



A Journal of the Gesellschaft Deutscher Chemiker

Angewandte Chemie

GDCh

International Edition

www.angewandte.org

Accepted Article

Title: Nickel as a Lewis Base in a T-Shaped Nickel(0) Germylene Complex Incorporating a Flexible Bis(NHC) Ligand

Authors: Chris Gendy, Akseli Mansikkamäki, Juuso Valjus, Joshua Heidebrecht, Paul Chuk-Yan Hui, Guy M. Bernard, Heikki M. Tuononen, Roderick E. Wasylishen, Vladimir K. Michaelis, and Roland Roesler

This manuscript has been accepted after peer review and appears as an Accepted Article online prior to editing, proofing, and formal publication of the final Version of Record (VoR). This work is currently citable by using the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) given below. The VoR will be published online in Early View as soon as possible and may be different to this Accepted Article as a result of editing. Readers should obtain the VoR from the journal website shown below when it is published to ensure accuracy of information. The authors are responsible for the content of this Accepted Article.

To be cited as: *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 10.1002/anie.201809889
Angew. Chem. 10.1002/ange.201809889

Link to VoR: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/anie.201809889>
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ange.201809889>


Nickel as a Lewis Base in a T-Shaped Nickel(0) Germylene Complex Incorporating a Flexible Bis(NHC) Ligand

Chris Gendy,^[a] Akseli Mansikkamäki,^[b] Juuso Valjus,^[b] Joshua Heidebrecht,^[a] Paul Chuk-Yan Hui,^[a] Guy M. Bernard,^[c] Heikki M. Tuononen,^[b] Roderick E. Wasylshen,^[c] Vladimir K. Michaelis,^[c] and Roland Roesler^{*[a]}

Abstract: Flexible, chelating bis(NHC) ligand **2**, able to accommodate both *cis*- and *trans*-coordination modes, was used to synthesize (2)Ni(η^2 -cod), **3**. In reaction with GeCl₂, this produced (2)NiGeCl₂, **4**, featuring a T-shaped Ni(0) and a pyramidal Ge center. Complex **4** could also be prepared from [(2)GeCl]Cl, **5**, and Ni(cod)₂, in a reaction that formally involved Ni-Ge transmetalation, followed by coordination of the extruded GeCl₂ moiety to Ni. A computational analysis showed that **4** possesses considerable multiconfigurational character and the Ni→Ge bond is formed through σ -donation from the Ni 4s, 4p, and 3d orbitals to Ge. (NHC)₂Ni(cod) complexes **9** and **10**, as well as (NHC)₂GeCl₂ derivative **11**, incorporating ligands that cannot accommodate a wide bite angle, failed to produce isolable Ni-Ge complexes. The isolation of (2)Ni(η^2 -Py), **12**, provides further evidence for the reluctance of the (2)Ni(0) fragment to act as a σ -Lewis acid.

The Lewis basicity of transition metals plays a key role in the formation of their complexes.¹ This includes the concepts of back bonding, as well as Z-type ligands² and metal-only Lewis pairs³ for the most basic metals, with the latter leading to metal-only frustrated Lewis pairs.⁴ In agreement with the increase in basicity for the heavier transition elements,^{1,5} little has been reported so far on the chemistry of nickel Lewis bases,^{3,6} in stark contrast to platinum.³ Among the most basic compounds of nickel are the dicoordinate Ni(0) complexes, which are linear and highly reactive.⁷ As opposite to Pd(0) and Pt(0), where dicoordinate complexes with phosphine and N-heterocyclic carbene (NHC) ligands are common, L₂Ni(0) complexes were isolated exclusively with bulky NHC substituents, even though the phosphine analogs are commonly postulated active species in Ni(0)-Ni(II) catalytic cycles.^{8,9} (NHC)₂Ni(0) derivatives proved to be proficient precatalysts in a number of bond-forming transformations,¹⁰ and their stoichiometric chemistry targeted

mostly the related oxidative addition reactions leading to Ni(I) and Ni(II) complexes.¹¹ While L₂Pt(0) moieties have been shown to act as lone pair donors in a variety of complexes,¹² there is no record of the lighter Ni congeners being able to emulate this binding mode.



