

THE SYNTHESIS AND TIN-119m MÖSSBAUER SPECTRA OF SOME DIORGANOTIN DIHALIDE AND DIPSEUDOHALIDE COMPLEXES WITH NITROGEN- AND OXYGEN-DONOR LIGANDS

ALAN J. CROWE and PETER J. SMITH

International Tin Research Institute, Greenford, Middlesex UB6 7AQ (Great Britain)

(Received August 13th, 1981)

Summary

The synthesis and $^{119\text{m}}\text{Sn}$ Mössbauer spectra of 114 complexes of the type $\text{R}_2\text{SnX}_2 \cdot \text{L}_2$ ($\text{R} = \text{Me, Et, n-Pr, n-Bu, n-Oct, Ph, Bz}$; $\text{X} = \text{F, Cl, Br, I, NCS}$; $\text{L}_2 = 2$ monodentate or 1 bidentate O- or N-donor ligand(s)), 74 of which are new, are reported. The majority of the complexes are isostructural, having an octahedral *trans*- R_2SnX_4 geometry about tin, whilst five of the diphenyltin complexes ($\text{R} = \text{Ph}$; $\text{X} = \text{Cl}$; $\text{L}_2 = \text{AMP, Nphen}$; $\text{X} = \text{NCS}$; $\text{L}_2 = \text{bipy, phen, TMphen}$) adopt a *cis*- R_2SnX_4 octahedral structure.

A convenient method for the synthesis of a number of novel 1 : 1 diorganotin difluoride complexes using hot acetonitrile is reported and a structure for the unusual adduct, $\text{Ph}_2\text{SnF}_2 \cdot 0.5 \text{ phen}$, is proposed.

Introduction

In the course of an investigation into the antitumour activity of organotin compounds, we have found [1,2] that many of the titled complexes exhibit reproducible *in vivo* activity towards the P388 lymphocytic leukaemia in mice. The $^{119\text{m}}\text{Sn}$ Mössbauer spectra of both the active and inactive complexes (a total of 114 compounds) have been recorded, so that structure/activity relationships may be investigated.

Diorganotin dihalide complexes are well known and some have had their structures determined by X-ray analysis. Table 1 lists these compounds and indicates their structures.

From the Table, it can be seen that the complexes adopt the *trans*- R_2SnX_4 octahedral geometry about tin (I) and it may be concluded that this is the preferred structure. However, a few complexes do have the *cis*- R_2SnX_4 octahedral structure (II) as will be described shortly.


Discrete monomeric diorganotin dihalide complexes with monodentate ligands may have *cis*- or *trans*-halogens, whereas those with bidentate ligands can

TABLE 1

X-RAY STRUCTURES OF DIORGANOTIN DIHALIDE COMPLEXES *

Complex	Structure	Configuration of halogens	Ref.
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ DMF}$	<i>trans</i> - R_2SnX_4	<i>cis</i>	3
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ DMSO}$	"	<i>cis</i>	3, 4
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ HMPT}$	"	<i>trans</i>	3
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot \text{NiSalen}$	"	<i>cis</i>	5
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ py}$	"	<i>trans</i>	6
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ pyO}$	"	<i>trans</i>	7
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot \text{salenH}_2$	"	<i>trans</i>	8
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnBr}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ DMSO}$	"	<i>trans</i>	3, 9
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnBr}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ HMPT}$	"	<i>trans</i>	3
$\text{Me}_2\text{SnBr}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ py}$	"	<i>trans</i>	6
$\text{Et}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot \text{bipy}$	"	<i>cis</i>	10
$\text{Ph}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot 2 \text{ DMSO}$	"	<i>cis</i>	11
$\text{Ph}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot \text{bipy}$	"	<i>cis</i>	12
$\text{Bz}_2\text{SnCl}_2 \cdot \text{bipy}$	"	<i>cis</i>	13

only have *cis*-halogens. From the results of his studies with platinum complexes, Rosenberg [14] was able to demonstrate that the presence of *cis*-halogens was



necessary for potential antitumour activity. For this reason, the majority of the complexes reported in this study contain bidentate donor ligands.

Although examples of diorganotin dihalide and dipseudohalide complexes with organic ligands, $\text{R}_2\text{SnX}_2 \cdot \text{L}_2$ ($\text{X} = \text{Cl}, \text{Br}, \text{I}, \text{NCS}$) are well known, the only report of a dialkyltin difluoride complex of this type is by May and Curran [15], who prepared $\text{Bu}_2\text{SnF}_2 \cdot \text{phen}$ by the reaction of Bu_2SnF_2 with 1,10-phenanthroline in DMSO. We have found that the 1 : 1 adducts of dialkyltin difluorides with 1,10-phenanthroline and 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline may be conveniently synthesized using hot acetonitrile as a solvent. However, when the experiments were repeated using 2,2'-bipyridyl as the ligand, only starting materials were recovered, in agreement with the earlier work of Alleston and Davies [16].

