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## Summary

The investigation of different structure-property relations of some squaraines dyes was the objective of this thesis. The synthesized squaraines consisted of one, two or three chromophore units. For all the dyes the indole end grouped squaraine dye (4-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) was chosen as a reference system. This Monosquaraine (MSQ) was chemically modified with one and two phenyl or benzo[e]indole, respectively, in order to determine their influence on the properties of the chromophore. The unsymmetrical introduction of a single modification thereof were made according to the synthesis method of Terpetschnig et al. (Analytica Chimica Acta, 282(3):633-641, 1993). The symmetric implementation was performed according to Treibs and Jacob (Justus Liebig's Annalen der Chemie, 712:123-137, 1968). The value of the absorption maximum ( $\lambda_{\max }$ ), measured in chloroform, could thereby be shifted from 637.5 nm of the reference MSQs to 665.5 nm of the double benzo[e]indole modification. The molar absorption coefficient of the MSQs remained practically unchangeably giant at about $350000 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. A linear structure-property relation was found: for each additional $\pi$-electron pair outside the chromophore unit the $\lambda_{\max }$ value is bathochromically shifted by 7 nm .
For a better understanding of the interaction of two squaraine chromophores in one molecule, the dye units were linked together over various conjugated aromatic bridges. These bridges were selected in a way that the distance dependence (phenylene versus fluorene; naphthalene vs. anthracene), the donor or acceptor properties (phenylene vs. alkoxy-phenylene vs. perfluoro-phenylene) and the torsion angular dependence of the bridge relative to the dye system could be correlated with the optical and electrochemical properties. In order to synthesize the said Bissquaraines (BSQs) individually, the synthesis strategy of Terpetschnig et al. was adopted. As a result of the dye-dye interaction the $\lambda_{\max }$ values of these BSQs were red shifted and they were in the range of 670 to 730 nm .
Some Trissquariane (TSQs) were synthesized upon polymerization with the same bridges as the BSQs (phenylene, fluorene, alkoxy-phenylene and perfluoro-phenylene). Those $\lambda_{\max }$ values were in the range of 674-688 nm, which was a few nano meters further red shifted than the absorption of the BSQs. However, the naphthalene bridged TSQ was synthesized regio-selectively to the trimer, which showed a $\lambda_{\max }$ value of 760
nm in chloroform which corresponded to a 100 nm shift compared with the MSQ and a 30 nm shift compared with the BSQ.
The $\lambda_{\max }$ values were then related with the number of repeat units in a plot from which the bridge-dependent saturation curves were developed. Depending on the kind of the bridge, the saturation of the $\lambda_{\max }$ value will be reached after five to eight repeating units which is in the range between 700 and 800 nm . This data was used to describe a multi dimensional saturation formula to determine the absorption maximum of any structurally related dye. The parameters for this formula were given by the molecular structure of the dye. For this formula, the torsion angle between the dye system and the bridge, the distance between the individual chromophores and the number of $\pi$-electron pairs in conjugation were balanced. Thus, the influence of the donor or acceptor properties of the bridges on the $\lambda_{\max }$ value is negligible. Furthermore, the therewith calculated absorption maximum had an accuracy of a few nanometers.
The electrochemical properties of the squaraine dyes were effect by their molecular structure in similar way as the optical ones. Concluding, a linear relation between the optical band gap ( $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ ) and the first electrochemical oxidation or reduction potential ( $E_{o x}^{1}$ and $E_{r e d}^{1}$, respectively) was found. The developed structure-property relations from the optical and the electrochemical measurements were confirmed with molecular modeling. The geometry optimized molecular structures and the picture of the frontier orbitals were calculated using Density Functional Theory (DFT) with B3LYP functional and $6-31 \mathrm{G}^{*}$ as basis set. The molecular modeling additionally showed that an unsymmetrically constructed, naphthalene bridged dimeric squaraine dye shows a directional charge transfer during optical excitation. This unsymmetric BSQ was synthesized, immobilized on titanium dioxide nano-particels and to get a proof-ofconcept a first dye sensitized solar cell (DSC) was made therewith having an energy conversion efficiency $(\eta)$ of $1.3 \%$.
In addition to all the indole-based dyes, a 1,5-diaza anthrazene bridge was synthesized over a double Doebner-Miller-Reaction wherewith then the corresponding BSQ was synthesized. This BSQ shows a $\lambda_{\max }$ value of 805 nm in chloroform which was unexpectedly far red shifted. According to molecular modeling, the two squaraine dye units were fused together, which exceeds the chromophore-chromophore interactions of the other BSQs.

## Zusammenfassung

Die Untersuchung verschiedener Struktur-Eigenschafts-Beziehungen von einigen Squaraine Farbstoffen sind die Zielsetzungen dieser Dissertation. Die dafür synthetisierten Squaraine bestehen aus einer, zwei oder drei Chromophor-Einheiten. Als Referenzsystem wurde der Indol-Endgruppen-Squaraine-Farbstoff gewählt (4-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylen)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindo-lin-2-yliden)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolat). Dieses Monosquaraine (MSQ) wurde mit einer bzw. zwei Phenylsubstituenten oder Benzo[e]indolsysteme modifiziert, um deren Einfluss auf die Chromophor-Eigenschaften zu bestimmen. Die unsymmetrische, also einfache Einführung dieser Modifikationen erfolgte gemäss der Synthesemethode von Terpetschnig et al. (Analytica Chimica Acta, 282(3):633-641, 1993). Die symmetrische, also zweifache Einführung wurde gemäss Treibs und Jacob (Justus Liebig's Annalen der Chemie, 712:123-137, 1968) durchgeführt. Das Absorptionsmaximum ( $\lambda_{\max }$ ), gemessen in Chloroform, konnte dabei von 637.5 nm des Referenz MSQs bis 665.5 nm mit der zweifachen Benzo[e]indole Modifikation verschoben werden. Der molare Absorptionskoeffizient der MSQs blieb dabei praktisch unverändert riesig bei etwa $350000 \mathrm{~L} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$. Eine lineare Struktur-Eigenschafts-Beziehung wurde gefunden, welche für jedes weitere Elektronenpaar ausserhalb der Chromophoreinheit das $\lambda_{\max }$ um 7 nm bathochromisch verschiebt.
Um das Zusammenspiel zweier squaraine Chromophore in einem Molekül besser zu verstehen, wurden diese Systeme über verschiedene konjugierte aromatische Brücken miteinander verbunden. Diese Brücken wurden so gewählt, dass die Distanzabhängigkeit (Phenylen versus Fluoren; Naphthalen vs. Anthrazen), die Donor oder Akzeptor Eigenschaften (Phenylen vs. Alkoxy-phenylen vs. Perfluoro-phenylen) und die Torsionswinkelabhängigkeit der Brücke relativ zum Farbstoffsystem mit den optischen und elektrochemischen Eigenschaften in Korrelation gebracht werden konnten. Um die jeweiligen Bissquaraine (BSQs) individuell zu synthetisieren, wurde die Synthesestrategie von Terpetschnig et al. angewendet. Als Resultat der Farbstoff-Farbstoff-Wechselwirkung sind die $\lambda_{\max }$ Werte dieser BSQs rot-verschoben und liegen im Bereich zwischen 670 und 730 nm .
Einige Trissquariane (TSQs) wurden durch Polymerisation mit den gleichen Brücken wie die BSQs synthetisiert (Phenylen, Fluorene, Alkoxy-phenylen und Perfluorophenylen). Die $\lambda_{\max }$ Werte dieser TSQs lagen im Bereich von 674 bis 688 nm , was
im Vergleich mit den BSQs nur ein paar Nanometer weiter rot verschoben ist. Im Gegensatz dazu steht das Naphthalen verbrückte TSQ, welches über regioselektive Synthese zum Trimer aufgebaut wurde und ein $\lambda_{\max }$ Wert von 760 nm in Chloroform aufwies. Dieser Wert ist im Vergleich zum entsprechenden MSQ um 100 nm und zum BSQ um 30 nm rot verschoben.
Die $\lambda_{\max }$-Werte wurden dann als Funktion von der Anzahl Wiederholungseinheiten in einem Graphen korreliert, aus welchem die brückenabhängige Sättigungskurven entwickelt werden konnten. Je nach Art der Brücke wird die Sättigung von $\lambda_{\max }$ nach fünf bis acht Wiederholungseinheiten erreicht und liegt im Bereich zwischen 700 und 800 nm . Mit diesen Daten konnte eine multidimensionale Sättigungsformel zur Bestimmung des Absorptionsmaximums eines beliebigen strukturverwandten Farbstoffes beschrieben werden, dessen Parameter durch die molekulare Struktur des Farbstoffes gegeben sind. Für diese Formel wurden der Torsionswinkel zwischen Farbstoffsystem und der Brücke, die Distanz zwischen den einzelnen Chromophoren und die Anzahl an in Konjugation stehenden $\pi$-Elektronenpaare miteinander gewichtet. Somit kann der Einfluss auf den $\lambda_{\max }$ Wert der Donor- oder Akzeptorgruppen an der Brücken vernachlässigt werden. Des Weiteren, stimmten die damit berechneten Absorptionsmaxima bis auf wenige Nanometer mit den gemessenen überein.
Die elektrochemischen Eigenschaften der Squaraine-Farbstoffe werden durch deren molekulare Struktur gleichermassen wie die optischen beeinflusst. Daraus ergab sich ein linearer Zusammenhang zwischen der optischen Bandlücke ( $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ ) und dem ersten elektrochemischen Oxidationspotenzial $\left(E_{o x}^{1}\right)$; sowie dem ersten elektrochemischen Reduktionspotenzial ( $E_{r e d}^{1}$ ). Die mittels optischen und elektrochemischen Messungen hergeleiteten Struktur-Eigenschafts-Beziehungen konnten mit Molekular Modelling bestätigt werden. Sowohl die geometrie-optimierte Molekülstruktur als auch die Bilder der Grenzorbitale wurden mit Density Functional Theory (DFT) mit B3LYP Functional und 6-31G* als Basis Set berechnet. Des weiteren zeigte das Molekular Modelling, dass ein unsymmetrisch aufgebautes, naphthalen verbrücktes Squarain Dimer eine gerichtete Ladungsverschiebung während der optischen Anregung zeigt. Dieses BSQ wurde synthetisiert, auf Titandioxid-Nanopartikeln immobilisiert und als proof-ofconcept wurde damit eine Hybridsolarzelle (dye sensitized solar cell, DSC) hergestellt, welche einen Wirkungsgrad der Energieübertragung $(\eta)$ von $1.3 \%$ aufwies.
Zusätzlich zu diesen Indol-basierten Farbstoffen wurde eine 1,5-DiazaanthrazeneBrücke über eine doppelte Doebner-Miller-Reaktion synthetisiert, mit welchem dann ein BSQ Farbstoff aufgebaut wurde. Dieser BSQ zeigte in Chloroform ein $\lambda_{\max }$

Wert von 805 nm . Diese unerwartet grosse Rotverschiebung stammt gemäss Molekular Modelling von einer Fusion der Farbstoffsysteme, was über die ChromophorChromophor Interaktionen der anderen BSQs hinausgeht.
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## Chapter 1

## Introduction

If a compound possesses the ability to absorb or emit light in the visible (vis) range (400-700 nm [1]), it is called a colourant [2]. Colourants can be of inorganic or organic nature and they were classified as being either soluble dyes or insoluble pigments with many subordinated hierarchy elements [2].
The first few thoughts, when talking about dyes and pigments, are the colouring and dying of hair, textiles, paper, leather goods, plastics, walls, paintings and also their use in varnish, in CDs, DVDs and BDs, as bio markers, in TV screens and as food colourant [3]. Many of those dyes and pigments are of organic nature. The here presented work deals with organic dyes and focuses on organic molecules with more than one dye unit. The influences of the molecular structure on properties of the dye systems and the intra molecular dye-dye interactions were studied.

### 1.1 Interaction of matter with light

From the structural point of view, organic dyes are in general polarised aromatic compounds. The chromophoric part of the molecule consists of a conjugated $\pi$-electron system in between a $\pi$-electron donor ( $D$ ) and a $\pi$-electron acceptor ( $A$ ). According to the valence bond theory the organic dyes are represented by several contributing structures which either show charge separation or are neutral. The changing between these canonical forms is known as the delocalized $\pi$-system. With the help of the charge separated contributing structures the polarization is substantiated. However,
the interaction of a dye with light is described using quantum mechanics. Light as electromagnetic waves is formulated by the adapted Maxwell's differential equations 1.1 to 1.4 [1], here stated with the Nabla operator $(\nabla)$. Where the space and time dependent electric field $\vec{E}(\vec{r}, t)$ is defined by a function of the space and time dependent magnetic field $\vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)$ and visa versa. For $\mu_{0}$ and $\epsilon_{0}$ in equation 1.4 refer to the magnetic field constant and the electric field constant, respectively.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla \cdot \vec{E}(\vec{r}, t)=0 \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{gather*}
\nabla \cdot \vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)=0  \tag{1.2}\\
\nabla \times \vec{E}(\vec{r}, t)=-\frac{\partial \vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t}  \tag{1.3}\\
\nabla \times \vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)=+\mu_{0} \cdot \epsilon_{0} \cdot \frac{\partial \vec{E}(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} \tag{1.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

In order to disentangle this equation system one normally introduces the vector potential $\vec{A}(\vec{r}, t)$ and the scalar potential $\phi(\vec{r}, t)$ resulting in equation 1.5 and $1.6[1,4,5,6,7]$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vec{E}(\vec{r}, t)=-\nabla \cdot \phi(\vec{r}, t)-\frac{\partial \vec{A}(\vec{r}, t)}{\partial t} \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)=\nabla \times \vec{A}(\vec{r}, t) \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

With the help of the vector potential $\vec{A}(\vec{r}, t)$ and the scalar potential $\phi(\vec{r}, t)$ the time dependent Hamiltonian for a single free particle of mass $m$, momentum $p$ and charge $q$ in an electromagnetic field takes the form $1.7[4,5,6,7]$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
H(t)=\frac{1}{2 \cdot m}(p-q \cdot \vec{A}(\vec{r}, t))^{2}+q \cdot \phi(\vec{r}, t) \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

However, a dye is not a single particle and therefore the Hamiltonian becomes accordingly more complex. To answer the question which molecular properties interact with the electromagnetic irradiation during a finite measurement, e.g. recording an UV/vis spectrum of a dye, the time dependent Hamilton operator $\widehat{H}(t)$ of the dye is calculated. $\widehat{H}(t)$ is given by the sum of the the time independent Hamilton operator
$\widehat{H}_{0}$ and the time dependent Hamilton operator $\widehat{V}(t)$ (Equation 1.8 [4, 5, 6, 7]). $\widehat{H}_{0}$ represents the equilibrium state of the molecular system and $\widehat{V}(t)$ represents an external perturbation as the electromagnetic field of the light beam.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{H}(t)=\widehat{H}_{0}+\widehat{V}(t) \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\widehat{V}(t)$ is the negative sum of all products of a molecule property based interaction operator and a time dependent experimental stimuli. The dipole approximation was used as an approach for this equation 1.8 when only the main interactions were accounted [4]. Since the experimental stimuli is a light beam, $\widehat{V}(t)$ is split into an electric and a magnetic part. So those operators act on $\vec{E}(\vec{r}, t)$ and $\vec{B}(\vec{r}, t)$. Without going into the details, the molecule property based interaction operators are the electric dipole operator $\widehat{\vec{\mu}}_{e l}$ and the magnetic dipole operator $\widehat{\vec{\mu}}_{\text {mag }}[4]$. So the time dependent perturbation is described by the formula 1.9 [4].

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{V}(t)=-\left(\widehat{V}_{e l}(t)+\widehat{V}_{\text {mag }}(t)\right)=-\left(\widehat{\vec{\mu}}_{e l} \cdot \vec{E}(t)+\widehat{\vec{\mu}}_{\text {mag }} \cdot \vec{B}(t)\right) \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

In UV/vis spectroscopy as well as in infrared (IR) and microwave spectroscopy the electric dipole dominates the measurable interaction with the light, whereas in nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) and electron paramagnetic resonance (EPR) spectroscopy the magnetic dipole interaction with the experimental electromagnetic wave is determined. Therefore, considering an electronic transition in the UV/vis range of a chromophore, the measurable response after the perturbation with a light pulse is the electric transition dipole moment $\vec{M}_{g e}$ ( $g$ for ground state $\mid g>$ and $e$ for excited state $\mid e>$ ). One can determine $\vec{M}_{i t}$ by solving the Dirac Bra-ket notation $<f\left|\widehat{\vec{\mu}}_{e l}\right| i>(i$ for initial and $f$ for final state) with the harmonic oscillator approximation but this is only valid for the same energy state; so it is used for IR and microwave spectroscopy [4, 8,9]. For an electron transition the absolute value $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ can be approximated as linear combination of the norm of the static electric dipole moments of each electronic state ( $\mu_{e l, g}$ and $\mu_{e l, e}$ ) as shown in equation 1.10, where the sum of the coefficients $a_{g}$ and $a_{e}$ is unity.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|=a_{g} \cdot\left|\vec{\mu}_{e l, g}\right|+a_{e} \cdot\left|\vec{\mu}_{e, e,}\right|=a_{g} \cdot \mu_{e l, g}+a_{e} \cdot \mu_{e l, e} \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Except for the linear combination coefficients all three values can be estimated from a series of $\mathrm{UV} / \mathrm{vis}$ and fluorescence spectra. The experimental determination of those
values is included in section 2.2.

### 1.2 Molecular structure in relation to the absorption

After defining the general physical property for the absorption phenomenon, the structural aspects in respect to their absorption were discussed with the help of the following examples of the azo dye class [2] as representatives for most of the organic dyes [2, 10, 11] (Figure 1.1): ( $E$ )-azobenzene (1), 4-( $N, N$-dimethylamino)-azobenzene (2) and 4-( $N, N$-dimethylamino)-4'-nitro-azobenzene (3). When molecule 1 is excited by light the absorption maximum ( $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ ) is 450 nm and one quantity of the strength of the transition is the molar absorption coefficient $\left(\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\right)\right)$. The value of $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}\right)$ for molecule 1 is very low $463 \mathrm{~m}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ [2]. Understandably, molecule 1 is not a dye, because it only contains two aromatic $\pi$-systems with one $\pi$-electron accepting group $A$, namely the azo group. In accordance with the valence bond theory no canonical form with charge separation fulfilling the octet rule can be drawn for molecule 1, because it does not possess a $\pi$-electron donating group $D$. Therefore, also no static electric dipole moment is dominant in this molecule. However, when formally a donor group $D$ in form of a $N, N$-dimethylamino group at the 4-position is added to the structure of molecule 1, the azo dye 4-( $N, N$-dimethylamino)-azobenzene (2) is created (Figure 1.1). As shown in this figure, charge separation occurs in one of the canonical formulas of dye 2. From this resonance structure a reasonable static electric dipole moment for the ground state $\mu_{e l, g}$ and presumably also for the excited state $\mu_{e l, e}$ can be derived. The bigger the value of the transition moment and the more probable the charge separated canonical formulas are, the more intensive the absorptivity of the electronic transition is. Consequently, a 60 -fold higher value of $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\right)$ for dye $2\left(27500 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}\right.$ at $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}=408 \mathrm{~nm}$, [2]) than that of molecule 1 underlines the theory from a structure property relation of a $D-\pi-A$ dye system.
In order to answer the question about the properties of multi dye unit molecules, extended $D-\pi-A$ systems were investigated. When an additional $A$ in form of a nitro group was formally added to dye 2, then dye 3 (4-( $N, N$-dimethylamino)-4'-nitro-azobenzene, Figure 1.1) was formed. Dye 3 represents a $D-\pi-A-\pi-A$ system and possesses two canonical formulas with charge separation of which one is uniform with the one of dye 2 (Figure 1.1). This resonance structure is symbolized by $\overrightarrow{D-\pi-A}-\pi-A$. The second canonical formula with charge separation showed a resonance system through the hole
molecule $(\overrightarrow{D-\pi-A-\pi-A})$. These arrows were suggested as representatives for the static electric dipole moments (Figure 1.1). These two vectors of the extended dye system in dye 3 are linearly dependent because they have the same origin and the same direction. Linearly depending vectors could be linearly combined but cannot be coupled.
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Figure 1.1: (E)-azobenzene (1), 4-(N,N-dimethylamino)-azobenzene (2) and 4-(N,N-di-methylamino)-4'-nitro-azobenzene (3) and their canonical formulas.

As a result, $\vec{M}_{g e}$ of dye $\mathbf{3}$ is a linear combination of the dipole moments from the two resonance structures and therefore its value is larger than the value of $\vec{M}_{g e}$ of dye 2. With this theoretical ansatz the further increased value of $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}\right)$ to $33100 \mathrm{M}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ of dye $\mathbf{3}$ is easily explained. In addition to the hyperchromic shift, $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ is bathochromically shifted to 478 nm because of the enlargement of the $\pi$-system.
Furthermore, many different concepts to elongate the $\pi$-system in combination with $A$ and $D$ were realized, for example: $(D-\pi-A)_{n}, D-(\pi)_{n}-A, D-(\pi-A)_{n}$ and $(D-\pi)_{n}-A$, where $n$ refers to the number of repeating units. These concepts were applied in several dye families: azo dyes, the carbonyl dyes (hydroquinone, anthraquinone and perylene derivatives), arylmethane dyes and polymethine dyes to yield a diversity of hundreds of thousands of dyes $[3,2,10,11]$.
The influence on $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{a b s}$ and $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\right)$ upon elongation of the dye system led to the question if these values are further increased when one or more additional " $-\pi-A-$ " units are introduced. If yes, is it a linear increase or does it follow a function? In addition it is
of interest whether the values of $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{a b s}$ can decrease and if any exceptional or special compounds exist. Meier dealt with these questions and summarized his results in a review [12, 13]. He discussed the relation of the number of repeating units $n$ with the optical properties with the help of several examples of the polyene dye class (dyes with $D-(\pi)_{n}-A$ as general structure) polythiophene dyes, merocyanine dyes and some other dye classes [12]. Here, the dye system $D-(\pi)_{n}-A$ was chosen to explain the context. Therefore, a series of phenylene vinylene dye systems 4a-e were displayed in figure 1.2. The donor of the dyes 4a-e was a tertiary amine function and the $A$ was varied as shown by the different R's being a hydrogen (4a), a cyano group (4b), a formyl function (4c), a nitro group (4d) or a dicyanovinylene moiety (4e). For each series the number of repeating units $n$ was varied from one to four. The series 4a-c showed a monotonic growth of the $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}$ value with increasing number of repeating units $n$. Which was explained with the expansion of the $\pi$-system [12] comparable with the elongation of the one dimensional box length in the electron-in-the-box model [14]. In contrast, the values of $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}(n)$ for the two other series $\mathbf{4 d}$,e run in the opposite direction (Figure 1.2). Particularly, because of the very strong $A$ (nitro group and dicyanovinylene moiety) in comparison with the amine donor in respect to the Lewis acid-base theory. According to Meier, the smaller the distance in the molecule inbetween $A$ and $D$ was and the stronger $A$ was, the more populated the canonical structure with charge separation was, resulting in a more red shifted spectra due to the intra molecular charge transition (ICT) [12]. The resulting monotonic hypsochromic shift is a contrary tendency to the bathochromic shift upon $\pi$-electron framework elongation. If the ICT dominated over the bathochromic effect by enlarging the $\pi$-system, the $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ was hypsochromically shifted, else bathochromic. However, in any case the value of $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ reached a limit - so called $\lambda_{\infty}-$ after a certain number of repeating units $n$ (Figure 1.2, [12]). $\lambda_{\infty}$ corresponded to $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ of a poly phenylene vinylene [15]. The progress of $\lambda_{\max }(n)$ was described with an exponential growth function (Equation $1.11[15,12]$ ) which was fitted to the data set, where $\lambda_{1}$ was equal to $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ of the initial compound ( $n=1$ ) and $b$ represents the only parameter in this equation!

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\max }(n)=\lambda_{\infty}-\left(\lambda_{\infty}-\lambda_{1}\right) e^{-b(n-1)} \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

In general the limit of the optical properties was approximatively reached after 5 to 10 repeating units. This point was called effective conjugation length ( $n_{\text {eff }},[15,12]$ ) and it represented the canonical formula with the furthermost charge separation. $n_{\text {eff }}$ was


Figure 1.2: Comparison of $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ of phenylene vinylene dye system series $4 a-e$ with various different R's as acceptors being a hydrogen (4a), a cyano group (4b), a formyl function (4c), a nitro group (4d) or a dicyanovinylene moiety (4e); $n=1$ to 4 [12].
calculated using the same parameters as in equation 1.11 from equation $1.12[15,12]$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{e f f}=1+\frac{\ln \left(\lambda_{\infty}-\lambda_{1}\right)}{b} \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Meier stated, that equation 1.11 was true for all conjugated oligomeric dyes, except for the cyanine dye class [12] which made them more interesting for further investigation. The cyanine dye class is part of the polymethine dye family [11]. In order to see the special behavior of the cyanine dye class, their function $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}(n)$ was plotted with other dye classes of the polymethine dye family in figure 1.3: polyene oligomers (magenta) [16], poly(triacetylene) oligomers (red) [17], poly(phenylene vinylene) oligomers (light green) [15], merocyanine dyes (blue) [18], oxonol dyes (cyan) [18] and cyanine dyes (black) [18]. In all these cases the values of $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}(n)$ showed a monotonic increase with mostly a decreasing slope, resulting in a limitation, except for the oxonol dyes and the cyanine dyes; or at least no proven convergence up to now. Because of the linear


Figure 1.3: Some groups of the polymethine dye class: polyene oligomers (magenta) [16], poly(triacetylene) oligomers (red) [17], poly(phenylene vinylene) oligomers (green) [15], merocyanine dyes (blue) [18], oxonol dyes (cyan) [18] and cyanine dyes (black) [18].
behaviour of the function $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}(n)$ for these two dye classes the cyanine dyes (Equation 1.13 ) and the oxonole dyes (Equation 1.14) it is suggested, that no limitation of the optical properties exist.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \lambda_{\max }(n)=105 \cdot n+211 \quad[n m] \quad \text { with } \quad R^{2}: 0.999  \tag{1.13}\\
& \lambda_{\max }(n)=93 \cdot n+175 \quad[n m] \quad \text { with } \quad R^{2}: 1.000 \tag{1.14}
\end{align*}
$$

It is not yet clearly known why the behavior of the oxonol dyes and cyanine dyes is fundamentally different from the analogue merocyanine dyes and polyenes. Obviously, from the structural point the two latter are basically neutral structures. They therefore have one or several canonical formulas where charge separated occurs which is similar to the above mentioned canonical formulas of azo dyes 2 and $\mathbf{3}$. However, oxonol dyes and cyanine dyes have a permanently charged conjugated and therefore delocalized
$\pi$-system with two mirror-inverted contributing structures which fulfill the octet-rule (Figure 1.4). Thus, one can set $n_{\text {eff }}$ equal to $n$ for the reported data of the oxonol dyes and cyanine dyes. And according to Shalhoub et al. the cyanine dyes were "real world" examples for the electron-in-the-box model [11, 14]. So no limiting effective conjugation length ( $n_{\text {eff }}$ ) exists than the real length of the resonance system. Because the probability to find oxonol and cyanine dyes in the canonical form with charge separation is $100 \%$, these dyes have a bigger $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ value in respect to the one for the merocyanine dyes and the polyenes. The static electric dipole moment for each canonical form of the cyanine and the oxonol dyes was also drawn in figure 1.4. In the conversion from one


Figure 1.4: The two mirror-inverted canonical forms from cyanine dyes (top) and oxonol dyes (bottom) with their static electric dipole moment approximated as schematic representation (always below the structure).
form into the other the charge also moves, entailing an oscillation of $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ since the two canonical forms have an opposite vectorial orientation. Thus it is to mention, that these dye systems cannot be elongated from the side meaning the chromophore synthon of these dyes starts and ends with the heteroatoms, but neighbouring groups have a strong influence on the chromophoric part of the dye [11].
The above mentioned concept to connect several $D-\pi-A$ units together was also applied to the cyanine dye class. This ansatz led to the interesting questions whether the connection influences the optical properties and whether the optical properties show a linear behaviour or if they follow a saturating growth function. Kiprianov dealt with these questions and studied the interference of two covalently connected cyanine dyes [19]. He found, that the total transition dipole moment $\left|\vec{M}_{\text {total }}\right|$ of dimeric cyanine dyes is a result of a coupling of the individual transition dipole moment $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ of each chromophore
unit and not a linear combination. By comparing a series of dimeric cyanine dyes he also found a dependency of the relative angle $(\varphi)$ of the two connected chromophores. In the two extreme cases, where $\varphi$ is $0^{\circ}$ or $180^{\circ}$, the connection is either serial or parallel as indicated in table 1.1. In this table the schematic representation of the cyanine dyes of figure 1.4 with suggested dipole moments were used to illustrate the theory of Kiprianov. In both cases the two individual dipole moments of each chromophore unit can be drawn rectified or antipodal. When both chromophores in such a compound were the same, then the sum of the individual dipole moments in the antipodal combination is zero and consequently $\left|\vec{M}_{\text {total }}\right|$ is also zero. In terms of the previously mentioned quantum mechanic description, if the time dependent perturbation operator $\widehat{V}(t)$ (equation 1.9) acts on zero, the time dependency vanishes. Concluding, the state with the antipodal combination of the dipole moments does not interact with light. Furthermore, Kiprianov defined that the state where charge repulsion occurs as the high energy state. For the serial connection of the chromophores the antipodal combination of the theoretically individual dipole moments is the high energy state and for the parallel connection it is the rectified combination [19] (table 1.1). According to him this led to the following result for a dimeric cyanine dye [19]: in respect

Table 1.1: Comparison of serial and parallel connected cyanine dyes by the schematic representation from figure 1.4 with the individual dipole moments and the overall transition moment $\left|\vec{M}_{\text {total }}\right|$ [19].

|  | serial connection | parallel connection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| High energy state | $\longrightarrow\left(\vec{M}_{\text {total }}=0\right.$ |  |
| Low energy state |  | $\left\|\overrightarrow{\mathrm{M}}_{\text {total }}\right\|=0$ |

to the absorption band of the corresponding single cyanine dye the absorption band is bathochromically shifted when serially connected, because the measurable optical transition (rectified dipole moment combination) is in the lower energy state. For the
absorption band of the parallel connected compound the absorption band is therefore hypsochromically shifted.
The correlation of Kiprianov paved the way for the preparation of new dyestuffs. With his serial approach, oligomeric and polymeric cyanine dyes could be synthesized which absorb in the far near infra red (NIR) region, but up to now only a few have been reported. The first oligomeric cyanine dye ( $n: 4-6$ ) was described by Pailer and RennerKuhn [20], Kiprianov reported a cyanine dye trimer [19], Kossmehl et al. proclaimed polymeric cyanine dyes $[21,22]$ and Geiger et al. recently synthesized polymeric cyanine dyes with $n$ : 30-60 [23]. They all used an eight $\pi$-electron resonance system as dye, a so called trimethine cyanine dye, however with some different connecting groups. The measured bathochromic shifts between the trimethine monomer $\left(\lambda_{\max }^{a b s} \approx 550 \mathrm{~nm}[22,23]\right)$ and the polymers ( $\left.\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}: 680-710 \mathrm{~nm}[22,23]\right)$ were 130-160 nm . Since the polydispersity of the polymeric material from Geiger et al. [23] was broad and its published absorption spectrum did not show an absorption curve with several discrete absorption maxima it is assumed that $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}(n)$ of serially coupled cyanine dye systems connected over the reported conjugated bridges will show a limitation. Geiger et al. also introduced a twelve $\pi$-electron resonance system (heptamethine cyanine dye) into a polymer and observed the same bathochromic shift of 160 nm ( $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ (monomer): $831 \mathrm{~nm}, \lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ (polymer): 990 nm ) [23]. Since only little was reported in this area the field of oligomeric and polmyeric cyanine dyes is still undiscovered. Nevertheless, new questions arose. Whether the structure of the connected conjugated bridge influences the coupling and therefore the optical properties and if the reported bathochromic shift of 160 nm is the maximal achievable one. To these questions it is refered in section 1.4 after the introduction into the main dye class for this thesis.