Scheme 1. Synthesis of ligand **2** and its complex **3**.

Aiming to investigate the Lewis acid-base chemistry of (NHC)₂Ni(0) species, we designed the flexible, chelating dicarbene ligand **2** that could stabilize both the linear Ni(0) starting material and its tri- and tetracoordinated reaction products expected to feature narrower C_{NHC}-Ni-C_{NHC} angles. It was prepared from **1** (Scheme 1), and its reaction with Ni(cod)₂ afforded the pentane-soluble, thermally sensitive η^2 -cyclooctadiene complex **3**. (NHC)₂Ni(η^2 -cod) and (NHC)₂Ni(η^4 -cod) complexes have been used extensively as precursors in lieu of (NHC)₂Ni.¹³ The NMR analysis of diamagnetic derivative **3** was hindered by broad, poorly resolved resonances between 25 and -65 °C. It was postulated that this was a consequence of conformational fluxionality involving flipping of the siloxane backbone and the reciprocal arrangement of the Dipp (2,6-diisopropylphenyl) substituents. A solid-state ¹³C NMR spectrum featured four resonances corresponding to Me₂Si, and two resonances corresponding to the coordinated carbene carbons (200.2 and 212.5 ppm), as expected when they are not related through site symmetry. It mirrored the solution spectrum acquired at -65 °C (Figure 1), indicating that a similar local chemical environment was preserved on NMR time scale due to reduced conformational fluxionality.

X-ray diffractometry revealed that **3** had a Y-geometry at nickel with chelating ligand **2** and η^2 -1,5-cyclooctadiene completing the coordination sphere of the metal (Figure 2). The C1-Ni1-C19 angle measures 110.40(1)°, and there is substantial steric crowding around the metal (Figure S10), as well as an anagostic interaction involving the backbone. The postulated siloxane backbone ring flipping was modeled using DFT, and a barrier of 90 kJ·mol⁻¹ was found for swapping the orientations of the NHC rings, accounting for the observed lack of time-averaged C_s-symmetry at low temperature in solution.

- [a] C. Gendy, P. C.-Y. Hui, Prof. R. Roesler
Department of Chemistry
University of Calgary
2500 University Drive NW, Calgary, AB, T2N 1N4 Canada
E-mail: roesler@ucalgary.ca
- [b] Dr. A. Mansikkamäki, J. Valjus, Prof. H. M. Tuononen
Department of Chemistry, Nanoscience Centre
University of Jyväskylä
FI-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland
- [c] Dr. G. M. Bernard, Prof. R. E. Wasylshen, Prof. V. K. Michaelis
Gunning-Lemieux Chemistry Centre
University of Alberta
11227 Saskatchewan Drive NW, Edmonton, AB, T6G 2G2 Canada

Supporting information and the ORCID identification number(s) for the author(s) of this can be found under:




Figure 1. Selected regions from the solution and solid-state ^{13}C NMR spectra of **3**.

Temperature-sensitive **4** was prepared via the reaction of **3** with GeCl_2 (Scheme 2). Its solution NMR characterization was also hindered by conformational equilibria leading to complex spectra and broad resonances. The solid-state ^{13}C NMR spectrum featured resonances in the expected ranges, including a prominent one corresponding to the carbene carbons at 182.2 ppm. An X-ray diffraction experiment revealed a (2)Ni- GeCl_2 structure featuring a T-shaped, tricoordinated nickel with a weak ($<10 \text{ kJ}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$ by DFT) anagostic interaction *trans* to germanium (Figure 3). On undergoing the transformation from **3** to **4**, the bite angle of the chelating bis(NHC) ligand widens substantially, from $110.42(13)^\circ$ to $167.2(3)^\circ$. Both *cis*- and *trans*-binding bis(NHC) complexes are known,¹⁴ and interconversions of the two binding modes are known for non-chelating NHCs.¹⁵ The ring-flipping barrier in **4** was calculated to be only $50 \text{ kJ}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}$.





