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#### Abstract

Recrystallisation of copper(1) iodide from benzonitrile yields not the $1: 1$ adduct as with the chloride and bromide, but a novel 2:1 adduct, [(Cul) $)_{2}(\mathrm{PhCN})$ ], the nature of which has been established by single-crystal $X$-ray structure determination. Crystals are monoclinic, space group $C 2 / c, a=21.99(1), b=15.109(6), c=15.286(9) \AA, \beta=125.63(4)^{\circ}, Z=16$, and $R=0.033$ for 2403 'observed' reflections. The compound is a novel infinite polymer based on chiral, interlocking arrays of extended 'step' motifs.


Recrystallisation of the copper(I) halides $\mathrm{CuX}(\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Br}$, or I$)$ from acetonitrile yields $1: 1$ adducts which adopt the common 'stair polymer' configuration. ${ }^{2-6}$ Similar complexes are obtained for the chloride ${ }^{7}$ and bromide ${ }^{8}$ with benzonitrile, but no copper(1) iodide-benzonitrile adduct has been characterised. We find that the reaction of copper iodide with benzonitrile under nitrogen does not yield $1: 1$ stair polymers but rather colourless crystals of stoicheiometry $\left[(\mathrm{CuI})_{2}(\mathrm{PhCN})\right]$ (Found: C, 17.3; H, 1.05; I, 52.4; N, 2.90. Calc. for $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{I}_{2} \mathrm{~N}$ : C, 17.3; $\mathrm{H}, 1.05 ; \mathrm{I}, 52.4 ; \mathrm{N}, 2.90 \%$ ). The compound has been structurally characterised by a single-crystal $X$-ray study on a specimen mounted in a capillary along the needle axis as a unique, complex polymeric species (Figure).

The generators of the structure are a pair of extended $\mathrm{Cu}_{8} \mathrm{I}_{8}$ step motifs, shown dissected from the cell [Figure (a)]. Both are centrosymmetric; one $(\alpha)$ is defined so that one half is the asymmetric unit of the structure, the other half being generated by the inversion at $\left(-\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, 1\right)$. The $\mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{I}_{2}$ planes within it are defined ABCDCBA as shown (Figure); the nitrogen atoms $\mathrm{N}(1)$ at either end differ in $y$ by 0.36 , so that through its length $\alpha$ achieves a substantial inclination in $y$ through the cell, along $a$. In conjunction with its attached inversion image through ( $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1$ ), centred on ( $\frac{1}{4},-\frac{1}{4}, 1$ ), the entire $a$ axis is traversed with ABCDCBA, ABCDCBA in toto descending through one unit of $b$ from $(0,1,1)$ to $(1,0,1)$. The other, ' $\beta$ ', motif, running across the cell perpendicular to $a$ through ( $\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}$ ), is also centrosymmetric and traverses the whole cell encompassing a descent of $\frac{1}{2}$ in $y$ and connecting four $\alpha$ motifs in the process in a sequence CXAYAXC. Motifs ' $\beta$ ' are cross-linked by $B$ units to give the cell contents, which can similarly be visualised as made up of motifs ' $\alpha$ ' cross-linked by X and Y units.

One other polymeric compound with 2:1 copper(I) halidebase stoicheiometry has been reported, that of $\left[(\mathrm{CuI})_{2}{ }^{-}\right.$ (2Me-py)] (2Me-py $=2$-methylpyridine). ${ }^{9}$ However, the two compounds represent different structural classes and this is illustrated, together with the relationship between them and the 'stair' polymer, in the schematic diagrams (I)-(III). Both (II) and (III) can be considered to be derived from the stair polymer (I) in which iodide atoms on successive units replace two of the