### 1.3 Squaraine Dyes

If an oxonol dye is formally integrated into a cyanine dye then it can be done in such a way that the charges are still permanently separated but leading to an overall electronically neutral species. One of these special species are the so called squaraine dyes, or just squaraines. They were named according to their synthetic equivalent: squaric acid (3,4-dihydroxy-3-cyclobuten-1,2-dion). Here, squaraine 5 was formally made from a pentamethin cyanine dye 6 and a monomethin oxonol dye 7 as shown in figure 1.5. Since it is a combination of two polymethine dye systems their dipoles


Figure 1.5: Artificial combination of a pentamethin cyanine dye 6 and a monomethin oxonol dye 7 to a squaraine 5.
were also combined. When all four resonance structures were drawn side by side as in figure 1.6, one could almost think that squaraines have rather an electronic quadrupole than a dipole. Indeed, squaraines have a not-negligible quadrupole which interacts in solution with the permanent dipole of the solvent [24]. Also the quadrupole tensors were calculated by Xu et al. [25]. A quadrupole is also a condition for non-linear optics (NLO) and those effects were surprisingly big for squaraines [26,27,28]. However, some of


Figure 1.6: The four resonance structures of squaraine 5 with its controversial quadrupole (drawing).
these NLO effects were later diminished by Ashwell et al. [29].
Squaraines were not only used for NLO applications but also in solar cells, due to their good ability to absorb light and transfer the energy of the absorbed light efficiently which is an essential property for this application [30]. Unsymmetric squaraine dyes were used as sensitizer in dye sensitized solar cells (DSC's) where they achieved an Incident-Photon-to-electron Conversion Efficiency (IPCE) of over 80\%, which is quite unique in this area $[30,31,32]$. However the "energy conversion efficiency" $(\eta)$ was only
around $5 \%$, because squaraines similar to cyanine dyes have an intense but narrow absorption band. Efforts were made to broaden the absorption band but the dye showed a diminished $\eta$ of about $1 \%$ presumably due to an unoptimised cell preparation [33]. Also polymeric squaraine dyes were prepared [34,35,36], but since they were barely soluble they were not characterized very well. Their optical band gap ( $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ ) of 0.8 eV was extrapolated from a diluted sulfuric acid solution. This very low value of $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ gave an input to theoreticians which calculated some polymeric squaraines with ab initio methods and predicted semiconducting properties for this dye class [37]. As a result several chemists synthesized polymeric squaraines and measured their conductivity [38, 39], which was poor ( $10^{-7}$ to $10^{-4} \mathrm{~S} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ [38]). Although lots of oligomeric and polymeric squaraines were reported there is less known about the interaction of the chromophores over the conjugated bridge than for the cyanine dyes.
Additionally, the optophysical property of squaraines to absorb light and transfer the energy was also used in cancer treatment by Devi et al. [40]. He used bis(3,5-diiodo-2,4,6-trihydroxyphenyl)squaraine as an anti skin cancer agent [40]. They used cancerogenic mice and medicated them with this squaraine dye under full sun light treatment. Basically, the dye acted as a photo energy absorber which interacted after excitation with oxygen and produced singled oxygen. This reactive compound "burnt" the tumors. It was also found, that this treatment reactivated the apoptosis (programmed cell death, which is arrested during cancer progression [40]). Both properties led to a destruction of the cancer. Indeed, the reduction of the mean tumor burden on mice was 88\%.

### 1.4 Targets and Approach

As previously indicated, the knowledge about squaraines with more than one chromophore is poor. In order to increase it, the targeted questions concentrate on the structure property relations of coupled squaraines. The main questions were: How differently conjugated bridges influence the coupling of two squaraines? And whether one can predict the optophysical properties from the nature of the coupling or not. In order to prove a coupling inbetween two squaraine chromophore units, the structural influence of the aromatic surrounding on the optophysical properties of squaraines were investigated by model compounds. As a reference dye, the unmodified 3 H -
indole squaraine 8 (Figure 1.9) was chosen because of the following four reasons: Firstly, the indole side group is synthetically readily available, offers several synthetic modification possibilities and orthogonal derivatization. Secondly, the used 3 H -indole offers possibilities for derivatization at the aromatic synthon, nitrogen side group as well as at the $3 H$-dimethyl groups. Thirdly, the incident solubility of these dyes increases in respect to other aromatic end groups as quinolines, oxazolines, thiazolins [11] due to the latter methyl groups. Fourthly, the 3 H -indoles are also a common end group for cyanine dyes [11] which facilitates the comparison with literature.
The model compounds were mono squaraines (MSQs) with an additional aromatic ring system connected to the 3 H -indole end group. On the one hand, the additional aromatic ring system was connected at the 5-position of one (MSQ 9) or on both (MSQ 10) 3 H indoles as phenyl substituent as shown in figure 1.7. On the other hand, the additional
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Figure 1.7: Targeted mono squaraines (MSQs) used to study the influence of the aromatic end groups on the optophysical properties of the chromophore.
aromatic ring system was condensed to the [e] bond of the $3 H$-indoles resulting in MSQ 11 and MSQ 12 with one and two $1 H$-benzo[e]indole end groups, respectively (Figure 1.7). Please also note the changed numeration of indoles and benzo[e]indole according to the IUPAC nomenclature.
The basic principle to explore the structure property relation of squaraines with two chromophore units connected over a conjugated bridging synthon was to prepare
defined bis squaraine (BSQ) dyes with 1 H -benzo[e]indole end groups where only the bridging synthon was varied. Furthermore, it was decided to aim at solely serially connected dyes because in this relative constitution only one allowed transition occurs leading to a bathochromic shift of the absorption band according to Kiprianov (table 1.1).

The interesting questions concerning the bridging synthon were whether the torsion angle $(\phi)$ between the $\pi$-system of the chromophore and the $\pi$-system of the conjugated bridge is a factor influencing the dye-dye interaction. Whether the distance inbetween the two chromophores plays an important role. And whether the interaction is effected by a different electrostatic environment of the bridge. As an approach for the study of the influence of $\phi$ the tilted phenylene bridging synthon and the planar naphthalene bridging synthon were introduced resulting in the bis squaraines (BSQs) 13 and 14, respectively, as shown in figure 1.8. To determine the distance dependency in the bridging synthons of the BSQs 13 and 14, an additional phenyl system was inserted, resulting in the fluoreneylene bridged BSQ 15 and the anthracene bridged BSQ 16 (Figure 1.8). The influence of the aromatic end groups on squaraines with two chromophores was analysed using the naphthalene bridge. Thereto both end groups were changed to 3 H indoles in BSQ 17 (Figure 1.9). Kiprianov also investigated the combination of different chromophores [19], however, only squaraines were used as chromophores in this work. To study this possibility, two different end groups were introduced in a naphthalene bridged BSQ 18 resulting in two slightly different chromophores.
To study the effect of the electronic environment of the bridge, the phenylene synthon was modified. To create a higher $\pi$-electron density on the bridge an alkoxy phenylene synthone was used and the opposite, a poorer $\pi$-electron density, a tetrafluoro phenylene bridge was used. These two bridges were introduced in the target molecules BSQ 19 and BSQ 20, respectively (Figure 1.9).
The next interesting question was whether the Meier's equation could be adapted to the squaraines with more than one dye unit connected over the before mentioned bridging synthons. For this, oligomeric squaraines were targeted with the phenylene bridged dye 21, the fluoreneylene bridged dye 22, the bis-alkoxy-phenylene bridged dye 23, tetrafluoro phenylene bridged dye 24 and in addition to investigate on the distance dependency another oligomeric squaraine (dye 25) was synthesized. Dye 25 is the homo oligomer of the reference dye 8 connected over a single bond at the 5 -position of the indole system. Alongside the naphthalene bridged oligomeric dye 26 was synthesized.

Next to the torsion angle also the planarity of bridge might have an influence on the coupling. Consequently, the out-of-plane elements in the five membered ring system of the 3 H -indoles on the bridging synthons were replaced by a six membered aromatic system. The 1,5-diaza anthracene derivative was introduced as a bridging synthetic equivalent into BSQ 27 (Figure 1.8).
In order to analyse the above named structure based impact, the optical properties of the target molecules were studied. It was investigated whether the structure have a similar or different influence on the absorption maximum $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$, the molar absorption coefficient $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{a b s}\right)$, the emission maximum $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{a b s}$, the Einstein coefficients ( $\mathrm{A}_{g, e}$ and $\mathrm{B}_{g, e}$ ), the static electronic dipole moments of the ground state and excited state ( $\mu_{e l, g}$ and $\mu_{e l, e}$ ) and the optical band gap ( $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ ). Additionally, the question was asked whether the predicted bathochromic shift correlates with the transition moment $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ of the dye as the theory of Kiprianov predicted. Thereto, $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ was calculated on the one hand by the integral of the absorbance of a UV/vis spectrum (see section 2.2.1) and on the other hand with the help of the Lippert parameter which was determined by the solvatochromy of the dyes (see section 2.2.2).
In addition, the structure was related to the electrochemical properties. Those were determined by cyclic voltammetry measurements to give evidence whether the redox potentials, the electronic band gap ( $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{e l}$ ) or the number of involved electrons were influenced by the molecular structure of the target molecules. Furthermore, the question shall be answered whether the optical property correlates with the electrochemical ones.
The structural influence of the bridge in the BSQs on the spacial frontier orbital cloud distributions was investigated by molecular modeling using the reported parameters by Geiger et al. [32] on the Ipazia cluster [41].
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Figure 1.8: Targeted bis squaraines (BSQs) used to study the influence of different bridging synthons on squaraines with two chromophores. The circle represents the phenylene, the fluorenylene, the bis alkoxy phenylene and the tetra fluoro phenylene bridging synthon. The rectangle represents the naphthalene, the anthracene and the diaza-anthracene bridging synthon.
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Figure 1.9: Special targeted bis squaraines (BSQs) used to study the influence of the aromatic end groups on squaraines with two chromophores.

## Chapter 2

## Results and discussions

### 2.1 Synthesis

### 2.1.1 Synthesis of squaraines with one dye unit

The synthesis towards the reference mono squaraine (MSQ) dye 8 started with an octylation of 1,1,2-trimethyl-1H-indole to yield imminium ion 28 as shown in figure 2.1 (details on page 126). In the literature, indole derivatives are normally alkylated in acetonitril with a yield of $46-59 \%$ within $72 \mathrm{~h}[42,31,43,44]$. In the present case, the reaction was performed in 1-butanol which yielded $68 \%$ in half the time. Further correction of the reported "standard" procedure had to be made, namely an anion exchange from the in situ generated imminium iodide 28 to the imminium perchlorate. This was necessary because the iodide was a honey-like resin and the exchange lead to a crystalline powder. The final reaction step to obtain MSQ 8 was a double Knoevenagel type condensation (page 94). Thereto, the imminium perchlorate 28 was deprotonated in situ by quinoline to the homologous Emil-Fischer base which then reacted as the reactive nucleophilic species with the electrophilic squaric acid. Interestingly, the reported homologue product with $N$-methyl instead of $N$-octyl groups has a decomposition point at about $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ [45, 46]. However, MSQ 8 and also its dibromo derivative 29 (Figure 2.4) have a melting point of $155-160^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $205-215^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, respectively. Furthermore, MSQ 8 can be sublimated which is an outstanding property for a permanently charged organic dye, especially for a possible further use of this compound in thin-film photovoltaic applications.
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Figure 2.1: a) Synthesis of imminium perchlorate 28 from 1,1,2-trimethyl-1H-indole, details described on page 126; b) synthesis of MSQ 8 (page 94).

The route to obtain unsymmetrical squaraines with one dye unit was developed by Terpetschnig et al. [47, 48]. Their route was followed to produce the mono phenyl extended MSQ 9 (Figure 2.3). For this, squaric acid diethyl ester (30) (Figure 2.2) and bromo indolium compound 31 (Figure 2.2) had to be synthesized first. The diester 30 was synthesized according to Liu et al. [49] with necessary changes in the isolation procedure (page 130). Liu et al. prepared the diester 30 as yellow oil after column chromatography with $91 \%$ yield. Here, it was distilled twice to get a colourless transparent liquid with a similar yield of $86 \%$. The other intermediate, the bromo indolium derivative 31, was synthesized starting with a Fischer-Indole-Synthesis according to the descripced method by Kim et al. [43] from 4-bromophenylhydrazine hydrochloride to the bromo indole derivative 32 [50] in 49\% yield (page 132). Followed by an ethylation reaction of intermediate 32 in 1-butanol yielded bromo indole derivative 31 [50] (page 131). The next reaction step towards the unsymmetrical MSQ 9 (Figure 2.3) was the coupling of one indole synthetic equivalent to the squaric acid derivative. So imminium perchlorate 28 was deprotonated with triethylamine to the homologue Emil-Fischer base which then reacted as a nucleophilic en-amine with the electrophilic vinylogue carboxylic acid ester synthon in squaric acid diethyl ester 30 which yielded in ester 33 (Figure 2.3; details on page 133) after elimination of ethanol. Next, the ester group in the ester 33 was cleaved in alkaline conditions to obtain the acid sodium salt of 34 [48] which was then acidified in aqueous solution to yield the free, water insoluble acid 34 (page 135). With the isolated acid 34 the pH could be controlled easier in the following reaction than with the sodium salt, because the latter contained a not negligible amount of inseparable sodium hydroxide. The subsequent condensation



Figure 2.2: a) Synthesis of squaric acid diethyl ester 30 from squaric acid (page 130); b) synthesis of bromo indole derivative 32 from 4-bromophenylhydrazine hydrochloride (page 132); c) synthesis of bromo indolium compound 31 (page 131).
reaction of acid 34 with the previously produced bromo indolium derivative 31 according to literature $[47,48]$ yielded an unsymmetrical squaraine dye 35 (page 136). Via the
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Figure 2.3: a) Synthesis of ester 33 from imminium perchlorate 28 and diester 30 (page 133); b) synthesis of acid 34 (page 135); c) synthesis of bromo dye 35 also by bromo indolium derivative 31 (page 136); d) synthesis of boron dye 36 (page 138); e) synthesis of unsymmetrical MSQ 9 (page 95).

Miyaura-Borylation-Reaction [51] with the protocol described by Sauter et al. [52,53] the aryl bromide in dye 35 was transformed into a boronic acid ester to yield borone dye 36 (page 138). By following the patent protocol [52] MSQ 9 was yielded by the Suzuki coupling of boron dye 36 with bromobenzene (page 95).
The synthesis to the symmetric MSQ 10 is illustraded in figure 2.4 and started with the octylation of bromo indole derivative $\mathbf{3 2}$ in 1-butanol to bromo imminium iodide $\mathbf{3 7}$ (page 139), followed by a double Knoevenagel type condensation with squaric acid to the meltable squaraine dye 29 analogue to the method in [43] with necessary changes (page 128). Dye 29 was purified by column chromatography where an interesting major


Figure 2.4: a) Synthesis of bromo imminium iodide 37 from bromo indole derivative 32 (page 139); b) synthesis of dibromo dye 29 (page 128); c) synthesis of diboron dye 38 (page 140); d) synthesis of symmetric MSQ 10 (page 96).
side product was separated ( $3-5 \%$ yield) which was an unsymmetric squaraine dye with a similar structure to dye 29 according to NMR analysis but with two different $N$-alkyl chains: one a $N$-octyl and the other $N$-butyl (data not shown). It is suggested that the butyl chain originated from 1-butanol in the previous octylation from an undesired side reaction. Thereby, the nitrogen atom in indole 32 attacks the electrophilic carbon of protonated 1-butanol in a $S_{N} 2$ reaction which is caused by traces of water. Even the crystallization step in order to purify the alkylated indolium derivative was insufficient for
the removal of this major side product.
The next reaction step in the route towards MSQ 10 was a double Miyaura-BorylationReaction with dibromo dye 29 according to the prescription of Sauter et al. [52], but with an adjusted isolation method of the diboron dye 38 (page 140). The thereby produced intermediate and product react with the starting material under the applied conditions in an undesirable poly Suzuki cross coupling reaction. Therefore, a low concentration of staring material in the reaction mixture ( $\sim 13 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and a 100\% excess of bis(pinacolato)diboron was used. Thus, no dimeric or oligomeric side products were detected by UV/vis spectroscopy and NMR analysis in the isolated product. Finally, the desirable Suzuki coupling of the diboron dye 38 with bromobenzene yielded MSQ 10 ( [52], details on page 96).
For the production of the unsymmetrical MSQ 11 the Terpetschnig ansatz was adapted (Figure 2.5). The two different end groups were synthesised separately. One end group was prepared by starting with an etylation reaction of 2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indole to indolium iodide 39 as reported by Pardal [42] with the following adjustments: 1-butanol was used instead of acetonitril, only 2 equivalents of ethyl iodide in respect to 3-5 equivalents were inserted and the concentration of the starting material in the reaction mixture was increased from 0.04 M to 2.3 M . All these modifications yielded one third more product in half the time (page 141). The other end group was synthesised as already published elsewhere [33]. Hereunto, 1,1,2-trimethyl-1H-benzo[e]inole was ethylated in 1-butanol to the benzo[e]indole derivative 40 (page 142) which was then condensed with squaric acid diethyl ester 30 in a Knoevenagel type condensation to ester 41 (page 143). Subsequent alkaline ester cleavage of ester 41 followed by acidification yielded the free acid 42 (page 145). Both end groups, indolium iodide 39 and acid 42 were then combined by another Knoevenagel condensation to yield MSQ 11 (page 98).
The double benzo extended MSQ 12 was produced in a one step synthesis from benzo[e]indole derivative 40 with squaric acid by a double Knoevenagel type condensation (Figure 2.6) according to Kim et al. [43]. During the optimization of the isolation method of MSQ 12 two differently coloured crystals were obtained. Copper coloured crystals appeared when MSQ 12 was recrystallized from chloroform and they were golden-green when methanol was used for the recrystallization. According to differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) and NMR analysis the former showed solvent incorporation and the latter not. Details thereof are reported in the experimental description on page 99.






Figure 2.5: a) Synthesis of indolium iodide 39 from 2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indole (page 141); b) synthesis of benzo[e]indole derivative 40 from 1,1,2-trimethyl-1H-benzo[e]inole (page 142); c) synthesis of ester 41 also with diester 30 (page 143); d) synthesis of acid 42 (page 145); e) synthesis of unsymmetric MSQ 11 also with indolium iodide 39 (page 98).


Figure 2.6: a) Synthesis of symmetric MSQ 12 (page 99).

### 2.1.2 Synthesis of squaraines with two dye units

The retrosynthetic analysis of bis squaraine dyes (BSQ's) followed an enhanced method from the Terpetschnig ansatz. Thereby, any BSQ was split into two squaraine containing synthetic equivalents like the previously described acid 42 (Figure 2.5) and the bridge with two alkylated $3 H$-indolium synthons. To improve the solubility of the BSQ's their benzo[e]indole end group was alkylated with an octyl chain. Therefore, the homologue acid 43 (Figure 2.7) from the published one $42[32,33]$ was prepared as follows: First,


Figure 2.7: a) Synthesis of imminium ion 44 from 1,1,2-trimethyl-1H-benzo[e]indole (page 147); b) synthesis of ester 45 (page 148); c) synthesis of acid 43 (page 146).

1,1,2-trimethyl-1H-benzo[e]indole was octylated in 1-butanol to imminium ion 44 (page 147). Second, Knoevenagel condensation of imminium ion 44 with squaric acid diethyl ester 30 to ester 45 (page 148). Ester 45 was purified by column chromatography to separate the side product with the $N$-butyl synthon before it was incorporated into the dye. Finally, basic ester cleavage of compound 45 with subsequent aqueous acidification yielded acid 43 (page 146). This acid was used in most of the BSQ productions.
The synthesis path of phenyl bridged BSQ 13 is displayed in figure 2.8. The first step, a double Suzuki coupling with bromo indole derivative 32 and benzene-1,4-diboronic acid catalysed by tetrakis(triphenylphosphin)palladium(0) yielded bis-indole
derivative 46 (page 149). Followed by a double methylation reaction of this bis-indole derivative 46 with methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate the bis-imminium ion 47 (page 151) was obtained. Finally, two acids 43 were condensed to the bridging synthetic equivalent 47 in a Knoevenagel type condensation which resulted in the phenyl linked BSQ 13 (page 102). In this last reaction procedure, the first condensation was very fast and proceded as expected whereas the second was very slow. It is suggested that some volatile acid condensed with water in the Dean-Stark trap which changed the pH value of the reaction mixture during the reaction. For the product isolation, quinoline had to be removed because it would disturb the phase separation in the extraction, reduce the separation ability of the column and hinder the crystallization. Therefore, a precipitation in aqueous citric acid was selected to remove the quinoline. A further task was to increase the critical solubility of the BSQs by replacing the two $N$-methyl groups at the bridge with longer alkyl chains. Accordingly, the bis alkylation was performed with butyl iodide and octyl iodide, respectively, in chloroform, dimethylsulfoxide or in substance, but no corresponding bis alkylated product was obtained. So the longer alkyl chains were introduced in the previous reaction step of the synthetic pathway. Thus, an alkylated bromo indole derivative like 37 was used in the Suzuki-Reaktion with benzene-1,4-diboronic acid. Different catalysts $\left(\mathrm{Pd}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{4}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{Pd}\left[\mathrm{P}(p \text {-tol })_{3}\right]_{3}\right)$ and bases $\left(\mathrm{NaHCO}_{3}\right.$ and $\left.\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\right)$ were tested, but without success. This can be explained as follows: After oxidative addition of the palladium(0) species at the aryl bromide, charge repulsion occurs with the positive imminium ion which might hinder the catalytic cycle. When a stronger base was used the imminium ion was deprotonated to the Emil-Fischer base derivative. Thus the palladium(0) species prefered to coordinate to the en-amine in lieu of starting the catalytic cycle by an oxidative addition.
The synthesis of the next target molecule, the fluoreneylene bridged BSQ 15 started from commercial available 2,7-dibromo-9,9-bis-(2-ethyl-hexyl)-9H-fluorene. However for the Suzuki coupling a boronic acid derivative was needed. For this reason, the bromo indole derivative 32 was derivatized by a Miyaura-Borylation-Reaction according to the patent description [52] to the boron indole intermediate 48 with a 81\% yield after column chromatography and sublimation (Figure 2.9, prescription on p .152 ). The said boron compound 48 and 2,7-dibromo-9,9-bis-(2-ethyl-hexyl)-9H-fluorene reacted in a double Suzuki coupling to the fluerene bridged bis indole derivative 49 (page 153) which was then double methylated by methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate to the fluoreneylene bridged bis indolium 50 (page 155). The condensation of the end group acid 43 to the fluoreneylene bridged bis indolium 50 was not performed with quinoline as the previous ones because


Figure 2.8: a) Synthesis of bis-indole derivative 46 from benzene-1,4-diboronic acid and bromo indole derivative 32 (page 149); b) synthesis of bis-imminium ion 47 (page 151); c) synthesis of phenyl linked BSQ 13 (page 102).
of the above mentioned problems in the isolation of the product. For solubility reasons, 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone was added to the solvent mixture of toluene and 1-butanol. With these conditions BSQ 15 was yielded in $82 \%$ after two days (page 106). In order to synthesize BSQ 19 which has an electron rich center, the bis-iso-
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octyloxy bridge had to be prepared in advance. The whole synthetic pathway is illustrated in figure 2.10. Thus, hydroquinone was transformed in a Williamson-Ether synthesis as reported by Aubert et al. [54] into diether 51 (page 156). Subsequently, electrophilic aromatic substitution of diether 51 with $N$-bromosuccinimide yielded the dibromo derivative 52 [54] (page 157). A double Suzuki coupling of dibromo derivative 52 with boron indole derivative 48 followed which resulted in bis-indole derivative 53; performed according to Sauter et al. [52] with some necessary modifications (page 158). Double methylation of this bis-iso-octyloxy bridged bis-indole derivative 53 with methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate followed by anion exchange from the tosylates to the perchlorates, yielded bis-indolium ion 54 (page 160). This exchange was a purification step but it also made the product thermo sensitive. Bis-indolium ion 54 as perchlorate decomposes spontaneously at $286^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ! The final step to BSQ 19 was via the Knoevenagel condensation and was performed similarly to the one for BSQ 15. However, this reaction paused after the first condensation of end group acid 43 to the bis-indolium ion 54 . This was because the pH changed during the reaction which will be explained later. After adjusting the pH with a small amount of aqueous hydrochloric acid the reaction continued as expected and yielded BSQ 19 (page 113).
BSQ 20 with the tetra fluorinated bridge (Figure 2.11) was prepared in a similar way as the previous one, whereas the preparation of the center part was not as complicated. The boron compound 48 was reacted with commercially available 1,4-dibromotetrafluorobenzene under Suzuki coupling conditions following the description in the patent [52] to the bis indole derivative 55 (page 161). After the double methylation of bis indole derivative 55 with methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate the anion was exchanged to perchlorate for purification reasons to result in the center unit 56 which was also thermolabile. In the final reaction of this synthetic path (Figure 2.11), the center unit 56 was condensed to the two end groups 43 in a Knoevenagel type condensation using toluene, 1-butanol and 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone as solvents. As observed in the analogue reaction to BSQ 19, also this reaction paused after the first condensation step, due to a change in the pH . After adjusting the pH with aqueous hydrochloric acid, the reaction continued and BSQ 20 was formed. The correct pH value is crucial for the Knoevenagel-Reaction because it is an acid and base catalysed reaction. In the general accepted reaction mechanism [55] the catalytic base deprotonates the "C-H"-acid compound to generate a $C$-nucleophile. Here, the positive charged indolium ion was deprotonated to the nucleophilic en-amine. The catalytic acid increases the electrophilic character of the vinylogue carboxylic acid synthon. In this particular case,







Figure 2.10: a) Synthesis of diether 51 from hydroquinone (page 156); b) synthesis of dibromo derivative 52 (page 157); c) synthesis of bis-indole derivative 53 also with boron compound 48 (page 158); d) synthesis of bis-iso-octyloxy bridged bis-indolium ion 54 (page 160); e) synthesis of MSQ 19 (page 113).
it protonated the squaric acid unit of the end group 43. Furthermore, acid is important for the elimination of water which is the "psydo"-irreversible step in the Knoevenagel condensation mechanism because the water is removed from the reaction mixture


Figure 2.11: a) Synthesis of bis indole derivative 55 from 1,4-dibromotetrafluorobenzene and boron compound 48 (page 161); b) synthesis of center unit 56 (page 162); c) synthesis of tetra fluoro phenylene bridged BSQ 20 (page 115).
by azeotropic distillation into the Dean-Stark trap. So a buffering system consisting of a weak base and its corresponding acid is the preferable catalyst for this reaction. These additional requirements are needed for the base: non nucloephilic character, soluble in the used organic solvent, stable during the reaction and less volatile than
water. Quinoline fulfills these parameters and so it is normally used in the Knoevenagel condensation, however it causes problems in the isolation and purification of the product. Therefore, the last three reactions were preformed without this base which lead to the prior described uncontrollable pH during the reaction. Nevertheless, it was decided to use quinoline as catalyst since the advantages overruled the disadvantages. The big disadvantage is that quinoline has to be removed in a laborious and messy way - precipitation of the reaction concentrate in aqueous citric acid - before the "real" isolation of the product could start. In all following condensations quinoline was chosen as catalyst.
The planar naphthalene bridged BSQ 14 (Figure 2.12) was prepared according to the reported conditions of Kim et al. [43] in a double Knoevenagel type condensation of the benzo[e]indole end group 43 (Figure 2.7) with the naphthalene bridge 57 which was obtained by Geiger et al. [32] (page 104). After reaction, quinoline was removed by an acidic precipitation in water and the excess of end group derivative 43 was washed out with water after alkali treatment. BSQ 14 was purified by column chromatography. Fortunately, the intermediate mono condensation product MSQ 58 was thereby also isolated in one of the earlier fractions, which was used in the preparation of the tris squaraine (TSQ) 26 (Figure 2.20, details on page 123).
In the series of the flat bridged squaraines with two chromophore units BSQ 16 had an anthracene derivative as its linker. The bis indolium synthetic equivalent of the said bridge had to be synthesized ab ovo. The synthetic strategy as illustrated in figure 2.13 followed the path suggested by Geiger et al. [23] for the preparation of the naphthalene bridge 57. Because anthracene derivatives are generally light sensitive, the entire preparation of BSQ 16 was performed under exclusion of light. Since 1,5-diaminoanthracene (59) was not commercially available it was produced by a modified Clemmensen-Reduction from 1,5-diaminoanthraquinone following the general description of Martin [56] with a changed isolation and purification procedure (page 163). The amino groups in diamine 59 were derivatisated to an intermediate with two diazonium groups which were directly reduced in situ with tin(II)chloride to hydrazine functional groups yielding the compound bis hydrazine 60. For the success of the reaction the controlling of the temperature was essential (page 165). The subsequent Fischer-Indole-Synthesis was performed stepwise. Bis hydrazone 61 was produced from bis hydrazine 60 and 3-methyl-2-butanone (page 166), which was directly used in the final Fischer-Indole synthesis reaction step. The thereby obtained bis indole derivative 62 (page 167) was methylated by methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate and subsequent
 57
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Figure 2.12: a) Synthesis of intermiediate MSQ 58 and BSQ 14 from naphthalene bridge 57 and acid 43 (page 104).
anion exchange from tosylate to perchlorate yielded the anthracene linker 63 which was purified by elutriation with boiling water (page 168). BSQ 16 was finally obtained by a Knoevenagel condensation of the end group acid 43 and the anthracene linker 63 (page 107).
The second BSQ with a naphthalene bridge, BSQ 17 was synthesized as shown in figure 2.14. So the indole acid 34 (in figure 2.3) was condensed to the naphthalene bridge 57, which was obtained by Geiger et al. [32] in a similar way as it was described for BSQ 14. The washing of the precipitation after the quinoline removal increased the
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Figure 2.13: a) Synthesis of 1,5-diaminoanthracene 59 from 1,5-diaminoanthraquinone (page 163); b) synthesis of bis hydrazine 60 (page 165); c) synthesis of bis hydrazone 61 (page 166); d) synthesis of bis indole derivative 62 (page 167); e) synthesis of anthracene linker 63 (page 168); f) synthesis of anthracene bridged BSQ 16 also with acid 43 (page 107).
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Figure 2.14: a) Synthesis of BSQ 17 from naphthalene bridge 57 and acid 34 (page 109).
separation performance on the silica column which led to the improved yield (page 109).

