A New Method for the Preparation of Bis(bistrimethylsilylmethyl)tin(\parallel) Sn[CH(SiMe₃)₂]₂ and Its Molecular Structure has been Determined by Gas Electron Diffraction. Prediction of Non-planar, *trans*-Folded Ground State Structures for Digermene (Ge₂H₄) and Distannene (Sn₂H₄)

Torgny Fjeldberg,^a Arne Haaland,^{*b} Michael F. Lappert,^{*c} Birgitte E. R. Schilling,^b Ragnhild Seip,^b and Andrew J. Thorne^c

^a Department of Chemistry, University of Trondheim NLHT, Trondheim, Norway

^b Department of Chemistry, University of Oslo, Blindern, Oslo 3, Norway

^c School of Chemistry and Molecular Sciences, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9QJ, U.K.

Reduction of $SnCl_2R_2$ [R = CH(SiMe_3)_2] (Li_2C_8H_8) provides SnR_2 , which in the gas phase (electron diffraction) is a V-shaped monomer with <CSnC 96(1)° and Sn–C 224(1) pm; *ab initio* M.O. calculations predict non-planar *trans*-folded equilibrium structures for the ethene analogues Ge_2H_4 and Sn_2H_4 .

Bis(bistrimethylsilylmethyl)tin(II) SnR_2 [R = CH(SiMe_3)₂] (1) is monomeric in cyclohexane or benzene solution (by cryoscopy) and in the gas phase (by mass spectroscopy).^{1,2} In the crystalline phase SnR_2 forms dimers, Sn_2R_4 , which may be regarded as ethene analogues. The synthesis of the disilene Si₂(mesityl)₄ has recently been reported by West and co-workers.³

SnR₂ has previously been made only from Sn^{TI} precursors: (SnCl₂)_n or Sn[N(SiMe₃)₂]₂. We now show that it is available from a Sn^{TV} starting material. Treatment of SnCl₂R₂ with Li₂(cot) (cot = C_8H_8) (1 mmol) as a saturated solution (0.24 mol dm⁻³) in diethyl ether readily yields SnR₂. SnCl₂R₂ is prepared from SnCl₄, 2LiR, and tetramethylethylenediamine in diethyl ether.

We have recorded the electron diffraction pattern of monomeric SnR_2 with reservoir and nozzle temperatures of about 120 °C and determined the molecular structure. Structure refinements were based on a model of C_2 symmetry defined by three bond distances (Sn ·C, Si ·C, and C–H), five valence angles, and three torsional angles, see (1). Least-squares refinements gave Sn–C 224(1) and Si–C 189(1) pm (mean



Sn-C 224(1) pm. <CSnC 96(1)⁵.

value); <CSnC 96(1), <SnCSi 109(1), and <SiCSi 113(1) $^{\circ}$. The other structure parameters were unexceptional.

The Sn–C bond distance is about 10 pm longer than in SnMe₄, 214.4(2) pm.⁴ A somewhat smaller difference is found between Sn–N bond distances in Sn[N(SiMe₃)₂]₂ and Sn(NMe₂)₄, 209(1)⁶ and 204.5(7) pm,⁶ respectively. In the Sn¹¹ diamide the \langle NSiN angle is 96°. The longer Sn-X bonds and smaller \langle XSnX angles in the Sn¹¹ compounds may be rationalized by assuming that the electron lone pair



(2)

Sn-C 228(3) pm. <CSnC 112°. Sn-Sn 276.4(2) pm. $\theta = 41^{\circ}$.



For (4): Ge-H 158 pm. < HGeH 107°. Ge-Ge 230 pm. $\theta = 40^{\circ}$.



Figure 1. Variation in SCF energy for C_2H_4 , Si_2H_4 , and Ge_2H_4 with fold angle θ , where θ is the angle between the metal-metal bond and the MH₂ plane of each monomer unit.

orbital has predominantly s-character, while the Sn-X bonding orbitals have mainly p-character.

An X-ray crystallographic study has shown $SnR_2[R=CH-(SiMe_3)_2]$ to be *dimeric* in the solid phase (2).¹ The structure is non-planar, *trans*-folded, the angle θ between the Sn–Sn bond and the SnC₂ plane of each monomer unit being about 41°. The Sn–Sn bond distance in the dimer is indistinguishable from the single Sn–Sn bond distance in hexaphenylditin, 277(1) pm.⁷ This is in contrast with the short C=C bonds in ethene derivatives and the Si=Si bond reported for Si₂-(mesityl)₄.³ It is further noteworthy that the Sn–C bond distance in Sn₂R₄ is indistinguishable from that in the monomer and significantly longer than in SnMe₄, while the C–C single bond in C₂Me₄ is *shorter* than in CMe₄, 150.5(2)⁸ and 153.7(3) pm, respectively.⁹