[^0]Table 1. Non-hydrogen atom co-ordinates for $\left[(\mathrm{CuI})_{2}(\mathrm{PhCN})\right]$

| Atom | $x$ | $y$ | $z$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{I}(1)$ | $0.43909(4)$ | $0.58681(5)$ | $0.85300(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{I}(2)$ | $0.45572(4)$ | $0.29498(6)$ | $0.84748(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{I}(3)$ | $0.64531(4)$ | $0.45653(6)$ | $0.94842(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{I}(4)$ | $0.65436(4)$ | $0.15965(5)$ | $0.93865(6)$ |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(1)$ | $0.37463(8)$ | $0.43892(11)$ | $0.74664(13)$ |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(2)$ | $0.52425(9)$ | $0.44727(11)$ | $0.95145(12)$ |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(3)$ | $0.57936(9)$ | $0.30537(11)$ | $0.85081(12)$ |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(4)$ | $0.72226(9)$ | $0.30511(11)$ | $1.04898(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{N}(1)$ | $0.2774(5)$ | $0.4319(6)$ | $0.7235(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(11)$ | $0.1418(6)$ | $0.4380(8)$ | $0.6762(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(12)$ | $0.0939(8)$ | $0.3671(9)$ | $0.6242(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(13)$ | $0.0217(7)$ | $0.3749(9)$ | $0.5948(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(14)$ | $0.0006(7)$ | $0.4520(11)$ | $0.6200(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(15)$ | $0.0480(8)$ | $0.5201(10)$ | $0.6708(12)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(16)$ | $0.1200(7)$ | $0.5129(8)$ | $0.6996(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(17)$ | $0.2172(6)$ | $0.4338(7)$ | $0.7029(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{N}(4)$ | $0.7448(5)$ | $0.2992(7)$ | $1.1926(7)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(41)$ | $0.7980(6)$ | $0.2936(8)$ | $1.3961(8)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(42)$ | $0.8406(8)$ | $0.2224(9)$ | $1.4575(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(43)$ | $0.8708(7)$ | $0.2224(10)$ | $1.5663(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(44)$ | $0.8595(7)$ | $0.2930(10)$ | $1.6115(9)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(45)$ | $0.8179(8)$ | $0.3621(10)$ | $1.5506(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(46)$ | $0.7869(7)$ | $0.3633(8)$ | $1.4409(11)$ |
| $\mathrm{C}(47)$ | $0.7688(6)$ | $0.2950(8)$ | $1.2842(10)$ |

Table 2. Polymer geometry: distances in $\AA$

| $\mathrm{Cu}(1)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}(2)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}(3)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}(4)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}(1) \quad 1.96(1)$ | I(1) 2.633(2) | I(3) $2.650(1)$ | $\mathrm{N}(4)$ | ,72 |
| I(1) 2.638(1) | I(2) 2.702(2) | I(4) 2.606(1) | I(3) | 2.726 (2) |
| I(2) $2.661(2)$ | I(3) 2.693(3) | I(2) 2.694(3) | I(4) | 2.640 (2) |
| I(3) ${ }^{1}$ 2.762(2) | $\mathrm{I}\left(1^{11}\right) \quad 2.654(3)$ | $\mathrm{I}\left(2^{1}\right) \quad 2.661(2)$ | I(4II) | 2.662(2) |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(2) 2.940(3)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}\left(2^{11}\right) 2.779(3)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}(4) \quad 2.822(3)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}\left(4^{\text {III }}\right)$ | 2.938(3) |
| $\mathrm{Cu}\left(3^{1}\right) 3.012(3)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}(3) 3.257(3)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}\left(3^{1}\right) 3.025(3)$ |  |  |
| I(1) | I(2) | I(3) | I(4) |  |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(1)$ 2.638(1) | $\mathrm{Cu}(1)$ 2.661(2) | $\mathrm{Cu}(2)$ 2.693(3) | $\mathrm{Cu}(3)$ | $2.606(1)$ |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(2)$ 2.633(2) | $\mathrm{Cu}(2)$ 2.702(2) | $\mathrm{Cu}(3)$ 2.650(2) | $\mathrm{Cu}(4)$ | 2.640(2) |
| $\mathrm{Cu}\left(2^{\text {II }}\right.$ ) $2.654(3)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}(3)$ 2.694(3) | $\mathrm{Cu}\left(1^{1}\right)$ 2.762(2) | $\mathrm{Cu}\left(4^{\text {III }}\right.$ ) | 2.662(2) |
|  | $\mathrm{Cu}\left(3^{1}\right)$ 2.661(2) | $\mathrm{Cu}(4)$ 2.726(2) |  |  |
| Transformations of the asymmetric unit: I $1-x, y, \frac{3}{2}-z$; II $1-x$, $1-y, 2-z$; III $\frac{3}{2}-x, \frac{1}{2}-y, 2-z$. |  |  |  |  |