For the investigation of the coupling of two slightly different dye units, the third BSQ dye with a naphthalene bridge 18 was created which had two different end groups as reported elsewhere [33]. One was a benzo[e]indole derivative where acid 42 was used as synthetic equivalent. And for the other one, an indole derivative with a carboxylic acid function (diacid 64) was prepared. The synthetic strategy to obtain BSQ 18 followed the path of the Terpetschnig route to prepare the carboxylic acid functionalized end group (Figure 2.15) and then the stepwise condensation of the two different end groups to the linker (Figure 2.16). The synthetic path started with the octylation reaction of 2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indole-5-carboxylic acid according to literature [31] with some essential modifications in the isolation procedure to yield carboxy indole derivative 65 (page 170). Subsequently, squaric acid diethyl ester 30 was condensed to carboxy indole derivative 65 to yield ester 66 (page 171). Alkaline ester cleavage of ester 66 followed by acidification yielded diacid 64 (Figure 2.15; details on page 169). The key step in the synthesis of unsymmetric BSQ 18 was the condensation of a single end group synthetic equivalent (acid 42) to the naphthalene linker of derivative 57 . Although it was found that the reaction pauses after the first condensation when no quinoline was used in the preparation of BSQ 19 and 20, it could not be adapted to the naphthalene bridge 57. Furthermore, any trials using the barely soluble 57 directly resulted in very low ( $\sim 5 \%$ )


Figure 2.15: a) Synthesis of carboxy indole derivative 65 from 2,3,3-tri-methyl-3H-indole-5-carboxylic acid (page 170); b) synthesis of ester 66 also with squaric acid diethyl ester 30 (page 171); c) synthesis of diacid 64 (page 169).
yields of 68 , because the basicity of quinoline is too low to deprotonate both imminium ions in the linker 57. Thereunto the naphthalene derivative 57 was deprotonated in a two layer mixture of toluene and aqueous sodium hydroxide solution (40\%). The resulting highly reactive, well soluble bis enamine intermediate 67 reacted with one acid 42 in a kinetically controlled Knoevenagel type condensation to MSQ 68 (Figure 2.16; details on page 172). Finally, the diacid end group 64 was condensed to MSQ 68 to yield the unsymmetric BSQ 18 (page 110).
The last target molecule with two squaraine dye units, BSQ 27, had a flat linker. The bridge was not an indole derivative with a five membered heterocycle, but a six membered aromatic ring system. The two six membered heterocycles were part of a 1,5-diaza-anthracene system, which was chosen because the starting materials were commercially available and the synthetic rout towards BSQ 27 (Figure 4.2) was straight forward. First, the flat bridge was produced starting with a double Doebner-Miller-Reaction, a variation of the Skraup-Quinoline-Synthesis, of 1,4-benzene diamine with crotonaldehyde to yield 2,6-dimethyl-1,5-diaza-anthracene 69 (page 173 ). This intermediate was subsequently bis methylated by methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate and yielded bridging synthetic equivalent 70 after anion exchange from tosylate
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Figure 2.17: a) Synthesis of 2,6-dimethyl-1,5-diaza-anthracene 69 from 1,4-benzene diamine and crotonaldehyde (page 173); b) synthesis of the bridging synthetic equivalent 70 (page 174); c) synthesis of super flat bridged BSQ 27 also with acid 43 (page 125).
methylation was estimated to be about 100 times slower than the first one. Finally, BSQ 27 was obtained by a doubled Knoevenagel type condensation of two end group synthetic equivalents in the form of acid 43 to the bridging moiety 70 using the reported method [43] with the isolation method developed in this work (page 125).

### 2.1.3 Synthesis of squaraines with more than two dye units

Oligomeric dyes were prepared in order to determine the possible limitation of the optical properties as it was correlated by Meier for the $D-\pi-A$ dyes [12]. The synthetic ansatz for the preparation of the four phenylene derivative bridged (dye 21, dye 22, dye 23 and dye 24) and the direct linked oligomeric dyes (dye 25) was an AA/BB type poly Suzuki cross coupling reaction. For the synthesis of the phenylene brided oligomeric squaraine 21 (Figure 2.18) diboronic acid ester 37 was prepared from benzene-1,4diboronic acid (page 139) accoring to Kandre et al. [57]. Also their reaction conditions for the poly Suzuki coupling were adopted [57]. So dibromo MSQ 29, diboronic acid ester 37 and catalyst 71 were mixed in a mixture of tetrahydrofuran and 1-methyl-2-


Figure 2.18: a) Synthesis of phenylene bridged TSQ 21 from dibromo dye 29, diboronic acid ester 37 and catalyst 71 (page 116); b) synthesis of TSQ 25 from dibromo dye 29, diboron dye 38 and catalyst 71 (page 122).
pyrrolidinone (page 116). The latter solvent was added to increase the solubility of the starting materials as well as the products. Unfortunately, chloroform could not be used as solvent during the reaction due to it intolerance with the used catalyst [58]. Although the solvent mixture was optimised oligomeric material precipitated during the reaction.

Therefore, a product precipitation was performed in the isolation procedure. According to the UV/vis analysis the $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value of the filtrate quite well matched with the one of the corresponding BSQ 13. But $\lambda_{\max }$ of a dissolved aliquot of the filtration residue was more bathochromically shifted which indicated that this precipitation method separated some of the lower molecular weight materials. The averaged number of repeating units $\bar{X}_{n}$ in the filtration residue of the oligomeric materials was determined by three methods: $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {Carother }}$ by the Carother's equation (eq. 4.1, page 90 ), $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {MALDI-TOF }}$ by the medial allegation of the MALDI-TOF measurement (eq. 4.2, page 90) and $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {NMR }}$ by the end group determination by NMR (eq. 4.3, page 90). $\bar{X}_{n}$ for product 21 was determined by Carother's and by MALDI-TOF to be three and by NMR to be five to six (table 2.1). Dyes 22, 23, 24, 25 were prepared according to the production method of dye 21. Their averaged number of repeating units were also calculated and summarized in table 2.1. Since all these products showed $\bar{X}_{n}$ values which are typical for trimeric to tetrameric squaraines, they were abbreviated as TSQs. TSQ 22, the one with the fluoreneylene bridge, was synthesized from diboron dye 38, specially purified 2,7-dibromo-9,9-bis-(2-ethyl-hexyl)-9H-fluorene and freshly prepared catalyst 71 following the developed route of TSQ 21 (Figure 2.19, details on page 118). Although TSQ 22 had additional long and branched side chains, the degree of polymerization was not noticeably different from the one of TSQ 21. Thus, even two iso-octyl side chains were too small for these rod like, flat molecules.
Also TSQ 23 had two iso-octyl side chains but connected to the linker as two ethers. TSQ 23 was synthesized as the previous TSQ 21 starting with diboron dye 38, the already prepared 1,4-dibromo-2,5-bis(2-ethylhexyloxy)benzene (52) and catalyst 71 (Figure 2.19, details on page 119).
Also starting from diboron dye 38 the tetrafluoro phenylene bridged TSQ 24 was prepared. Additionally, freshly sublimed 1,4-dibromotetrafluorobenzene and freshly

| Entry | $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {Carother }}$ | $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {MALDI-TOF }}$ | $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {NMR }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSQ 21 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| TSQ 22 | 3 | 3 | $4-5$ |
| TSQ 23 | 2 | 4 | $4-6$ |
| TSQ 24 | 2 | 3 | n.d. |
| TSQ 25 | 3 | 3 | $5-6$ |

Table 2.1: Comparison of the averaged number of repeating units $\left(\bar{X}_{n}\right)$ determined by the Carothers equation, the medial allegation of the MALDI-TOF measurement and the end group determination by NMR.


Figure 2.19: a) Synthesis of fluoreneylene bridged TSQ 22 from diboron dye 38, 2,7-di-bromo-9,9-bis-(2-ethyl-hexyl)-9H-fluorene and catalyst 71 (page 118); b) synthesis of bis iso-octyloxy phenylene bridged TSQ 23 from diboron dye 38, 1,4-dibromo-2,5-bis-(2-ethylhexyloxy)benzene 52 and catalyst 71 (page 119); c) synthesis of tetrafluoro phenylene linked TSQ 24 from diboron dye 38, 1,4-dibromotetrafluorobenzene and catalyst 71 (page 119).
prepared catalyst 71 were added following the here developed standard procedure (page 121). But several problems appeared, especially in the analysis of TSQ 24. Not only did it have the lowest yield of all TSQ productions, but also the MALDI-TOF was very noisy and the end groups could not be resolved by NMR. These observations led to the assumption, that some not negligible side reaction occurred. Although the $C$ - $F$ bond is known for its chemical stability, unfortunately, perfluorinated aromatic systems can undergo nucleophilic substitution under the applied conditions according to Sandford et al. [59]. This suggests that the palladium(0) species did not only react as nucleophile with the $C-B r$ bond in 1,4-dibromotetrafluorobenzene, but also with the $C-F$ bond which led to cross linking, bends in the linear structure and ligand scrambling.
The direct dye-dye connection in TSQ 25 (Figure 2.18) was also formed in a poly Suzuki coupling using dibromo dye 29 and diboron dye 38 as monomers. This homo trimer was prepared and analysed according to the same procedure as for the previous four TSQs, meaning TSQ 25 also precipitated during the reaction in the tetrahydrofurane / 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone solvent mixture (page 122). Simultaneously to this preparation, Voelker et al. synthesized and published a structure homologue of TSQ 25 with hexadecyl instead of octyl side chains by a nickel catalyzed Yamamoto coupling from its dibromo precursor [60]. But their polymerised dye had about 40 repeating units. This large degree of polymerization was enabled because of the better solubility of the product in their dimethyl formamide and toluene solvent mixture due to the longer side chains [60]. In the here presented work, the shorter octyl synthon was introduced, because it was a compromise between chain length and price per mol of the synthetic equivalent 1-iodooctane.
To also investigate the promising optophysical properties of multi chromophoric squaraine dyes with the said naphthalene bridge a poly Knoevenagel condensation of naphthalene linker 57 and squaric acid were performed. The condensation stopped automatically after the formation of the trimeric species, which could be measured by UV/vis spectroscopy when dissolved in hot 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone. In order to increase the solubility, a defined dye (TSQ 26, Figure 2.20) with three squaraine chromophores and two octyl side chains was prepared as already mentioned in the preparation of MSQ intermediate 58 (Figure 2.12 on page 33) and squaric acid in a Knoevenagel type condensation (page 123).


Figure 2.20: a) Synthesis of naphthalene bridged TSQ 26 from MSQ 58 (page 123).

### 2.2 Analysis and Characterization

### 2.2.1 Optical Properties

UV/vis and fluorescence spectra of all target molecules were recorded in chloroform. The analysis procedure of the optical spectra was explicitly explained by using reference dye MSQ 8. A solution of MSQ $8\left(2.8 \mu \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{dm}^{-3} ; 4.3 \mathrm{mg}\right.$ in 5.00 mL chloroform with an additional dilution by factor 500) was used for recording the UV/vis spectrum and a $1: 10$ dilution thereof was used for the fluorescence spectrum ( $0.28 \mu \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{dm}^{-3}$ ). Both normalized and base line corrected spectra [61] of MSQ 8 are shown in figure 2.21. From the baseline corrected absorption spectra [61] of MSQ 8 the $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ value was determined to be 637.5 nm (literature [62]: 636.5 nm ) and the molar extinction coefficient $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\right)$ of $350000 \mathrm{dm}^{3} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-1}$ was calculated with the Lambert-Beer equation 2.1:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }^{e m}\right)=\frac{A\left(\lambda_{\max }^{e m}\right)}{c_{\text {mol }} \cdot L} \quad\left[\frac{d m^{3}}{\mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}}\right] \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 2.21: Normalized and baseline corrected absorption (-) and fluorescence (—) spectra of MSQ 8 in chloroform as a function of absorption A vs. wavelength $\lambda$.
where the unitless absorbance $A\left(\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\right)$ is the maximum peak hight, $c_{\text {mol }}$ is the used molar concentration in [mol/dm ${ }^{3}$ ] and $L$ is the width of the cuvette in [cm]. The very narrow absorption band is a characteristic for squaraines. Since the chromophore of squaraines does not have diffuse aromatic ring systems nor multiple path between the donor group $D$ to the acceptor group $A$, it behaves more like a two dimensional box with confined length and resonance frequency resulting in the small half-width of 23.5 nm of MSQ 8 and the strong absorbance. The appearing shoulder in the UV/vis spectrum is a contradicting argument to this demonstration but it is known as vibronic shoulder which is similar to the one in cyanine dyes [11]. The optical band gap ( $\Delta E_{g e}^{\text {opt })}$, an important value for the comparison with the electrochemical analysis, was calculated from the onset wavelength ( $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ ) of the absorption. $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ is defined as the intersection of the tangent at the inflexion point of the absorption curve and its baseline (Figure 2.21). From this follows equation 2.2 for the determination $\Delta E_{g e}^{o p t}$ with the Planck's constant $h$, the speed of light $c$ and the energy transition frequency $\nu_{g e}$. Since $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ of MSQ 8 was
645.5 nm , its $\Delta E_{g e}^{o p t}$ was 1.921 eV .

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta E_{g e}^{o p t}=h \nu_{g e}=\frac{h \cdot c}{\lambda_{\text {onset }}} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The maximal emission wavelength $\left(\lambda_{\max }^{e m}\right)$ was taken from the fluorescence spectrum ( $\lambda_{\max }^{e m}(8)$ : 644.0 nm ; literature [62]: 647 nm ). The shape of the fluorescence spectrum is almost the mirror image of the absorption spectrum with a small variation of the vibronic shoulder intensity (Figure 2.21). The Stock's shift ( $\lambda_{s}$ ) was calculated from the difference of $\lambda_{\max }^{e m}$ and $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$. For MSQ 8, $\lambda_{s}$ is 6.5 nm which implies that the minima of the potential curve in the ground state $\mid g>$ is approximately exactly below the minima of the excited state $\mid e>$. And this again gave reason to assume that the geometric orientation of the excited state is the same as in the ground state. Furthermore, this observation verified the previously made "dipole approximation" on page 3 . Especially, it validates the splitting of the Hamilton operator in equation 1.8 in a time-independent operator $\widehat{H}_{0}$ (containing the geometric orientation of the molecule) and the time-dependent perturbation $\widehat{V}(t)$ which only acts on the electromagnetic transition moments $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ of the molecule. $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ was calculated from an absorption spectrum as it was mentioned in the explanation to equation 1.10 on page 3 . Therefore, the wavelength axis and the absorbance axis had to be transformed. Each data point of the wavelength $\lambda$ axis in [nm] was transformed to frequency $\nu$ in $\left[\mathrm{s}^{-1}\right]$ by the formula 2.3:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu_{i}=\frac{c}{\lambda_{i}} \quad\left[s^{-1}\right] \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The transformation of the absorbance axis starts with the Lambert-Beer law (eq. 2.4), in which the absorbance $\mathrm{A}\left(\lambda_{\max }\right)$ is defined by the logarithm of the relation of the intensity of the light beam before $\left(I_{0}\right)$ and after $(I)$ the sample.

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(\lambda_{\max }\right)=\log \left(\frac{I_{0}}{I}\right)=\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }\right) \cdot c_{\operatorname{mol}} \cdot L \quad[-] \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to transform the axis, the Lambert-Beer law was rewritten using the Napierian absorbance $\ln \left(\frac{l_{0}}{I}\right)$ as shown in equation 2.5 with the absorption cross section $\sigma_{g e}(\nu)$ for a specific transition in $\left[\mathrm{m}^{2}\right]$, concentration $c_{\text {particle }}$ of absorbing particles $\left[\mathrm{m}^{-3}\right.$ ] and the width of the cuvette $L$ in [m].

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(\lambda_{\max }\right)=\frac{1}{\ln (10)} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{I_{0}}{I}\right)=\frac{\sigma_{g e}\left(\nu_{\max }\right) \cdot c_{\text {particle }} \cdot L}{\ln (10)} \quad[-] \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\sigma_{g e}\left(\nu_{\max }\right)$ is given by equation 2.6 as a result of the combination of equation 2.5 and the relation of $c_{\text {mol }}$ with $c_{\text {particle }}$ by the Avogadro constant $N_{A}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma_{g e}(\nu)=\frac{\ln (10) \cdot A\left(\lambda_{\max }\right)}{C_{\text {mol }} \cdot N_{A} \cdot L} \quad\left[m^{2}\right] \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the reference dye MSQ $8 \sigma_{g e}(\nu)$ was calculated to be $1.34 \cdot 10^{-19} \mathrm{~m}^{2}$. For the transformation the value of the absorbance axis $\boldsymbol{A}\left(\lambda_{\max }\right)$ was scaled by $\sigma_{g e}(\nu)$ and then each data point was divided by its frequency value. So the new axis $\frac{\sigma_{g e}(\nu)}{\nu}$ was plotted versus $\nu$ as shown in figure 2.22 for the reference dye 8. The area under this


Figure 2.22: Transformed UV/vis absorption spectrum of MSQ 8 in chloroform as a function of $\frac{\sigma_{g e}(\nu)}{\nu}$ vs. $\nu$. The area under the curve is equal to the integral absorption cross section ( $G_{g e}$ ).
particular curve is called integral absorption cross section $\left(G_{g e}\right)$ and was calculated with the program Origin [61]. For dye $8 G_{g e}$ was $6.92 \cdot 10^{-21} \mathrm{~m}^{2}$ (eq. 2.7).

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{g e}=\int \frac{\sigma_{g e}(\nu)}{\nu} d \nu \quad\left[m^{2}\right] \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

$G_{g e}$ is the value to calculate the Einstein coefficients $A_{g e}$ for the spontaneous emission (eq. 2.8 [4]) and $B_{\text {eg }}$ for the absorption (eq. 2.9 [4]). The energy density of the monochromatic light source during the UV/vis measurement was assumed to be to low and therefore, the excited state $\mid e>$ is not populated significantly. Because the third Einstein coefficient $B_{g e}$ for the stimulated emission relays on the product of the energy density and the population of $\mid e>, B_{g e}$ was neglected. The value of $A_{g e}$ for the reference dye was $1.94 \cdot 10^{+08} \mathrm{~s}^{-1}$ according to equation 2.8 and the one of $B_{e g}$ was $3.13 \cdot 10^{+21} \mathrm{~m} \cdot \mathrm{~kg}^{-1}$ according to equation 2.9.

$$
\begin{gather*}
A_{g e}=\frac{8 \cdot \pi \cdot \nu_{g e}^{3}}{c^{2}} \cdot G_{g e} \quad\left[\mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right]  \tag{2.8}\\
B_{e g}=\frac{c}{h} \cdot G_{g e} \quad\left[m \cdot \mathrm{~kg}^{-1}\right] \tag{2.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

For the comparison of dyes from this work with each other and the theory the relation of $G_{g e}$ to $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ in [C.m] (eq. $2.10[4]$ ) is more useful than the Einstein coefficients. Additionally, the unitless oscillator strength $f_{g e}$ (eq. 2.11 [4]) was calculated from $G_{g e}$ which gives an indication for the number of electrons involved in the transition. For the above mentioned equations the following constants were used: the vacuum permittivity $\epsilon_{0}$ in $\left[\mathrm{C}^{2} \cdot \mathrm{~N}^{-1} \cdot \mathrm{~m}^{-2}\right]$, the mass of an electron $m_{e}$ in $[\mathrm{kg}]$ and the charge of an electron $e$ in [C].

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right| & =\sqrt[2]{\frac{3 \cdot h \cdot \epsilon_{0} \cdot c}{2 \cdot \pi^{2}} \cdot G_{g e}} \quad[C \cdot m]  \tag{2.10}\\
f_{g e} & =\frac{4 \cdot \epsilon_{0} \cdot m_{e}}{e^{2}} \cdot \frac{\nu_{g e}}{c} \cdot G_{g e} \tag{2.11}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ is normally given in Debye and not in an SI unit equation 2.10 was reformulated to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right| /[\text { Debye }]=\sqrt[2]{\frac{G_{g e}}{41.624}} /\left[p m^{2}\right] \tag{2.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

The transition moment of the reference dye 8 was determined to be 13 D (lit. [63]: 12.2 D). The comparison of $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ of the target molecules is discussed later in this section. The calculated $f_{g e}$ value of 1.2 of the reference dye gives evidence that one electron interacts with light in the absorption process. $f_{g e}$ will be relevant in the comparison of the optical and electrochemical properties of the squaraines.
After the detailed analysis of the optical properties of the reference dye 8 the structure-
property relation of the MSQ dyes will be discussed. The normalized UV/vis spectra of all five MSQ dyes are shown in figure 2.23. Strikingly, all curves have the same shape but are just bathochromically shifted in respect to the reference dye MSQ 8 (black line). In chloroform the mono phenylene extended MSQ 9 (cyan line) had a $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ value of 646.5 nm (compare table 2.2) and the double phenylene extended MSQ 10 (blue line) one of 658.5 nm . For the benzo extended MSQ series ( 11 in red, 12 in green) the following basic rule can be applied: the more enlarged the aromatic system the more increased the bathochromic shift of $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ is. This was already known for the cyanine dyes [11]. Also the emission maximum $\lambda_{\max }^{e m}$ and the optical band gap $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ followed this trend. No such tendency was observed for the values of $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\right)$. A slightly larger $\lambda_{s}$ was calculated for the phenyl extended MSQs (9 and 10) then for the benzo extended MSQs, presumably due to the additional degree of freedom in the rotation. Finally, all of the


Figure 2.23: Normalized UV/vis spectra of MSQ 8 (-), MSQ 9 (-), MSQ 10 (-), MSQ 11 (-) and MSQ 12 (-) in chloroform.
optical properties were related to the structure of the dyes. Although, the $\pi$-system of the phenyl extended dyes is more extended than the benzo $\pi$-system, the $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ values of the former are lower than those of the latter. However, one should also take into account,

Table 2.2: Photophysical properties of MSQs in homogeneous chloroform solution and the structure relayed corrected number of $\pi$-electron pairs outside the chromophore unit (\#EP).

| entry | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\log \left(\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {ass }}\right)\right)$ <br> $[-]$ | $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{eV}]$ | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{e m}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | $\lambda_{s}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | \#EP <br> $[-]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSQ 8 | 637.5 | 5.54 | 645.5 | 1.921 | 644.0 | 6.5 | 6.0 |
| MSQ 9 | 646.5 | 5.47 | 665.5 | 1.863 | 656.0 | 9.5 | 7.5 |
| MSQ 10 | 658.5 | 5.60 | 680.0 | 1.824 | 667.5 | 9.0 | 9.1 |
| MSQ 11 | 650.0 | 5.53 | 668.5 | 1.855 | 657.5 | 7.5 | 8.0 |
| MSQ 12 | 665.5 | 5.52 | 684.0 | 1.813 | 672.0 | 6.5 | 10.0 |

that the phenyl substituents were tilted whereas the benzo extensions lay in plane. These observations led to the question how one could merge the optical properties of these five dyes. The information of the structure were the number of $\pi$-electron pairs at the end groups outside the chromophore unit and their relative angle to the $\pi$-system of the chromophore. So the sum of the $\pi$-electron pairs corrected with a cos ${ }^{2}$ function of their torsion angle ( $\phi$ ) contains all information of the structure. This sum is called the actual number of $\pi$-electron pairs (\#EP) and this was then correlated to the absorption maximum value. The $\cos ^{2}$ function was used because Vonlanthen et al. reported the structure property relation of $\phi$ with the conductivity in single molecules and they used the $\cos ^{2}(\phi)$ function for the correlation [64]. For this work the function was adapted to $\cos ^{2 \cdot m}(\phi)$ with $m$ as the number of tilts inbetween the $\pi$-systems. Furthermore, it was assumed that in the MSQs $\mathbf{9}$ and $10 \phi$ was the same as the equilibrium $\phi$ in a bisphenyl molecule (44.4 ${ }^{\circ}[65]$ ).


Figure 2.24: Projecion of MSQ 9 with the number of $\pi$-electron pairs (EP's) and their torsion angle ( $\phi$ ) relative to the $\pi$-electron system of the chromophore.

For example MSQ 9 has 6 EP's with $\phi=0^{\circ}$ and 3 EP's with $\phi=44.4^{\circ}$ (Figure 2.24). So
\#EP is about 7.5 (see table 2.2) according to equation 2.13.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\# E P=\sum_{i=1}^{j} E P_{i} \cdot \cos ^{2 \cdot m}(\phi) \quad[-] \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The plot of \#EP of the MSQs versus their $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ value showed a linear correlation with $R^{2}: 0.994$ (Figure 2.25). The formula 2.14 which described the linear fit is as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}=7 \cdot \# E P+595 \quad[\mathrm{~nm}] \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

This equation 2.14 indicated that per additional $\pi$-electron pair lying in the chromophore $\pi$-system plain the value of $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}$ was increased by 7 nm . This structure property relation


Figure 2.25: The plot of $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ versus the effective number of planar $\pi$-electron pairs outside the chromophore unit (\#EP) of the MSQs 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 with the correlation displayed in equation 2.14 with $R^{2}=0.994$.
was used to estimate the influence of the aromatic system in the phenylene bridged BSQ 13 in order to answer the question whether a dye-dye interaction occurs in this

BSQ or not. Thus, \#EP for BSQ 13 was calculated from its structure (Figure 2.26) by the equation 2.13. \#EP was calculated by the sum of $5 \cdot \cos ^{0}\left(0^{\circ}\right)$ of the benzo end group plus $3 \cdot \cos ^{\circ}\left(0^{\circ}\right)$ from the indole at the bridge plus $3 \cdot \cos ^{2}\left(44.4^{\circ}\right)$ from the phenylene bridge plus $3 \cdot \cos ^{4}\left(44.4^{\circ}\right)$ from the indol of the second chromophore which resulted in 10.3.


Figure 2.26: Projecion of BSQ 13 with the number of $\pi$-electron pairs (EP's) and their torsion angle ( $\phi$ ) relative to the $\pi$-electron system of the chromophore.

Therefore, the aromatic surroundings of the chromophore shifted the $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ value to 667 nm (Equation 2.14). Anything further red shifted than this value derives from the dye-dye interaction. In deed, BSQ 13 showed a $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value of 678.0 nm in chloroform which is a bathoromic shift of about 11 nm compared to the solely aromatic influenced calculation. After the proof of existence of the dye-dye interaction, the influence of the electron density of the bridge on this interaction was investigated. Therefore, the normalized and base line corrected UV/vis spectra of the discussed phenylene bridged BSQ 13 (Figure 2.8), the fluoreneylene bridged BSQ 15 (Figure 2.9), BSQ 19 with a high electron density (Figure 2.10) and BSQ 20 (Figure 2.11) with a low electron density on the bridge were plotted in figure 2.27 and their analysed photophysical properties were listed in table 2.3. On the one hand the four BSQ spectra were not uniform indicating that different effects influence the system and on the other hand it was not possible to determine a correlation of $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ with their electron density property of the bridging synthon. Obviously, all three BSQs (15, 19 and 20) with electronically modified bridges have a hypsochromic shifted $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value compared to the phenylene
bridged BSQ 13. Neither $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}$ nor $\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}\right)$, nor $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ gave a reasonable correlation


Figure 2.27: Normalized absorption spectra of BSQ 13 (-), BSQ 15 (-), BSQ 19 (一) and BSQ 20 (-) measured in chloroform.
with the electronic density. Only the $\lambda_{s}$ values were in the same range for all four BSQ with tilted bridges presumably due to the same degree of freedom (data in table 2.3). Consequently, it was suggested that another influence dominates the dye-dye interaction. Using the developed formula 2.14 to determine \#EP the influence of the planar bridges on the optical properties of the BSQ was calculated. \#EP of BSQ 17, structure in figure 2.14, was 8 . Therefore, the aromatic bridge shifted the $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value

Table 2.3: Photophysical properties of BSQs with tilted bridges in homogeneous chloroform solution.

| entry | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\log \left(\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}\right)\right)$ <br> $[-]$ | $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{eV}]$ | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{e m}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | $\lambda_{s}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | \#EP <br> $[-]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BSQ 13 | 678.0 | 5.68 | 697.5 | 1.778 | 688.5 | 10.5 | 10.3 |
| BSQ 15 | 673.0 | 5.65 | 695.0 | 1.784 | 684.0 | 11.0 | 11.8 |
| BSQ 20 | 667.0 | 5.62 | 686.0 | 1.808 | 676.0 | 9.0 | 10.3 |
| BSQ 19 | 672.5 | 5.67 | 694.5 | 1.785 | 682.0 | 9.5 | 10.3 |

to 651 nm and anything further red shifted originated from the dye－dye interaction． Due to this interaction $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ of BSQ 17 was shifted by 64 nm to 715 nm in chloroform （normalized and base line corrected UV／vis spectrum in figure 2.28 and data in table 2．4）．This amazing shift was also observed in BSQ 14 （structure in figure 2．12）where


Figure 2．28：Normalized absorption spectra of BSQ 17 （一），BSQ 14 （一），BSQ 18 （一） and BSQ 16 （－）measured in chloroform．
the aromatic surroundings shifted $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ to 665 nm and the dye－dye interaction further to $728.5 \mathrm{~nm}(+63.5 \mathrm{~nm})$ ．Also the unsymmetrical BSQ 18，which had a comparable \＃EP to the symmetrical naphthalene linked BSQ 14，had a $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }} 727 \mathrm{~nm}$ in chloroform．The maximal absorption wavelength of BSQ 16 （Figure 2．13）was 730.5 nm in chloroform which is about the same as the naphthalene bridged BSQ 14 which is contradictive since \＃EP of BSQ 16 is larger than that of BSQ 14．This was interpreted as the decreasing influence of the dye－dye interaction when enlarging the distance inbetween． By coincidence this reduction of 14 nm was about as large as the reduction caused by the enlarged $\pi$－system（Equation 2．14）．Consequently，the distance between the two chromophores should also be considered in the formula to relate the structure with the optical property．

Table 2.4: Optical properties of planar naphthalene and anthracene linked BSQ dyes in homogeneous chloroform solution.

| entry | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\log \left(\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}\right)\right)$ <br> $[-]$ | $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{eV}]$ | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{e m}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | $\lambda_{s}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | \#EP <br> $[-]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BSQ 17 | 715.0 | 5.61 | 738.5 | 1.679 | 726.5 | 11.5 | 8 |
| BSQ 14 | 728.5 | 5.51 | 754.0 | 1.645 | 739.5 | 11.0 | 10 |
| BSQ 16 | 730.5 | 5.69 | 753.0 | 1.647 | 738.0 | 7.5 | 12 |
| BSQ 18 | 727.0 | 5.63 | 753.0 | 1.647 | 743.0 | 16.0 | 10 |

Before continuing with the discussion about the structure-property relation, the shape of the displayed UV/vis spectra in figure 2.28 of the naphthalene and anthracene linked BSQs shall be explained. Each main transition band of these BSQs showed more than one shoulder. Additional shoulders could appear due to aggregate formation or can be explained according to the theory of Kiprianov that the antipodal superimposed transition moment of serial connected BSQs is practically not zero (see table 1.1). Since the shape of aggregate spectra would change with the concentration, the former argument was verified by taking UV/vis spectra of every order of magnitude in the range of $3 \cdot 10^{-5}$ to $3 \cdot 10^{-10} \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L}$ as shown in figure 2.29 with BSQ 14. Indeed, the shape of the spectra did not change in this concentration range, indicating that the spectra was recorded of nicely solvated single molecules. Therefore, the additional shoulders originated from the non-zero antipodal superimposed transition moments. These cannot origin from the coupled antipodal dipole moments because of the serial connection (see Table 1.1 and [19]). Consequently, it is assumed that the non-zero contribution to the transition moment derived from higher order coupling, for example quadrupole coupling, which were not zero [24]. In other words the small additional shoulders might be evidence of the presence of "not negligible quadrupole interactions" [24] in squaraine dyes according to Laia et al. [24].
The spectra were normalized and base line corrected with the help of the program Origin [61]. The corrected spectra of the synthesized oligomeric squaraines are shown in figure 2.30 and the corresponding analysed optical data are reported in table 2.5. $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value of the phenylene linked TSQ 21 was 687.5 nm . Thus, the additional coupling with a third chromophore shifted the $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value bathochromically by "only" about 10 nm in respect to $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ of BSQ 13. A similar small additional red shift was also observed for the fluoreneylene bridged TSQ 22, the bis alkoxy phenylene bridged TSQ 23 and the tetra fluoro phenylene linked TSQ 24. The direct linked homo oligomere of a squaraine dye, TSQ 25, showed an absorption maximum of 718.0 nm . This relatively high $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}$ is


Figure 2.29: UV/vis spectra of BSQ 14 of every order of magnitude from $3 \cdot 10^{-5}$ to $3 \cdot 10^{-10} \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L}$ in chloroform were normalized and put on top of each other. The two most concentrated spectra were recorded in a 1 mm cell, the lowest two in a 100 mm cell and the rest in a 10 mm cell.
explained with the shorter distance between the two chromophores and the fact, that the structure of TSQ 25 contains one tilted single bond between the chromophores whereas the just mentioned TSQs contain two of them. As mentioned earlier, Voelker et al. [60] also synthesized the structure homologue of TSQ 25 with a value of $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ of 738 nm measured as $\sim 40-\mathrm{mer}$ in chloroform which is henceforth considered as $\lambda_{\infty}$ in the Meier's equation (eq. 1.11 at page 6) for the series of the direct linked squaraine dyes. The value of $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}$ of the defined naphthalene trimer 26 (Figure 2.30) was red shifted by 31 nm in respect to the corresponding dimeric BSQ 14. This bathochromic shift was about half as big as the one from MSQ 12 to BSQ 14, which implied that the used linker in combination with squaraine dyes led to a limitation of the $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{a b s}$.