Figure 2. Solid-state structure of **3** with 50% probability ellipsoids. Most hydrogen atoms have been removed for clarity. Selected bond distances [Å] and angles [°]: Ni1-C 1.884(3), 1.911(3), Ni1...H 2.51(3), C1-Ni1-C19 $110.42(13)$.

Very similar $(\text{Cy}_3\text{P})_2\text{Pt}^0\text{-ECl}_2$ and $(\text{Cy}_3\text{P})(\text{IMes})\text{Pt}^0\text{-ECl}_2$ complexes (E = Ge, Sn, Pb; P-Pt-P = $156.90(3) - 163.62(2)^\circ$; C-M-P = $165.11(7) - 166.37(7)^\circ$) have been reported.¹² In these analogues the metal-metalloid bond was described as featuring mainly σ -electron donation from Pt.^{12b,d,16} The T-geometry has

been documented for Ni(I),¹⁷ Ni(II),^{11d,18} and Ni(III),^{18b,c} but so far not for Ni(0), although it is ubiquitous for the isoelectronic Cu(I).¹⁹



Scheme 2. Synthesis of T-shaped Ni(0) complex **4**.




Figure 3. Solid-state structure of **4** with 50% probability ellipsoids. Most hydrogen atoms have been removed for clarity. Selected bond distances [Å] and angles [°]: Ni1-Ge1 2.2854(11), Ni1-C 1.902(7), 1.884(7), Ge1-Cl 2.340(2), 2.3363(18), Ni1...H 2.47(4), C1-Ni1-C19 $167.2(3)$, C-Ni1-Ge1 $92.96(19)$, $97.26(19)$, Cl1-Ge1-Cl2 $94.69(4)$, Ge1-Ni1...H $172.8(9)$.

The singlet DFT solution of **4** showed symmetry breaking, indicative of multiconfigurational character. Multireference QD-NEVPT2//CASCF calculations performed on a simplified model system **4'** (see ESI) confirmed that the wave function consists of three major configurations: a closed-shell Ni $3d^{10}$ configuration (21 %) and two open-shell Ni $3d^9$ configurations (26 and 21 %) with a Ni-Ge bonding interaction. The nature of the metal-metalloid bond can be understood by analyzing the fractionally occupied natural orbitals of **4'** in terms of the fragments $(2')\text{Ni}(0)$ and GeCl_2 (Figure 4; see Figure S12 for a more complete diagram). Altogether nine electrons occupy the five Ni_{3d} orbitals in **4'** (146-150), with the tenth electron distributed over three orbitals (151-153) composed of the Ge_{4p} orbital of GeCl_2 (orbital 34) along with the bonding and antibonding combinations of C_{2p} and Ni_{4s-4p} orbitals of $(2')\text{Ni}(0)$ (orbitals 118 and 119). Of these, orbital 151 is clearly metal-metalloid bonding and, for the most part, responsible of the stability of the complex **4'**. Furthermore, the $3d_{z^2}$ orbital of Ni (orbital 115) shows some delocalization onto Ge_{4p} (orbital 34), giving rise to a minor bonding component (orbital 148). Thus, two separate dative Ni→Ge interactions play a role in stabilizing **4'**. In contrast, the GeCl_2 lone pair (orbital 33)

has only a minor influence on the metal-metalloid bond as back-bonding interactions are virtually absent in **4'** (orbital 145).





Figure 4. Selected natural orbitals of **(2')**Ni(0), **4'** = **(2')**Ni→GeCl₂, and GeCl₂ with their occupancies.

