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The structures of two edge-shared, bioctahedral, bismuth halide phosphine complexes $\left[\mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6}\left(\mathrm{PMe}_{3}\right)_{4}\right]$ and $\left[\mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6}\left(\mathrm{PMe}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}\right)_{2}\left(\mathrm{OPMe} \mathrm{Ph}_{2}\right)_{2}\right]$ have been determined and compared with those of related transitionmetal complexes.

The co-ordination chemistry of the heavier p-block elements with phosphine ligands is still a rather underdeveloped area and, although a fair number of complexes have been prepared, particularly for $\mathrm{In}^{\mathrm{III}}$ and $\mathrm{Sn}^{\mathrm{IV}}$, very little structural data are available for these or any other elements. ${ }^{1}$ Herein we report two structures of general formula $\left[\mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6} \mathrm{~L}_{4}\right]$ containing phosphine and phosphine oxide ligands ( L ) and comment on the differences between these structures and those of some related transition-metal complexes.

The trimethylphosphine complex $\left[\mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6}\left(\mathrm{PMe}_{3}\right)_{4}\right] 1$ was obtained $\dagger$ by stirring a suspension of $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}$ in neat $\mathrm{PMe}_{3} \cdot{ }^{2}$ The resulting yellow solid was recrystallised from $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ to give well formed yellow crystals which were characterised by X-ray crystallography. $\ddagger$ Complex 1 adopts an edge-shared,
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Fig. 1 A view of the molecular structure of complex 1 showing the atom numbering scheme. Hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Selected bond distances $(\AA)$ and angles $\left({ }^{\circ}\right): \mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1) 2.875(1), \mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(2)$ 2.774(1), $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(3)$ 2.916(1), $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a}) 3.403(1), \mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1) 2.866(3)$ and $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(2) \quad 2.714(2) ; \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(2) \quad 167.3(1), \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(3) 93.7(1)$, $\mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(3) 97.4(1), \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1) 86.0(1), \mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1) 82.2(1)$, $\mathrm{Br}(3)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1)$ 172.8(1), $\mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(2) 86.6(1), \mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(2) 89.3(1)$, $\mathrm{Br}(3)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(2) 80.4(1), \mathrm{P}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(2) 92.4(1), \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a}) 89.8(1)$, $\mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(\mathrm{la}) \quad 94.4(1), \quad \mathrm{Br}(3)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a}) \quad 98.9(1), \quad \mathrm{P}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a})$ 88.3(1), $\mathrm{P}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a})$ 176.2(1) and $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}(\mathrm{a}) 90.2(1)$
bioctahedral centrosymmetric structure as shown in Fig. 1 and in the diagram. The two bismuth centres do not deviate markedly from regular octahedral geometry, in common with what is usually found for six-co-ordinate bismuth, and are bridged asymmetrically by two bromine atoms $\mathrm{Br}(1)$ and $\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a})$.

One way of understanding this structure is in terms of the secondary bonding model advanced by Alcock ${ }^{3}$ and discussed more recently in connection with other bismuth halide complexes. ${ }^{4}$ As shown in $\mathbf{A}$ we can view the structure as based on a trigonal-pyramidal $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}$ centre with three secondary bonds trans to the $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}$ bonds of this unit. If the acceptor orbitals of the $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}$ molecule are the $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br} \sigma^{*}$ orbitals ${ }^{3,4}$ this trans arrangement is to be expected as is the observed correlation between the trans $\mathrm{Br}-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}$ bond distances, i.e. the shortest $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}$ distance $[2.714(2)$ vs. $2.866(3) \AA$ ] is trans to the longer $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}$ distance $[3.403(1)$ vs. 2.916(1) $\AA$ ] although care must be exercised here since the bromines are in different environments, i.e. one terminal and one bridging. Nevertheless, it is clear that the structure adopted by 1 is the only one that allows the $\mathrm{PMe}_{3}$ ligands to be trans to bromines whilst maintaining an identifiable trigonal-pyramidal $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}$ unit, and is therefore the one expected on the basis of the secondary bonding model ${ }^{3}$ whereby the Lewis bases go trans to the most electronegative atoms or groups. Moreover, the observed stereochemical inactivity of the bismuth lone pair is a consequence of this model whereby the coordination geometry around the bismuth centre is determined