Figure 2.30: Normalized and base line corrected absorption spectra [61] of phenylene bridged TSQ 21 (-), fluoreneylene bridged TSQ 22 (-), alkoxy phenylene bridged TSQ 23 (-), tetrafluoro phenylene bridged TSQ 24 (-), directly linked TSQ 25 (-) and the naphthalene bridged TSQ 26 (-) measured in chloroform.

The theory of Meier [12] was adopted in order to correlate the optical properties of the TSQs to the corresponding BSQs and MSQs. Therefore, the photophysical properties of the dye series, consisting of a MSQ, a BSQ, a TSQ and a $\infty$-SQ as a real polymer with the same bridge, were compared within one seires and with each other series. Because of the different electron density of the linker synthon the bis-alkoxy-phenylene and the tetrafluorophenylene bridged dye series were left aside, since they could not been compared with the pure hydrocarbon linked dyes. So three known data points in the hydrocarbon linked dye series were used to calculate the three parameters in the Meier equation (eq. 1.11). Therefore, $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ of MSQ 12 was chosen as $\lambda_{1}$ for the naphthalene linked dye series (DS1), because MSQ 12 had the most structural similarity with the repeating unit of the DS1. For direct linked DS2 and the phenylene linked DS3 $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ of MSQ 10 was defined as $\lambda_{1}$. As a result the Meier equation for DS1 (eq. 2.15), DS2 (eq. 2.16) and DS3 (eq. 2.17) were reported here and the curves were shown in the main

Table 2.5: Photophysical properties of the TSQs, parameters of the Meier's equations 2.15, 2.16 and 2.17 and the estimated length of the linking synthon from the geometry optimized molecular structure.

| entry | $\lambda_{\text {am }}^{\text {abs }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\log \left(\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}\right)\right)$ <br> $[-]$ | $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{eV}]$ | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{e m}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | $\lambda_{s}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | $\lambda_{\infty}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | -b <br> $[-]$ | d <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TSQ 21 | 687.5 | 5.82 | 711.0 | 1.744 | 697.0 | 9.5 | 696.5 | -0.720 | 1.418 |
| TSQ 22 | 683.5 | 5.96 | 704.0 | 1.761 | 692.0 | 8.5 | - | - | - |
| TSQ 23 | 684.5 | 6.09 | 706.0 | 1.756 | 691.0 | 6.5 | - | - | - |
| TSQ 24 | 674.0 | 5.26 | 697.0 | 1.779 | 681.0 | 7.0 | - | - | - |
| TSQ 25 | 718.0 | 5.77 | 754.5 | 1.644 | - | - | 738 | -0.692 | 0.984 |
| TSQ 26 | 759.5 | 5.81 | 785.5 | 1.579 | 771.0 | 11.5 | 789.5 | -0.709 | 0.632 |

part of figure 2.31. The calculated parameters were also summarized in table 2.5.

$$
\begin{align*}
& D S 1: \lambda_{\max }^{a b s}(n)=789.5-(789.5-665.5) \cdot e^{-0.709 \cdot(n-1)}  \tag{2.15}\\
& D S 2: \lambda_{\max }^{a b s}(n)=738.0-(738.0-658.5) \cdot e^{-0.692 \cdot(n-1)}  \tag{2.16}\\
& D S 3: \lambda_{\max }^{a b s}(n)=696.5-(696.5-658.5) \cdot e^{-0.720 \cdot(n-1)} \tag{2.17}
\end{align*}
$$

Because no structure analogue MSQ was prepared for the fluoreneylene linked DS4 the Meier equation for the fluoreneylene dye series DS4 was not calculated for now by the known data set.
To answer the initial question about which dye class shows a bigger bathochromic shift, DS1 was compared with the reported maximal red shift of the polymeric cyanine dyes [23]. The naphthalene bridge in combination with squaraines showed a maximal red shift of 124 nm whereas in combination with a cyanine chromophore a red shift of 159 nm occurs [23]. The reduced coupling strength is explained by the presence of the quadrupole in the squaraines. This interaction is estimated to be smaller than the coupling of a pure dipole in the cyanine dyes.
In order to get a three dimensional plot with one axis related to the structural input, the second axis being the number of repeating units and third the absorption maximum. Therefore, the two individual parameters in the Meier's equation, the exponential decay coefficient $-b$ and the limiting absorption maximum $\lambda_{\infty}$, must be correlated. According to the Meier's equation the $-b$ value defines the decay of interaction which is mainly
influenced by the nature of the linking synthon. So the \#EP value was correlated with the experimental based $-b$ values as it was done for the MSQs (see insert in figure 2.31). The \#EP for one bridge was inserted into equation 2.18 to give $-b$ as a function of $E P_{i}, \phi$ and $m$ with $R^{2}=1.00$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
-b\left(E P_{i}, \phi, m\right)=-\frac{14.47+\sum_{i=1}^{j} E P_{i} \cdot \cos ^{2 \cdot m}(\phi)}{27.46} \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the determination of the second individual parameter $\lambda_{\infty}$ the following ansatz was chosen. $\lambda_{\infty}$ is an indicator for the maximal coupling of the chromophores. The closer


Figure 2.31: graph: Calculated Meier's equation for DS1 (-, eq. 2.15), for DS2 (-, eq. 2.16) and for DS3 (-, eq. 2.17); insert: linear correlation of Meier's exponential decay coefficient -b with the empiric formula with the torsion angle $\phi$ and the distance square $d^{2}$ as parameters, $R^{2}=1.00$.
the chromophores the more intense is the coupling. The distance (d) was defined as the measurable length from one nitrogen atom to the other nitrogen atom over the conjugated bridge in the geometry optimized molecular structure. According to the
radiation law the $1 / d^{2}$ function was used to correlate the distance with the optical property. However, this distance does not have any influence on the coupling if the torsion angle is $90^{\circ}$. Therefore, a fraction of the pure cosine function and the distance square $\left(\frac{\cos ^{2} \cdot m(\phi)}{d^{2}}\right)$ was used as the $x$-axis in a plot versus the calculated $\lambda_{\infty}$ from equation $2.15,2.16$ and 2.17. These $d$ values were also reported in the table 2.5. The empirical fit for the three data points was a natural logarithm. As a result of that $\lambda_{\infty}$ was defined by empirical equation 2.19 as a function of $\phi, m$ and $d$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\infty}(\phi, m, d)=34.30 \cdot \ln \left(0.03937+\frac{\cos ^{2 \cdot m}(\phi)}{d^{2}}\right)+757.5 \tag{2.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a proof of concept the above stated equation for $\lambda_{\infty}(\phi, m, d)$ was probed by inserting two limiting conditions. Firstly, if $\phi$ is $90^{\circ}$, then $\lambda_{\infty}(\phi, m, d)$ is 646.5 nm , which is very similar to a single squaraine dye. Secondly, if two nitrogen were as close as possible like in hydrazine ( 0.146 nm ), so the linker inbetween the two chromophores is only one single bond and it is assumed that $\phi$ is $0^{\circ}$, then $\lambda_{\infty}(\phi, m, d)$ is 889.5 nm . These are reasonable values for serial connected squaraines with indole type end groups if no other influence is present.
Finally, the simple $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}(n)$ of the Meier's equation was developed to a multi dimensional structure related $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\left(n, E P_{i}, d, \phi, m\right)$ (eq. 2.20) for the characterization of the structural dependent influence on the optical property.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}\left(n, E P_{i}, d, \phi, m\right)=\lambda_{\infty}(\phi, m, d)-\left(\lambda_{\infty}(\phi, m, d)-\lambda_{1}\right) \cdot e^{-b\left(E P_{i}, \phi, m\right) \cdot(n-1)} \tag{2.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

To verify the corrected Meier's equation and to show that with this equation the absorption maximum of any similar dye can be calculated, the $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ of the fluoreneylene bridged dyes BSQ 15 and TSQ 22 were calculated using 1.809 nm for $d, 44.4^{\circ}$ for $\phi$, 2 for $m$, the assumed value of 658.5 nm for $\lambda_{1}$ and the calculated \#EP of 11.8 with $n=2$ for BSQ 15 and \#EP of 13.6 with $n=3$ for TSQ 22 (Figure 2.32). With these settings $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}(2)$ resulted in 674 nm and $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}(3)$ in 681 nm which was pretty close to the measured values of $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ of 673 nm and 683.5 nm , respectively. The example with the fluoreneylene bridged dyes proved the validity of the found structure-property relations in squaraines within certain parameter ranges.
Unfortunately, the developed equation 2.20 could not predict $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ for the flat bridged BSQ 27 correctly. The prediction proclaimed 727.5 nm (\#EP: $3, \phi: 0^{\circ}$, d: 0.565 nm ) but in reality a $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ of 804.5 nm was measured in chloroform. One would have to use


Figure 2.32: $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}\left(n, E P_{i}, d, \phi, m\right)$ calculated for the fluoreneylene bridged dye series based on the oligomeric structure of TSQ 22 with \#EP of 13.6, $\phi$ of $44.4^{\circ}, m$ was 2 and $\lambda_{1}$ was assumed to be 658.5 nm .
a $d$ value of 0.05 nm in the corrected Meier's equation to obtain the found absorption maximum, but such a small $d$ value is unnatural. Also the unexpected giant red shift of 139 nm even exceeded the $\lambda_{\infty}$ value of the naphthalene dye series. As a result BSQ 27 was treated as a speciality and was therefore excluded from the comparison so far. The photophysical properties of BSQ 27 were tabulated in an extra table 2.6.

Up to now the analysis of the structure-property relation was based on the geometric orientation of the molecules. Thus, the nature of the dye-dye interaction should also be studied. Specially, the determination whether the coupling is dominated by the dipole-

Table 2.6: Photophysical properties of the BSQ 27 and the distance $d$ between the middler two nitrogen atoms.

| entry | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\log \left(\epsilon\left(\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}\right)\right)$ <br> $[-]$ | $\lambda_{\text {onset }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ | $\Delta \mathrm{E}_{\text {opt }}$ <br> $[\mathrm{eV}]$ | $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{e m}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | $\lambda_{s}$ <br> $[\mathrm{~nm}]$ | d <br> $[\mathrm{nm}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BSQ 27 | 804.5 | 5.36 | 838 | 1.480 | 818 | 13.5 | 0.565 |

dipole coupling or if it is influenced otherwise. Therefore, in the following the electronic structure represented by the absolute value of the transition moment $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ is compared with the optical properties. According to the theory of Kiprianov when two chromophores are serially connected and they show a dipole-dipole coupling, then due to the reduction of the band gap the bathochromic shift of $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ occurs and the overall $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ is larger than each individual one. In fact this relation can be visualized by plotting the $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ of the dyes versus their $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$. The calculation of $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ was mentioned at the beginning of this section with the help of the reference dye MSQ 8. In table 2.7 the spectroscopic quantities of all targeted molecules were listed: the integral absorption cross section $G_{g e}$, the first and second Einstein coefficient $A_{g e}$ and $B_{e g}$, the oscillator strength $f_{g e}$ and the absolute value of the transition moment $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$. In figure $2.33\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ of the dyes versus their $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ was plotted. Although the pattern is quite weird, some generalities were found. In average the MSQs ( $\bullet$ ) and the BSQs ( $\square$ ) were about on the same level. Whereas the TSQs ( $\boldsymbol{\nabla})$ have the highest $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ values. However MSQs, all tilted bridged
Table 2.7: Summary of the optical properties of all targeted molecules measured in chloroform.

| entry | $G_{g e}$ <br> $\left[\mathrm{~m}^{2}\right]$ | $A_{g e}$ <br> $\left[\mathrm{~s}^{-1}\right]$ | $B_{e g}$ <br> $\left[\mathrm{~m} \cdot \mathrm{~kg}^{-1}\right]$ | $f_{g e}$ <br> $[-]$ | $\left\|\vec{M}_{g e}\right\|$ <br> $[$ Debey $]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSQ 8 | $6.92 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $1.94 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $3.13 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.2 | 13 |
| MSQ 9 | $5.45 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $1.39 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $2.46 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 0.9 | 11 |
| MSQ 10 | $1.20 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $2.87 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $5.42 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 2.0 | 17 |
| MSQ 11 | $8.43 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $2.13 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $3.81 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.4 | 14 |
| MSQ 12 | $1.01 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $2.37 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $4.55 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.7 | 16 |
| BSQ 13 | $1.64 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $3.63 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $7.40 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 2.7 | 20 |
| BSQ 15 | $7.52 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $1.69 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $3.40 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.2 | 13 |
| BSQ 20 | $7.21 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $1.68 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $3.26 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.2 | 13 |
| BSQ 19 | $8.39 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $1.89 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $3.80 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.4 | 14 |
| BSQ 17 | $7.71 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $1.44 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $3.49 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.2 | 14 |
| BSQ 14 | $6.58 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $1.16 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $2.98 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 1.0 | 13 |
| BSQ 16 | $3.88 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $6.85 \cdot 10^{+07}$ | $1.76 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 0.6 | 10 |
| BSQ 18 | $1.39 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $2.46 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $6.30 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 2.1 | 18 |
| BSQ 27 | $3.64 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $4.66 \cdot 10^{+07}$ | $1.65 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 0.5 | 9 |
| TSQ 21 | $1.27 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $2.66 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $5.73 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 2.0 | 17 |
| TSQ 22 | $1.62 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $3.50 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $7.33 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 2.6 | 20 |
| TSQ 23 | $2.16 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $4.64 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $9.79 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 3.5 | 23 |
| TSQ 24 | $2.65 \cdot 10^{-21}$ | $5.89 \cdot 10^{+07}$ | $1.20 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 0.4 | 8 |
| TSQ 25 | $1.73 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $3.04 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $7.84 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 2.6 | 20 |
| TSQ 26 | $1.56 \cdot 10^{-20}$ | $2.42 \cdot 10^{+08}$ | $7.04 \cdot 10^{+21}$ | 2.2 | 19 |



Figure 2.33: Plot of $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ versus $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ from chloroform solution of the MSQs 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 (॰), BSQs 13, 15, 20, 19, 17, 14, 16 and 18 (■), TSQs 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 ( $\mathbf{)}$ ) and the special BSQ 27 ( $*$ ). Data points in the oval were MSQs and BSQs and TSQs with tilted bridges. Linear fit relays on the data in the oval with $R^{2}=0.59$. Outside the oval were BSQs and TSQs with planar bridges.

BSQs and all tilted bridged TSQs were fitted linearly with $R^{2}=0.59$ (data points in the oval). Those values followed the theory of Kiprianov, since as a basic rule the higher the $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value the higher the $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ value was. However, the other dyes outside the oval were BSQs and TSQs with planar bridges, which seemed to disagree with the linear fitted tendency. Also the position of the super flat BSQ 27 ( $\star$ ) was unexpected. Since the calculation of the $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ values depended on the weighting of the sample of the dyes, their errors also depended on each other. It was estimated that the error for $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ is $25 \%$ which explains the variance of the data points in the oval. However, it is not sufficient to explain the rather low $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ values for the data points outside the oval. Therefore, it is postulated, that in the planar bridged squaraines an additional parameter of electronic nature influences the dye-dye interaction. Furthermore, it is postulated that the planar bridged squaraines with more than one chromophore have a decreased transition moment because the coupling is so intense, that the chromophore
units were somehow fused and thereby a new single dye unit emerged. This postulate can be confirmed or contradicted by the calculation of the molecular orbitals, which will be discussed in section 2.2.4. To verify the relative position of the data points in figure 2.33, the $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ values were calculated with equation 1.10 on page 3 with the help of the $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ and $\lambda_{\max }^{e m}$ in different solvents, which is discussed in the next section.

### 2.2.2 Solvatochromy

Solvatochromy describes the slightly different absorption behavior of a homogeneously dissolved molecule in different solvents, due to the solute-solvent interaction based on polar attraction. For the determination of the relation how the solvent polarity is linked to the polarity of the solute several different correlations were found and published. Tatikolov et al. summarized some of them with the help of the structure homologue reference squaraine dye 8 [62]. He found that the Dimroth-Richardt's $E_{T}$ value and also the solvent parameter $\pi^{*}$ by Kamlet-Taft plotted versus the maximal absorption wavenumber $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ in 22 different solvents gave $R^{2}<0.3$ [62]. In conclusion, both solvent parameters were determined with a set of uncharged dyes whereas squaraines were permanently charged. Therefore, the solute-solvent interaction did not only consist of polar attractions and so the simple linear correlation based on the two named parameters was invalid. Tatikolov et al. also mentioned two refractive index $\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)$ based functions for the correlation with $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$. One was the Bayliss function 2.21:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{\text {Bayliss }}\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)=\frac{\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)^{2}-1}{2 \cdot\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)^{2}+1} \tag{2.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the second one was similar to it, called the Lorentz-Lorenz function 2.22:

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{\text {Lorentz-Lorenz }}\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)=\frac{\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)^{2}-1}{\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)^{2}+2} \tag{2.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Both functions gave a reasonable correlation coefficient of about 0.89 [62]. Also the corresponding functions where $\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)^{2}$ is replaced by the dielectric constant $\left(\epsilon_{s}\right)$ of the solvent gave $R^{2}$ values in the same range [62]. A better correlation of 0.93 was achieved with the Lippert parameter ( $\Delta f$, eq. 2.23) in terms of the Bayliss-Ooshika-McRae theory which he used in the argumentation of the postulated quadrupole moment in squaraines
in different mixtures of dioxane and water [62].

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta f=\frac{\epsilon_{S}-1}{2 \cdot \epsilon_{s}+1}-\frac{\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)^{2}-1}{2 \cdot\left(n_{D}^{20}\right)^{2}+1} \tag{2.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Albeit Tatikolov et al. even made more different plots for the correlation of the squaraine dye with the solvent. They ignored the fact that one cannot treat all solvents in the same manner [62].
In this work the solvatochromic effect was determined with ten solvents: decaline, dichloromethane, chloroform, toluene, chlorbenzene, 1,2-dichlorbenzene, acetone, ethanol, $N, N$-dimethylformamide and dimethylsulfoxide. For this solvents $\Delta f$ was calculated and plotted versus the measured $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{\text {abs }}(\Delta f)$ of the dyes. This function correlated for the data of the reference dye 8 with $R^{2}$ of 0.26 . But this moderate value was dramatically improved by subdividing the solvents into three groups:

- Group A, solvents with an aromatic system as toluene, chlorbenzene and 1,2-dichlorbenzene.
- Group B, solvents containing an oxygen atom as acetone, ethanol, $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-diemthylformamide and dimethylsulfoxide.
- Group C, consisting neither of an aromatic system nor of an oxygen atom as decaline, dichloromethane and chloroform.

This segmentation was justified by the following arguments: $\pi-\pi$ interactions occur between aromatic solvents and the dye system, which is a stronger interaction than the Van-der-Waals interaction of the dye system with apolar solvents. The oxygen atom containing solvents were grouped according to the behavior of iodine. Iodine solutions are violet in solvents without any oxygen atoms and brown when the solvent contains them, due to the coordination of the iodine to the electron pairs of the oxygen atom. In figure 2.34 the function $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{a b s}(\Delta f)$ of MSQ 8 for each group and their linear fit were displayed. $R^{2}$ from group A in black was 0.87 , group B in red and C in green were both 0.98 . Indeed, after the novel segmentation three very nice linear relations between the solute property $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{a b s}$ and the solvent Lippert paramtert $\Delta f$ were found. This was proven for all target dyes (data not shown).
The parameter $\Delta f$ was actually used in the Ooshika-Lippert-Mataga-Equation 2.24 as a factor to connect the Stoke's shift (in wave numbers) with the difference of the


Figure 2.34: $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{\text {abs }}(\Delta f)$ of $M S Q$ 8, group $A(\square)$, group $B(\bullet)$ and group $C(\nabla)$ and their linear fit.
static electric dipole moments of the ground state and the excited state $\mu_{e l, g}$ and $\mu_{e l, e}[66,67,8]$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta \widetilde{\nu}=\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{a b s}-\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{e m}=\frac{2 \cdot \Delta f}{h \cdot c \cdot a_{r}^{3}} \cdot\left(\mu_{e l, e}-\mu_{e l, g}\right)^{2} \quad\left[m^{-1}\right] \tag{2.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

$a_{r}$ refers to the Onsager active radius which is defined in equation 2.25 as the spherical radius with the same volume and mass of one molecule, $M_{R}$ refers to the molar mass of the dye and $\rho$ to the estimated density of the dye crystal $(1 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}) . a_{r}$ of all the dyes were listed in table 2.8.

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{r}=\sqrt[3]{\frac{3 \cdot M_{R}}{4 \cdot \pi \cdot \rho \cdot N_{A}}} \quad[m] \tag{2.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, Ooshika-Lippert-Mataga-Equation 2.24 was split in order to determine $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ (eq. 2.26) and $\widetilde{\nu}_{\text {max }}^{e m}$ (eq. 2.27) separately $[68,8]$. The spliting of the formula was possible because some factors as the effective reaction field and the dispersion force
could be neglected.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{a b s}=\frac{2 \mu_{e l, g}\left(\mu_{e l, g}-\mu_{e l, e}\right)}{h \cdot c \cdot a_{r}^{3}} \cdot \Delta f+C & {\left[m^{-1}\right]} \\
\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{e m}=\frac{2 \mu_{e l, e}\left(\mu_{e l e}-\mu_{e l, g}\right)}{h \cdot c \cdot a_{r}^{3}} \cdot \Delta f+C & {\left[m^{-1}\right]} \tag{2.27}
\end{array}
$$

Herewith $\mu_{e l, g}$ and $\mu_{e l, e}$ can be calculated by the slope $p$ of group C in the plot $\widetilde{\nu}_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}(\Delta f)$ and the slope $q$ of group C in the plot $\widetilde{\nu}_{\max }^{m}(\Delta f)$ according to the following formulas [68,8]:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mu_{e l, g}=-\frac{p}{q} \cdot a_{r}^{3 / 2} \cdot \sqrt[2]{\frac{q^{2} \cdot h \cdot c}{2 \cdot(p-q)}} \quad[C \cdot m]  \tag{2.28}\\
& \mu_{e l, e}=a_{r}^{3 / 2} \cdot \sqrt[2]{\frac{q^{2} \cdot h \cdot c}{2 \cdot(p-q)}}\quad C \cdot m] \tag{2.29}
\end{align*}
$$

In fact, only the data from group C were used, because several effects could be neglected and the lowest distortion of the solute-solvent interaction was in group C. $\mu_{e, g}$ and $\mu_{e, e}$ were calculated for all dyes and listed in table 2.8.
As already indicated in equation 1.10 in the introduction, the weighted sample based $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ can be compared with the UV/vis spectrum based values of $\mu_{e l, g}$ and $\mu_{e l, e}$. Therefore the linear combination coefficients $a_{g}$ and $a_{e}$ were estimated. Since a quantum leap is much faster than the life time of the excited state, a step function from the ground state $\mid g>$ to the excited state $\mid e>$ was assumed for the observable moment of absorption. Furthermore, in the moment of absorption the molecule is $50 \%$ in $\mid g>$ and $50 \%$ in $\mid e>$. Consequently, $a_{g}$ and $a_{e}$ were both set to 0.5 . So the transition moment calculated over the solvatochromic effect was named $\mu_{\text {total }}$. Because of the made simplification in the equation leading to the values of $\mu_{e, g}$ and $\mu_{e l, e}$ an empirical constant summand was introduced for every dye which was actually the averaged difference of $\mu_{\text {total }}$ and $\left|\vec{M}_{\text {ge }}\right|$ and amounted 13.7 D. The corrected $\mu_{\text {totat, corrected }}$ was determined by the equation 2.30 :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mu_{\text {total }, \text { corrected }}=\mu_{\text {total }}+13.7=0.5 \cdot \mu_{e l, g}+0.5 \cdot \mu_{e l, e}+13.7 \quad[\text { Debey }] \tag{2.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a better comparison the $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ values were also listed next to the $\mu_{\text {total, corrected }}$ values of the dyes in the table 2.8 and the $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ appear as $\times$ in the figure 2.35. In this figure the data points of the squaraine dyes with tilted bridges and the MSQs ( $\square$ ) were surrounded


Figure 2.35: Plot of $\mu_{\text {total,corrected }}$ calculated from the solvatochromic effect versus $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ in chloroform of the MSQs 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 (■), BSQs 13, 15, 20, 19, 17, 14 and 16 (•), TSQs 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 (v) and the special BSQ 27 (*). Data points in the quad were MSQs and BSQs and TSQs with tilted bridges. Linear fit relays on the data in the oval with $R^{2}=0.490$. Outside the quad were BSQs and TSQs with planar bridges.
by the quad. These data were fitted linearly so that in general with increasing $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ also $\mu_{\text {total, corrected }}$ increases which is according to the Kiprianov theory and very similar to $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$. The data points of all BSQs and TSQs with a planar linking synthon were outside the quad. Moreover, these data showed a largely reduced transition moment compared to their absorption maximum, which proved the correct tendency of the $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ values and underlined the thereby derived postulate.

### 2.2.3 Electrochemical Properties

Cyclic voltammetry was performed to determine the electrochemical properties in order to find the answers to the following questions whether the electrochemical band gap

Table 2.8: The Onsager radius $a_{r}$ and the determination the static electric dipole moments of the ground and excited state and the corrected transition dipole moment $\mu_{\text {total, corrected }}$ by the Ooshika-Lippert-Mataga-Equation in comparison with the transition moment $\left|\vec{M}_{g e}\right|$ calculated over the peak area.

| dye | $a_{r}$ | $\mu_{e l, g}$ | $\mu_{e l, e}$ | $\mu_{\text {total, corrected }}$ | $\left\|\vec{M}_{\text {ge }}\right\|$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSQ 8 | $6.3 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | 2.5 | 0.1 | 15 | 13 |
| MSQ 9 | $6.3 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -9.9 | 9.3 | 13 | 11 |
| MSQ 10 | $6.8 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -3.6 | 1.4 | 13 | 17 |
| MSQ 11 | $5.9 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -2.2 | 0.3 | 13 | 14 |
| MSQ 12 | $6.1 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -4.8 | 3.7 | 13 | 16 |
| BSQ 13 | $7.9 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -0.5 | 4.0 | 15 | 20 |
| BSQ 15 | $8.5 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | 0.8 | 3.4 | 16 | 13 |
| BSQ 19 | $8.4 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -3.5 | 5.8 | 15 | 14 |
| BSQ 20 | $8.1 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -3.7 | 7.0 | 15 | 13 |
| BSQ 17 | $7.4 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -0.8 | 5.5 | 16 | 14 |
| BSQ 14 | $7.7 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -1.2 | 4.5 | 15 | 13 |
| BSQ 16 | $7.8 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -1.4 | 6.3 | 16 | 10 |
| BSQ 27 | $7.5 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -12.8 | 8.6 | 12 | 9 |
| TSQ 21 | $9.6 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -9.5 | 4.5 | 11 | 17 |
| TSQ 22 | $1.1 \cdot 10^{-9}$ | 5.4 | 3.9 | 18 | 20 |
| TSQ 23 | $1.2 \cdot 10^{-9}$ | -2.2 | 8.0 | 17 | 23 |
| TSQ 24 | $6.5 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -1.8 | 4.5 | 15 | 8 |
| TSQ 25 | $9.3 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -4.7 | 12.6 | 18 | 20 |
| TSQ 26 | $8.5 \cdot 10^{-10}$ | -0.4 | 5.7 | 16 | 19 |

$\Delta E_{e l}$ is interrelated with the optical band gap $\Delta E_{o p t}$, whether the values of the oscillator strength $f_{g e}$ are comparable with the values of the number of transferred electrons in the reduction and oxidation process ( $z_{\text {red/ox }}$ ) and whether the redox potentials are individually affected by the dye-dye interaction. As hitherto the analysis procedure was explained with the help of the reference dye 8. In figure 2.36 the cyclic voltammogram of the neat solvent $N, N$-dimethylformamide (-) and the reference dye 8 (-) are displayed. The electrochemical band gap $\Delta E_{e l}$ was determined by the difference of the values of the first reduction and oxidation potential ( $E_{\text {red }}^{1}$ respectively $E_{o x}^{1}$ ). For the reference dye $8 E_{o x}^{1}$ was 0.75 V and $E_{o x}^{1}$ was -0.87 V under applied conditions and after calibration versus normal hydrogen electrode (NHE) [69]. The first redox potentials ( $E_{\text {red/ox }}^{1}$ ) were defined as the average of their cathodic and anodic peak potentials


Figure 2.36: Cyclic voltammogram of the reference dye 8 (-) and neat (—). Conditions: $c(8): 1.16 \mathrm{~mm}$, in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide with 0.10 m tetrabutylammonium perchlorate, Au rotating disc working electrode with 50 rpm , Pt counter electrode and $\mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{AgCl}$ reference electrode in 0.10 m tetrabutylammonium chlorid in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide, scaning rate was $100 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}$.
( $E_{\text {red } / o x}^{c}$ and $E_{\text {red } / o x}^{a}$ ) as shown in equation 2.31 [69].