The frontier orbitals of **4'** suggest a non-integer oxidation state of + $\frac{1}{2}$ for Ni, assuming that the electrons in orbitals 151–153 are distributed equally between Ni and Ge. However, considering the relative importance of the 3d¹⁰ configuration on the overall wave function and the lack of any significant contribution from configurations in which the Ge_{4p} orbital is doubly occupied, the system is best approximated as a Ni(0) complex in which the electrons forming the dative metal-metalloid bond are exclusively from Ni. The preference of **4** for a T-shaped geometry over the Y-shape usually observed in three-coordinate Ni(0) complexes¹⁹ can be rationalized with the bonding interaction in orbital 118 of **(2')**Ni(0): any bending of the C–Ni–C moiety would weaken the C–Ni bonds and, consequently, destabilize also the metal-metalloid bond in **4'** (orbital 151). The importance of d⁹s¹ vs. d¹⁰s⁰ electron configurations in the chemistry of nickel and its heavier congeners has been discussed,²⁰ and the T-geometry for tricoordinate d⁹-nickel complexes, albeit in oxidation state I, is well documented.¹⁷


The Ni–Ge bond in **4** (2.2854(11) Å) is slightly longer than that recorded in the related, Y-shaped Ni(0) complexes (Ph₃P)₂Ni–GeX₂ (X = [(N(SiMe₃)₂]₂, 2,4,6-(CF₃)₃C₆H₂) (2.206(1) and 2.1814(7) Å). The Ni–Ge interaction in these derivatives was

described as a classic case of σ -bonding, π -backbonding with a planar, σ -donating germylene.²¹ The acute P–Ni–P angles in the latter compounds (113.81(4) and 118.10(5)^o vs. C–Ni–C 167.2(3)^o in **4**) and the planar coordination environment at germanium (vs. pyramidal with a Ni–Ge/GeCl₂ angle of 66.2(3)^o in **4**) strongly suggest a different Ni–Ge binding mode. N-heterocyclic germylens (NHGes) have lower Lewis acidity than GeCl₂ owing to N→Ge- π -donation, and it was of interest to assess the impact of this factor on the Ni–Ge bonding. The reaction of **3** with a neopentyl substituted NHGe²² resulted in ligand displacement (Scheme 3) with formation of a homoleptic Ni(NHGe)₄ complex (Figure S6).




Scheme 3. Reaction of **3** with an N-heterocyclic germylene.

Germylene and stannylene complexes **5** and **6** were prepared as shown in Scheme 4. The broad resonances in the room temperature ¹H NMR spectrum of **5** sharpened upon cooling in a manner typical for conformational equilibrium in the slow exchange regime. A lineshape analysis yielded the activation parameters $\Delta H^\ddagger = 32.7$ kJ·mol⁻¹ and $\Delta S^\ddagger = -96$ J·mol⁻¹·K⁻¹, suggesting an associative chloride exchange rather than ring flipping dynamics.²³ Complex **5** crystallizes as an ion pair, [(**2**)GeCl]Cl (Figure S4), while **6** has a disphenoidal (**2**)SnCl₂ structure (Figure S6). Reaction of Ni(cod)₂ with **5** led to transmetalation where Ni(0) replaced GeCl₂, followed by coordination of the extruded metalloid fragment to Ni(0) to form complex **4** (Scheme 2). This type of castling reaction relying on the Lewis-amphoteric properties of germanium is to our knowledge unprecedented.



Scheme 4. Synthesis of complexes **5** and **6**.

To explore whether the ability of **2** to accommodate a wide range of bite angles was essential to the chemistry reported above, *cis*-chelators **7** and **8**²⁴ were used to prepare nickel complexes **9**^{13d} and **10** (Figure S7), as well as germanium derivative **11** (Scheme 5, Figure S8). Reactions of **9** or **10** with GeCl₂, and reaction of **11** with Ni(cod)₂ produced intractable mixtures of products. While the influence of the N-substituent (Dipp vs *t*Bu) on the stability of compound **4** cannot be neglected,²⁵ this result confirms that the ability of ligand **2** to stabilize (NHC)₂Ni–GeCl₂ species is exceptional.



Scheme 5. Synthesis of derivatives 9-11.

The reaction of **3** with pyridine produced an equilibrium mixture from which pyridine π -adduct **12** was isolated by crystallization. The η^2 -coordination mode has been observed for $\text{L}_2\text{Ni}(0)$ species (L = R_3P , NHC) with quinoline and N-coordinated pyridine.^{9a, 26 a} The preference for π vs. σ -coordination in **12** highlights the reluctance of the $(\text{NHC})_2\text{Ni}(0)$ fragment to act as a σ -Lewis acid.^{26b}




Figure 6. Solid-state structure of **12** with 50% probability ellipsoids. Most hydrogen atoms have been removed for clarity. Selected bond distances [Å] and angles [°]: Ni1-C1 1.922(3), Ni1-C19 1.915(3), Ni1...H 2.76(4), 2.82(3), C1-Ni1-C19 116.28(15).

