atoms is distorted tetrahedral and the additional ligand atom may be visualized to complete either a very distorted trigonal bipyramid or a capped tetrahedron, about the cobalt (Figure 1). According to the former view, the ligands N and Cl occupy the apices of the bipyramid (N-Co-Cl angle, 178.9°) and the metal atom lies as much as 0.6 Å below the equatorial plane defined by the phosphorus atoms. Distances (Å) and angles (deg) in the coordination polyhedron are: Co-Cl, 2.226; Co-P₁, 2.378; Co- P_2 , 2.374; Co- P_3 , 2.355; Co-N, 2.675; $Cl-Co-P_1$, 105.0; $Cl-Co-P_2$, 104.5; $Cl-Co-P_3$, 104.3; P_1 -Co- P_2 , 118.4; P_1 -Co- P_3 , 110.1; P_2 -Co- P_3 , 113.0; N-Co-P₁, 75.4; N-Co-P₂, 76.1; and N-Co-P₃, 74.6. Standard deviations are less than 0.010 Å for bond distances and less than 0.3° for angles.

The contribution to the field of the ligands by the nitrogen atom is significant. The spectrum of the complex is indeed indicative of five coordination and definitely differs from that of tetrahedral Co(II). This is apparent from Figure 2, where the reflectance spectrum of $[Co(NP_3)Cl]PF_6$ is compared with those of



Figure 2. Reflectance spectra of (A) [Co(Mestren)Br]Br, (B) [Co- $(NOP_2)Cl]PF_6$, (C) $[Co(NP_3)Cl]PF_6$ (present case), (D) CoCl₂-(PPh2)2.

the five-coordinate [Co(Mestren)Br]Br (ref 4), of the tetrahedral $CoCl_2(PPh_2)_2$ (ref 5), and of $[Co(NOP_2)-$ Cl]PF₆, which has revealed a coordination geometry similar to that of the present complex.⁶

The spin state of complexes of the series [Co(NP₃)-XJY shows a dependence on the softness of the ligand atom X, as measured by the value of the overall nucleophilic reactivity constant Σn° (ref 7). Indeed, the observed tendency of the ligand X to stabilize the low-spin state¹ (which increases in the order Cl =Br < I < NCS) parallels the ordering for Σn° (Cl < Br < I < NCS). Moreoever, the geometry of coordination, other factors being unchanged, is of importance. In fact, for the Co(NP₃)I chromophore both spin isomers are known¹ and the square-pyramidal geometry is ascertained for the low-spin case, ³ whereas a structure of the [Co(NP₃)Cl]PF₆ type may be reasonably assumed for the other case, on the basis of the spectral analogy.¹ This would indicate that the square pyramid favors low-spin states.

The unusual geometry found for [Co(NP₃)Cl]PF₆ probably originates from a tendency of Co(II) toward tetradehral coordination. A tendency of this sort has been noticed for other Co(II) complexes⁸ and may originate from stability of the e⁴t₂³ configuration for seven d electrons in the T_d ligand field. In order to shed more light on the last points, further structural investigations have been undertaken on complexes of this series.

- (4) M. Ciampolini and N. Nardi, Inorg. Chem., 5, 41 (1966).
- (5) F. A. Cotton, O. D. Faut, D. M. L. Goodgame, and R. H. Holm, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 83, 1780 (1961).
 - (6) P. Dapporto and L. Sacconi, in preparation.
 - (7) L. Sacconi, J. Chem. Soc. A, 248 (1970).
- (8) L. Sacconi and G. P. Speroni, Inorg. Chem., 7, 295 (1968); L. Sacconi and I. Bertini, ibid., 7, 1178 (1968).

L. Sacconi, M. Di Vaira, A. Bianchi Laboratorio di Stereochimica ed Energetica dei Composti di Coordinazione del C.N.R. Istituto di Chimica Generale ed Inorganica dell' Universitá di Firenze, 50132 Florence, Italy Received May 6, 1970

⁽¹⁾ L. Sacconi and I. Bertini, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 90, 5443 (1968).

⁽²⁾ P. Dapporto and L. Sacconi, Chem. Commun., 1091 (1969).

⁽³⁾ P. L. Orioli and L. Sacconi, ibid., 1012 (1969).