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{r e d / o x}^{1}=\frac{E_{\text {red/ox }}^{c}+E_{\text {red/ox }}^{a}}{2}[V] \tag{2.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

The electrochemical band gap $\Delta E_{e l}$ of the reference dye 8 was 1.62 V , which was about 260 mV smaller than the optical band gap $\Delta E_{o p t}$ of 1.88 V measured in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide ( 1.92 V in chloroform table 2.2). Additionally, the number of transferred electrons for the reduction $z_{\text {red }}$ and the oxidation $z_{o x}$ were calculated by the modified Nernst equation 2.32 [69] where $R$ is the universal gas constant, $T$ the absolute temperature and $F$ the Faraday constant with a scanning rate of $100 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}$. An approximation was made for room temperature of $25^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{\text {red } / o x}=\frac{R \cdot T}{F \cdot\left(\left|E_{\text {red } / o x}^{c}-E_{\text {red } / o x}^{a}\right|\right)} \approx \frac{59.2 \mathrm{mV}}{\left|E_{\text {red } / o x}^{c}-E_{\text {red/ox }}^{a}\right|} \quad[-] \tag{2.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

The values of $z_{o x}$ and $z_{\text {red }}$ for MSQ 8 were about 0.8 , indicating a not complete reduction and oxidation process. Furthermore, the quotient of the cathodic and anodic peak hight $i_{\text {red } / 0 x}^{a} / i_{\text {red } / o x}^{c}$ per redox step was measured (Equation 2.33 [69]). If the quotient reaches unity then the process is reversible. If the quotient is close to unity the process is called quasi reversible, because of the diffusion of reduced or oxidized dye from the boundary layer into the bulk solution. The process is irreversible if the quotient is much different from unity, which is caused by reactions with the solvent, decomposition or elimination of the reduced and oxidized dye species.

$$
\frac{i_{r e d / o x}^{a}}{i_{r e d / o x}^{c}}\left\{\begin{align*}
=1 & \text { reversible process }  \tag{2.33}\\
\approx 1 & \text { quasi reversible process } \\
\ll 1 & \text { irreversible process }
\end{align*}\right.
$$

For the reference dye 8 the quotient was calculated to be 0.77 for the oxidation and 0.89 for the reduction, indicating quasi reversible processes.

The dyes were measured in $N, N$-dimethylformamide (DMF) because DMF is electrochemically stable in a very wide potential range ( -2.0 to +1.8 V ) and the reported value of the ferrozene calibration versus NHE was measured therein [69]. For some dyes the solvent was changed to chloroform due to their poor solubility ( $<1 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) in $N, N$-dimethylformamide. The data of the cyclic voltammogram were analysed having a scanning rate of $100 \mathrm{mV} / \mathrm{s}$ and they were tabulated in table 2.9. A linear relationship of the optical band gap $\Delta E_{\text {opt }}$ and the electrochemical band gap $\Delta E_{e l}$ was reported for over fifty cyanine dyes by Loutfy et al. (eq. 2.34 [70]):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta E_{o p t}=\Delta E_{e l}+C_{\text {Loutty }} \tag{2.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Loutfy et al. determined the averaged constant $\bar{C}_{\text {Loutty }}$ to be +0.35 V [70]. Here, for the squaraine dyes measured in $N, N$-dimethylformamide the correction constant $C_{o p t-e l}$ was determined by the individual difference of $\Delta E_{o p t}$ and $\Delta E_{e l}$. The averaged constant $\bar{C}_{\text {Loutty }}$ for the squaraines was calculated to be +0.20 V with a variance of $\pm 0.056 \mathrm{~V}$. This relation connects the optical property with the electrochemical one.
In order to study the influence of the dye-dye interaction, the first reduction potential $E_{\text {red }}^{1}$ and the first oxidation potential $E_{o x}^{1}$ of the in $N, N$-dimethylformamide measured dyes (Table 2.9) were plotted versus their electrochemical band gap $\Delta E_{e l}$ (Figure 2.37). The data points for the first oxidation potential $E_{o x}^{1}$ in Volt (black) and the one for the first reduction potential $E_{r e d}^{1}$ in Volt (red) were linearly fitted resulting in function 2.35

Table 2.9: Summary of the electrochemical data of the squaraines and the comparison with the optical band gap.

| entry | solv. | $\begin{aligned} & E_{o x}^{1} \\ & {[\mathrm{~V}]} \end{aligned}$ | $[-]$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{i i_{x}}{i_{0 x}^{\prime}} \\ & {[-]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} E_{\text {red }}^{1} \\ \text { [V] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} z_{\text {red }} \\ {[-]} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{c}{i_{\text {red }}} \\ & {[-]} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \Delta E_{e l} \\ {[\mathrm{~V}]} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\Delta E_{o p t}$ <br> [V] | $\begin{gathered} C_{o p t-e l} \\ {[\mathrm{mV}]} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MSQ 8 | DMF | 0.75 | 0.78 | 0.77 | -0.87 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 1.62 | 1.88 | 0.26 |
| MSQ 9 | DMF | 0.75 | 0.81 | 0.83 | -0.86 | 0.79 | 0.87 | 1.61 | 1.84 | 0.24 |
| MSQ 10 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.75 | 0.07 | 0.46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MSQ 11 | DMF | 0.74 | 0.83 | 0.90 | -0.86 | 0.83 | 0.90 | 1.59 | . 84 | 0.25 |
| MSQ 12 | DMF | 0.73 | 0.79 | 0.83 | -0.85 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 1.58 | 1.80 | 0.23 |
| BSQ 13 | DMF | 0.73 | 0.76 | 0.84 | -0.85 | 0.74 | 0.91 | 1.57 | 1.76 | 0.19 |
| BSQ 15 | DMF | 0.73 | 0.71 | 0.74 | -0.84 | 0.75 | 0.99 | 1.57 | 1.78 | 0.21 |
| BSQ 19 | DMF | 0.74 | 0.76 | 0.75 | -0.84 | 0.81 | 0.99 | 1.58 | 1.77 | 0.19 |
| BSQ 20 | DMF | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.86 | -0.81 | 0.76 | 0.99 | 1.58 | 1.79 | 0.21 |
| BSQ 17 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.85 | 0.20 | 0.81 | -0.98 | 0.20 | 0.89 | 1.84 | 1.68 | -0.16 |
| BSQ 14 | DMF | 0.71 | 0.97 | 0.97 | -0.82 | 0.58 | 0.92 | 1.53 | 1.63 | 0.10 |
| BSQ 16 | DMF | 0.72 | 0.54 | 0.66 | -0.82 | 0.67 | 0.85 | 1.54 | 1.63 | 0.09 |
| BSQ 27 | DMF | 0.59 | 0.71 | 0.84 | -0.72 | 0.97 | 0.63 | 1.31 | 1.49 | 0.18 |
| BSQ 18 | DMF | 0.73 | - | - | -0.73 | - |  | 1.47 | 1.65 | 0.18 |
| TSQ 21 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.80 | 0.42 | 0.93 | -1.05 | 0.37 | 0.69 | 1.85 | 1.74 | -0.10 |
| TSQ 24 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.92 | 0.53 | 0.64 | -0.92 | 0.45 | 0.87 | 1.84 | 1.76 | -0.08 |
| TSQ 22 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.78 | 0.50 | 0.68 | -1.06 | 0.41 | 0.38 | 1.84 | 1.76 | -0.08 |
| TSQ 23 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.79 | 0.48 | 0.56 | -1.05 | 0.39 | 0.59 | 1.84 | 1.78 | -0.06 |
| TSQ 25 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.82 | 0.29 | 0.70 | -1.03 | 0.30 | 0.53 | 1.85 | 1.64 | -0.21 |
| TSQ 26 | $\mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

for the oxidation with $R^{2}=0.814$ and function 2.36 for the reduction with $R^{2}=0.826$. Furthermore, according to the linear correlation of the optical and electrochemical band gap in equation 2.34 the energy of the redox potentials can be expressed by the optical band gap $\Delta E_{o p t}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{o x}^{1}=0.49 \cdot \Delta E_{e l}-0.033 \approx 0.49 \cdot \Delta E_{o p t}-0.131 \quad[V] \tag{2.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{r e d}^{1}=-0.51 \cdot \Delta E_{e l}-0.033 \approx 0.51 \cdot \Delta E_{o p t}+0.069 \quad[\mathrm{~V}] \tag{2.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

Conspicuously, the absolute values of functions 2.35 and 2.36 were similar. The slope of the reduction potential was a bit steeper than the one of the oxidation potential, evidencing that the influence of the aromatic $\pi$-systems and the dye-dye interactions affected the reduction slightly more than the oxidation potentials of squaraine dyes. Assuming that the size of the electric band gap $\Delta E_{e l}$ in these kind of dyes can be


Figure 2.37: Comparison of the first oxidation potential $E_{o x}^{1}\left(\square, R^{2}=0.814\right)$ and the first reduction potential $E_{r e d}^{1}\left(\bullet, R^{2}=0.826\right)$ versus the electrochemical band gap $\Delta E_{e l}$ of the in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide measured dyes (table 2.9).
reduced to zero, the resulting Fermi energy level of a kind of metallic material would be -33 mV . This value implies a elektrono-ambident property of squaraine dye radicals with a slight tendency towards the electrono-dative property [11], meaning those dyes have no preference for either being an oxidized or a reduced radical. In fact, radicals of the cyanine dyes with 3 H -indole aromatic end groups were also electrono-ambident materials [11].
The link between the electrochemical redox levels, the optical transition and the molecular orbital was explicitly explained by Loutfy et al. for the cyanine dyes [70]. The energy of the first oxidation potential $E_{o x}^{1}$ defined the energy of the ground state $\mid g>$ and was also set as the energy level of the HOMO. To obtain the energy of the LUMO level of the ground state $\mid g>$ three values were available: the energy of the first reduction potential $E_{\text {red }}^{1}$, the optically excited singlet state $\mid e_{S}>$ and the optically excited triplet state $\left|e_{T}\right\rangle$. According to Loutfy et al. the optically excited triplet state $\mid e_{T}>$ was equalizedidentical with the calculated LUMO level, but unfortunately this energy level could not be measured. However, the energy of the first reduction potential $E_{\text {red }}^{1}$ is more
likely the one of $\mid e_{T}>$ than the energy of the $\mid e_{S}>$ [70]. And so it was assumed that the energy of the calculated LUMO level corresponded to the first reduction potential $E_{\text {red }}^{1}$. In table 2.9 also the number of involved electrons during a redox process ( $z_{\text {red } / o x}$ ) was listed. Comparing these $z_{\text {red } / o x}$-values with the optical oscillator strength $f_{g e}$ in table 2.7 on page 61 a fundamental difference was observed. The $f_{g e}$-values corresponded to the number of involved electrons during the optical transition and for the MSQs and the BSQs with tilted bridges at least the $f_{g e}$-values could be correlated with the number of chromophore units. This pointed towards nearly degenerated frontier orbitals due to the weak chromophore-chromophore coupling. In contrast, none of the dyes showed $z_{\text {red/ox }}$-values bigger than one. With the help of a simple model of frontier orbital levels (Figure 2.38) this apparent contradiction was explained. Firstly, the MSQs with one chromophore unit behaved as expected. Upon photon excitation one electron from the HOMO of the ground state $\mid g>$ moved to the LUMO resulting in the singlet excited state $\left|e_{S}\right\rangle$. And in the case of the electrochemical reduction the additional electron was added into the LUMO level of $\mid g>$ resulting in the reduced state $\mid$ red $>$ of the dye. Secondly, if the BSQs showed a small dye-dye interaction as it is the case for the tilted bridges then linear combination of the two chromophores resulted in nearly degenerated molecular orbitals. Therefore, upon photon excitation both chromophores can be excited individually by roughly the same energy, resulting in a higher value of the oscillator strength $f_{g e}$. However, each chromophore in the BSQs with small dyedye interaction was reduced individually and step wise, resulting in a single electron reduction at the first reduction potential. This explanation was also valid for the TSQs with tilted bridges. Thirdly, BSQs with planar bridges showed a larger coupling which led to the creation of a single dye system with a reduced band gap. This new dye system behaved as the one of the MSQs, which explained the reduced values of the oscillator strength $f_{g e}$ for these kind of dyes. Since the new dye system was a linear combination of the squaraine chromophore units, its frontier orbitals should be distributed over the entire molecule with a certain electron density distribution on the bridge which was investigated and reported in the next section.

### 2.2.4 Analysis of the dye structure - molecular modeling

As a result of the optical and electrochemical analysis it was assumed that the BSQs with a tilted linker inbetween the two chromophore units have nearly degenerated


Figure 2.38: Model of the electron distribution of the frontier orbitals upon electrochemical reduction and photon excitation from the ground state.
energy levels with a small coupling. Due to the more intense dye-dye coupling in the planar linked BSQs a new single dye system was expected, which is visible in a different constellation of the frontier orbital density. So as to prove that, molecular modeling of the structure of the dyes was performed in order to investigate the distribution of the frontier orbitals in the molecule. For simplification of the calculations the alkyl chains were reduced to methyl synthons. The drawn molecules were then pre-optimization with the help of the molecular mechanics force field method MM2 using the program package ChemBioOffice 2008. Subsequently, a list of the Cartesian coordinates of the atoms served as the input for the geometry optimization of the molecular structure in
the parallelized NWChem 5.1 program [71,72] on Ipazia - the Linux computing cluster at Empa [41]. According to literature [32] the reported calculation settings used Density Functional Theory (DFT, [73]) with B3LYP functional and 6-31G* as the basis set. In an additional calculation step, the energy of the geometry optimized molecular structure was calculated using the same settings in the NWChem 5.1 program. The programming and monitoring of the calculations on Ipazia as well as the analysis of the NWChem output files were performed by Dr. Thomas Geiger. For the illustration of the molecular structure and the calculated frontier orbitals the program Jmol open-source Java viewer for chemical structures was used [74]. With the help of the jmol-program also the torsion angle $\phi$ between the chromophore unit and the tilted bride in the phenylene bridged BSQ 13, fluorene bridged BSQ 15, alkoxy phenylene bridged BSQ 19 and tetra fluoro phenylene bridged BSQ 20 were measured and listed in table 2.10. These $\phi$ values were different from the prior assumed value of $44.4^{\circ}$ from the diphenyl molecule which was expected since the calculation was performed in vacuum. However, the larger torsion angle in the alkoxy phenylene bridged BSQ 19 and the tetrafluoro phenylen bridged BSQ 20 compared to the plain phenylene bridged BSQ 13 explained the lower values of the absorption maximum for these dyes according to the structure-property relation formula 2.20 on page 59. This evidence implied that the electronical structure of a tilted bridge might have a smaller impact than the torsion angle.
For a better illustration the frontier orbitals cut off was set to $2 \%$ for all dyes. In figure 2.39 the plain optimized structure (top), the LUMO (middle) and the HOMO (bottom) were grouped for the phenylene bridged BSQ 13 (top left), the fluorene bridged BSQ 15 (top right), the alkoxy phenylene bridged BSQ 19 (bottom left) and the tetrafluoro phenylene bridged BSQ 20 (bottom right). For these four BSQs the weight of the orbital clouds in the frontier orbitals were always equally distributed amoung the two chromophore units. The measurable impact of the aromatic end group indole derivatives was evidenced by the small electron density contributions in their HOMO and LUMO. However, the electron probability density in the frontier orbitals located on the linker

Table 2.10: Measured torsion angle $\phi$ between the chromophore unit and the tilted bride in the geometry optimized structure of the BSQs.

| BSQ | $\phi$ | $\cos ^{2}(\phi)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | $36^{\circ}$ | 0.655 |
| 15 | $37^{\circ}$ | 0.638 |
| 19 | $41^{\circ}$ | 0.570 |
| 20 | $41^{\circ}$ | 0.570 |







Figure 2.39: The optimized dye structure (top), the LUMO (middle) and the HOMO (bottom) were grouped for the phenylene bridged BSQ 13 (top left), the fluorene bridged BSQ 15 (top right), the alkoxy phenylene bridged BSQ 19 (bottom left) and the tetrafluoro phenylene bridged BSQ 20 (bottom right).
synthon is bearly measurable, except in the HOMO of the alkoxy bridged BSQ 19 and
the LUMO of the tetrafluoro phenylen bridged BSQ 20. The constellation of the frontier orbital electron probability density in the BSQs with tilted linkers underlined the priorly made educated guess that in these dyes the chromophores were nearly individual and showed quite degenertated energy states.
The more interesting question to be answered was whether the planar linked BSQs had a different constellation of the frontier orbital electron probability density. Therefore, the plain optimized structure (top), the LUMO (middle) and the HOMO (bottom) were grouped for the naphthalene bridged BSQ 17 with indole end groups (top left), the naphthalene bridged BSQ 14 (top right), the anthracene bridged BSQ 16 (bottom left) and the flat bridged BSQ 27 (bottom right) were displayed in figure 2.40. Indeed, the frontier orbitals of the naphthalene and anthracene bridged BSQs indicated a fusion of the two chromophore systems. However, the biggest part of the electron probability density was still at the center of each chromophore. So one can describe these three BSQs as the two strongly coupled but individual chromophores or as an incomplete fusion of the two squaraine dye units. Remarkably, the characteristics of the nodal planes through the LUMO of the planar linked BSQs implicated an over all conjugated system, especially over the five membered ring systems next to the center part. The HOMO of the flat bridged BSQ 27 showed a similar orbital cloud distribution as the naphthalene and anthracene bridged BSQs. However, its LUMO suggested that a new dye system was created since the centroid of the spacial distribution of the electron probability density was calculated to be in the center of the molecule, on the bridge! It is assumed that this complete fusion of the chromophore units accounted for the reduction of the band gap according to the model in the figure 2.38 on page 74 which thereby resulted in the giant bathochromic shift of the absorption maximum.
Finally, the effect on the frontier orbitals of BSQ 18 with the slightly unsymmetrical structure was investigated. One end group was a benzo[e]indole derivative and the other one a carboxy indole. Since both end groups have the same number of $\pi$-electron pairs in line with the chromophore it was not expected that the difference between the two dye systems would be noticeable. But in fact, roughly $75 \%$ of the total spacial orbital cloud distribution of the HOMO lay on the chromophore with the benzo[e]indole end group whereas the remaining $25 \%$ where on the other side as shown in figure 2.41. Interestingly, in the LUMO the spacial distribution was exactly the opposite, which suggested an electron transfer from the HOMO of the chromophore at the benzo[e]indole end group to the LUMO of the other chromophore upon photon excitation. This transfer can be seen as intra molecular charge separation resulting


Figure 2.40: Per dye the optimized structure (top), the LUMO (middle) and the HOMO (bottom) were grouped for the naphthalene bridged BSQ with indole end groups 17 (top left), the naphthalene bridged BSQ 14 (top right), the anthracene bridged BSQ 16 (bottom left) and the flat bridged BSQ 27 (bottom right).
in a reduced dye unit at the carboxy indole end and an oxidized dye unit at the benzo[e]indole end of the molecule.


Figure 2.41: The optimized structure (top), the LUMO (middle) and the HOMO (bottom) of the unsymmetric BSQ 18.

### 2.2.5 Proof-of-concept in a dye sensitized solar cell

The calculated vectorial electron transfer, the fact that BSQ 18 possesses a carboxylic acid group and the broad and highly intense absorption band were three basic requirements for the use of this dye as a sensitizer in a dye sensitized solar cell (DSC). Therefore, a collaboration with the research group of Prof. Dr. Michael Grätzel at EPFL was intended in order to answer the question whether BSQ 18 shows the vectorial electron transfer and if this dye could be used as a NIR sensitizer for the DSC application. Next to the just mentioned three basic requirements for the use of an unsymmetric dye as a sensitizer additional conditions must be fulfilled. The fourth requirement is that after dye excitation the electron injection into the wide band gap semiconductor should be fast and efficient which requires specific electronic properties. This was proven for the squaraine dye class with SQ01 and SQ02 (Figure 2.42) [31,32]. Fifthly, the reduction potential of the dye has to match the titanium dioxide conduction band edge and finally the oxidation potential must be high enough to provide the necessary driving force for a fast dye regeneration by the electrolyte redox system. The latter two conditions were verified with cyclic voltammetry and is reported in section 2.2.3. Furthermore, BSQ 18 is a Ruthenium-free dye. Since ruthenium is a rather rare and expensive element any alternatives are of special interest [75,30,76].
The DSC device was prepared in the Grätzel group at the EPFL by Dr. Frédéric



Figure 2.42: Molecular structure from SQ01 and SQ02 [31, 32].
Sauvage. He used their standard procedure for the cell preparation. According to it a screen-printed double layer thick film of interconnected titanium dioxide $\left(\mathrm{TiO}_{2}\right)$ particles was used as photo-anode upon NSG10 TCO glass (Nippon Sheet Glass). The first layer of $8 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ thickness and optically transparent, was composed of 20 nm particles of anatase $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}$. A second $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ thick layer, based on 400 nm size particles, was used to backscatter the unabsorbed photons towards the dye. The cells were sensitized in a $10^{-5} \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1}$ solution of BSQ 18 in chloroform overnight. $3 \alpha, 7 \alpha$-Dihydroxy- $5 \beta$-cholanic acid (CDCA) was used as de-aggregating agent in different proportions from 0 to $40 \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}$ during cell optimization. After being washed with acetonitrile and dried in a water free air box, the sensitized electrodes were separated by a $25 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ thick Surlyn gasket melt by heating with the Pt-modified TEC15 TCO. This Platinum latter was prepared by spreading out a drop of $5 \mathrm{mmol} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{PtCl}_{6}$ in ethanol solution prior to heating the counter electrode at $400^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 min under air. The internal space between the two electrodes was filled via a hole with electrolyte (called: M1, see section 4.1) using a vacuum back filling system. The hole, priorly made by sand-blasting, was clogged-up with a melted Bynel sheet. One of these cells is shown in figure 2.43. Then, the prepared DSC was characterized. The evolution of the "incident photon conversion efficiency" (IPCE) curve as a function of the molar ratio of CDCA rising from 0 to 40 $\mathrm{mol} / \mathrm{mol}$ was investigated where the best performance was obtained at the highest CDCA ratio. The current-voltage $\mathrm{J}-\mathrm{V}$ curve is displayed in figure 2.44. The insert in this figure shows the wavelength dependent IPCE of the working DSC device. The cell showed a short circuit current density $\left(J_{s c}\right)$ of $3.11 \mathrm{~mA} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}$, an open circuit voltage ( $V_{o c}$ ) of 545 mV and a fill factor (ff) of 0.76 leading to the photon-to-electron conversion efficiency $(\eta)$ of $1.3 \%$ obtained under $100 \mathrm{~mW} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}$ illumination intensity. It was clearly


Figure 2.43: Picture of a working DSC of 6 mm in diameter coated with BSQ 18 by courtesy of Dr. Frédéric Sauvage.


Figure 2.44: Graph: current-voltage (J-V) characteristics of a BSQ 18 sensitized solar cell; insert: wavelength dependent incident photon conversion efficiency (IPCE) of the working solar cell.
demonstrated that photo-current is produced from 550 nm up to 800 nm where BSQ 18 absorbs. This verified the calculated vectorial electron transfer. Furthermore, it was proven that NIR photons were converted to electricity by this dye.
The UV/vis spectrum in the homogeneous chloroform solution (Figure 2.27, page 52) looks different from the IPCE spectrum. The IPCE curve have mainly two bands situated at 675 nm and 742 nm whereas the solvent spectrum showed only one main transition
band at 727 nm in chloroform. It was assumed that this discrepancy might either derive from the presence of electrochemical decomposition products or from the formation of aggregates on the $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}$ surface. The former argument was disproved by a longterm electrochemical stress experiment of BSQ 18 measured by cyclic voltammetry in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide. The long-term measurement was performed by accomplishing 3500 full cycles up to 1.15 V and down to -0.85 V within 24 hours. The first and last scan of the series is shown in figure 2.45. Importantly, the electrochemical band gap of BSQ


Figure 2.45: Long-term electrochemical stress experiment of dimer BSQ 18 measured in DMF. Cyclic voltammograms of the first and the $3500^{\text {th }}$ scan after 24 h are provided.

18 remained unchanged after 3500 scans. All potentials were shifted towards lower voltage because the diffusion processes of chloride ions out of the reference electrode occured. Also during the one day measurement neither an additional oxidation nor reduction peak appeared implying that the dye is indeed electrochemically stable under applied experimental conditions.
Aggregate formation was the second argument describing the discrepancy. Thus, aggregates from BSQ 18 were induced by successive change of the solvent polarity from a homogeneous dimethylsulfoxide solution to water [77,78, 79]. The normalized spectra of this series were summarized in figure 2.46. Indeed, the induced aggregates
in the 40:60 dimethylsulfoxide-water mixture looked like the recorded IPCE spectrum. It was assumed that these aggregates were $H$-aggregates [79, 80] and they were known as one of the reasons for a bad solar cell performance. It was concluded that


Figure 2.46: Normalized UV/vis absorption spectrum of BSQ 18 in DMSO-water mixtures. The arrows indicate the spectrum development with increasing water content.
although the anti-aggregation agent CDCA was used, aggregates were formed in the DSC device.
Furthermore, it was investigated in which production step towards the DSC device the aggregation of the well solublized dye occured. So BSQ 18 in chloroform $\left(10^{-5} \mathrm{M}\right)$ without anti-aggregation agent was absorbed on the surface of sintered $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}$ nano particles. The UV/vis spectrum of this half-cell was recorded against air and is displayed in figure 2.47 together with the normalized spectrum of the chloroform solution. The spectrum of the absorbed dye was more similar to the spectrum of the chloroform solution than to the IPCE curve. Therefore, the aggregation of BSQ 18 might take place when it gets in contact with the very polar electrolyte. Measures to prevent this dye from aggregating were on the one hand the change of the electrolyte system and on the other hand the introduction of much longer alkyl side chains into the molecular structure. As already mentioned, if the aggregation of BSQ 18 could be avoided then the DSC performance will be better.


Figure 2.47: BSQ 18 immobilized on $\mathrm{TiO}_{2}$ surface against air (solid line), dissolved in MTBE (dashed line) and dissolved in DMSO (dotted line).

## Chapter 3

## Conclusions and outlook

### 3.1 Conclusions

For the synthesis of the MSQs the strategy of Treibs and Jacob [45] for the symmetrical squaraines and the one of Terpetschnig et al. [48] for the unsymmetrical squaraines were followed. Their processes were adopted and modified. Mentionable is the alkylation with alkyl iodides and indole derivatives where the solvent was optimized. Using acetonitrile instead of 1-butanol gave $10-20 \%$ more total yield in half the time. Furthermore, the pathways for the modification of the end groups were optimized. It was shown that the only way to transform the aryl bromide at the indole derivative via Miyaura Borylation Reaction and Suzuki cross coupling was either before the nitrogen atom in the indole system had been alkylated or after the squaraine dye had been built up. Regarding the introduction of alkyl side chains, the longer the chain the better soluble the dyes were. Here, a maximal chain length of eight carbon atoms were introduced which was suitable for the MSQs, BSQs and TSQs in respect of the solubility. However, for a larger number of repeating units longer alkyl side chains would be needed as it was recently indicated by Völker et al. [60]. The last point concerning the alkylations, dealt with the double methylation of the bridging moieties. Although, tosylates are really strong alkylation agents, only methyl tosylates worked sufficiently under harsh conditions. Nevertheless, it was possible to prepare, purify and isolate all target molecules individually by multi step synthesis and optimized unit operations of chemical engineering. The experimental details were reported in chapter 4.
The characterization of the optical property of the prepared dyes were determined
with UV/vis spectroscopy in diluted solution of various solvents. In the case of the five MSQs, their absorption maximum ( $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ ) were in the range of 637.5 to 665.5 nm in chloroform solution. The correlation of these $\lambda_{\max }^{a b s}$ values with the number of the $\pi$-electron pairs outside the chromophore unit corrected by the torsion angle resulted in a linear structure-property relation. With this formula it was possible to prove the chromophore-chromophore interaction in the prepared BSQ molecules. The $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{\text {abs }}$ values of those BSQs together with the ones of the corresponding MSQs and TSQs were the basic values for the determination of the saturation curves according to Meier [12]. Concluding, the here presented bridged squaraine dyes reach a saturation of the optical properties after five to eight repeating units and are in the range between 700 and 800 nm . These saturation curves were further analyzed resulting in a multi dimensional formula in which the parameters only consisted of structural information. Firstly, the structural information which influenced the optical properties were the number of $\pi$-electron pairs of the bridge corrected by the torsion angle. The more $\pi$ electron pairs and the more in-plan the bridge is, the more red shifted the $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ value was. Secondly, the distance ( $d$ ) in-between the two chromophore units was also taken into account which showed that $1 / d^{2}$ is proportional with the bathochromic shift. Thirdly, since the conjugation was also studied in tilted, biphenyl like bridges the number of tilts $(m)$ between the two chromophores is also relevant. The more tilts the bridge has, the smaller the coupling of the chromophores is. Finally, the number of chromophore units $(n)$ had a strong influence on the red shift when the value of $n$ is between one and eight; above saturation is reached.
Also solvatochromic effects were studied by using various solvents to measure UV/vis spectroscopy of the prepared dyes. Concluding, three solvent groups were found which showed a linear behavior in a plot where the absorption wavenumber maximum of the dye is a function of the dielectric constant of the solvent. The solvents were subdivided into those who contain either an oxygen atom, an aromatic moiety or non of the two.
The electrochemical properties of the prepared dyes were determined by cyclic voltammetry in N,N-dimethylformamide or in chloroform. It was found, that the change of the molecular structure effected the first reduction and the first oxidation potential in a similar way and its influence on the electrochemical properties was linearly correlated with its impact on the optical properties. Furthermore, a direct relation between the individual reduction or oxidation potentials and the optical band gap ( $\Delta E_{o p t}$ ) was found which allows the estimation of these electrochemical properties for any structure related squaranie dye when $\Delta E_{o p t}$ is known.

This study indicated that the stronger the coupling in between two dye systems, the bigger the transition dipole moment is, as predicted by Kiprianov [19]. However, after a certain coupling strength, visible by the determined red shift, the transition dipole moment decreased. This contradicting behavior was explained with the increasing probability to form a fused, single dye system. This process was pictured by molecular modeling. Deducing, the BSQs showing a bigger bathochromic shifted $\lambda_{\text {max }}^{a b s}$ value had a bigger weight of probability density of the electrons in the frontier orbitals located on the bridging moiety. Furthermore, in the special case of the BSQ 27 the said probability density was actually predominant on the bridge in the LUMO.
Additionally, the molecular modeling showed that an unsymmetrically constructed, naphthalene bridged dimeric squaraine dye shows a directional charge transfer during optical excitation. This unsymmetric BSQ was synthesized, immobilized on titanium dioxide nano-particels and to get a proof-of-concept a first dye sensitized solar cell (DSC) was made therewith having an energy conversion efficiency $(\eta)$ of $1.3 \%$.

### 3.2 Outlook

In this thesis the indole based squaraine dyes with one, two and more dye units were studied. Though, a 1,5-diaza anthrazene bridged dye (BSQ 27) was synthesized and characterized which showed outstanding optical properties. Therefore, a further study in the field with this type of bridges would open a new and interesting research area because they will have huge batochromically shifted $\lambda_{\max }^{\text {abs }}$ values. Their polymeric variation might show the postulated electroconductivity and the broad absorption range of these type of dyes might be of special interest for the possible use in solar cell devices. As an outlook of this thesis, it is suggested that the series of similar flat conjugated bridges, as shown in figure 3.1, shall be synthesized. Additionaly, trimers, oligomers and polymers with the said bridges would be interesting target molecules. And also the herein developed unsymmetric synthesis method for the BSQ 18 could be adopted in order to produce new NIR absorbers for solar cell applications. All these synthetic efforts should create a good basis for a similar structure-property relation study and also pave the way towards improved materials in optical applications.




Figure 3.1: Suggested squaraines with new flat bridging synthons.