In conclusion, chelating, flexible bis(NHC) ligand **2** can accommodate a wide range of bite angles, from 93.0(3)^o in **6** to 167.2(3)^o in **4**. It formed Ni(0) complexes **3**, **4**, and **12**, with good crystallization properties and complex NMR spectra, owing to slow equilibria between several conformers. Nickel-germanium complex **4**, which displays a T-geometry that is unprecedented for Ni(0), could be prepared either via substitution of COD by GeCl_2 in **3**, or via transmetalation of **5** with $\text{Ni}(\text{cod})_2$, followed by coordination of the extruded metalloid fragment to Ni, in a unique castling-like reaction. The unusual Ni-Ge bonding in **4** is best described as a dative $\text{Ni}(0) \rightarrow \text{Ge}(\text{II})$ interaction with two components: a weak σ -donation from Ni_{3d} to Ge_{4p} , representing a minor contribution, and a one-electron σ -donation from Ni_{4s-4p} to GeCl_2 . The poor σ -Lewis acidity of the 14-valence-electron $(\text{NHC})_2\text{Ni}(0)$ fragment is further supported by the formation of η^2 -pyridine adduct **12**. Chelating ligands **7** and **8**, which cannot accommodate wide bite angles, were unable to support Ni-Ge complexes analogous to **4**, and neither were N-heterocyclic germylenes due to their lower Lewis acidity. This work proves that, with the judicious choice of ligands, nickel-only Lewis bases can parallel the remarkable reactivity previously observed only for the more basic platinum analogues. It also shows that the

d^9s^1 electronic structure can play an important role in the chemistry of metal complexes usually typecast as $3d^{10}$.

Experimental Section

Experimental details, NMR spectra, computational details, as well as the relevant crystallography tables are provided in the Supporting Information. CCDC 1861471-1861479 contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data are provided free of charge by The Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre.

Acknowledgements

Financial support for this work was provided by the Universities of Calgary, Jyväskylä, and Alberta, as well as the NSERC of Canada in the form of Discovery Grants #262037 to R.R. and #05447 to V.K.M., and a CGS-M scholarship to J.H.. This research was undertaken thanks in part to funding from the Canada First Research Excellence Fund. Computational resources were provided by CSC-IT Center for Science in Finland and the Finnish Grid and Cloud Infrastructure (persistent identifier urn:nbn:fi:research-infras-2016072533).

Keywords: N-heterocyclic carbene • nickel • metal-only Lewis pairs • germanium • T-geometry