Experimental

Preparation of complexes

Dimethyl-, diethyl-, di-n-propyl- and diphenyl-tin dichlorides were generous gifts from Mr. M. Ohata, Chugoku Marine Paints, Shiga-Ken, Japan, Dr. E.J. Bulten, Institute for Organic Chemistry TNO, Utrecht, The Netherlands, and

* A recent X-ray crystal structure determination of $\text{Ph}_2\text{Sn}(\text{NCS})_2 \cdot \text{bipy}$ has revealed a distorted octahedral *cis*- R_2SnX_4 geometry with *trans*-isothiocyanato groups [50].

Dr. D.A. Armitage, Queen Elizabeth College, London. Di-n-butyltin dichloride was obtained commercially from BDH Ltd. The other diorganotin dihalides and dipseudohalides, R_2SnX_2 , were obtained from the dichlorides by heating in acetone with the appropriate sodium or potassium salt, MX. The organic ligands {bipy; DMSO; phen; py; 2-aminomethyl-pyridine (AMP); 2-mercaptopyridine (merpy); 2-(2-pyridyl)benzimidazole (PBI); 5-chloro-1,10-phenanthroline (Cphen); 5,6-dimethyl-1,10-phenanthroline (DMphen); 4,7-diphenyl-1,10-phenanthroline (DPphen); 5-nitro-1,10-phenanthroline (Nphen); 5-phenyl-1,10-phenanthroline (Pphen); 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline (TMphen); pyrido{2,3-b}pyrazine (pypy)} were obtained commercially and were used without further purification.

Preparation of diorganotin difluoride complexes

The series of 1 : 1 adducts of dialkyltin difluorides with 1,10-phenanthroline and 3,4,7,8-tetramethyl-1,10-phenanthroline were prepared by the reaction of equimolar amounts of the starting materials in refluxing acetonitrile. The phenanthroline solution was added to a stirred suspension of the appropriate R_2SnF_2 compound in hot acetonitrile, whereupon the mixture immediately turned clear. The resulting solution was then cooled, and the complex separated out as white crystals. The 2 : 1 adduct of diphenyltin difluoride with phenanthroline was prepared similarly, although, in this case, filtration of the hot solution was necessary prior to cooling.

Preparation of diorganotin dihalide complexes

These compounds were prepared by mixing, typically, hot methanolic or dry ethereal solutions of the appropriate diorganotin dihalide and the ligand in a 1 : 1 or 1 : 2 molar ratio. The products, which formed immediately (or on cooling the solution to room temperature or below) as crystalline precipitates, were collected by filtration and dried in air. Pure samples of $R_2SnI_2 \cdot L_2$ ($R = Me, n-Bu$; $L_2 = PBI, DPphen, TMphen$; $R = n-Pr, Et$; $L_2 = PBI$; $R = Ph$; $L_2 = PBI, DPphen$) could not be obtained.

The 1 : 1 adduct of dimethyltin dichloride with N,N' -ethylene-bis(salicylideneiminato)nickel(II) (NiSalen) was prepared by the method of Pellerito et al. [17].

The analytical and melting point data for the complexes are shown in Table 2, together with literature values, where known.

Mössbauer spectra

^{119m}Sn Mössbauer spectra were obtained using a constant acceleration microprocessor spectrometer (from Cryophysics Ltd., Oxford) with a 512-channel data store. A 15 mCi $Ba^{119m}SnO_3$ source was used at room temperature and samples were packed in perspex discs and cooled to 80 K, using a liquid nitrogen cryostat.

The experimental error in the measured values of isomer shift (δ) and quadrupole splitting (ΔE_Q) parameters is $\pm 0.05 \text{ mm s}^{-1}$.

(Continued on p. 230)