Figure. (a) (i), (ii) The extended 'step' structure motifs in orientation corresponding to Figure (b); interplanar dihedral angles are: ( $\alpha$ ) A/B, $62.7(7), \mathrm{B} / \mathrm{C}, 64.2(8), \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{D}, 66.9(8)$, ( $\beta$ ) $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{X}, 59.3(8), \mathrm{X} / \mathrm{A}, 59.5(8)$, and $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{Y}, 61.9(8)^{\circ}$. (b) The unit-cell contents of the $2: 1 \mathrm{copper}(\mathrm{I})$ iodidebenzonitrile adduct. The polymer is 'grown' from the centre of the cell, $\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right)$, discontinuities arising because of its helical structure
base ligands L in the $\mathrm{Cu}_{4} \mathrm{I}_{4}$ in each of the two arrangements that are consistent with polymer generation.

The benzonitrile ligands occupy voids in the structure, being sited around the $2_{1}$ screw axis to give rise to a lattice generating helical array. The benzonitrile ligands disrupt the close-packed structure of the iodide atoms. However, the iodide $\cdot$. . phenyl ring distances of $4.0-4.2 \AA$ are the same as the iodide... iodide distances and in this compound the phenyl groups occupy sites in the iodide lattice; it is this feature of the steric profile of both the anion and the ligand that results in this unusual polymeric system.

Atomic co-ordinates are given in Table 1, motif geometries in Tables 2 and 3. As expected, the geometries around the copper atoms are not unusual. It is worth noting, however, that, as for

(1) Stair polymer
(11) Methylpyridine polymer

(III) Benzonitrite polymer

Table 3. Polymer geometry: angles in ${ }^{\circ}$ (transformations as for Table 2)

| $\mathrm{Cu}(1)$ | $\mathrm{Cu}(2)$ |  |  | $\mathrm{Cu}(3)$ |  | $\mathrm{Cu}(4)$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}(1) \mathrm{I}(1)$ | 107.2(3) | I(1)I(2) | 112.23(7) | I(2)I(3) | 106.03(8) | N(4)I(3) | 109.9(3) |
| $\mathrm{N}(1) \mathrm{I}(2)$ | 110.7(3) | I(1)I(3) | 109.25(9) | I(2)I(4) | 106.82(8) | N(4)I(4) | 111.1(3) |
| $\mathrm{N}(1) \mathrm{I}\left(3^{1}\right)$ | 109.9(3) | I(1)I(1I) | 116.57(9) | I(2)I( $\mathbf{2}^{\text {l }}$ ) | 110.81(6) | N(4)I(4il) | 110.4(3) |
| I(1)I(2) | 113.39(7) | I(2)I(3) | 104.62(8) | I(3)I(4) | 117.61(7) | I(3)I(4) | 113.84(7) |
| I(1)I(3) | 105.90(8) | I(2)I(1) | 101.34(8) | I(3)I( $2^{1}$ ) | 113.11(8) | I(3)I(4 ${ }^{\text {III }}$ ) | 98.31(8) |
| I(2)I(3) | 109.59(9) | I(3)I( $1^{\text {III }}$ ) | 112.01(8) | I(4)I( $2^{\text {I }}$ ) | 102.33(8) | I(4)I(4 ${ }^{\text {III }}$ ) | 112.69(8) |
| I(1) | I(2) |  |  | I(3) |  | I(4) |  |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(1) \mathrm{Cu}(2)$ | 67.79(9) | $\mathrm{Cu}(1) \mathrm{Cu}(2)$ | 66.74(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(2) \mathrm{Cu}(3)$ | 75.09(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(3) \mathrm{Cu}(4)$ | 65.07(7) |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(1) \mathrm{Cu}\left(2^{\prime \prime}\right)$ | 103.38(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(1) \mathrm{Cu}(3)$ | 106.96(8) | $\mathrm{Cu}(2) \mathrm{Cu}(4)$ | 104.00(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(3) \mathrm{Cu}\left(4^{\text {III }}\right)$ | 100.41(7) |
| $\mathrm{Cu}(2) \mathrm{Cu}\left(2^{\text {II }}\right)$ | 63.43(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(1) \mathrm{Cu}\left(3^{\text {I }}\right.$ ) | 68.92(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(2) \mathrm{Cu}\left(1^{1}\right)$ | 118.47(6) | $\mathrm{Cu}(4) \mathrm{Cu}\left(4^{\text {III }}\right.$ ) | 67.31(7) |
|  |  | $\mathrm{Cu}(2) \mathrm{Cu}(3)$ | 74.24(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(3) \mathrm{Cu}(4)$ | 63.29(7) |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{Cu}(2) \mathrm{Cu}\left(3^{\text {I }}\right.$ ) | 108.18(7) | $\mathrm{Cu}(3) \mathrm{Cu}\left(1^{1}\right)$ | 67.58(7) |  |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{Cu}(3) \mathrm{Cu}\left(3^{\text {I }}\right.$ ) | 68.77(6) | $\mathrm{Cu}(4) \mathrm{Cu}\left(1^{1}\right)$ | 100.60(7) |  |  |