- [1] D. F. Shriver, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **1970**, *3*, 231-238.
- [2] a) A. Amgoune, D. Bourissou, *Chem. Commun.* **2011**, *47*, 859-871; b) G. Bouhadir, D. Bourissou, in *The Chemical Bond III* (Ed. D. M. P. Mingos) Springer, **2016**.
- [3] J. Bauer, H. Braunschweig, R. D. Dewhurst, *Chem. Rev.* **2012**, *112*, 4329-4346.
- [4] J. Campos, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2017**, *139*, 2944-2947.
- [5] H. Kameo, T. Kawamoto, D. Bourissou, S. Sakaki, H. Nakazawa, *Organometallics* **2015**, *34*, 1440-1448.
- [6] a) J. S. Jones, C. R. Wade, F. P. Gabbaï, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 8876-8879; *Angew. Chem.* **2014**, *53*, 9022-9025; b) B. R. Barnett, J. S. Figueroa, *Chem. Commun.* **2016**, *52*, 13829-13839.
- [7] a) A. J. Arduengo, S. F. Camper, J. C. Calabrese, F. Davidson, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, *116*, 4391-4394; b) P. L. Arnold, F. G. N. Cloke, T. Geldbach, P. B. Hitchcock, *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 3228-3233; c) S. Caddick, F. G. N. Cloke, P. B. Hitchcock, A. K. de K. Lewis, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, *116*, 5824-5827; *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, *43*, 5948-5951; d) K. Matsubara, Y. Koga, Y. Nibu, T. Hashimura, T. Matsumoto, *Organometallics* **2008**, *27*, 6020-6024; e) A. A. Danopoulos, D. Pugh, *Dalton Trans.* **2008**, 30-31; f) R. C. Poulten, M. J. Page, A. G. Algarra, J. J. Le Roy, I. López, E. Carter, A. Llobet, S. A. Macgregor, M. F. Mahon, D. M. Murphy, M. Murugesu, M. K. Whittlesey, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 13640-13643; g) Y. Hoshimoto, Y. Hayashi, H. Suzuki, M. Ohashi, S. Ogoshi, *Organometallics* **2014**, *33*, 1276-1282; h) B. Dittrich, C. M. Wandtke, A. Meents, K. Pröpper, K. C. Mondal, P. P. Samuel, N. Amin SK, A. P. Singh, H. W. Roesky, N. Sidhu, *ChemPhysChem* **2015**, *16*, 412-419; i) K. C. Mondal, P. P. Samuel, Y. Li, H. W. Roesky, S. Roy, L. Ackermann, N. S. Sidhu, G. M. Sheldrick, E. Carl, S. Demeshko, S. De, P. Parameswaran, L. Ungur, L. F. Chibotaru, D. M. Andrada, *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* **2014**, *2014*, 818-823.