TABLE 2

MELTING POINT AND ANALYTICAL DATA FOR DIORGANOTIN DIHALIDE AND DIPSEUDO-HALIDE COMPLEXES, $R_2SnX_2 \cdot L_2$

Complex	Microanalytical data. Found (calcd.) (%)				M.p. (°C)
	C	H	N	X	
<i>Me</i> ₂ <i>SnX</i> ₂ · <i>L</i> ₂					
X = Cl, L = DMSO	—	—	—	—	112–113 (113) [18]
L = merpy	32.64 (32.58)	3.73 (3.62)	6.28 (6.33)	16.41 ^a (16.06)	141
L = py	—	—	—	—	163 (163) [19]
L ₂ = AMP	29.31 (29.27)	4.50 (4.27)	8.53 (8.54)	21.15 (21.65)	190–192
L ₂ = bipy	—	—	—	—	233–235 (232–233 [20])
L ₂ = NiSalen	39.79 (39.69)	3.71 (3.67)	5.17 (5.14)	13.03 (13.02)	280 dec. (277 dec [17])
L ₂ = PBI	40.67 (40.48)	3.62 (3.61)	9.99 (10.12)	16.99 (17.11)	238–239
L ₂ = phen	—	—	—	—	284 (284 [21])
L ₂ = DPphen	55.53 (56.39)	4.39 (3.99)	4.82 (5.07)	12.22 (12.86)	232–235 (250–254 dec [22])
L ₂ = Tmphen	47.55 (47.37)	4.96 (4.82)	6.23 (6.14)	15.53 (15.57)	277–280 dec (267–270 dec [22])
L ₂ = pypy	30.70 (30.77)	3.15 (3.13)	12.04 (11.97)	20.37 (20.23)	120–121
X = Br, L ₂ = bipy	—	—	—	—	224 (224) [23]
L ₂ = PBI	34.25 (33.33)	3.26 (2.98)	8.43 (8.33)	32.72 (31.75)	221
L ₂ = phen	33.70 (34.36)	2.84 (2.86)	5.76 (5.73)	32.87 (32.72)	255–257 (232–235 [24])
L ₂ = DPphen	49.22 (48.67)	3.57 (3.43)	4.52 (4.37)	25.68 (24.96)	251–255
L ₂ = TMphen	40.32 (39.63)	4.20 (4.04)	5.18 (5.14)	30.10 (29.36)	271–273 dec
X = I, L ₂ = bipy	25.93 (25.76)	2.63 (2.50)	4.89 (5.81)	45.75 (45.44)	208–209 (214 [23])
L ₂ = phen	—	—	—	—	237–240 (235–245) [24]
X = NCS, L ₂ = bipy	—	—	—	—	222–224 (219–220.5 [25])
L ₂ = phen	43.38 (43.15)	3.12 (3.15)	12.21 (12.58)	14.59 ^b (14.38)	250–251
<i>Et</i> ₂ <i>SnX</i> ₂ · <i>L</i> ₂					
X = F, L ₂ = phen	48.27 (48.60)	4.55 (4.55)	7.06 (7.08)	—	164–167
L ₂ = TMphen	52.20 (53.22)	5.96 (5.76)	6.13 (6.20)	—	254–267
X = Cl, L = DMSO	23.79 (23.76)	5.37 (5.45)	17.76 (17.57)	15.84 ^b (15.84)	57–59 (64 [26])
L = merpy	35.81 (35.74)	4.41 (4.26)	6.43 (5.96)	14.80 ^c (15.11)	77–79
L = py	40.93 (41.38)	4.90 (4.93)	6.82 (6.92)	17.93 (17.49)	119–121
L ₂ = AMP	34.19 (33.71)	5.03 (5.06)	8.37 (7.87)	20.70 (19.94)	157–159 dec

TABLE 2 (continued)

Complex		Microanalytical data. Found (calcd.) (%)				M.p. (°C)
		C	H	N	X	
X = Br,	L ₂ = bipy	—	—	—	—	177–179 (177–179) [24]
	L ₂ = PBI	43.42 (43.34)	4.41 (4.29)	9.51 (9.48)	15.97 (16.03)	229–231
	L ₂ = phen	—	—	—	—	235–236 (235–236 [16])
	L ₂ = Cphen	41.34 (41.51)	3.67 (3.68)	6.09 (6.05)	22.83 (23.03)	211–212
	L ₂ = DMphen	46.44 (47.37)	4.82 (4.82)	6.03 (4.14)	15.72 (15.57)	247–249
	L ₂ = DPphen	57.47 (57.93)	4.54 (4.48)	4.73 (4.83)	12.21 (12.24)	231–232
	L ₂ = Nphen	40.40 (40.49)	3.68 (3.59)	8.88 (8.88)	14.83 (15.01)	202–203
	L ₂ = Pphen	53.24 (52.39)	4.49 (4.37)	5.43 (5.56)	13.86 (14.09)	246–249
	L ₂ = TMphen	49.66 (49.59)	5.35 (5.37)	5.58 (5.78)	14.72 (14.67)	280 dec
	L ₂ = bipy	34.29 (34.08)	3.77 (3.65)	5.60 (5.68)	32.48 (32.45)	204–206 (201–202 [24])
	L ₂ = PBI	36.55 (36.09)	3.58 (3.57)	8.01 (7.89)	30.30 (30.08)	224–225
	L ₂ = phen	37.06 (37.14)	3.55 (3.48)	5.57 (5.42)	31.15 (30.95)	236–238 (225–230 dec [24])
	L ₂ = DPphen	50.57 (50.22)	4.04 (3.89)	4.25 (4.19)	23.81 (23.92)	259–265 dec.
	L ₂ = TMphen	42.84 (41.88)	4.81 (4.54)	4.99 (4.89)	28.60 (27.92)	>300
	L ₂ = bipy	—	—	—	—	177–179 (177–179 [24])
X = I,	L ₂ = phen	31.27 (31.42)	3.01 (2.95)	4.73 (4.58)	41.43 (41.57)	206–207 (202–203 [24])
	L ₂ = DPphen	44.15 (44.04)	3.52 (3.41)	3.33 (3.67)	33.40 (23.29)	246–248
	L ₂ = TMphen	36.07 (35.98)	3.89 (3.90)	4.06 (4.20)	38.30 (38.08)	dec. >260
	L ₂ = bipy	—	—	—	—	221–223 (220–222.[27])
X = NCS,	L ₂ = phen	45.87 (45.67)	3.78 (3.81)	11.68 (11.84)	13.18 ^b (13.53)	210–212
	L ₂ = phen	49.97 (51.06)	5.42 (5.20)	6.39 (6.61)	—	159–164
	L ₂ = TMphen	54.39 (55.11)	6.37 (6.26)	5.81 (5.84)	—	234–237
X = Cl,	L = py	42.93 (44.24)	6.00 (5.53)	6.04 (6.45)	16.64 (16.36)	105–107
	L ₂ = bipy	44.36 (44.44)	5.18 (5.09)	6.45 (6.48)	16.53 (16.44)	206–207 (204–205 [20])
	L ₂ = PBI	46.05 (45.86)	4.95 (4.88)	9.08 (8.92)	14.89 (15.07)	189–190
	L ₂ = phen	47.46 (47.37)	4.82 (4.82)	6.05 (6.14)	15.72 (15.57)	127–128
	L ₂ = DPphen	58.02 (59.21)	4.94 (4.93)	4.53 (4.61)	11.30 (11.68)	228–229
	L ₂ = TMphen	51.52 (51.56)	5.93 (5.86)	5.44 (5.47)	13.60 (13.87)	dec. >290
	L ₂ = phen	49.97 (51.06)	5.42 (5.20)	6.39 (6.61)	—	159–164
	L ₂ = TMphen	54.39 (55.11)	6.37 (6.26)	5.81 (5.84)	—	234–237
	L = py	42.93 (44.24)	6.00 (5.53)	6.04 (6.45)	16.64 (16.36)	105–107
	L ₂ = bipy	44.36 (44.44)	5.18 (5.09)	6.45 (6.48)	16.53 (16.44)	206–207 (204–205 [20])
	L ₂ = PBI	46.05 (45.86)	4.95 (4.88)	9.08 (8.92)	14.89 (15.07)	189–190