[(CuI) $\left.)_{2}(2 \mathrm{Me}-\mathrm{py})\right]$, the two $\mu_{4}$ iodide atoms exhibit marginally longer $1-\mathrm{Cu}$ distances on average than the two $\mu_{3}$ atoms: $2.694(13) \AA v s .2 .639(8) \AA$. Within each rhomb the internal $\mathrm{Cu}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{Cu}$ angles are significantly greater for $\mathrm{I}_{2} \mathrm{CuI}_{2} \mathrm{CuI}_{2}$ compared to either the $\mathrm{I}_{2} \mathrm{CuI}_{2} \mathrm{CuIL}$ or $\mathrm{ILCuI}_{2} \mathrm{LI}$ dimeric units: $74.24(7)-75.09(7)$ vs. $63.29(7)-68.77(6)^{\circ}$.

## Experimental

Crystallography.-Crystal data. $\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{Cu}_{2} \mathrm{I}_{2} \mathrm{~N}, \quad M=484$, monoclinic, space group $C 2 / c\left(C_{2 h}^{6}\right.$, no. 15), $a=21.99(1), b=$ 15.109(6), $c=15.286(9) \AA, \beta=125.63(4)^{\circ}, U=4128(4) \AA^{3}$, $D_{\mathrm{c}}=3.11 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}(Z=16), F(000)=3488$, monochromatic Mo- $K_{\alpha}$ radiation ( $\lambda=0.71069 \AA, \mu=102.6 \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ ). Specimen: $0.10 \times 0.10 \times 0.50 \mathrm{~mm}$; transmission factors $=1.32$ (minimum), 1.63 (maximum).

Structure determination. A unique data set was measured to $2 \theta_{\text {max. }}=50^{\circ}$ using a Syntex P2 four-circle diffractometer in conventional $2 \theta-\theta$ scan mode. 3639 Independent reflections were obtained, 2403 with $I>3 \sigma(I)$ being considered 'observed' and used in the full-matrix least-squares refinement after Gaussian absorption correction. Anisotropic thermal parameters were refined for the non-hydrogen atoms; $(x, y, z$, $\left.U_{\text {iso }}\right)_{\mathbf{H}}$ were included at estimated values. Conventional $R, R^{\prime}$ on $|F|$ were $0.033,0.027$ [statistical weights derived from $\left.\sigma^{2}(I)=\sigma^{2}\left(I_{\text {diff. }}\right)+0.0005 \sigma^{4}\left(I_{\text {diff. }}\right)\right]$. Neutral atom complex scattering factors were used. ${ }^{10}$ Computation employed the XTAL program system ${ }^{11}$ implemented by S. R. Hall on a Perkin-Elmer 3241 computer.

Additional material available from the Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre comprises H -atom co-ordinates, thermal parameters, and remaining bond lengths and angles.
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