- [8] a) D. G. Morrell, J. K. Kochi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1975**, *97*, 7262–7270; b) V. Percec, J.-Y. Bae, D. H. Hill, *J. Org. Chem.* **1995**, *60*, 1060–1065; c) K. W. Quasdorf, A. Antoft-Finch, P. Liu, A. L. Silberstein, A. Komaromi, T. Blackburn, S. D. Ramgren, K. N. Houk, V. Snieckus, N. K. Garg, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2011**, *133*, 6352–6363; d) M. C. Schwarzer, R. Konno, T. Hojo, A. Ohtsuki, K. Nakamura, A. Yasutome, H. Takahashi, T. Shimasaki, M. Tobisu, N. Chatani, S. Mori, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2017**, *139*, 10347–10358.
- [9] See also the body of work on “masked” (R₃P)₂Ni complexes, e.g. a) J. J. Garcia, N. M. Brunkan, W. D. Jones, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2002**, *124*, 9547–9555; b) S. A. Johnson, C. W. Huff, F. Mustafa, M. Saliba, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 17278–17280; c) J. M. Weber, A. R. Longstreet, T. F. Jamison, *Organometallics* **2018**, *37*, in press, DOI: 10.1021/acs.organomet.8b00351.
- [10] a) *N-Heterocyclic Carbenes: From Laboratory Curiosities to Efficient Synthetic Tools* (Ed. S. Díez-González) RSC: Cambridge, UK, **2011**; b) *N-Heterocyclic Carbenes* (Ed. S. P. Nolan) Wiley-VCH: Weinheim, **2014**; c) A. Thakur, J. Louie, *Acc. Chem. Res.* **2015**, *48*, 2354–2365; d) V. Rittleng, M. I. Henrion, M. J. Chetcuti, *ACS Catal.* **2016**, *6*, 890–906; e) H. V. Huynh in *The Organometallic Chemistry of N-Heterocyclic Carbenes*; John Wiley & Sons, Ltd: Chichester, UK, **2017**; f) N. Hazari, P. R. Melvin, M. M. Beromi, *Nat. Rev. Chem.* **2017**, *1*, 0025.
- [11] a) N. D. Clement, K. J. Cavell, C. Jones, C. J. Elsevier, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2004**, *43*, 1277–1279; *Angew. Chem.* **2004**, *116*, 1297–1297; b) N. D. Clement, K. J. Cavell, L.-I. Ooi, *Organometallics* **2006**, *25*, 4155–4165; c) S. Miyazaki, Y. Koga, T. Matsumoto, K. Matsubara, *Chem. Commun.* **2010**, *46*, 1932–1934; d) K. Zhang, M. Conda-Sheridan, S. R. Cooke, J. Louie, *Organometallics* **2011**, *30*, 2546–2552; e) J. Li, J. Morris, W. W. Brennessel, W. D. Jones, *J. Chem. Crystallogr.* **2014**, *44*, 15–19; f) K. C. Mondal, S. Roy, B. Maity, D. Koley, H. W. Roesky, *Inorg. Chem.* **2016**, *55*, 163–169; g) N. D. Harrold, A. R. Corcos, G. L. Hillhouse, *J. Organomet. Chem.* **2016**, *813*, 46–54.
- [12] a) J. Bauer, R. Bertermann, H. Braunschweig, K. Gruss, F. Hupp, T. Kramer, *Inorg. Chem.* **2012**, *51*, 5617–5626; b) H. Braunschweig, A. Damme, R. D. Dewhurst, F. Hupp, J. O. C. Jimenez-Halla, K. Radacki, *Chem. Commun.* **2012**, *48*, 10410–10412; c) F. Hupp, M. Ma, F. Kroll, J. O. C. Jimenez-Halla, R. D. Dewhurst, K. Radacki, A. Stasch, C. Jones, H. Braunschweig, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2014**, *20*, 16888–16898; d) H. Braunschweig, M. A. Celik, R. D. Dewhurst, M. Heid, F. Hupp, S. S. Sen, *Chem. Sci.* **2015**, *6*, 425–435; e) R. Bertermann, J. Böhnke, H. Braunschweig, R. D. Dewhurst, T. Kupfer, J. H. Muessig, L. Pentecost, K. Radacki, S. S. Sen, A. Vargas, *Dynamic, J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2016**, *138*, 16140–16147.
- [13] a) T. Schaub, U. Radius, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2005**, *11*, 5024–5030; b) T. Schaub, P. Fischer, A. Steffen, T. Braun, U. Radius, A. Mix, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2008**, *130*, 9304–9317; c) N. D. Harrold, G. L. Hillhouse, *Chem. Sci.* **2013**, *4*, 4011–4015; d) M. Brendel, C. Braun, F. Rominger, P. Hofmann, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 8741–8745; *Angew. Chem.* **2014**, *126*, 8886–8890.
- [14] a) D. S. Clyne, J. Jin, E. Genest, J. C. Gallucci, T. V. RajanBabu, *Org. Lett.* **2000**, *2*, 1125–1128; b) H. V. Huynh, D. Yuan, Y. Han, *Dalton Trans.* **2009**, 7262–7268; c) M. V. Baker, D. H. Brown, P. V. Simpson, B. W. Skelton, A. H. White, *Dalton Trans.* **2009**, 7294–7307.