TABLE 2 (continued)

Complex		Microanalytical data. Found (calcd.) (%)				M.p. (°C)
		C	H	N	X	
X = Br	L ₂ = bipy	36.71	4.29	5.29	30.72	205—206
		(35.85)	(4.22)	(5.37)	(30.71)	
	L ₂ = PBI	38.92	4.26	7.52	29.73	228—232
		(38.57)	(4.11)	(7.50)	(28.57)	
	L ₂ = phen	39.12	4.08	5.07	29.59	248—249
		(39.63)	(4.04)	(5.14)	(29.36)	
	L ₂ = DPphen	51.54	4.51	3.95	23.11	226—227
		(51.65)	(4.30)	(4.02)	(22.96)	
	L ₂ = TMphen	44.44	5.19	7.78	26.34	>300
		(43.92)	(4.99)	(4.65)	(26.62)	
	L ₂ = bipy	31.52	3.64	4.45	41.55	188—190
		(31.22)	(3.58)	(4.55)	(41.30)	
X = NCS,	L ₂ = PBI	33.10	3.81	6.30	38.44	146—150
		(33.03)	(3.52)	(6.42)	(38.84)	
	L ₂ = phen	33.87	3.55	4.29	39.81	234—236
		(33.80)	(3.44)	(4.38)	(39.75)	
	L ₂ = DPphen	45.36	3.98	3.61	32.19	209—211
		(45.51)	(3.79)	(3.54)	(32.11)	
	L ₂ = TMphen	38.01	4.46	4.15	36.43	265—267 dec.
		(37.99)	(4.32)	(4.03)	(36.55)	
	L ₂ = bipy	45.04	4.61	11.39	13.12 ^b	155—157
		(45.28)	(4.61)	(11.74)	(13.42)	
	L ₂ = phen	47.51	4.60	11.11	12.30 ^c	225—227 dec.
		(47.90)	(4.39)	(11.18)	(12.77)	
<i>Bu₂SnX₂ · L₂</i>						
X = F,	L ₂ = phen	52.79	5.91	6.03	—	140—141
		(53.21)	(5.76)	(6.20)	—	(140—144 [15])
	L ₂ = TMphen	56.44	6.70	5.58	—	>160
X = Cl,	L ₂ = AMP	56.80	6.70	5.52	—	
		(56.80)	(6.70)	(5.52)	—	
	L ₂ = bipy	39.78	6.24	7.66	17.87	103—106
		(40.78)	(6.31)	(6.80)	(17.23)	
	L ₂ = PBI	—	—	—	—	190—181
		—	—	—	—	(179—179.5 [16])
	L ₂ = TMphen	48.02	5.51	8.26	14.21	196—197
		(48.10)	(5.41)	(8.42)	(14.23)	
	L ₂ = phen	—	—	—	—	199—200
		—	—	—	—	(200 [16])
X = Br,	L ₂ = DPphen	60.00	5.54	4.29	10.75	178—179
		(60.38)	(5.35)	(4.40)	(11.16)	
	L ₂ = TMphen	53.29	6.47	5.19	12.93	dec. >245
		(53.33)	(6.30)	(5.19)	(13.15)	
	L ₂ = bipy	—	—	—	—	175—177
		—	—	—	—	(176—177 [16])
X = I,	L ₂ = PBI	40.96	4.59	7.17	27.05	192—193
		(40.82)	(4.59)	(7.14)	(27.21)	
	L ₂ = phen	41.49	4.67	4.78	27.60	203—205
		(41.88)	(4.54)	(4.89)	(27.92)	(199—200 [16])
	L ₂ = DPphen	52.47	4.83	3.83	21.64	186—187
		(52.97)	(4.69)	(3.86)	(22.07)	
	L ₂ = TMphen	46.06	5.55	4.31	25.78	256—257 dec.
		(45.74)	(5.41)	(4.45)	(25.43)	
	L ₂ = bipy	34.51	4.22	4.44	37.30	160—161
		(33.59)	(4.04)	(4.35)	(39.50)	(163 [16])
	L ₂ = phen	36.21	3.97	4.28	37.95	230—232
		(35.98)	(3.90)	(4.20)	(38.08)	(234—236 [16])
X = NCS, L	L ₂ = bipy	47.57	5.14	11.21	12.21 ^b	151—152
		(47.52)	(5.15)	(11.09)	(12.67)	(152—153 [16])