Fig. 2 A view of the molecular structure of complex 2 showing the atom numbering scheme. Hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Selected bond distances $(\AA)$ and angles ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ): $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1) 3.362(1), \mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(2)$ 2.741(1), $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(3) 2.788(1), \mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a}) 2.926(1), \mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1)$ 2.725(2) and $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{O}(1) \quad 2.371(6) ; \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(2) \quad 92.7(1), \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(3) \quad 108.5(1)$, $\mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(3) 92.1(1), \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1)$ 165.1(1), $\mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1)$ 92.3(1), $\mathrm{Br}(3)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1) 85.3(1), \mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{O}(1) 86.4(1), \mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{O}(1) 88.4(1)$, $\mathrm{Br}(3)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{O}(1) 165.0(1), \mathrm{P}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{O}(1)$ 79.7(1), $\mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a}) 92.3(1)$, $\mathrm{Br}(2)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a}) \quad 171.5(1), \quad \mathrm{Br}(3)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(\mathrm{la}) \quad 92.8(1), \quad \mathrm{P}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a})$ 81.2(1), $\mathrm{O}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1 \mathrm{a}) 85.0(1)$ and $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{Br}(1)-\mathrm{Bi}(\mathrm{a}) 87.7$ (1)
by the $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}$ acceptor orbitals rather than by the lone pair itself.

We also carried out a reaction between $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{PMe}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}$ in thf ${ }^{*}$ and isolated crystals of the complex $\left[\mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6}\left(\mathrm{PMe}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}\right)_{2^{-}}\right.$ ( $\left.\mathrm{OPMe}{ }_{2} \mathrm{Ph}\right)_{2}$ ] 2. The structure of this compound, as determined by X-ray crystallography, $\dagger$ is shown in Fig. 2 and is clearly of the same basic type as 1 although in this case some adventitious oxidation has occurred such that the complex contains two phosphine and two phosphine oxide ligands. The $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}$ bond distances in $1[\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1) 2.866(3)$ and $\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(2) 2.714(2) \AA]$ and in $\mathbf{2}[\mathrm{Bi}-\mathrm{P}(1) 2.725(2) \AA]$ are comparable to that found $[2.762(3)$ $\AA$ ] in the only other example of a bismuth phosphine complex, $\left[\left\{\mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{7}\left(\mathrm{PMe}_{3}\right)_{2}\right\}_{n}\right]^{n-5}$.
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The structures of both $\mathbf{1}$ and 2 are similar to that of the complex $\left[\mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{I}_{6}\left(\mathrm{OPPh}_{3}\right)_{4}\right] 3,{ }^{6}$ but are different from the related metal(III) dimers which have been observed for a number of transition-metal complexes. These latter structures fall into two types $\mathbf{B}$ and $\mathbf{C}$. Structures of type $\mathbf{B}$ have been reported for [ $\mathrm{Zr}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{6} \mathrm{~L}_{4}$ ] ( $\mathrm{L}=\mathrm{PBu}_{3}{ }_{3}, \mathrm{PEt}_{3}$ or $\mathrm{PMe}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}^{8}$ ), whilst those of type $\mathbf{C}$ have been described for $\left[\mathrm{Ta}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{6}\left(\mathrm{PMe}_{3}\right)_{4}\right],{ }^{9}\left[\mathrm{Ru}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{6}\right.$ $\left.\left(\mathrm{PBu}^{\mathrm{n}}\right)_{4}\right]^{10}$ and $\left[\mathrm{Rh}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{6}\left(\mathrm{PBu}^{\mathrm{n}}\right)_{4}\right] \cdot{ }^{11}$ Cotton et al. ${ }^{8}$ have stated that the reasons why different structures are adopted for these transition-metal complexes are not well understood and, although we have provided a rationale for the bismuth structures, it is clear that more detailed work is required in order fully to understand the factors which determine the ligand stereochemistry in compounds of general formula [ $\mathrm{M}_{2} \mathrm{X}_{6} \mathrm{~L}_{4}$ ]. One factor which is important for the transition-metal complexes is the possibility of M-M bonding but this is unlikely to be significant for the bismuth examples, the metal-metal distances of which are quite long $[1, \mathrm{Bi} \cdots \operatorname{Bi}(a) 4.463$; 2, $\mathrm{Bi} \cdots \operatorname{Bi}(\mathrm{a}) 4.365 \AA$ §].
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[^0]:    $\dagger$ Trimethylphosphine ( $20 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}$ ) was condensed onto solid $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}(0.905$ $\mathrm{g}, 2.017 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and the resulting mixture stirred for 48 h after which time a yellow solid remained. The $\mathrm{PMe}_{3}$ was then condensed into a receiving vessel and the resulting yellow material was dissolved in $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$ and cooled ( $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) to give pale yellow crystals of complex $1(0.290 \mathrm{~g}, 12 \%)$. There is no obvious change during the course of the reaction but it would seem that the $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}$ slowly dissolves to form 1 which then precipitates. NMR $\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}\right):{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}, \delta 1.90\left(\mathrm{~d},{ }^{2} J_{\mathrm{PH}}=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}, \mathrm{PMe}_{3}\right) ;{ }^{31} \mathrm{P}$ $\left\{{ }^{1} \mathbf{H}\right\}, \delta-33.3$ (br, s); the observation of only one $\mathrm{PMe}_{3}$ environment indicates the likelihood of either a fluxional process or intermolecular exchange (Found: C, 11.95; H, 3.00. Calc. for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6} \mathrm{P}_{4}: \mathrm{C}, 12.00$; H, $3.00 \%$ ).
    $\ddagger$ Complex 1: $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6} \mathrm{P}_{2}, 0.18 \times 0.32 \times 0.36 \mathrm{~mm}, M=1201.7$, monoclinic, space group $P 2_{1} / n, a=7.920(1), b=12.007(2), c=$ 16.608(2) $\AA, \beta=96.61(2)^{\circ}, U=1568.9 \AA^{3}, Z=2, D_{\mathrm{c}}=2.543 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}$, $\mu=18.94 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}$ (Mo-K $\alpha$ radiation, $\lambda=0.71073 \AA$ ), $F(000)=1088$; $R=0.0294, R^{\prime}=0.0318$ for 110 parameters, including anisotropic thermal parameters and constrained isotropic H atoms, by refinement on $F$ from 2245 unique observed $\left[F>4 \sigma_{\mathrm{c}}(F)\right]$ data $\left(2 \theta_{\max } 50^{\circ}\right.$ ), $w^{-1}=$ $\sigma_{c}{ }^{2}(F)+16+109 G+11 G^{2}-58 S+52 S^{2}-163 G S\left(G=F_{0} \mid F_{\max }\right.$, $\left.S=\sin / \sin \sigma_{\max }\right)$, measured at 240 K on a Stoe-Siemens diffractometer and corrected semiempirically for absorption.