## Chapter 4

## Experimental Descriptions

### 4.1 General Information and Procedures

If not specially indicated, all chemicals were purchased either from Aldrich, Fluka or VWR with the appropriate purity and used unmodified. Room temperature (rt) refers to $23^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Unless otherwise stated, the reactions were run in a (three necked) round bottom flask under an argon atmosphere. The reaction mixtures and the apparatuses were evacuated ( 200 mbar ) and flushed with argon several times before the reactions were started. Where indicated the reactor content was degassed using freeze-pump-thaw cycling thrice, utilizing liquid nitrogen, a high vacuum pump (down to $10^{-2} \mathrm{mbar}$ ) and thawing in argon atmosphere.
Reactions were monitored by analytical thin-layer chromatography (TLC) using silica gel baked on glass, on aluminium-foil or on PET-foil with a fluorescent indicator 254 nm from RediSep ${ }^{T M}$, Fluka or Merck. In order to visualize the TLC's by UV (254 and/or 365 nm ) they were developed with either aqueous cobalt thiocyanate, aqueous alkaline potassium permanganate solution or silver nitrate in concentrated ammonium hydroxide solution.
Water free sodium sulphate powder $\left(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{SO}_{4}\right)$ was used for drying the organic layers after extraction. Subsequent evaporation of the solvent was performed in a Heidolph Laborota 4000 rotary evaporator with a bath temperature of $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and an appropriate pressure.
For individual purification flash chromatography was performed with the CombyFlash TeledyneISCO system from Companion using RediSep ${ }^{T M}$ Normal Phase Disposable

Columns (various sizes). To increase the separation performance, $0.1 \%$ of 1,1,1,3,3,3hexafluoro isopropanol (ABCR) was added to the eluent. Isocratic flows as well as gradients were used.
Where stated the isolated compounds were dried in the Salvislab vacuum oven at $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and 1 mbar overnight or for three days in special cases.
The yield is defined as the purified, dried and isolated material given in mass. The weighed starting materials are reported with three valid digits and the weigh-out quantity is given with two valid digits due to the accuracy of the purity calculation via NMR of 1\%.
The averaged number of repeating units $\left(\bar{X}_{n}\right)$ in the filtration residue of the oligomeric materials was determined by three methods:

- Carother's equation (eq. 4.1) where $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {Carother }}$ is calculated over the conversion to the polymer $(U) . U$ was defined as the isolated mass yield.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {Carother }}=\frac{1}{1-U} \quad[-] \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

- Medial allegation of the MALDI-TOF measurement results in $\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {MALDI-TOF }}$ according to equation 4.2, where $M_{R}^{\text {unit }}$ is the molar mass of the repeating unit, $m_{i}^{i o n}$ the mass of ion $i$ and $S_{i}^{i o n}$ is the signal intensity of ion $i$. For this equation it is assumed, that all ions have the same flying ability.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{X}_{n}^{\text {MALDI-TOF }}=\frac{1}{M_{R}^{\text {unit }}} \cdot \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(m_{i}^{\text {ion }} \cdot S_{i}^{\text {ion }}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} S_{i}^{\text {ion }}} \quad[-] \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

- End group determination by NMR gives $\bar{X}_{n}^{N M R}$ with the equation 4.3. Protons which were nearby the coupling side show a different shifted signal if they were in the bulk polymer or at the end of it. Their integrals per proton were entered into the equation only if both signals were identified.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{X}_{n}^{N M R}=\frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{I_{\text {bulk }}}{l_{\text {end }}} \quad[-] \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The microscopic pictures from crystalline material were taken on a Research HighClass Stereo-Microscope Olympus SZX16 with SDF PLAPO lenses with a $\kappa$ DX 40
camera and appropriate software.
For the definition of the melting and freezing points but also for the verification of decomposition differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) was performed on a Perkin Elmer, DSC-7 in nitrogen atmosphere at various temperature ranges with a scanning speed of 5 or $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ per minute.
Thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) was performed on a NETZSCH, TG 209 F1 in nitrogen atmosphere. In the thermogramm the onset was used to calculate the boiling, sublimating or decomposition points. For this analysis, one to five milligrams of compound were weighed in a ceramic crucible and heated from room temperature to $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a heating rate of $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ per minute. In addition, the ash residue at $600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ is reported in percent. "Spontaneous decomposition" marks compounds which deflagrated at their decomposition point. Caution: This mini-explosion might crack the ceramic crucible.
Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) spectra were recorded at 297 K in a 5 mm broadband inverse probe on a Bruker 400 MHz spectrometer operating at 400 MHz for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$-NMR, 100 MHz for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}, 376 \mathrm{MHz}$ for ${ }^{19} \mathrm{~F}-\mathrm{NMR}$ and 162 MHz for ${ }^{31} \mathrm{P}-\mathrm{NMR}$. Unless otherwise stated deuterated chloroform was used as solvent. All NMR spectra were referenced to residual proto-deutero solvent signals in the solvent indicated according to Gottlieb et al. [81] (see below).

| Solvent | $\delta / \mathrm{ppm}\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\right)$ | $\delta / \mathrm{ppm}\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}\right)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ | 7.26 | 77.00 |
| $\mathrm{DMSO}_{6} \mathrm{~d}_{6}$ | 2.50 | 39.52 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}$ | 7.16 | 128.06 |

Data were reported as follows: chemical shifts ( $\delta$ ) in parts per million (ppm), if possible identification according to the numeration in the drawn molecular structure, corresponding signal integral, multiplicity abbreviation ( $\mathrm{s}=$ singlet, $\mathrm{d}=$ doublet, $\mathrm{t}=$ triplet, $q=$ quartet, $p=$ pentet, hex = hexet, hep = heptet, $m=$ multiplet, $b r=b r o a d$ ) and if possible coupling constant in Herz (Hz).
Mass spectra were recorded on a Bruker maXis-ESI-Q-TOF mass spectrometer (ESI-QTOF) or on a HiRes-ESI IonSpec Varian Ultima-ESI FTICR-MS spectrometer (lonspec, Lake Forest, CA, USA). ESI spectra of small organic molecules were measured in methanol or dichloromethane if not otherwise stated. For the electron ionization mass spectrometry a Micromass (Waters) AutoSpec Ultima-EI-EBE-MS (EI) was used without any solvents or matrices. Matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization
(MALDI) spectra were performed on an IonSpec Varian Ultima-MALDI-FTICR-MS or on a Bruker UltraFlex II - MALDI-TOF (MALDI-TOF). MALDI spectra of small organic molecules were usually measured in a matrix of 3-hydroxypicolinic acid (3-HPA). MALDI-TOF was measured in a matrix of 2-[(2E)-3-(4-tert-butylphenyl)-2-methylprop-2-enylidene]malononitrile sodium salt (DCTB+Na). Calculated masses were based on average isotope composition or on single isotope masses for high resolution spectra. Unless otherwise indicated MALDI was used for mass spectroscopy and HR-MALDI for exact mass determination. Data are reported as follows: isotopic mass in atomic mass units, relative intensity in percent written in in parenthesis and if possible the identification is given in squared brackets. If special isotopic constellations were visible, like two bromine atoms, some of the isotopic distribution signals were also described as $A, A+1, A+2$ and so on.
Elemental analysis for $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{N}$ and O was measured by an apparatus from LECO. The elements $\mathrm{F}, \mathrm{Cl}, \mathrm{Br}$, I were measured by titration or with an ion chromatograph after a Schöniger-pulping. Due to solvent incorporation into the product crystals of most of the target compounds those elemental analysis results were outside the tolerance of $0.5 \%$. Data were reported as follows: chemical element symbol with its per cent content of the molecular formula.
Ultraviolet and visible (UV/vis) spectra were recorded on a Varian Cary 50 Scan spectrometer in a 1.000 cm optical glass or quartz cuvette. The spectra were recorded in the absorption versus wavelenght mode with a linear sweep of monochromatic light starting from the lower energy end of the spectra in 0.5 nm steps. All spectra were base line corrected before they were analyzed.
Fluorescence spectroscopy was carried out on a Fluorolog from Horbia Jobin Yvon with a UV/vis detector. The detection mode was front face because of the big re-absorption of the emitted light due to the very small Stock's shift. The excitation wavelength was normally set 50 nm below the absorption maximum, because the machine had a light diffusion of $\pm 25 \mathrm{~nm}$ and squaraine dyes generally have a very small Stock's shift.
Cyclic voltammetry measurements were recorded on a PGStat 30 potentiostat (Autolab) using a three cell electrode system consisting of a rotating gold or glassic carbon working electrode, a platinum counter electrode and a $\mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{AgCl}(0.1 \mathrm{M}$ tetrabutyl ammonium chloride in water free solvent) reference electrode. As a nonaqueous supporting electrolyte 0.1 M tetrabutyl ammonium perchlorate (TBAP) in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide or chloroform were used. All solvents were deoxygenated with argon prior to electrochemical measurements. The ferrocene/ferrocenium couple
$\left(\mathrm{Fc}_{\mathrm{Fc}}{ }^{+}\right)$was used as an internal reference. The scanning rate was varied from 10$2000 \mathrm{mVs}^{-1}$ and the rotation speed of the working electrode was set to 50 rpm . For comparability with the published literature, all potentials were referenced to normal hydrogen electrode ( NHE ), by adopting a potential for $\mathrm{Fc} / \mathrm{Fc}^{+}$to +0.72 V vs. NHE in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide [69] and +0.25 V vs. NHE in chloroform.
The DSC was prepared as descried in section 2.2.5 with the volatile M1 electrolyte. This electrolyte is composed by $0.6 \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1} 1$-butyl-3-methylimidazolium iodide (BMII), 50 $\mathrm{mmol} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1} \mathrm{Lil}, 40 \mathrm{mmol} \cdot \mathrm{L}^{-1} \mathrm{I}_{2}, 0.275 \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1}$ tert-butylpyridine and $0.05 \mathrm{~mol} \cdot \mathrm{~L}^{-1}$ GuNCS in a solvent mixture of $85 \%$ acetonitrile with $15 \%$ valeronitrile by volume. The prepared DSC was then characterized as follows: A 450 W xenon light source (Oriel, USA) was used to provide an incident irradiance of $100 \mathrm{~mW} \cdot \mathrm{~cm}^{-2}$ at the surface of the solar cells. The spectral output of the lamp was filtered using Schott K113 Tempax sunlight filter (Präzisions Glas \& Optik GmbH, Germany) to reduce light mismatch between real solar illumination and the simulated one to less than $2 \%$. Light intensities were regulated with wire mesh attenuators. The J-V measurements were performed using a Keithley model 2400 digital source meter (Keithley, USA) by applying independently external voltage to the cell and by measuring the photo-generated current out from the cell. Incident photon-to-current conversion efficiency (IPCE) measurements were realized using a 300 W xenon light source (ILC Technology, USA). A Gemini-180 double monochromator Jobin Yvon Ltd. (UK), was used to select and increment wavelength irradiation to the cell.

### 4.2 Synthesis: Prescription and Characterization

## 4-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dime-thyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (8)



In a Dean-Stark apparatus 28 ( $15.0 \mathrm{~g}, 40.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 126), squaric acid ( $2.24 \mathrm{~g}, 19.7$ mmol , OChem Inc.), toluene ( 60 mL ), 1-butanol ( 120 mL ) and quinoline ( 10 mL ) were combined and boiled under reflux overnight. The next morning the reaction mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure to the half of its volume. The ensuing residue was poured while stirring into an aqueous citric acid solution (1.5 L, 5\%). The stirring was prolonged until the copper shiny oil transformed to a golden-green solid. The precipitate was filtered and the residue was recrystallized from boiling ethanol ( 500 mL ) to yield 8 ( $9.4 \mathrm{~g}, 15 \mathrm{mmol}, 76 \%$ ).

Melting point: $155-160^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $290^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $16 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.34\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4\right.\right.$ ") H, 2H, d, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-5\right.$ " $\left.)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.29\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-\right.\right.$ $\left.7 ")=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6 "-5 ")=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6 "-4 ")=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz},\right), 7.12\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-4 "\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-6 "\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},\right), 6.96\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6 "\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.95\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.1-3.8$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right)$, 1.8-1.7 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.4-1.2 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.86\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.25, 179.42, 169.92, 142.41, 142.17, 127.66, 123.55, 122.20, 109.27, 86.48, 49.20, 43.66, 31.66, 29.25, 29.08, 27.01, 26.98, 22.52, 14.00.

MS: 621 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 620(100)[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 605(7)\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 364(7)\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 310.7$
(5) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 310.2$ (4) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 207.1$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{3+}$, 155.4 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}$, 103.6 (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{6+}$, $88.8(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{7+}, 77.7(0.4)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{8+}$, $69.1(0.4)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{9+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}:$620.4336. Found: 620.4410.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}$ : C, 81.24; H, 9.09; N, 4.51; O, 5.15. Found: C, 81.14; H, 9.10; N, 4.50; O, 5.23.

## 4-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((1-ethyl-3,3-dimethyl-5-phenylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1enolate (9)



In a 50 mL Schlenk tube $36(1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 1.51 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 138 ), bromobenzene ( 0.355 $\mathrm{g}, 2.26 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), potassium acetate ( $0.445 \mathrm{~g}, 4.53 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), dichloro[1,1'-bis(diphenyl-phosphino)-ferrocen]-palladium(II) ( $50 \mathrm{mg}, 56 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, CombiPhos Catalysts Inc.) and dioxane ( 20 mL ) were mixed and stirred at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 d . The solvent was then evaporated under vacuum and the residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 50 mL ). The suspension was filtered through a silica gel bed $(3 \mathrm{~cm})$ and the residue was washed with chloroform $(2 \times 40 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solvent of the filtrate was removed under reduced pressure. The purification of the crude product by column chromatography (chloroform) yielded 9 ( $0.42 \mathrm{~g}, 0.60 \mathrm{mmol}, 40 \%$ ) as a golden crystalline powder.

Decomposition onset: $283^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $17 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 7.85\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-6^{*}\right)=1.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.71(\mathrm{C}(2 \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$,
$\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \S-3 \S)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(2 \S-4 \S)=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.64\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-5^{*}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.6^{*}\right)=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.51\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{* *}-5^{* *}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.46\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3 \S-\right.$ $\left.4 \S)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, \quad{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3 \S-2 \S)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.39\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \quad 1 \mathrm{H}, \quad \mathrm{d}, \quad{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), \quad 7.37-7.29$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\star *}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(4 \S) \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.16\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\star *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-6^{* *}\right)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-\right.$ $\left.\left.4^{* *}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.80\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 4.15\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \ddagger-2 \ddagger)=6.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.07\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \not \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \ddagger \ddagger-2 \ddagger \ddagger)=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, 1.77-1.65 (C(1†) $\mathrm{H}_{3}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 14 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.4-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(4 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(7 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(2 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 13 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.81\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \ddagger \ddagger-7 \ddagger \ddagger)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO- $d_{6}$ ): 180.65, 178.90, 178.45, 169.11, 168.34, 142.38, 142.21, 141.43, 141.30, 139.93, 135.89, 128.89, 127.96, 127.10, 126.59, 126.52, 123.69, 122.25, $120.76,110.34,86.15,86.02,48.80,48.73,42.92,38.06,31.14,28.66,28.58,26.51$, 26.50, 26.47, 26.19, 25.49, 22.04, 13.93, 11.78.

MS: 613 (99) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 612$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 597$ (21) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 583$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}, 499$ (1) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{17}\right]^{+}, 364$ (11) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 356$ (13) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 306$ (9) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 153(2)[\mathrm{M}]^{4+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{48} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}^{+}\right.$: 612.3710. Found: 612.3589.

## 4-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octyl-5-phenyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-5-phenylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (10)



38 ( $3.00 \mathrm{~g}, 3.44 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 140), bromobenzene ( $1.62 \mathrm{~g}, 10.32 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), potassium acetate ( $2.02 \mathrm{~g}, 20.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), dichloro[1,1'-bis(diphenylphosphino)-ferrocen]palladium(II) ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 250 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, CombiPhos Catalysts Inc.) and dioxane ( 50 mL ) were combined in a 100 mL Schlenk tube and heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 4 d . The product precipitated during the reaction. After reaction, the reactor content was cooled to rt and the crude product was filtered. The filtration residue was recrystallized from hot dimethyl sulfoxide ( 600 mL at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). The crystals were filtered and washed with cold ethanol ( $3 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and dried to yield 10 ( $1.9 \mathrm{~g}, 2.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 71 \%$ ) as golden needle like crystals (Figure 4.1).


Figure 4.1: Isolated 10 as golden needle like crystals.

Due to insolubility in common organic solvents and aggregation formation in chloroform, NMR analysis was performed in dimethylsulfoxide in low concentration ( $<1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{mL}$ ) causing the inability to measure ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-\mathrm{NMR}$.

Decomposition onset: $304^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $25 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 7.86\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4\right.\right.$ ")H, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4 "-6 ")=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.72\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \dagger-\right.$ $3 \dagger)=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.66\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-7\right.\right.$ " $\left.)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-4 "\right)=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.47(\mathrm{C}(3 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}$, dd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3 \dagger-2 \dagger)=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3 \dagger-4 \dagger)=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.41\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6\right.\right.$ " $\left.)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.35$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \dagger-3 \dagger)=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.83\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.12\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br), 1.8-1.6 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.5-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 0.85\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.

MS: 774 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 772(97)[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 757(21)\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 660(2)\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{17}\right]^{+}, 440$ (10) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 386$ (3) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 193$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}]^{4+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{54} \mathrm{H}_{64} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 772.4962. Found: 772.4974.

## 2-((3-Ethyl-1,1-dimethyl-1 H-benzo[e]indol-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)-4-((1-ethyl-3,3-dimethyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (11)


$42(6.85 \mathrm{~g}, 20.5 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 145), 39 ( $6.80 \mathrm{~g}, 21.6 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 141), toluene ( 50 mL ), 1-butanol ( 100 mL ) and quinoline ( 10 mL ) were mixed in a Dean-Stark apparatus. The condensation proceeded for 15 h at reflux temperature. Then the reaction mixture was concentrated under vacuum and the bluish-black oily residue was diluted in ethanol ( 50 mL ). While stirring vigorously the solution was poured in an aqueous citric acid solution ( $800 \mathrm{~mL}, 5 \%$ ). The green precipitate was filtered off and the ensuing residue was recrystallized from boiling methanol ( 120 mL ) to yield $11(3.8 \mathrm{~g}, 7.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 37 \%$ ) as golden crystals.

Decomposition onset: $288^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $28 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.23\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \quad \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{\prime \prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $8.03\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.01\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{" \prime}-7^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}\right)=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.71\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-5^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.62\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-9{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-7^{\prime \prime}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\right)=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.53\left(\mathrm{C}(7 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \dagger \dagger-\right.$ $\left.6 \dagger \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(7 \dagger \dagger-5 \dagger \dagger)=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.45\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.8^{\prime \prime}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-99^{\prime \prime}\right)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.35 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}(6 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, \quad 1 \mathrm{H}, \quad \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6 \dagger \dagger-5 \dagger \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6 \dagger \dagger-\right.$ $\left.7 \dagger \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6 \dagger \dagger-4 \dagger \dagger)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.31\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \dagger \dagger-5 \dagger \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4 \dagger \dagger-\right.$
$6 \dagger \dagger)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.16\left(\mathrm{C}(5 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5 \dagger \dagger-6 \dagger \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5 \dagger \dagger-4 \dagger \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(5 \dagger \dagger-\right.$ $7 \dagger \dagger)=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 5.86\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 5.80(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.27\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{* *}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.2^{* *}\right)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.12\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \ddagger-2 \ddagger)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.95\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.70$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \pm \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.34\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(2^{* *}-1^{* *}\right)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right) .1 .29\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \ddagger-\right.$ $1 \ddagger)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ).
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 180.72, 178.36, 177.91, 170.24, 168.18, 141.77, 141.51, 139.24, $133.31,130.91,129.83,129.73,127.99,127.95,127.44,124.22,123.53,122.29$, $122.25,111.15,109.96,85.66,85.58,50.62,48.63,38.22,37.89,26.50,26.10,12.09$, 11.72.

MS: 525 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 503$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 502$ (97) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 487$ (5) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 473$ (1)
$\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}, 330$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 280$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 276$ (7) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{NO}\right]^{+}, 252$ (7) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{2+}, 251$ (7) $[\mathrm{M}]^{2+}, 168$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{3+}, 126$ (3) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}$, 101 (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{5+}, 84$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{6+}, 72(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{7+}, 63(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{8+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{35} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 503.2693. Found: 503.2696.

## 2-((3-Ethyl-1,1-dimethyl-1 H-benzo[e]indol-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)-4-((3-ethyl-1,1-dimethyl-1 H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (12)



In a Dean-Stark apparatus 40 ( $15.4 \mathrm{~g}, 42.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 142), squaric acid ( $2.34 \mathrm{~g}, 20.5$ mmol , OChem Inc.), toluene ( 50 mL ), 1-butanol ( 100 mL ) and quinoline ( 10 mL ) were mixed and heated to reflux for 36 h . Thereafter, the reaction mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure and the oily residue was dissolved in ethanol ( 100 mL ). While stirring, the solution was added dropwise to an aqueous citric acid solution ( $1 \mathrm{~L}, 5 \%$ ).

After 30 min the precipitate was filtered and subsequent recrystallization of the remnant from boiling chloroform ( 750 mL ) yielded 12 as copper-red shiny crystals (Figure 4.2 right hand side). After drying in the vacuum oven, NMR analysis showed that two mol chloroform per one mol 12 were present which was also verified by TGA analytics. Chloroform was incorporated into the crystal structure, since chloroform is only released above $130^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. These reddish crystals were then recrystallized from boiling methanol to yield chloroform- and methanol-free, golden-green shiny crystalline 12 ( $6.6 \mathrm{~g}, 12 \mathrm{mmol}$, $58 \%$, Figure 4.2 left hand side). Interestingly this transformation is reversible.


Figure 4.2: Picture of the solvent-free, golden-green crystals (left hand side) and the copper-red chloroform adduct of 12.

TGA of the copper-red coloured shiny crystal modification: onset(1): $130^{\circ} \mathrm{C} \Delta \mathrm{m}$ : $30 \%$ (corresponds to two mol chloroform per mol 12; decomposition onset(2): $323^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: 18\%.

DSC of the copper-red coloured shiny crystal modification: no melting point before decomposition. Release of Chloroform visible from $130-200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

TGA of the golden-green shiny crystal modification: decomposition onset: $318^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $26 \%$. No release of methanol visible.

DSC of the golden-green shiny crystal modification: no melting point before decomposition. No release of methanol visible.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right)$ : 8.31 (chloroform, 2 H , s, only in reddish crystal modification), 8.23 (C(9")H, 2H, dd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{\prime \prime}-8 "\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{\prime \prime}-7^{\prime \prime}\right)=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.03\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-\right.\right.$
$4 ")=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.02\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-7\right.\right.$ ") $\left.=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}\right)=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.71\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$, d, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-5 "\right)=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.62$ ( $\mathrm{C}\left(8^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-7\right.$ ") $=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-\right.$ $6 ")=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.45\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6 "\right)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-8 "\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-9 "\right)=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $5.87\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.27\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{* *}-2^{* *}\right)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.97\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, $1.35\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(2^{* *}-1^{* *}\right)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 184.74, 177.51, 169.85, 138.91, 133.18, 130.86, 129.82, 129.75, 127.99, 127.45, 124.18, 122.24, 111.12, 85.54, 50.55, 38.18, 26.16, 12.08.

MS: 575 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 552$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 537$ (5) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 523$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}, 330$ (18) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 276$ (7) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 184$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}]^{3+}, 138$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}]^{4+}, 110(1)[\mathrm{M}]^{5+}, 92(1)[\mathrm{M}]^{6+}, 79$ (1) $[M]^{7+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{38} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}: 552.2771$. Found: 552.2779.

## 2,2'-(5,5'-(1,4-Phenylene)bis(1,3,3-trimethylindoline-5-yl-2-ylidene))bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(4-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) (13)


$43(1.36 \mathrm{~g}, 3.27 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 146$)$, $47(1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 1.31 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 151), toluene (10 $\mathrm{mL})$, 1-butanol ( 20 mL ) and quinoline ( 5 mL ) were combined and boiled for 60 h in a Dean-Stark apparatus. Afterwards, the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The residue was diluted with ethanol ( 50 mL ) and added dropwise to cold aqueous citric acid solution ( $600 \mathrm{~mL}, 10 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v}$ ) as it was stirred vigorously for 15 min . The suspension was filtered and the residue was digested in saturated potassium carbonate solution $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and, afterwards, washed with water thrice. Subsequent purification by column chromatography (chloroform) yielded 13 ( $1.1 \mathrm{~g}, 0.85 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $300^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $44 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.18\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.86\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $8.84\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-4^{*}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.66(\mathrm{C}(2 \S) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.6-7.5\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}\right.$,
$\mathrm{C}(6 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.38\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-8^{*}\right)=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.27$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-5^{*}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.03\left(\mathrm{C}(7 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \dagger \dagger-6 \dagger \dagger)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.04$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 5.95\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.10\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right), 3.52\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right)$, $2.06\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 2.0-1.8 (C(1£) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.5-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(5 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(7 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.84\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \dagger-7 \dagger)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.27, 179.74, 177.49, 172.13, 169.24, 142.55, 142.45, 139.26, 135.93, $134.50,131.15,129.53,128.41,127.18,127.14,126.43,124.29,122.40,120.59$, $110.05,109.04,86.84,86.48,51.22,48.79,43.78,31.51,29.12,28.94,27.25,27.14$, 26.83, 26.50, 22.39, 13.90.

MS: 1220 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1219$ (82) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 1205$ (24) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1190$ (10) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-$ 2. $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 912(16)\left[\mathrm{C}_{62} \mathrm{H}_{62} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 805$ (11) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{56} \mathrm{H}_{59} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 790(6)\left[\mathrm{C}_{55} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 609.8$ (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 609.3$ (3) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 414$ (12) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{84} \mathrm{H}_{90} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}\left[\mathrm{M}^{+}\right.$: 1218.6957. Found: 1218.6980.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{84} \mathrm{H}_{90} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ : C, 82.72; $\mathrm{H}, 7.44 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.59 ; \mathrm{O}, 5.25$. Found: C, 82.45; H, 7.50; N, 4.65; O, 5.45.

## 2,2'-(1,1,3,6,6,8-Hexamethylindolo[7,6-g]indole-2,7(1H,3H,6H,8H)-diylidene)bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(4-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) (14)



43 ( $1.36 \mathrm{~g}, 3.27 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 146), 57 ( $1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 1.31 \mathrm{mmol}$, Thomas Geiger [23]), toluene $(10 \mathrm{~mL})$, 1-butanol ( 20 mL ) and quinoline ( 5 mL ) were combined in a Dean-Stark apparatus and boiled for 60 h . Subsequently, the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The residue was dissolved in ethanol ( 50 mL ) and added dropwise to cold aqueous citric acid solution ( $600 \mathrm{~mL}, 10 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v}$ ) as it was stirred vigorously for 15 min. The suspension was filtered and the residue was digested in saturated potassium carbonate solution ( 100 mL ) and, afterwards, washed with water four times. Subsequent purification by column chromatography (chloroform) yielded 14 ( $1.1 \mathrm{~g}, 0.85 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%$ ) and in an earlier fraction the mono Knoevenagel condensation product 58 ( $0.12 \mathrm{~g}, 0.14$ mmol ) was verified by UV/Vis spectroscopy ( $\lambda_{\max }=687 \mathrm{~nm}$ in chloroform, same $\lambda_{\max }$ as the compound 68 with ethylated benzo[e]indole synthon) which was then used without further characterization in the preparation of 26 (page 123).

Decomposition onset: $317^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $28 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.25-8.15(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $8.21\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.7^{*}\right)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.90\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-8^{*}\right)=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.88\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$,
$\left.\mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-4^{*}\right)=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.58\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-9^{*}\right)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-\right.$ $\left.\left.6^{*}\right)=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.55-7.45(\mathrm{C}(5 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.43\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.8^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-9^{*}\right)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.31\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-5^{*}\right)=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.2-6.0\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}\right.$, $\mathrm{C}\left(1\right.$ ") H, 4H, m), 4.5-4.0 (C(1†) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \neq \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 2.08\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.95$1.15\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(3 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(7 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 36 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.86$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \dagger-7 \dagger)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.43, 180.19, 177.13 (2C), 172.72, 171.12, 139.31, 138.93, 138.42, $134.86,131.39,129.72,129.67,128.54,127.36,124.54,122.60,122.33,119.43$, $117.89,110.21,88.08,86.87,51.50,49.35,48.62,44.03,31.66,29.64,29.28,29.08$, $27.45,26.98,26.59,22.53,14.01$.

MS: 1140 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 1118$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1117$ (65) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 1103$ (17) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 1088 (7) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1062$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{72} \mathrm{H}_{77} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 1006$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{68} \mathrm{H}_{69} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 810$ (5) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{54} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 718$ (10) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{49} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 704$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{48} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 558.8$ (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 414$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 279 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{76} \mathrm{H}_{85} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 1117.6565. Found: 1117.6590.

## 2,2'-(5,5'-(9,9-Bis(2-ethylhexyl)-9H-fluorene-2,7-diyl)bis(1,3,3-trimethylindoline-5-yl-2-ylidene))bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(4-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1 H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) (15)



A mixture of $50(1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 0.928 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 155), 43 ( $1.02 \mathrm{~g}, 2.32 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 146) toluene ( 10 mL ), 1-butanol ( 10 mL ) and 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone ( 10 mL ) was heated to reflux for 2 d . Afterwards, the solvent was removed under vacuum and the concentrate was dissolved in ethanol ( 25 mL ). This solution was dropped onto ice-water ( 1 L ) under stirring. After 1 h the precipitation was filtered and the ensuing residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 200 mL ). This solution was then extracted with saturated citric acid $(2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$, water $(4 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine $(150 \mathrm{~mL})$. After evaporating the solvent under reduced pressure, the remnant was suspended in diethyl ether ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to dissolve the intermediates and side products. After filtration and drying in a vacuum oven 15 (1.2 $\mathrm{g}, 0.76 \mathrm{mmol}, 82 \%$ ) was isolated as a dark blue amorphous powder.

Decomposition onset: $283^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $35 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.21\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.91\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.88\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-4^{*}\right)=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.78\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \S-3 \S)=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.65-7.55$
$\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(1 \S) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(3 \S) \mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.43\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.6^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-8^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-9^{*}\right)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.31\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-5^{*}\right)=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.05\left(\mathrm{C}(7 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \dagger \dagger-6 \dagger \dagger)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.15-5.9\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 4.2-4.0$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 3.7-3.5\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right)$, 2.2-2.0 (C(1§§) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 2.0-1.7 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.5-1.2 (alkyl chain, $24 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}$ ), 1.0-0.7 (alkyl chain, 20H, m), 0.65-0.5 (alkyl chain, 10H, m).

MS: 1532 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1517$ (14) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 1225 (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{85} \mathrm{H}_{99} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$, 1118 (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{79} \mathrm{H}_{95} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 766(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{107} \mathrm{H}_{127} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 1531.9852. Found: 1531.9823.

4-((1,1-Dimethyl-3-octyl-1 H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((8-((3-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-oxido-4-oxocyclobut-1-enyl)methylene)-1,3,3,7,9,9-hexamethyl-8,9-dihydro-1,7-diaza-dicyclopenta[a,h]anthracen-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (16)


To transform 63 ( $3.00 \mathrm{~g}, 5.27 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 168) into the deprotonated reactive species, it was suspended in a mixture of toluene ( 30 mL ) and aqueous sodium hydroxide solution $(10 \mathrm{~mL}, 40 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w})$ at rt in the dark while stirring for 30 min . The product containing organic layer was separated, dried with sodium sulphate and placed in a new reactor in which $43(8.80 \mathrm{~g}, 21.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 146), 1-butanol ( 70 mL ) and quinoline ( 10 mL ) were also added. The reaction mixture was then heated to reflux for 3 d . Thereafter, the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure and the remainder was dissolved in ethanol ( 50 mL ). This solution was then added dropwise into ice-water ( 1 L ) and stirred for 1 h . The precipitate was filtered and subsequent purification of the residue by column chromatography (chloroform) yielded 16 ( $0.46 \mathrm{~g}, 0.39 \mathrm{mmol}, 7 \%$ ) as a gold shimmering crystalline powder.