TABLE 2 (continued)

Complex		Microanalysis data. Found (calcd.) (%)				M.p. (°C)
		C	H	N	X	
$Ph_2SnX_2 \cdot L_2$	$L_2 = phen$	49.84 (49.91)	5.18 (4.91)	10.73 (10.59)	11.47 ^b (12.10)	211–212 (208–210 [28])
	$L_2 = 0.5 phen$	53.61 (53.86)	3.04 (3.49)	4.46 (3.49)	—	235–248
X = Cl,	L = DMSO	—	—	—	—	133–136 (132–135 [29])
	L = py	52.19 (52.59)	4.08 (3.98)	5.58 (5.58)	14.17 (14.14)	141–143 (150–151 [30])
	$L_2 = AMP$	39.78 (40.78)	6.24 (6.31)	7.66 (6.80)	17.87 (17.23)	103–106
	$L_2 = bipy$	—	—	—	—	248–250 (245–248 [20])
	$L_2 = PBI$	52.38 (52.43)	4.07 (3.53)	7.37 (7.79)	12.62 (13.17)	222–223
	$L_2 = phen$	54.58 (54.96)	3.45 (3.44)	5.35 (5.34)	13.28 (13.55)	284–286 (235 [16])
	$L_2 = Cphen$	51.07 (51.57)	3.11 (3.04)	4.93 (5.01)	19.10 (19.07)	258–260
	$L_2 = DMphen$	55.84 (56.52)	4.09 (3.99)	4.96 (5.07)	12.67 (12.86)	dec. >290
	$L_2 = DPphen$	63.29 (63.91)	3.91 (3.81)	4.15 (4.14)	10.19 (10.50)	242–243
	$L_2 = Nphen$	50.18 (50.62)	3.02 (2.99)	7.29 (7.38)	12.48 (12.48)	216–219
	$L_2 = Pphen$	59.01 (60.00)	3.72 (3.67)	4.61 (4.67)	11.83 (11.83)	269–270
	$L_2 = TMphen$	57.45 (57.93)	4.64 (4.48)	4.79 (4.83)	11.81 (12.24)	267–268 dec.
X = Br,	$L_2 = bipy$	45.60 (44.82)	3.25 (3.06)	4.78 (4.75)	27.70 (27.16)	236–240 (245–248 [31])
	$L_2 = PBI$	45.79 (45.86)	3.42 (3.03)	6.46 (6.69)	24.49 (25.48)	227–228
	$L_2 = phen$	47.17 (46.98)	3.06 (2.94)	4.22 (4.57)	26.74 (26.10)	296–298
	$L_2 = DPphen$	56.06 (56.47)	3.38 (3.40)	3.59 (3.66)	20.81 (20.92)	203–205
	$L_2 = TMphen$	50.35 (50.22)	4.05 (3.89)	4.05 (4.19)	24.11 (23.92)	265–267 dec.
X = I,	$L_2 = bipy$	38.69 (38.65)	2.82 (2.64)	3.96 (4.10)	36.23 (37.19)	199–200 (200 [30])
	$L_2 = phen$	40.88 (40.74)	2.49 (2.55)	3.88 (3.96)	35.34 (35.93)	280–281
	$L_2 = DPphen$	50.43 (50.29)	3.06 (3.03)	3.14 (3.26)	29.28 (29.57)	234–236
X = NCS,	$L_2 = bipy$	52.70 (52.84)	3.37 (3.30)	10.14 (10.27)	11.06 ^b (11.74)	198–201 (195–197 [28])
	$L_2 = phen$	54.58 (54.83)	4.41 (3.16)	9.52 (9.84)	10.76 ^b (11.24)	250–255 (>210 [28])
	$L_2 = TMphen$	56.83 (57.06)	4.12 (4.16)	8.73 (8.96)	9.39 ^b (10.24)	241–244
$Bz_2SnCl_2 \cdot phen$		56.11 (56.52)	4.03 (3.99)	5.24 (5.07)	13.24 (12.86)	218–220 dec.
$Oct_2SnCl_2 \cdot L_2$						
	$L_2 = bipy$	—	—	—	—	130–132 (133–135 [16])


TABLE 2 (continued)

Complex	Microanalysis data. Found (calcd.) (%)				M.p. (°C)
	C	H	N	X	
$L_2 = \text{PBI}$	54.90 (55.35)	7.32 (6.43)	6.72 (6.92)	11.74 (11.70)	134–144
$L_2 = \text{phen}$	—	—	—	—	101 (101) [16]
$L_2 = \text{DPphen}$	63.67 (64.52)	6.66 (6.18)	3.80 (3.76)	9.36 (9.54)	104–105
$L_2 = \text{TMphen}$	58.71 (59.26)	7.86 (7.10)	4.18 (4.32)	10.82 (10.96)	202

^a S 14.60 (14.48) %. ^b Sulphur. ^c S 14.48 (13.62) %.