[^1]:    * Compound 2 was obtained from $\mathrm{BiBr}_{3}(0.089 \mathrm{~g}, 0.198 \mathrm{mmol})$ and 1 equivalent of $\mathrm{PMe}_{2} \mathrm{Ph}(0.027 \mathrm{~g})$ in tetrahydrofuran (thf) $\left(20 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}\right)$ as a sparingly soluble yellow powder from which a small number of yellow crystals were obtained after crystallisation (over a period of 2 months) from thf-hexane mixtures at $-30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Found: $\mathrm{C}, 26.25 ; \mathrm{H}, 2.90$. Calc. for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{4}: \mathrm{C}, 25.90 ; \mathrm{H}, 2.95 \%$ ).
    $\dagger$ Complex 2: $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{Bi}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{4}, 0.42 \times 0.15 \times 0.14 \mathrm{~mm}, \quad M=$ 1482.0, triclinic, space group $P \bar{I}, a=8.007(1), b=10.367(2), c=$ 14.761(3) $\AA, x=106.95(1), \beta=91.39(1), \gamma=105.75(1)^{\circ}, U=1121.0$ $\AA^{3}, Z=1, D_{\mathrm{c}}=2.195 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}, \mu=13.28 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}, F(000)=688 ; R=$ $0.0290, R^{\prime}=0.0339$ for 208 parameters and 3304 unique observed $\left[F>4 \sigma_{\mathrm{c}}(F)\right]$ data $\left(2 \theta_{\max } 50^{\circ}\right), w^{-1}=\sigma_{\mathrm{c}}{ }^{2}(F)+1+11 G+29 G^{2}+$ $3 S+4 S^{2}-24 G S$, measured at room temperature and corrected for absorption.

    Atomic coordinates, thermal parameters and bond lengths and angles for both compounds have been deposited at the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre. See Instructions to Authors, J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1992, Issue 1, pp. xx-xxv.