- [15] a) C.-Y. Liao, K.-T. Chan, Y.-C. Chang, C.-Y. Chen, C.-Y. Tu, C.-H. Hu, H. M. Lee, *Organometallics* **2007**, *26*, 5826–5833. b) S. Hameury, P. de Frémont, P.-A. R. Breuil, H. Olivier-Bourbigou, P. Braunstein, *Organometallics*, **2015**, *34*, 2183–2201.
- [16] W. H. Liao, P. Y. Ho, M. D. Su, *Inorg. Chem.* **2013**, *52*, 1338–1348.
- [17] a) N. A. Eckert, A. Dinescu, T. R. Cundari, P. L. Holland, *Inorg. Chem.* **2005**, *44*, 7702–7704; b) J. Wenz, C. A. Rettenmeier, H. Wadepohl, L. H. Gade, *Chem. Commun.* **2016**, *52*, 202–205; c) C. Yoo, Y. Lee, A T-Shaped Nickel(I) Metallo-radical Species. *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2017**, *56*, 9502–9506; *Angew. Chem.* **2017**, *129*, 9630–9634; d) C.-Y. Lin, P. P. Power, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **2017**, *46*, 5347–5399.
- [18] a) T. Tamaki, M. Nagata, M. Ohashi, S. Ogoshi, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2009**, *15*, 10083–10091; b) M. I. Lipschutz, T. D. Tilley, *Chem. Commun.* **2012**, *48*, 7146–7148; c) M. I. Lipschutz, X. Yang, R. Chatterjee, T. D. Tilley, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2013**, *135*, 15298–15301; d) M. I. Lipschutz, T. D. Tilley, *Angew. Chem., Int. Ed.* **2014**, *53*, 7290–7294; *Angew. Chem.* **2014**, *126*, 7418–7422; e) N. O. Andrella, A. J. Sicard, S. I. Gorelsky, I. Korobkov, R. T. Baker, *Chem. Sci.* **2015**, *6*, 6392–6397; f) C.-Y. Lin, J. C. Fettinger, P. P. Power, *Inorg. Chem.* **2017**, *56*, 9892–9902.
- [19] S. Alvarez, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **1999**, *193*–195, 13–41.
- [20] a) M. R. A. Blomberg, P. E. M. Siegbahn, *J. Chem. Phys.* **1983**, *78*, 986–987. b) M. R. A. Blomberg, U. Brandemark, P. E. M. Siegbahn, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1983**, *105*, 5557–5563. c) J. J. Low, W. A. Goddard III, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1984**, *106*, 6928–6937.
- [21] a) K. E. Litz, J. E. Bender, J. W. Kampf, M. M. Banaszak Holl, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **1997**, *36*, 496–498; *Angew. Chem.* **1997**, *109*, 516–518; b) J. Bender, IV; A. Shusterman, M. Banaszak Holl, J. Kampf, *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 1547–1552.
- [22] O. Kühl, P. Lönnecke, J. Heinicke, *Polyhedron* **2001**, *20*, 2215–2222.
- [23] a) A. D. Bain, G. J. Duns, F. Rathgeb, J. Vanderkloet, *J. Phys. Chem.* **1995**, *99*, 17338–17343; b) A. D. Bain, *Prog. Nucl. Magn. Reson. Spectrosc.* **2003**, *43*, 63–103.
- [24] a) R. E. Douthwaite, D. Häußinger, M. L. Green, P. J. Silcock, P. T. Gomes, A. M. Martins, A. A. Danopoulos, *Organometallics* **1999**, *18*, 4584–4590; c) C. H. Leung, C. D. Incarvito, R. H. Crabtree, *Organometallics* **2006**, *25*, 6099–6107.
- [25] D. J. Liprot, P. P. Power, *Nature Rev. Chem.* **2017**, *1*, 0004.
- [26] a) C.-C. Tsai, W.-C. Shih, C.-H. Fang, C.-Y. Li, T.-G. Ong, G. P. A. Yap, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2010**, *132*, 11887–11889; b) L₂Ni(0) species (L = olefin) favor σ-coordination of pyridine, see U. Rosenthal, S. Pulst, R. Kempe, K.-R. Pörschke, R. Goddard, B. Proft, *Tetrahedron* **1998**, *54*, 1277–1287.

Entry for the Table of Contents

COMMUNICATION

Castling reaction: A metal-only Lewis pair was obtained via reaction of either a Ni(0) bis(N-heterocyclic carbene) complex with GeCl₂, or a GeCl₂-bis(N-heterocyclic carbene) adduct with Ni(cyclooctadiene)₂. The complex Ni-Ge bonding situation is best described as a one-electron donation from the T-shaped metal to the pyramidal metalloid. The near-linear C-Ni-C arrangement proved essential to the formation of the Ni-Ge bond.



Chris Gendy, Akseli Mansikkamäki
Juuso Valjus, Joshua Heidebrecht,
Paul Chuk-Yan Hui, Guy M. Bernard,
Heikki M. Tuononen, Roderick E.
Wasylishen, Vladimir K. Michaelis, and
Roland Roesler*

Page No. – Page No.

Nickel as a Lewis Base in a T-
Shaped Nickel(0) Germylene
Complex Incorporating a Flexible
Bis(NHC) Ligand