Discussion

The quadrupole splitting parameter (ΔE_Q) has, with the application of the results of point charge calculations [47], proved useful in distinguishing between *cis*- and *trans*- $R_2\text{SnX}_4$ configurations in complexes with octahedral geometries. Thus, a compound with a *trans*- $R_2\text{SnX}_4$ configuration (I) would be expected to give rise to ΔE_Q values of ca. 4 mm s⁻¹, whilst a value of ca. 2 mm s⁻¹ would be expected for a compound with a *cis*- $R_2\text{SnX}_4$ configuration (II). Sham and Bancroft [48] also using point charge calculations, have shown that the quadrupole splittings for *trans*- $R_2\text{SnX}_4$ compounds decrease smoothly away from 4 mm s⁻¹ for a regular octahedral geometry (III, $\theta = 180^\circ$) as the structure becomes more distorted, i.e. θ becomes less than 180° .



(III)

A study of the Mössbauer data for the complexes, presented in Table 3, indicates that the majority adopt a *trans*- $R_2\text{SnX}_4$ configuration (I) and a number of these, particularly the diphenyltin dihalide adducts, are of the distorted octahedral type (III). Five diphenyltin compounds, $\text{Ph}_2\text{SnX}_2 \cdot L_2$ (X = Cl, $L_2 = \text{AMP}$, Nphen; X = NCS, $L_2 = \text{bipy}$, phen, TMphen) adopt the *cis*- $R_2\text{SnX}_4$ structure (II). The reasons for this interesting change of geometry are not clear, but Parish and Johnson [46] have suggested that, since all *cis*- $R_2\text{SnX}_4 \cdot L_2$ complexes involve at least one chelating ligand and the majority are diphenyltin adducts, steric effects may be responsible for the *cis*-configuration.

Changing substituents on the ligand has very little effect on the Mössbauer parameters, i.e. change of the ligand substituents does not alter the electronic

(Continued on p. 233)

TABLE 3

Complex	δ^a (mm s ⁻¹)	ΔE_Q (mm s ⁻¹)	Structure	Ref.
X = I,	L ₂ = DPphen	1.51	I	
	L ₂ = TMphen	1.58	I	
	L ₂ = bipy	1.69	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.71	I	
	L ₂ = DPphen	1.67	III	
	L ₂ = TMphen	1.69	I	
X = NCS,	L ₂ = bipy	1.42	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.47	I	
<i>Pr₂SnX₂ · L₂</i>				
X = F,	L ₂ = phen	1.29	I	
	L ₂ = TMphen	1.32	I	
X = Cl,	L = py	1.57	I	
	L ₂ = bipy	1.48	I	
	L ₂ = PBI	1.56	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.55	I	
	L ₂ = DPphen	1.53	I	
	L ₂ = TMphen	1.46	I	
X = Br,	L ₂ = bipy	1.65	I	
	L ₂ = PBI	1.67	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.57	I	
	L ₂ = DPphen	1.58	I	
	L ₂ = TMphen	1.57	I	
	L ₂ = bipy	1.67	I	
X = I,	L ₂ = PBI	1.71	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.70	I	
	L ₂ = DPphen	1.61	I	
	L ₂ = TMphen	1.62	I	
	L ₂ = bipy	1.50	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.44	I	
<i>Bu₂SnX₂ · L₂</i>				
X = F,	L ₂ = phen	1.32	I	
		(1.30)	(4.03)	15
X = Cl,	L ₂ = TMphen	1.28	I	
	L ₂ = AMP	1.38	III	
	L ₂ = bipy	1.57	I	
		(1.56)	(3.83)	28
		(1.25)	(3.95)	39
		(1.64)	(4.10)	40
	L ₂ = PBI	1.64	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.57	I	
		(1.63)	(3.94)	41
		(1.59)	(4.07)	42
	L ₂ = Dphen	1.52	I	
	L ₂ = TMphen	1.44	I	
X = Br,	L ₂ = bipy	1.61	I	
		(1.62)	(3.95)	41
	L ₂ = PBI	1.64	I	
	L ₂ = phen	1.64	I	
		(1.63)	(3.94)	41
	L ₂ = DPphen	1.60	I	
X = I,	L ₂ = TMphen	1.61	I	
	L ₂ = bipy	1.71	I	
		(1.70)	(3.82)	41
	L ₂ = phen	1.67	I	
		(1.69)	(3.75)	41
	L ₂ = bipy	1.51	I	
X = NCS,		(1.43)	(4.04)	28
	L ₂ = phen	1.39	I	
		(1.42)	(4.18)	28