Decomposition onset: $293^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $34 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 9.05(\mathrm{C}(6 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 8.22\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.9-7.8\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.59\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-9^{*}\right)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-6^{*}\right)=1.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.5(\mathrm{C}(5 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.44\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \operatorname{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.8^{*}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-9^{*}\right)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.3-6.0\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 4.29\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, $4.15\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 2.09\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.0-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(3 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(7 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 36 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.87\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \dagger-7 \dagger)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.

MS: 1190 (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 1168$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1153$ (22) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1138$ (8) [M+H$\left.2 \cdot \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1123$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-3 \cdot \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1056$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{72} \mathrm{H}_{71} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 999$ (10) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{68} \mathrm{H}_{63} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 860$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{58} \mathrm{H}_{58} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 754$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{52} \mathrm{H}_{56} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 584$ (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 414$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{80} \mathrm{H}_{87} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 1167.6722. Found: 1167.6728.

## 2,2'-(1,1,3,6,6,8-Hexamethylindolo[7,6-g]indole-2,7(1H,3H,6H,8H)-diylidene)bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(4-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) (17)



The condensation reaction was performed in a Dean-Stark apparatus with 34 (1.50 $\mathrm{g}, 3.59 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 135) and $57(630 \mathrm{mg}, 1.44 \mathrm{mmol}$, Thomas Geiger [23]) in the solvent mixture of toluene ( 10 mL ), 1-butanol ( 20 mL ) and quinoline ( 5 mL ) at reflux temperature for 5 d . Afterwards, the solvent was evaporated in vacuo. The remainder was dissolved in ethanol ( 100 mL ) and added dropwise into cold aqueous citric acid solution ( $800 \mathrm{~mL}, 10 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) while stirring. After 15 min the suspension was filtered and the residue was suspended in saturated potassium carbonate solution ( 100 mL ) filtered and washed with water several times. Subsequent purification by column chromatography (chloroform:ethanol = 95:5) yielded 17 ( $0.93 \mathrm{~g}, 0.89 \mathrm{mmol}, 62 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $304^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $34 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.18\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \dagger \dagger-5 \dagger \dagger)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.47\left(\mathrm{C}(5 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5 \dagger \dagger-\right.$ $4 \dagger \dagger)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.37\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-5^{*}\right)=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.32\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}\right.$, 2 H , ddd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-4^{*}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-6^{*}\right)=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-7^{*}\right)=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.17\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-5^{*}\right)=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-4^{\star}\right)=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.01 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.5^{*}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-6^{\star}\right)=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.2-5.9 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 4.5-3.9 ( $\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 2.0-1.5 (C(1 $\left.\left.\ddagger\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 28 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.5-1.2 (C(3**) $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.86\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* *}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.7^{* *}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.35, 181.07, 178.27, 171.52, 171.03 (2C), 142.33, 142.24, 138.90,
138.56, 127.79, 124.07, 122.37, 122.30, 119.47, 118.14, 109.66, 88.09, 87.11, 49.55, 48.73, 43.87, 36.71, 31.67, 29.26, 29.08, 27.23, 27.10, 27.01, 26.85, 22.53, 14.02.

MS: 1040 (3) [M+Na] ${ }^{+}$, 1018 (100) [M+H] ${ }^{+}$, 1017 (58) [M] ${ }^{+}$, 1003 (12) [ $\left.\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 988$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 654$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{44} \mathrm{H}_{52} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 508.8 (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{68} \mathrm{H}_{80} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 1016.6174. Found: 1016.6180.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{68} \mathrm{H}_{80} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}$ : C, 80.28; H, 7.93; $\mathrm{N}, 5.51 ; \mathrm{O}, 6.29$. Found: C, 80.00; H, 7.94; N, 5.28; O, 6.37.

## 2-((5-Carboxy-3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-4-((7-((3-((3-ethyl-1,1-dimethyl-1H-benzo[e]indol-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)-

 2-oxido-4-oxocyclobut-2-enylidene)methyl)-1,1,3,6,6,8-hexamethyl-1,6-dihydroindolo[7,6-g]indol-3,8-diium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (18)
$68(1.50 \mathrm{~g}, 1.77 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 172), 64 ( $1.29 \mathrm{~g}, 1.84 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 169), toluene ( 15 mL ), 1-butanol ( 30 mL ) and quinoline ( 1 mL ) were combined and were brought to reaction for 3 d at reflux temperature. After this time the reaction mixture was cooled to rt
and poured in ice ( 1 L ). The precipitation was filtered and subsequently dissolved in chloroform $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ which was then extracted with water $(3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and saturated aqueous potassium carbonate solution ( 200 mL ). Unfortunately, the potassium salt of the product precipitated as a gel between the two phases. It could be separated by centrifugation. The gel-like residue was washed several times with water until the consistency of the residue changed to a powder like shape. The wet centrifugation residue was filtered through a $0.45 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ cellulose membrane filter. The fine powder was acidified with saturated citric acid ( 25 mL ), extracted with chloroform ( 250 mL ) and the organic layer was concentrated under vacuum to yield 18 ( $0.36 \mathrm{~g}, 0.35 \mathrm{mmol}, 19 \%$ ) as dark blue powder. The below presented picture shows the absorbed dye 18 on titanium dioxide nano particles ( 20 nm ) which were sintered to a homogeneous $8 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ think layer on a glass plate (Figure 4.3).


Figure 4.3: Picture of 64 absorbed from a $10^{-5} \mathrm{M}$ chloroform solution on sintered titanium dioxide nano particle spot of 6 mm in diameter on a glass plate.

Decomposition onset: $273^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $45 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.39\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \dagger-5 \dagger)=9.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.34(\mathrm{C}(9 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(9 \dagger-10 \dagger)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.26\left(\mathrm{C}(9 \#) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(9 \#-8 \#)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.05\left(\mathrm{C}(5 \#) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5 \#-\right.$ $4 \#)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.03\left(\mathrm{C}(6 \#) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6 \#-7 \#)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.00\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4{ }^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4{ }^{\prime \prime \prime}-\right.\right.$ $6 "$ ') $=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.94\left(\mathrm{C}(6 ") \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime \prime}-7\right.\right.$ "') $=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6 \mathrm{~m}-4$ "') $=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.78$ (C(10†)H, $\left.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(10 \dagger-9 \dagger)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.77\left(\mathrm{C}(5 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5 \dagger-7)=9.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.75(\mathrm{C}(4 \#) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}$, $\left.\mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \#-5 \#)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.63\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \#) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \#-9 \#)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \#-7 \#)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.47$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(7 \#) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \#-8 \#)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \#-6 \#)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},\right), 7.36\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7{ }^{\prime \prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7{ }^{\prime \prime \prime}-\right.\right.$
$\left.\left.6^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.0-5.85\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(1 \neq \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(1 \S \S) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 4.31\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \# \#-2 \# \#)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.15-4.05\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(1 \neq \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.96$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \S \S \S) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.74\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.70\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.74-1.70$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.40-1.20\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(3^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(7^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 13 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.85\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* * *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* * *}-7^{* * *}\right)=6.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 181.10, 181.02, 180.89, 180.76, 177.70, 176.72, 173.17, 171.15, 167.86, 167.12, 146.24, 141.26, 139.12, 138.91, 138.71, 138.31, 133.76, 131.09, $130.28,129.93,129.76,127.90$, 127.53, 125.22, 124.47, 123.13, 122.38, 122.08, 121.78, 120.16, 119.64, 118.26, 111.30, 109.67, 104.58, 88.10, 87.56, 87.28, 86.16, 50.91, 48.89, 48.17, 48.10, 42.98, 40.19, 38.48, 37.50, 31.15, 28.67, 28.59, 26.67, 26.66, 26.44, 26.43, 26.19, 26.17, 26.00, 22.06, 13.96, 12.21.

MS: 1050 (3) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 1028$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1027$ (64) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 1012$ (16) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 997$ (5) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 983$ (1) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 915$ (1) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{59} \mathrm{H}_{55} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{6}\right]^{+}, 804$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{51} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{6}\right]^{+}, 726$ (1) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{48} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 709$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{46} \mathrm{H}_{51} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$, 697 (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{45} \mathrm{H}_{51} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 619$ (1) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{41} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 514 (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 408$ (1) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{4}\right]^{+}, 330$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 257(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{67} \mathrm{H}_{71} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{6}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 1027.5368. Found: 1027.5386.

## 2,2'-(5,5’-(2,5-Bis(2-ethylhexyloxy)-1,4-phenylene)bis(1,3,3-trimethylindoline-5-yl-2-ylidene))bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(4-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1 H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) (19)



In a Dean-Stark apparatus 43 ( $1.25 \mathrm{~g}, 2.85 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 146 ), $54(1.00 \mathrm{~g}, 1.14 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 160), toluene ( 5 mL ), 1-butanol ( 5 mL ) and 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone ( 5 mL ) were mixed and heated to reflux for 2 d . According to UV/Vis measurements the reaction proceeded slowly and the pH changed from 6 to 7.5 . In order to acidify the reaction mixture, aqueous hydrochloric acid ( $2 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{~N}$ ) was added. The reaction was completed by refluxing for an additional day. Afterwards, the solvent was removed under reduced pressure. The concentrate was diluted with ethanol ( 10 mL ) and poured in water ( 250 mL ). The suspension was stirred for 30 min and the precipitate was filtered. The residue was digested with diethyl ether several times. Subsequent purification by column chromatography (chloroform) yielded 19 ( $0.48 \mathrm{~g}, 0.33 \mathrm{mmol}, 29 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $287^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $35 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.21\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-7^{*}\right)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.90\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}\right.$, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-8^{*}\right)=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.88\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-4^{*}\right)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.66\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4 \dagger \dagger-6 \dagger \dagger)=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.58\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \operatorname{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-9^{*}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$,
$\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}, \quad{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-6^{*}\right)=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), \quad 7.51 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}(6 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, \quad 2 \mathrm{H}, \quad \mathrm{dd}, \quad{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6 \dagger \dagger-7 \dagger \dagger)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6 \dagger \dagger-5 \dagger \dagger)=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.42\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-8^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-\right.$ $\left.\left.9^{*}\right)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.31\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-5^{*}\right)=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.05\left(\mathrm{C}(7 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \dagger \dagger-\right.$ $6 \dagger \dagger)=8.2 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.99(\mathrm{C}(3 \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 6.1-5.8\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1\right.\right.$ ")H, 4H, m), 4.2-4.0 (C(1†) $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.0-3.7\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \S \S) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 3.7-3.5\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right)$, $2.07\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}\right.$, s), 2.0-1.7 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.7-1.5 (C(2§§) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.5-1.1 (C(3†) $\mathrm{H}_{2}$, $\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(7 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(3 \S \S) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(4 \S \S) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \S \S) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 36 \mathrm{H}$, m), $0.86\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(6 \S \S) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(2 \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.43, 178.68, 177.47, 172.13, 170.04, 166.59, 150.35, 141.45139 .46 , 134.63, 134.07, 131.28, 130.14, 129.67, 129.65, 128.86, 128.60, 127.31, 124.39, 123.86, 122.59, 120.27, 115.54, 110.18, 108.47, 86.88, 86.54, 71.61, 51.32, 49.06, $43.95,39.59,31.72,31.69,30.40$, 29.30, 29.11, 28.97, 27.40, 27.21, 27.01, 26.66, 23.88, 22.95, 22.55, 14.03, 11.01.

MS: 1498 (3) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 1476$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1475$ (55) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 1461$ (11) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 1446 (2) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}, 1169$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{78} \mathrm{H}_{94} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{6}\right]^{+}, 1077$ (12) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{73} \mathrm{H}_{94} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$, 1062 (7) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{72} \mathrm{H}_{91} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 738(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{100} \mathrm{H}_{123} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~N}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 1475.9437$. Found: 1475.9468.

## 2,2'-(5,5’-(Perfluoro-1,4-phenylene)bis(1,3,3-trimethylindoline-5-yl-2-ylidene))bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(4-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) (20)



In a Dean-Stark apparatus 43 ( $474 \mathrm{mg}, 1.08 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 146), 56 ( $300 \mathrm{mg}, 0.433 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 162), toluene ( 5 mL ), 1-butanol ( 5 mL ) and 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone ( 5 mL ) were combined to generate 20 within 7 d at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Due to a change of the pH value to about 7.5 the reaction proceeded very slowly which was visualized by UV/Vis measurements. Therefore aqueous hydrochloric acid ( $2 \mathrm{~mL}, 1 \mathrm{~N}$ ) was added and the reaction mixture was heated for an additional 2 d . Then the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo and the remnant was dissolved in ethanol ( 10 mL ). This solution was added dropwise into water ( 1 L ). After stirring for 30 min the suspension was filtered and the residue was digested in diethyl ether several times to yield 20 ( $0.39 \mathrm{~g}, 0.30 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $283^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $37 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.21\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.91\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.89\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-4^{*}\right)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.59\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-9^{*}\right)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.7^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.5-7.4\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.32\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.5^{*}\right)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.05\left(\mathrm{C}(7 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \dagger \dagger-6 \dagger \dagger)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.12\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{"}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right), 6.00$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right), 4.18\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 3.56\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \not \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br), $2.07\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}\right.$, s), 2.0-1.7 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.5-1.2 (C(3†) $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}$,
$\left.\mathrm{C}(7 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.87\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \dagger-7 \dagger)=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.44, 178.68, 177.47, 173.36, 170.04, 168.89, 145.49, 143.84, 142.86, 142.25, 139.23, 135.10, 131.51, 130.70, 130.02, 129.80, 129.70, 128.53, 127.44, 124.70, 124.05, 122.66, 121.99, 110.28, 108.71, 87.32, 87.07, 51.64, 48.69, 44.18, 31.69, 30.43, 29.29, 29.10, 27.51, 27.22, 27.00, 26.56, 22.55, 14.03.
${ }^{19}$ F-NMR: -144.4 (C(2§)F, 4F, s).
MS: 1314 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 1292$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1277$ (16) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1262(7)\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}$, 984 (5) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{62} \mathrm{H}_{58} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$, 877 (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{56} \mathrm{H}_{55} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 720 (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{45} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 646 (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 414(4)\left[\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{84} \mathrm{H}_{87} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 1291.6658. Found: 1291.6634.
(para-phenylene-(4-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2,5-diyl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene-5-yl)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) $)_{3-4}$ (21)


All solvents and solutions were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. 29 ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 257$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 128), 37 ( $63.2 \mathrm{mg}, 257 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, page 139) and the catalyst $71(2.0 \mathrm{mg}, 1.8$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 175) were placed in a 25 mL round bottom flask and fitted with a septum. Then 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone ( 5 mL ), tetrahydrofuran ( 3 mL ) and an aqueous saturated
sodium hydrogen carbonate solution ( 2 mL ) were added via syringe. The reaction mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 d , while a very dark powder started to precipitate. After reaction, the solvent was completely removed under vacuum and the residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 100 mL ). This organic layer was washed with water ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( 50 mL ). The dried organic layer was concentrated under reduced pressure to about $2-5 \mathrm{~mL}$ which was then dripped into ethanol ( 250 mL ) under vigorously stirring. A very fine dark powder precipitated and was filtered. According to UV/Vis measurements the residue showed an more red shifted $\lambda_{\max }$ then the filtrate, therefore it was assumed that some of the lower molecular weight component could be washed out by this precipitation. 21 ( $0.12 \mathrm{~g}, 0.17 \mathrm{mmol}$ per formal unit, $67 \%, \bar{X}_{n}: 3$ ) was obtained by drying the filtration residue in a vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $288^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $52 \%$.
MS (MALDI-TOF): 4254 (2) [6 dye units and 5 bridges], 3559 (10) [5 dye units and 5 bridges], 3132 (4) [ 4 dye units and 5 bridges], 2864 (42) [ 4 dye units and 3 bridges], 2437 (13) [3 dye units and 4 bridges], 2168 (100) [3 dye units and 2 bridges], 1742 (10) [2 dye units and 3 bridges], 1047 (7) [1 dye unit and 2 bridges].

## (9,9-bis(2-ethylhexyl)-9H-2,7-fluorenylene-(4-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-

## 3H-indolium-2,5-diyl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene-5-yl)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) $)_{3-4}$ (22)



All solvents and solutions were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. 38 ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 229$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 140), 2,7-dibromo-9,9-bis(2-ethylhexyl)-9H-fluorene (126 mg, $229 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ ) and the catalyst 71 ( $1.9 \mathrm{mg}, 1.6 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, page 175) were placed in a 25 mL round bottom flask and fitted with a septum. Then 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone ( 5 mL ), tetrahydrofuran $(3 \mathrm{~mL})$ and an aqueous saturated sodium hydrogen carbonate solution ( 2 mL ) were added via syringe. The reaction mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 d , while a very dark powder started to precipitate. After reaction, the solvent was completely removed under vacuum and the residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 100 mL ). This organic layer was washed with water ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine $(50 \mathrm{~mL})$. The dried organic layer was concentrated under reduced pressure to about $2-5 \mathrm{~mL}$ which was then dripped into ethanol ( 250 mL ) under vigorously stirring. A very fine dark powder precipitated and was filtered. According to UV/Vis measurements the residue showed an more red
shifted $\lambda_{\text {max }}$ then the filtrate, therefore it was assumed that some of the lower molecular weight component could be washed out by this precipitation. $22(150 \mathrm{mg}, 0.15 \mathrm{mmol}$ per formal unit, $64 \%, X_{n}: 3$ ) was obtained by drying the filtration residue in a vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $296^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $49 \%$.
MS (MALDI-TOF): 6595 (3) [6 dye units and 7 bridges], 5587 (10) [5 dye units and 6 bridges], 4578 (34) [ 4 dye units and 5 bridges], 4186 (8) [ 4 dye units and 4 bridges], 3764 (15) [ 4 dye units and 3 bridges], 3571 (77) [3 dye units and 4 bridges], 3180 (11) [ 3 dye units and 3 bridges], 2756 (21) [ 3 dye units and 2 bridges], 2563 (24) [2 dye units and 3 bridges], 1748 (41) [2 dye units and 1 bridge], 933 (55).

## (2,5-bis(2-ethylhexyloxy)-para-phenylene-(4-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2,5-diyl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene-5-yl)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate)) ${ }_{3-5}(23)$



All solvents and solutions were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. 38 ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 229$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 140), $52(113 \mathrm{mg}, 229 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, page 157$)$ and the catalyst $71(1.9 \mathrm{mg}, 1.6$
$\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 175) were placed in a 25 mL round bottom flask and fitted with a septum. Then 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone ( 5 mL ), tetrahydrofuran ( 3 mL ) and an aqueous saturated sodium hydrogen carbonate solution ( 2 mL ) were added via syringe. The reaction mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 d , while a very dark powder started to precipitate. After reaction, the solvent was completely removed under vacuum and the residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 100 mL ). This organic layer was washed with water ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( 50 mL ). The dried organic layer was concentrated under reduced pressure to about $2-5 \mathrm{~mL}$ which was then dripped into ethanol ( 250 mL ) under vigorously stirring. A very fine dark powder precipitated and was filtered. According to UV/Vis measurements the residue showed an more red shifted $\lambda_{\max }$ then the filtrate, therefore it was assumed that some of the lower molecular weight component could be washed out by this precipitation. 23 ( $80 \mathrm{mg}, 84 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ per formal unit, $37 \%, \bar{X}_{n}$ : 2) was obtained by drying the filtration residue in a vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $344^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $44 \%$.
MS (MALDI-TOF): 8106 (2) [8 dye units and 9 bridges], 7153 (3) [7 dye units and 8 bridges], 6202 (12) [ 6 dye units and 7 bridges], 5250 (34) [ 5 dye units and 6 bridges], 4854 (9) [5 dye units and 5 bridges], 4298 (100) [4 dye units and 5 bridges], 3903 (23) [ 4 dye units and 4 bridges], 3347 (80) [3 dye units and 4 bridges], 2588 ( 8 ) [3 dye units and 2 bridges], 1636 (16) [2 dye units and 1 bridge].

## (para-2,3,5,6-tetra fluoro phenylene-(4-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2,5-diyl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene-5-yl)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate)) 3 -4 (24)



All solvents and solutions were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. 38 ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 229$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 140), 1,4-dibromotetrafluorobenzene ( $70.5 \mathrm{mg}, 229 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, \mathrm{ABCR}$ ) and the catalyst 71 ( $1.9 \mathrm{mg}, 1.6 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, page 175) were placed in a 25 mL round bottom flask and fitted with a septum. Then 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone ( 5 mL ), tetrahydrofuran ( 3 mL ) and an aqueous saturated sodium hydrogen carbonate solution $(2 \mathrm{~mL})$ were added via syringe. The reaction mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 d , while a very dark powder started to precipitate. After reaction, the solvent was completely removed under vacuum and the residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 100 mL ). This organic layer was washed with water ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( 50 mL ). The dried organic layer was concentrated under reduced pressure to about $2-5 \mathrm{~mL}$ which was then dripped into ethanol ( 250 mL ) under vigorously stirring. A very fine dark powder precipitated and was filtered. According to UV/Vis measurements the residue showed an more red shifted $\lambda_{\max }$ then the filtrate, therefore it was assumed that some of the lower molecular weight component could be washed out by this precipitation. 24 ( $70 \mathrm{mg}, 91 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$ per formal unit, $40 \%, \bar{X}_{n}$ : 2) was obtained by drying the filtration residue in a vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $345^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $52 \%$.

MS (MALDI-TOF): 4682 (1) [6 dye units and 5 bridges], 4064 (4) [5 dye units and 5 bridges], 3837 (3) [5 dye units and 4 bridges], 3297 (8) [ 4 dye units and 4 bridges], 832 (13) [1 dye unit].

## (4-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2,5-diyl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene-5-yl)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1enolate) $)_{3-4}(25)$



All solvents and solutions were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. $38(200 \mathrm{mg}, 229$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 140), 29 ( $178 \mathrm{mg}, 229 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, page 128 ) and the catalyst $71(1.9 \mathrm{mg}, 1.6$ $\mu \mathrm{mol}$, page 175) were placed in a 25 mL round bottom flask and fitted with a septum. Then 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidone ( 5 mL ), tetrahydrofuran ( 3 mL ) and an aqueous saturated sodium hydrogen carbonate solution ( 2 mL ) were added via syringe. The reaction mixture was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 7 d , while a very dark powder started to precipitate. After reaction, the solvent was completely removed under vacuum and the residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 100 mL ). This organic layer was washed with water ( $2 \times 50 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( 50 mL ). The dried organic layer was concentrated under reduced pressure to about $2-5 \mathrm{~mL}$ which was then dripped into ethanol ( 250 mL ) under vigorously stirring. A very fine dark powder precipitated and was filtered. According to UV/Vis measurements the residue showed an more red shifted $\lambda_{\max }$ then the filtrate, therefore
it was assumed that some of the lower molecular weight component could be washed out by this precipitation. $\mathbf{2 5}\left(0.19 \mathrm{~g}, 0.31 \mathrm{mmol}\right.$ per formal unit, $\left.68 \%, \bar{X}_{n}: 3\right)$ was obtained by drying the filtration residue in a vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $282^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $52 \%$.
 [H-(dye unit) $4_{4}$-boronic acid ester+Na], 2208 (34) [P-Ligand-(dye unit) $)_{3}$-boronic acid ester+Na], 2145 (13) [boronic acid ester-(dye unit) $)_{3}$-boronic acid ester], 2017 (100) [Br(dye unit) $\left.)_{3}-\mathrm{Br}\right], 1890$ (62) $\left[\mathrm{H}-(\text { dye unit })_{3}-\mathrm{H}+\mathrm{Na}\right]$.

## 4-((7-((3-((1,1-Dimethyl-3-octyl-1 H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)-

 methylene)-2-oxido-4-oxocyclobut-1-enyl)methylene)-1,1,3,6,6,8-hexamethyl-7,8-dihydroindolo[7,6-g]indol-2(1H,3H,6H)-ylidene)-methyl)-2-((7-((3-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1 H-benzo[e]indol-2-(3H)-ylidene)-methyl)-2-oxido-4-oxocyclobut-2-enylidene)-methyl)-1,1,3,6,6,8-hexamethyl-1,6-dihydroindolo[7,6-g]indol-3,8-diium-2-yl)-methyl))-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (26)

58 (115 mg, $141 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, page 104) and squaric acid ( $7 \mathrm{mg}, 61 \mu \mathrm{~mol}$, OChem Inc.) were mixed with benzene ( 5 mL ), 1-butanol ( 5 mL ), 1-methyl-2-pyrrolidinone ( 5 mL ) and quinoline ( 0.1 mL ) in Dean-Stark apparatus. The reaction mixture was heated to reflux for 7 d before it was poured on ice-cold aqueous citric acid solution (5\%, 250 mL ). The precipitate was filtered, then dissolved in chloroform ( 250 mL ) which was subsequent washed with water ( $4 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine $(2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL})$. The dried organic layer was concentrated under reduced pressure to a view milliliters which was then cooled to room temperature. Meanwhile the product precipitated, it was filtered and dried in the vacuum oven ( $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, 1 mbar ) to yield 26 ( $48 \mathrm{mg}, 32 \mu \mathrm{~mol}, 52 \%$ ) as golden shiny crystalline powder.

Decomposition onset: $302^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $44 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.3-8.2\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4\right.\right.$ ") H, C(9")H, 4H, m), $8.21\left(\mathrm{C}(9 \S \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(9 \S \S-8 \S \S)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, 7.94 (C(6§§)H, 2H, d, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6 \S \S-7 \S \S)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.92\left(\mathrm{C}(5 \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5 \S \S-4 \S \S)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, 7.62 ( $\mathrm{C}(8 \S \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}$, dd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \S \S-9 \S \S)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \S \S-7 \S \S)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.55-7.5(\mathrm{C}(5 ") \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{C}(10$ ") H, $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.48\left(\mathrm{C}(7 \S \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \S \S-6 \S \S)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7 \S \S-8 \S \S)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.36$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \S \S) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \S \S-5 \S \S)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.6-6.0\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(1 \S) \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 4.4-4.0$ (C(1\#\#) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 2.1-2.0 (C(1\#) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 2.0$1.7\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(3 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 28 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.55-1.2 (C(4\#\#) $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(7 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.87\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \# \#) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \# \#-7 \# \#)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.

MS: 1514 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 1513$ (56) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$, 1499 (14) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1484$ (4) [M+H2. $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1100(10)\left[\mathrm{C}_{74} \mathrm{H}_{77} \mathrm{~N}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 414$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{102} \mathrm{H}_{108} \mathrm{~N}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{6}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}: 1512.8325$. Found: 1512.8291.

## 2,2'-(1,6-Dimethylpyrido[2,3-g]quinoline-2,7(1 H,6H)-diylidene)bis(methan-1-yl-1-ylidene)bis(4-((1,1-dimethyl-3-octyl-1H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate) (27)



The condensation reaction was performed in a Dean-Stark apparatus with 43 ( 670 mg , 1.60 mmol , page 146 ) and $70(280 \mathrm{mg}, 0.64 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 174) as reactants in a solvent mixture of toluene ( 20 mL ), 1-butanol ( 10 mL ) and quinoline $(5 \mathrm{~mL})$. The light yellow solution was heated to reflux for 4 d . The solvent was then evaporated under vacuum and the green-black remainder was dissolved in ethanol ( 40 mL ). To precipitate the crude product this solution was dripped in ice cold aqueous citric acid solution (600 $\mathrm{mL}, 5 \%$ ) while stirring vigorously for 30 min and then filtered. The ensuing residue was purified with column chromatography (chloroform) to yield 27 ( $0.25 \mathrm{~g}, 0.24 \mathrm{mmol}, 38 \%$ ) as an blue-black coloured powder.

Decomposition onset: $277^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $33 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-$ NMR (DMSO-d $\left.{ }_{6}, \mathrm{~T}: 313 \mathrm{~K}\right): 9.55\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3 \dagger \dagger-4 \dagger \dagger)=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.53$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 \dagger \dagger-3 \dagger \dagger)=9.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.17\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.08$ $(\mathrm{C}(5 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.93\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.58\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-9^{*}\right)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.50\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-5^{*}\right)=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.37\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.6^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-8^{*}\right)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.0-5.6\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br), $4.1\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br), 4.0 $\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right), 1.97\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.8\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.5-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(4 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(7 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.9-0.8\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$. Due to aggregate formation in $\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ and critical solubility in other deuterated solvents no ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR could be measured.

MS: 1036 (100) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}, 1035\right.$ (75) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$, 1021 (24) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 1006$ (7) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-$ 2. $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 922 (5) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{17}\right]^{+}, 728$ (17) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{48} \mathrm{H}_{46} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}, 659$ (17) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{45} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 517.8$ (4) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{70} \mathrm{H}_{74} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 1034.5705. Found: 1034.5671.

## 2,3,3-Trimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium perchlorate (28)



1,1,2-Trimethyl-1 H-indole ( $45.9 \mathrm{~g}, 288 \mathrm{mmol}$, FEW Chemicals), 1-iodooctane ( 100 g , $416 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{ABCR})$ and 1-butanol ( 60 mL ) were mixed and heated to $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 36 h . After that the reaction mixture was chilled to rt and subsequently poured into hexane ( 1 L ). A light brown coloured oil precipitated. The oil was emulsified in fresh hexane $(400 \mathrm{~mL})$, the supernatant was decanted and the remnant was dissolved in ethanol $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$. In order to precipitate the product, this solution was dripped in diethyl ether (1.2 L) under vigorously stirring, but 2,3,3-trimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium iodide had a honey like consistence of a transparent red colour (Figure 4.4 left hand side). An aliquot was taken for the analysis. For further purification a crystallization step was induced by anion exchange. Thereto, the rest was dissolved in hot ethanol ( 600 mL ), then saturated sodium perchlorate solution ( 100 mL ) was added and finally the mixture was cooled down slowly to rt while the white crystalline product precipitated. 28 ( $73 \mathrm{~g}, 0.20 \mathrm{~mol}$, $68 \%$, Figure 4.4 right hand side) was obtained by filtration and subsequent drying.

Melting point (lodide): $5-10^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (Phase transition), $60-75^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (melting).
Melting point (Perchlorate): 117-119 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (melting).
Decomposition onset (lodide): $208^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $4 \%$.
Decomposition onset (Perchlorate): $287^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $28 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.6-7.45(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.40\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{*}-\right.\right.$


Figure 4.4: The red transparent 28 as iodide in a beaker with the molecular structure on paper underneath (left hand side) and the isolated and dried white crystalls of 28 as perchlorate (right hand side).
$\left.\left.2^{*}\right)=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.76\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.86\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.51\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.4$1.15\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.81\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.7^{*}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ).
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 195.65, 141.51, 140.67, 129.87, 129.19, 123.17, 114.87, 54.46, 48.37, 31.40, 28.73, 27.58, 26.48, 22.50, 22.31, 14.03, 13.84.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 272 (100) [M-CIO $\left.{ }_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}$: 272.2373. Found: 272.2370.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NClO}_{4}$ : C, 61.36; $\mathrm{H}, 8.13 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.77 ; \mathrm{O}, 17.21$; CI, 9.53. Found: C, 61.20; H, 8.05; N, 3.77; O, 17.11; CI, 9.63.