We plan to carry out structure determinations on GeR_2 and Ge_2R_4 . In the meantime we are exploring the structure and bonding in GeH_2 , Ge_2H_4 , SnH_2 , and Sn_2H_4 by means of *ab initio* M.O. calculations¹⁰ with better than double zeta basis.¹¹ The calculated equilibrium structures of GeH_2 and Ge₂H₄ are shown in (3) and (4). The experimental value for the Ge–H bond distance in GeH₄ is 152.5(1) pm¹² and for the Ge–Ge single bond in Ge₂H₆ 240.3(3) pm.¹³ The structures are clearly related to those of SnR₂ and Sn₂R₄, though the Ge–Ge single bond in Ge₂H₄ appears to be somewhat shortened through π -bonding. If the molecule is constrained to a planar conformation the Ge–Ge bond distance decreases to 220 pm which seems reasonable for a Ge–Ge double bond, and the energy is about 12 kJ above that of the equilibrium conformation. Exploratory calculations on GeMe₂ and Ge₂Me₄ give similar results.

In Figure 1 we show how the calculated SCF energy of C_2H_4 , Si_2H_4 , and Ge_2H_4 varies with the fold angle θ . The potential energy (PE) surface of C_2H_4 shows a clearly defined minimum at the planar ($\theta = 0^\circ$) conformation. The potential well for Si_2H_4 is, however, very wide; only when $\theta > 20^\circ$ is PE > kT at room temperature.¹⁴ For Ge_2H_4 the curve develops distinct minima corresponding to a *trans*-folded C_{2h} conformation. Calculations on Sn_2H_4 which are still in progress have yielded similar results; the energy of a *trans*-folded model is at least 18 kJ mol⁻¹ below that of a planar model. It seems therefore that the stability of the non-planar form of the ethene analogues Si_2H_4 , Ge_2H_4 , and Sn_2H_4 increases with increasing atomic number of the metal.

We thank the S.E.R.C. and Dow Corning (Barry) for a C.A.S.E. grant to A.J.T. and the N.T.N.F. for a grant to B.E.R.S.

Received, 23rd August 1982; Com. 1022

References

- 1 D. E. Goldberg, D. H. Harris, M. F. Lappert, and K. M. Thomas, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1976, 256.
- 2 P. J. Davidson, D. H. Harris, and M. F. Lappert, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1976, 2268.
- 3 R. West, M. J. Fink, and J. Michl, *Science*, 1981, **214**, 1342; American Chemical Society Regional Meeting, June 1982, Midland, Michigan, U.S.A.
- 4 M. Nagashima, H. Fujii, and M. Kimura, Bull. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1973, 46, 3708.
- 5 M. F. Lappert, P. P. Power, M. J. Slade, L. Hedberg, K. Hedberg, and V. Schomaker, J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1979, 369.
- 6 L. V. Vilkov, N. A. Tarasendo, and A. K. Prokofev, Zh. Strukt. Khim., 1970, 11, 129.
- 7 H. Preut, H. J. Haupt, and F. Huber, Z. Anorg. Allg. Chem., 1973, 396, 81.
- 8 I. Tokue, T. Fukuyama, and K. Kuchitsu, J. Mol. Struct., 1974, 23, 33.
- 9 B. Beagley, D. P. Brown, and J. J. Monaghan, J. Mol. Struct., 1969, 4, 233.
- 10 J. Almlöf, K. Faegri, Jr., and K. Korsell, J. Comput. Chem., 1982, 3, 385.
- 11 S. Huzinaga, personal communication; T. H. Dunning, J. Chem. Phys., 1970, 53, 2823; A. Strömberg, O. Gropen, and U. Wahlgren, personal communication.
- 12 H. W. Kattenberg, W. Gabes, and A. Oskam, J. Mol. Spectrosc., 1972, 44, 425.
- 13 B. Beagley and J. J. Monaghan, *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 1970, 66, 2745.
- 14 Similar results on Si₂H₄ have already been reported by others:
 K. Krogh-Jespersen, J. Phys. Chem., 1982, 86, 1492; H. Lischka and H.-J. Köhler, Chem. Phys. Lett., 1982, 85, 467;
 R. A. Poirier and J. D. Goddard, *ibid.*, 1981, 80, 37; L. C. Snyder and Z. R. Wasserman, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1979, 101, 5222; F. F. Roelandt, D. F. van de Vondel, and G. P. van der Kelen, J. Organomet. Chem., 1979, 165, 151; R. Daudel, R. E. Kari, R. A. Poirier, J. D. Goddard, and I. G. Csizmadia, J. Mol. Struct., 1978, 50, 115.