TABLE 3 (continued)


Complex	δ^a (mm s ⁻¹)	ΔE_Q (mm s ⁻¹)	Structure	Ref.
<i>Ph</i> ₂ <i>SnX</i> ₂ · <i>L</i> ₂				
X = F, <i>L</i> ₂ = 0.5 phen	0.68	1.98	V	
	1.22	3.04		
X = Cl, <i>L</i> = DMSO	1.27	3.95	I	
	(1.30)	(3.86)		29,33
	(1.37)	(3.69)		34
	(1.23)	(3.54)		43
<i>L</i> = py	1.23	3.57	III	
	(1.32)	(3.39)		30
<i>L</i> ₂ = AMP	0.93	2.26	II	
<i>L</i> ₂ = bipy	1.25	3.52	III	
	(1.22)	(3.93)		28
	(1.26)	(3.51)		30,43
	(1.35)	(3.90)		44
<i>L</i> ₂ = PBI	1.27	3.75	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = phen	1.20	3.52	III	
	(1.21)	(3.37)		28
	(1.28)	(3.70)		44
<i>L</i> ₂ = Cphen	1.18	3.47	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = DMphen	1.22	3.35	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = DPphen	1.24	3.50	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = Nphen	0.87	2.31	II	
<i>L</i> ₂ = Pphen	1.23	3.57	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = TMphen	1.20	3.63	III	
X = Br, <i>L</i> ₂ = bipy	1.33	3.60	III	
	(1.33)	(3.52)		30
<i>L</i> ₂ = PBI	1.28	3.93	I	
<i>L</i> ₂ = phen	1.29	3.55	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = DPphen	1.31	3.73	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = TMphen	1.25	3.72	III	
X = I, <i>L</i> ₂ = bipy	—	—		
	(1.41)	(3.35)	III	30
<i>L</i> ₂ = phen	1.33	3.42	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = DPphen	1.41	3.52	III	
X = NCS, <i>L</i> ₂ = bipy	0.80	2.26	II	
	(0.82)	(2.13)		28
<i>L</i> ₂ = phen	0.80	2.46	II	
	(0.81)	(2.34)		28
	(0.82)	(2.36)		45, 46
<i>L</i> ₂ = TMphen	0.70	2.46	II	
<i>Bz</i> ₂ <i>SnCl</i> ₂ · phen	1.51	3.52	III	
<i>Oct</i> ₂ <i>SnCl</i> ₂ · <i>L</i> ₂				
<i>L</i> ₂ = bipy	1.52	4.11	I	
	(1.59)	(4.00)		32
<i>L</i> ₂ = PBI	1.64	4.23	I	
<i>L</i> ₂ = phen	1.57	4.16	I	
	(1.56)	(4.11)		32
<i>L</i> ₂ = DPphen	1.57	3.80	III	
<i>L</i> ₂ = TMphen	1.44	4.11	I	

^a Relative to CaSnO₃.


situation at the tin atom to a large degree. (See, for example, *R*₂*SnCl*₂ · *L*₂ where *R* = Et, Ph and *L*₂ = phen and substituted phen). This is in agreement with the work of Honnick et al. [22], who observed a similar lack of effect for a series of

dimethyltin dichloride complexes with 1,10-phenanthroline and substituted phenanthroline ligands.

The observation of two quadrupole split doublets in the Mössbauer spectrum of $\text{Ph}_2\text{SnF}_2 \cdot 0.5$ phen is most interesting. Mufti and Poller [49] have reported the preparation of $\text{Ph}_2\text{Sn}(\text{NCO})_2 \cdot 0.5$ bipy and have proposed it to have the structure IV, which contains a bridging bipyridyl group. Phenanthroline, however, is a



rigid ligand and so cannot behave in a similar manner. The Mössbauer parameters obtained for $\text{Ph}_2\text{SnF}_2 \cdot 0.5$ phen are consistent with the presence of a *cis*- R_2SnX_4 octahedral group ($\delta = 0.68$; $\Delta E_Q = 1.98 \text{ mm s}^{-1}$) and a *cis*- R_2SnX_3 trigonal bipyramidal group ($\delta = 1.22$; $\Delta E_Q = 3.04 \text{ mm s}^{-1}$). Based on this data, we suggest that this complex has the structure V, which contains a bridging fluorine between the 6-coordinate and 5-coordinate tin atoms.



Acknowledgements

The International Tin Research Council, London, is thanked for permission to publish this paper. The authors would like to express their appreciation to Miss B. Patel, I.T.R.I., for experimental assistance and Dr. B. Hubesch, University of Louvain, for making available his unpublished X-ray data.

References

- 1 A.J. Crowe and P.J. Smith, *Chem. Ind.*, March, (1980) 200.
- 2 A.J. Crowe, P.J. Smith and G. Atassi, *Chem.-Biol. Interact.*, 32 (1980) 171, and unpublished results.
- 3 L.A. Aslanov, V.M. Ionov, W.M. Attiya, A.B. Permin and V.S. Petrosyan, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 144 (1978) 39.
- 4 N.W. Isaacs and C.H.L. Kennard, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1970) 1257.
- 5 M. Calligaris, L. Randaccio, R. Barbieri and L. Pellerito, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 76 (1974) C56.
- 6 L.A. Aslanov, V.M. Ionov, W.M. Attiya and A.B. Permin, *J. Struct. Chem.*, 19 (1978) 166.
- 7 E.A. Blom, B.R. Penfold and W.T. Robinson, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1969) 913.
- 8 L. Randaccio, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 55 (1973) C58.
- 9 D.H. Patterson, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Illinois, 1972.
- 10 S.L. Chadha, P.G. Harrison and K.C. Molloy, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 202 (1980) 247.
- 11 L. Coghi, C. Pelizzi and G. Pelizzi, *Gazz. Chim. Ital.*, 104 (1974) 873.
- 12 P.G. Harrison, T.J. King and J.A. Richards, *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.*, (1974) 1723.
- 13 B. Hubesch, Ph. D. Thesis, Université de Louvain, 1980.
- 14 B. Rosenberg, *Cancer Chemother. Rep.*, 59 (1975) 589.
- 15 J.C. May and C. Curran, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 39 (1972) 289.
- 16 D.L. Alleston and A.G. Davies, *J. Chem. Soc.*, (1962) 2050.
- 17 L. Pellerito, R. Cefalù, A. Gianguzza and R. Barbieri, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 70 (1974) 303.
- 18 H.G. Langer and A.H. Blut, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 5 (1966) 288.
- 19 K.A. Kocheshkov, *Uchenye Zapiski*, 3 (1934) 297.
- 20 T. Tanaka, M. Kumura, Y. Kawasaki and R. Ikawara, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 1 (1964) 484.
- 21 I.R. Beattie and G.P. McQuillan, *J. Chem. Soc.*, (1963) 1519.
- 22 W.D. Honnick, M.C. Hughes, C.D. Schaeffer Jr. and J.J. Zuckerman, *Inorg. Chem.*, 15 (1976) 1391.
- 23 J.E. Fergusson, W.R. Roper and C.J. Wilkins, *J. Chem. Soc.*, (1965) 3716.
- 24 R.J.H. Clark, A.G. Davies and R.J. Puddephatt, *J. Amer. Chem. Soc.*, 90 (1968) 6923.
- 25 A.G. Davies and R.J. Puddephatt, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 5 (1966) 590.
- 26 T. Tanaka, *Inorg. Chim. Acta*, 1 (1967) 217.
- 27 M. Wada, M. Nishino and R. Okawara, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 3 (1965) 70.
- 28 M.A. Mullins and C. Curran, *Inorg. Chem.*, 7 (1968) 2584.
- 29 R.S. Randall, R.W.J. Wedd and J.R. Sams, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 30 (1971) C19.
- 30 R.C. Poller, J.N.R. Ruddick, M. Thevarasa and W.R. McWhinnie, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1969) 2327.
- 31 A.S. Mufti and R.C. Poller, *J. Chem. Soc.*, (1965) 5055.
- 32 A.G. Davies, L. Smith and P.J. Smith, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 23 (1970) 135.
- 33 B.V. Liengme, R.S. Randall and J.R. Sams, *Can. J. Chem.*, 50 (1972) 3212.
- 34 E.O. Kazimir, Ph. D. Thesis, Fordham University, 1969.
- 35 M. Cordey-Hayes, R.D. Peacock and M. Vučelić, *J. Inorg. Nucl. Chem.*, 29 (1967) 1177.
- 36 K.M. Ali, D. Cunningham, J.D. Donaldson, M.J. Frazer and B.J. Senior, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1969) 2836.
- 37 R.H. Herber, Int. Atomic Energy Agency, Vienna, Technical Report Series, 50 (1966) 127.
- 38 R.H. Herber and H.A. Stöckler, *J. Chem. Phys.*, 47 (1967) 1567.
- 39 A.G. Davies, *Chem. in Brit.*, (1968) 403.
- 40 V.V. Khrapov, Candidate Dissertation, Inst. of Chem. Phys., Acad. Sci. USSR, Moscow (1965).
- 41 M.A. Mullins and C. Curran, *Inorg. Chem.*, 6, (1967) 2017.
- 42 L.M. Krizhanskii, O.Yu. Okhlobystin, A.V. Popov and B.I. Rogozev, *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 160 (1965) 1121.
- 43 R.C. Poller, J.N.R. Ruddick, B. Taylor and D.L.B. Toley, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 24 (1970) 341.
- 44 B.W. Fitzsimmons, N.J. Sealy and A.W. Smith, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1969) 143.
- 45 R.V. Parish, *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, 10 (1971) 224.
- 46 R.V. Parish and C.E. Johnson, *J. Chem. Soc. A*, (1971) 1906.
- 47 N.W.G. Debye and J.J. Zuckerman, *Dev. Appl. Spectrosc.*, 8 (1970) 267.
- 48 T.K. Sham and G.M. Bancroft, *Inorg. Chem.*, 14 (1975) 2281.
- 49 A.S. Mufti and R.C. Poller, *J. Organometal. Chem.*, 3 (1965) 99.
- 50 F.E. Smith, University of Prince Edward Island, personal communication.