## 4-((5-Bromo-3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((5-bromo-3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocy-clobut-1-enolate (29)



In a Dean-Stark apparatus 72 ( $40.0 \mathrm{~g}, 83.6 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 176), squaric acid ( $4.65 \mathrm{~g}, 40.8$ mmol , OChem Inc.), toluene ( 150 mL ), 1-butanol ( 300 mL ) and quinoline ( 50 mL ) were combined and heated to reflux for 2 d . Then the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo. To remove the quinoline, the oily residue was dissolved in ethanol ( 200 mL ) and poured on aqueous citric acid solution ( $1 \mathrm{~L}, 5 \%$ ). After stirring for 30 min , the precipitation was filtered, dissolved in chloroform ( 350 mL ) and extracted with aqueous citric acid solution ( $600 \mathrm{~mL}, 10 \%$ ), water ( $4 \times 600 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), aqueous potassium carbonate solution ( $600 \mathrm{~mL}, 10 \%$ ) and anew with water ( $3 \times 600 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The solvent was removed under vacuum and the raw product was recrystallized from boiling ethanol ( 450 mL ) to yield 29 ( $21 \mathrm{~g}, 27 \mathrm{mmol}, 66 \%$ ) as golden crystals (Figure 4.5).

Melting point: $205-215^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $310^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $18 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.44\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-6\right.\right.$ " $\left.)=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.41\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6\right.\right.$ ") H, dd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6\right.$ " $\left.-7{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-\right.$ $6 ")=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.83\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6\right.\right.$ " $\left.)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.95\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 3.93\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, br), 1.8-1.71 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, ~ m\right), 1.77\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{~s}\right)$, 1.45-1.18 ( $\mathrm{C}\left(3^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{~m}\right), 0.87\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.


Figure 4.5: Picture of the crystal hedgehog of 29.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.04, 180.11, 169.41, 144.16, 141.49, 130.62, 125.65, 116.53, 110.64, 87.04, 49.29, 43.82, 31.65, 29.23, 29.06, 26.98, 26.91, 22.52, 14.01.

MS: 783 (4) $[M]^{+}(A+7)$ and $[M+H]^{+}(A+6), 782(19)[M]^{+}(A+6)$ and $[M+H]^{+}(A+5), 781$ (58) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+5)$ and $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+4), 780(80)[\mathrm{M}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+4)$ and $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+3), 779(95)[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$ $(A+3)$ and $[M+H]^{+}(A+2), 778(100)[M]^{+}(A+2)$ and $[M+H]^{+}(A+1), 777(44)[M]^{+}(A+1)$ and $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}), 776(41)[\mathrm{M}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}), 763(7)\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+2)$ and $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+1), 761$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{A}), 723(3)\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{8}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+3)$ and $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{8}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+2), 722(4)\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{8}\right]^{+}$ $(\mathrm{A}+2)$ and $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{8}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+1), 720$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{8}\right]^{+}(\mathrm{A}), 700$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{55}{ }^{81} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 698$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{55}{ }^{79} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 444$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{29}{ }^{81} \mathrm{BrNO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 442$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{29}{ }^{79} \mathrm{BrNO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 390.6$ (3) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}(\mathrm{A}+5)$ and $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}(\mathrm{A}+4), 390.1(3)[\mathrm{M}]^{++}(\mathrm{A}+4)$ and $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}(\mathrm{A}+3)$, $389.6(4)[\mathrm{M}]^{++}$ $(A+3)$ and $[M+H]^{++}(A+2), 389.1(4)[M]^{++}(A+2)$ and $[M+H]^{++}(A+1), 388.6(2)[M]^{++}(A+1)$ and $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}), 388.1(3)[\mathrm{M}]^{++}(\mathrm{A})$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{Br}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}: 776.2546$. Found: 776.2552.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{54} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 64.78$; $\mathrm{H}, 6.99$; $\mathrm{N}, 3.60 ; \mathrm{O}, 4.11$;
Br, 20.52. Found: C, 64.72; H, 7.02; N, 3.60; O, 4.18; Br, 20.47.

## 3,4-Diethoxycyclobut-3-ene-1,2-dione (30)



The reaction was performed analogue to Liu et al. [49] with some adjustments of the work-up method. In a 2 L round bottom flask first squaric acid ( $100 \mathrm{~g}, 0.877 \mathrm{~mol}$, OChem Inc.) and ethanol ( 1.2 L ) then triethyl orthoformate ( $325 \mathrm{~g}, 2.19 \mathrm{~mol}$ ) were combined in order to generate 30 at boiling temperature within 20 h . The solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. The remnant was distilled in high vacuum ( 0.03 mbar ) which resulted in a yellowish main fraction which was distilled a second time to yield 30 ( 0.13 $\mathrm{kg}, 0.75 \mathrm{~mol}, 86 \%$ ) as a colourless liquid.

Caution: This compound and some derivatives are used in medicinal applications as sensibilisers. Milligram quantities can amplify allergic reactions to such an extent that it can cause serious health problems.

Melting point: +13 to $+18^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Freezing point -5 to $-7^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Boiling point: $245^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (ambient pressure). Residue: 0\%. Head temperatur in the destillation: $82^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at 0.03 mbar.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 4.69\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}\right)=7.11 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.43\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(2^{\prime}-1^{\prime}\right)=7.11 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 189.08 (C(1), C(2)), 184.04 (C(3), C(4)), 70.37 C(1'), 15.40 C(2').
MS (Magnet El+): 170 (77) [M] ${ }^{+}$, 142 (11) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{4}\right]^{+}$, 113 (50) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{HO}_{4}\right]^{+}$, 84 (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{HO}_{3}\right]^{+}, 57$ (17) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{HO}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 29 (100) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS (Magnet El+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 170.0574. Found: 170.0572.

## 5-Bromo-1-ethyl-2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indolium iodide (31)



The alkylation of 32 ( $20.0 \mathrm{~g}, 84.0 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 132) with iodoethane ( $20.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 169$ mmol, Merck) in 1-buthanol ( 20 mL ) was performed in a 100 mL Schlenk tube at reflux temperature. Due to the instability of iodoethane a second portion ( $5.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 42.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added after 18 h . The orange-brown product started to precipitate after 24 h . After 40 h the reaction mixture was allowed to cool to rt before it was poured in diethyl ether ( 1 L ) and stirred for 1 h . The precipitate was filtered and washed with diethyl ether ( $3 \times 25$ $\mathrm{mL})$. The filtration residue was recrystallized from boiling chloroform ( 2 L ) to yield $\mathbf{3 1}$ ( $22 \mathrm{~g}, 54 \mathrm{mmol}, 64 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $227^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $14 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.19\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-6)=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.95\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-\right.$ $6)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.85\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6-4)=1.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.48\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.82\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.55\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.42\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-\right.\right.$ $\left.2^{\prime}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ).
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 196.62, 144.23, 140.07, 131.85, 126.93, 122.74, 117.27, 54.38, 43.30, 21.67, 14.00, 12.59.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 392 (0.3) [M-H] ${ }^{+}$, 266 (100) [M-I] ${ }^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{BrN}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{I}]^{+}$: 266.0539 . Found: 266.0542.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{NBrI}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 39.62 ; \mathrm{H}, 4.35 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.55 ; \mathrm{Br}, 20.28$; I, 32.20. Found: C, 39.48; H, 4.49; N, 3.50; Br, 20.16; I, 32.43.

## 5-Bromo-2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indole (32)



32 was produced differently by Moreau et al. [44]. The method analogue to Kim et al. [43] was used with necessary changes. Ethanol ( 460 mL ) was placed in a 2 L three necked round bottom flask and cooled to $\sim 0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an ice bath. Then sulphuric acid ( $45.0 \mathrm{~mL}, 0.84 \mathrm{~mol}, 98 \%$ pure) was added slowly at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Subsequently, 4bromophenylhydrazine hydrochloride ( $100 \mathrm{~g}, 447 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and 3-methyl-2-butanone ( 47.0 $\mathrm{g}, 546 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added and the brownish suspension was heated to reflux at $82^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 24 h . During the reaction the side product ammonium hydrogensulphate precipitated. After removal of the solvent in vacuo the residue was suspended in methyl tert-butyl ether $(500 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( $600 \mathrm{~mL}, 30 \%$ $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ), followed by aqueous sodium chloride solution ( $5 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL}, 10 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) and brine $(3 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL})$. The solvent of the combined dried organic layer was evaporated under reduced pressure. The product was purified by destillation to yield 32 ( $53 \mathrm{~g}, 0.22 \mathrm{~mol}$, $49 \%$ ) in the main fraction.

Melting point: $43-47^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (DSC).
Boiling point: $232^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (onset in TGA) and $77^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at 0.04 mbar (head temperature during distillation).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.42-7.34(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.23\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.27\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1{ }^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}\right.$, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}$ ).
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 188.32 C(2), 152.65 C(3a), 147.75 C(7a), 130.55 C(4), 124.75 C(6), 121.19 $C(7), 118.74 C(5), 54.04 C(3), 22.85 C(1 "), 15.34 C(1$ ) .

MS (Magnet El+): 237 (100) [M] $]^{+}, 224(55)\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{~N}^{81} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}, 222(57)\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{~N}^{79} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}, 198$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}^{81} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}, 196$ (7) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}^{79} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}$, 158 (27) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}, 143$ (31) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{10} \mathrm{H}_{9} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}, 118.5$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 117(46)\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{7} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$, 116 (17) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$, 115 (54) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$, $102(30)\left[\mathrm{C}_{7} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$, 75 (18) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 51 (15) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]^{+}, 39$ (17) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]^{+}, 27$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS (Magnet El+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}^{79} \mathrm{Br}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 237.0148 . Found: 237.0147.

Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{NBr}$ : C, 55.48; $\mathrm{H}, 5.08 ; \mathrm{N}, 5.88$; $\mathrm{Br}, 33.56$. Found: C, 55.21; H, 5.27; N, 5.92; Br, 33.74.

## 3-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-4-ethoxycyclobut-3-ene-1,2-dione (33)



In a 250 mL Schlenk tube 28 ( $15.0 \mathrm{~g}, 40.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 126) was suspended in ethanol $(150 \mathrm{~mL})$ at rt before triethylamine $(8.57 \mathrm{~g}, 84.7 \mathrm{mmol}$, distilled over KOH$)$ was added dropwise. While heating to reflux the starting material deprotonated to the soluble en-amine form. At that point the reaction mixture was cooled to rt and 30 ( 7.55 g , 44.4 mmol , page 130) was added via syringe. The reaction mixture was heated to reflux overnight and the next morning the solvent was evaporated under vacuum. The remainder was diluted in ethyl acetate ( 300 mL ), extracted with water ( $3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and the residue of the organic layer was purified via column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate $=8: 2 \rightarrow 5: 5$ ) to yield $33(10 \mathrm{~g}, 25 \mathrm{mmol}, 62 \%)$ as a bright yellow crystals (Figure 4.6).

Melting point: $71-77^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $275^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $16 \%$.
${ }^{1}$ H-NMR: 7.29-7.24 (C(4")H, C(6")H, 2H, m), 7.06 (C(5")H, 1 H , ddd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{"}-4\right.$ ") $=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-6 "\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.87\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6 "\right)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.40\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}\right.$, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.89\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \dagger-2 \dagger)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 3.80\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{*}-2^{*}\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$,


Figure 4.6: Microscopic picture of 33 ligthened with incident UV light.
1.80-1.68 (C $\left.\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.62\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.53\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \dagger-\right.$ $1 \dagger)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}), 1.46-1.20\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.87$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 192.39, 187.31, 173.65, 168.26, 142.55, 140.83, 127.61, 122.52 (2C), 121.84, 108.28, 81.15, 69.74, 47.83, 42.87, 31.61, 29.11, 28.98, 26.86, 26.82, 26.21, 22.46, 15.80, 13.94.

MS: 434 (7) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{K}]^{+}, 418$ (17) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 396$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 368$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{3}\right]^{+}, 340$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 310$ (5) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{NO}^{+}, 257\right.$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}, 198$ (6) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 132$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{3+}$, $99(2)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}, 79(0.5)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{5+}, 66(0.6)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{6+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{O}_{3} \mathrm{~N}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 396.2533. Found: 396.2526.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{3}$ : C, $75.92 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.41$; $\mathrm{N}, 3.54$; O, 12.13. Found: C, 75.86; H, 8.31; N, 3.55; O, 12.08.

## 3-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-4-hydroxycyclo-but-3-ene-1,2-dione (34)



33 ( $17.7 \mathrm{~g}, 44.7 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 133 ) was dissolved in ethanol ( 180 mL ) and heated to reflux. Then aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( $10.4 \mathrm{~mL}, 40 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) was dripped in. After 10 min the hot reactor content was poured into an ethanol-water (100:500 mL) mixture under vigorous stirring. The protonated product precipitated after the addition of concentrated hydrochloric acid $(30 \mathrm{~mL})$ and the brick stone coloured powder was filtered and washed with cold water. 34 was yielded by drying the residue in the vacuum oven ( $16 \mathrm{~g}, 43 \mathrm{mmol}, 93 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $195^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $22 \%$.
${ }^{1}$ H-NMR (DMSO- $\mathrm{d}_{6}$ ): 7.38 ( $\mathrm{C}\left(4\right.$ ") H, 1 H , dd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4 "-5 ")=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4 "-6 ")=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.25$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd $^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-5 "\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-4\right.$ ") $\left.=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.08$ (C(7")H, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6\right.$ " $\left.)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.00\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-6\right.\right.$ " $)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-4\right.$ ") $\left.=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.51$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 3.84\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{*}-2^{*}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.7-1.6\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.54$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.4-1.1\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.82$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 191.88 (2C), 190.87, 173.92, 165.71, 142.77, 140.16, 127.73, 121.87, 121.82, 108.61, 81.35, 47.00, 42.02, 31.15, 28.68, 28.58, 26.74, 26.20, 25.75, 22.04, 13.93.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 390 (9) [M+Na] ${ }^{+}, 386$ (17) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{O}\right]^{+}, 368$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 330$ (30).
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 368.2220. Found: 368.2208.

# 5-Bromo-2-((3-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-2-hydroxy-4-oxocyclobut-2-enylidene)methyl)-1-ethyl-3,3-dimethyl-3H-indolium (35) 



34 ( $12.5 \mathrm{~g}, 34.0 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 135), 31 ( $16.8 \mathrm{~g}, 42.5 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 131), 1-butanol $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$, toluene $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and quinoline ( 50 mL ) were combined in a Dean-Stark apparatus. The yellow mixture was heated to reflux for 2 d before the dark blue reaction mixture was concentrated under reduced pressure. The concentrate was dissolved in ethanol ( 75 mL ) and the solution was poured into ice cold aqueous citric acid solution ( $1 \mathrm{~L}, 5 \%$ ) while stirring. The ensuing precipitate was isolated by filtration. Subsequent purification with column chromatography (chloroform) yielded 35 ( $15 \mathrm{~g}, 24 \mathrm{mmol}, 70 \%$ ) as a copper shiny amorphous powder (Figure 4.7).

Decomposition onset: $282^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $19 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.41\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-6^{*}\right)=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.38\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-5^{*}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-6^{*}\right)=1.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.34\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{* *}-5^{* *}\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{* *}-6^{* *}\right)=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.30$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{* *}-5^{* *}\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{* *}-4^{* *}\right)=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.15$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-6^{* *}\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-4^{\star *}\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.99$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{* *}-6^{\star *}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.80\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.98\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}\right.$, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 5.90\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.1-3.9\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.8-1.7 (C(1†) $\mathrm{H}_{3}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 14 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.4-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(4 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(7 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(2 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 13 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.85\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \ddagger \ddagger-7 \ddagger \ddagger)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.20, 180.96, 178.42, 171.01, 167.83, 144.14, 142.25, 142.18, 141.10,


Figure 4.7: Isolated 35 after drying overnight in the vacuum oven.
$130.53,127.73,125.60,124.00,122.24,115.99,110.01,109.59,86.84,86.36,49.47$, 48.98, 43.81, 38.23, 31.62, 29.20, 29.03, 27.03, 27.01, 26.96, 26.82, 22.49, 13.98, 11.71 .

MS: 616 (100) [M] ${ }^{+}$(A+2), 615 (85) [M] ${ }^{+}(\mathrm{A}+1), 614$ (86) [M] ${ }^{+}(\mathrm{A}), 599(6)\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 364$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 360$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{17}{ }^{81} \mathrm{BrNO}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 358 (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{17}{ }^{79} \mathrm{BrNO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 307$ (4) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}$, $153.6(2)[M]^{4+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{43} \mathrm{BrN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 614.2502. Found: 614.2506.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{43} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Br}$ : C, 70.23; $\mathrm{H}, 7.04 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.55 ; \mathrm{O}, 5.20$; Br, 12.98. Found: C, 70.29; H, 7.08; N, 4.60; O, 5.34; Br, 12.86.

# 4-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((1-ethyl-3,3-dimethyl-5-(4,4,5,5-tetramethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2-yl)indolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (36) 



The Miyaura borylation reaction was performed in a 2 L round bottom flask using 35 ( $10.0 \mathrm{~g}, 15.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 136), bis(pinacolato)diboron ( $6.00 \mathrm{~g}, 23.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, CombiPhos Catalysts Inc.$)$ and potassium acetate ( $15.3 \mathrm{~g}, 156 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) as reactants, dichloro-[1,1'-bis(diphenylphosphino)-ferrocen]-palladium(II) ( $490 \mathrm{mg}, 0.600 \mathrm{mmol}$, CombiPhos Catalysts Inc.) as catalyst and dioxane ( 1 L ) as solvent. The reaction proceeded at an elevated temperature of $85-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 14 h . In the next step, the solvent was removed at reduced pressure and the remnant was suspended in chloroform (100 $\mathrm{mL})$. The suspension was filtered through a silica gel bed ( 5 cm ) and the residue was washed with chloroform ( $2 \times 30 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The solvent of the filtrate was evaporated under reduced pressure and the remainder was purified with column chromatography (chloroform). Subsequent sublimation $\left(145^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 0.02 \mathrm{mbar}\right)$ of the inseparable excess of bis(pinacolato)diboron out of the crude product yielded 36 ( $6.9 \mathrm{~g}, 10 \mathrm{mmol}, 65 \%$ ) as greenish-blue powder.

Decomposition onset: $286{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $29 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.78\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-4^{*}\right)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.75\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-6^{*}\right)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.35\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{* *}-5^{* *}\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{* *}-6^{* *}\right)=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.31\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{* *}-5^{* *}\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{* *}-5^{* *}\right)=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.15\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-6^{* *}\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-4^{* *}\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.99$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{* *}-6^{* *}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{* *}-5^{* *}\right)=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.96\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-\right.\right.$
$\left.\left.6^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.99\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right), 5.97\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right), 4.1-3.9\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \neq \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, 1.9-1.7 $\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 14 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.5-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(4 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}(5 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(6 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(7 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \S \S) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 22 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.86\left(\mathrm{C}(8 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8 \ddagger \ddagger-7 \ddagger \ddagger)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 182.29 (2C), 180.35, 178.78, 170.72, 169.26, 144.61, 142.32, 141.50, 135.10, 128.26, 127.75, 123.90, 123.66, 122.28, 109.53, 108.34, 86.79, 86.61, 83.81, 49.43, 48.96, 43.83, 38.28, 31.70, 29.28, 29.10, 27.07, 27.03, 27.02, 26.91, 24.82, $22.55,14.04,11.96 . \mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right)$ signal is not visible, since the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-{ }^{11} \mathrm{~B}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-{ }^{10} \mathrm{~B}$ couplings split the signal to zero.

MS: 662 (100) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 647$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 406$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{BNO}_{4}\right]^{+}, 364$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 331 (4) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 165.6$ (2) $[\mathrm{M}]^{4+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{55} \mathrm{BN}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 662.4255. Found: 662.4254.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{55} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~B}: \mathrm{C}, 76.12$; $\mathrm{H}, 8.36$; $\mathrm{N}, 4.23$; O, 9.66; B, 1.63. Found: C, 75.19; H, 8.37; N, 4.17. Boron disturbs the oxygen measurement.

## 1,4-Di-(1,3,2-dioxaborinan-2-yl)benzene (37)



Benzene-1,4-diboronic acid ( $2.50 \mathrm{~g}, 15.1 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{ABCR}$ ), 1,3-propandiol ( $8.15 \mathrm{~g}, 107$ mmol ) and toluene ( 50 mL ) were mixed and headed to reflux for 16 h . After the reaction, the solvent was removed under reduced pressure and the remnant was dried in high vacuum ( $10^{-3} \mathrm{mbar}$ ) overnight before it was recrystallized from boiling cyclohexane ( 250 mL ) to yield 37 ( $3.3 \mathrm{~g}, 14 \mathrm{mmol}, 89 \%$ ) as white crystals.

Melting point: $103-110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $222^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: 0\%.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.74(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 4.16\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime}-5^{\prime}\right)=5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.05\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, p, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime}-4^{\prime}\right)=5.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 132.70 C(2), 61.94 C(4'), 27.40 C(5'). $C(1)$ signal is not visible, since the
${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-{ }^{11} \mathrm{~B}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-{ }^{10} \mathrm{~B}$ couplings split the signal to zero.
MS (Magnet El+): 246 (100) [M] $]^{+}$, 188 (54) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{9} \mathrm{H}_{10} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\right]^{+}, 130(30)\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 117$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 103(4)\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{4} \mathrm{BO}\right]^{+}, 90(5)\left[\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{3} \mathrm{BO}\right]^{+}, 77(5)\left[\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{BO}\right]^{+}, 57(4)\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{O}\right]^{+}$, 41 (15) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}, 28(15)\left[\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS (Magnet El+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{4}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 246.1229 . Found: 246.1227.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{~B}_{2}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 58.62 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.56 ; \mathrm{O}, 26.03 ; \mathrm{B}, 8.79$. Found: C, 58.34; H, 6.65. Boron disturbs the oxygen measurement.

## 4-((3,3-Dimethyl-1-octyl-5-(4,4,5,5-tetramethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2-yl)-3H-indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((3,3-dimethyl-1-octyl-5-(4,4,5,5-tetramethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2-yl)indolin-2-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (38)



29 ( $15.0 \mathrm{~g}, 19.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 128), bis(pinacolato)diboron ( $19.6 \mathrm{~g}, 77.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, CombiPhos Catalysts Inc .), potassium acetate ( $11.4 \mathrm{~g}, 116 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), dioxane ( 1.5 L) and dichloro[1,1'-bis(diphenylphosphino)-ferrocene]-palladium(II) ( $310 \mathrm{mg}, 0.385$ mmol, CombiPhos Catalysts Inc.) were mixed and the suspension was heated to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h before it was concentrated in vacuo to about 350 mL . The concentrate was filtered and the solvent of the filtrate was evaporated under reduced pressure. The
remainder was suspended in boiling tetrahydrofuran ( 150 mL ) and filtered hot. Ethanol $(500 \mathrm{~mL})$ was added to the filtrate and while cooling to rt the product precipitated to yield 38 ( $13 \mathrm{~g}, 15 \mathrm{mmol}, 77 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $318^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $22 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.71\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-7\right.\right.$ ") $\left.=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4 "-6 ")=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.70\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4{ }^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$, d, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\right)=0.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.90\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\right)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.93\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 3.91$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br), 1.8-1.65 (C(2**) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, $1.73\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.39-1.10 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 20 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.26\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 24 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 0.78 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 181.97, 179.98, 170.00, 144.79, 141.22, 134.86, 128.01, 123.66, 108.57, 86.91, 83.56, 48.87, 43.46, 31.45, 29.05, 28.85, 26.82, 26.76, 24.61, 22.32, 13.83.

MS: 872 (100) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 857$ (10) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 490 (17) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{41} \mathrm{BNO}_{4}\right]^{+}, 436$ (3) $[\mathrm{M}]^{++}, 218$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}]^{4+}, 145(1)[M]^{6+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{54} \mathrm{H}_{78} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~N}^{2} \mathrm{~B}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+2)$ : 872.6056. Found: 872.6058.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{54} \mathrm{H}_{78} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \mathrm{~B}_{2} \mathrm{I}: \mathrm{C}, 74.31 ; \mathrm{H}, 9.01 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.21 ; \mathrm{O}, 11.00$; B, 2.48. Found: C, 74.24; H, 9.08; N, 3.07.

## 1-Ethyl-2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indolium iodide (39)



2,3,3-Trimethyl-3H-indole ( $100 \mathrm{~g}, 628 \mathrm{mmol}$, FEW Chemicals), 1-butanol ( 100 mL ) and 1-iodoethane ( $75 \mathrm{~mL}, 942 \mathrm{mmol}$, Merck) were suspended and heated to reflux ( $82^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) for 18 h . A second portion of 1-iodoethane ( $25 \mathrm{~mL}, 314 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added and the mixture was heated to reflux for additional 18 h . The green reaction mixture was cooled to rt and poured into diethyl ether ( 500 mL ) under vigorous stirring. The dark precipitate was filtered and then dissolved in boiling chloroform ( 400 mL ). By the addition of acetone ( 800 mL ) the precipitation was started and continued until rt was reached.

The light yellow crystals were filtered off and washed with acetone. The evaporated remainder of the mother liquid was recrystallized accordingly to yield in total 39 ( 170 g , $510 \mathrm{mmol}, 81 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $229^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $1 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.03(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.89(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.63-7.56(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}$, $\mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 4.53\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-\mathrm{D}^{\prime}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.91\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.55$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.45\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(2^{\prime}-1^{\prime}\right)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 195.88 C(2), 141.79 C(3a), 140.52 C(7a), 129.20 C(6), 128.79 C(5), 123.53 C(4), 115.28 C(7), 54.04 C(1'), 43.28 C(3), 21.85 C(1"), 14.56 C(2'), 12.81 C(1*).

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 188 (100) [M-I] $]^{+}, 173$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{12} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}, 158$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{11} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}$ [M-I]+: 188.1434. Found: 188.1437.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{13} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{NI}$ : C, 49.54; H, 5.76; N, 4.44; I, 40.26. Found: C, 49.44; H, 5.81; N, 4.67; I, 39.98.

## 3-Ethyl-1,1,2-trimethyl-1 H-benzo[e]indolium iodide (40)



1,1,2-Trimethyl-1H-benzo[e]indole ( $100 \mathrm{~g}, 0.478 \mathrm{~mol}$, FEW Chemicals), iodoethane ( $100 \mathrm{~g}, 0.641 \mathrm{~mol}$, Merck) and 1-butanol ( 100 mL ) were mixed in a 250 mL Schlenk tube and brought to react at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 8 h . Subsequently, another portion of iodoethane (40 $\mathrm{g}, 0.257 \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was added. After prolonged stirring at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 16 h the reaction mixture was chilled below $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ when it was poured into diethyl ether ( 1 L ). The precipitate was filtered and washed with cold diethyl ether several times. The residue was dissolved in boiling chloroform ( 450 mL ) and crystallized by the addition of acetone ( 2 L ). After
cooling to rt the white needle like crystalline 40 were filtered and dried ( $130 \mathrm{~g}, 0.35 \mathrm{~mol}$, $73 \%)$.

Decomposition onset: $228^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $6 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.37\left(\mathrm{C}(9) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(9-8)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.30\left(\mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5-\right.$ $4)=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.22\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.17\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4-5)=8.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.79$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(8) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8-7)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8-9)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.72\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-8)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.64\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}\right)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.97\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.76$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.51\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(2^{\prime}-1^{\prime}\right)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 195.87, 138.13, 136.95, 132.96, 130.65, 129.65, 128.34, 127.20, 127.16, 123.36, 113.17, 55.40, 43.39, 21.44, 13.84, 12.90.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 364 (0.5) [M-H] ${ }^{+}$, 238 (100) [M-I] ${ }^{+}$, 223 (1) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{17} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{I}]^{+}$: 238.1590 . Found: 238.1601.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{NI}: \mathrm{C}, 55.90 ; \mathrm{H}, 5.52 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.83 ;$ I, 34.74. Found: C, 55.75; H, 5.72; N, 3.83; I, 34.96.

## 3-Ethoxy-4-((3-ethyl-1,1-dimethyl-1H-benzo[e]indol-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)cyclobut-3-ene-1,2-dione (41)


$40(50.0 \mathrm{~g}, 137 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 142), ethanol ( 150 mL ) and triethylamine ( $22.8 \mathrm{~mL}, 164$ mmol, distilled over potassium hydroxide) were suspended and heating to reflux for 30 min until the entire starting material was converted to the soluble imminium salt by deprotonation. At that moment the solution was cooled to rt when 30 ( $25.6 \mathrm{~g}, 151$ mmol , page 130) was dripped in via a syringe. The reaction proceeded at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 30 min before the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. To get rid of the excess
triethylamine, the residue was dried in high vacuum overnight. Afterwards to remove the unreacted starting materials, the rest was digested in ethanol ( 50 mL ) for 1 h and then cooled to $-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, filtered and washed with cold ethanol ( $2 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The ensuing residue was dissolved in chloroform ( 100 mL ) at rt which was subsequently poured into toluene $(500 \mathrm{~mL})$. The white precipitate presumably triethylamine hydroiodide was filtered and the product containing filtrate was concentrated in vacuo. The last remaining, blue side product was separated by digesting the greenish concentrate in ethyl acetate ( 50 mL ) and subsequent filtration resulted in an orange residue which was crystallized after 3 h from a hot chloroform solution by adding ethanol and cooling the mixture slowly down to yield in 41 ( $44 \mathrm{~g}, 0.12 \mathrm{~mol}, 88 \%$ ) as orange hexagonal plates (Figure 4.8).


Figure 4.8: Microscopic picture of the hexagonal plates of 41.

Melting point: $182-184^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $265^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $27 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-$ NMR: $8.10\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.87\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{*}-7^{*}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.85\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{*}-4^{*}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.53\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-9^{*}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.7^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.37\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-6^{*}\right)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-8^{*}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}$, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-9^{*}\right)=1.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.9^{*}\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\star}-5^{*}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.45\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.93$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.01 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \dagger-2 \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.90$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.56\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(2^{\prime}-1^{\prime}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.39\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \dagger-\right.$ $1 \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ).
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 192.70, 187.14, 187.03, 173.26, 169.86, 139.22, 132.58, 130.79, 129.79, 129.60, 128.58, 127.15, 123.73, 122.16, 109.45, 80.48, 69.85, 49.82, 37.80, 26.58, 15.96, 11.68.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}_{3}{ }^{+}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 362.1751$. Found: 362.1753.

## 3-((3-Ethyl-1,1-dimethyl-1 H-benzo[e]indol-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)-4-hydroxycyclobut-3-ene-1,2-dione (42)



41 ( $10.0 \mathrm{~g}, 27.7 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 143) was dissolved in a mixture of chloroform ( 100 mL ) and ethanol $(100 \mathrm{~mL})$ and then heated to reflux when an aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( $10 \mathrm{~mL}, 40 \%$, w/w) was dripped in via syringe. After 20 min the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. The residue was suspended in ethanol ( 40 mL ), cooled to $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, filtered and washed with cold ethanol ( $2 \times 10 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The yellow filtration residue was dissolved in water ( 500 mL ) and acidified with aqueous saturated citric acid ( 50 mL ) which precipitated the product. To obtain 42 ( $5.9 \mathrm{~g}, 17 \mathrm{mmol}, 61 \%$ ) as an intensive yellow powder the residue was filtered, washed with water ( $3 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and dried in the vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $92^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $30 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.12\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{*}-8^{*}\right)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.88\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.54$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{\star}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\star}-9^{*}\right)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.41 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.6^{*}\right)=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{*}-8^{*}\right)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.27\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-5^{*}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.72\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, s), $4.10\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}\right)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.94\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.42\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(2^{\prime}-11^{\prime}\right)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 189.92, 188.01, 187.99, 176.16, 171.65, 139.01, 133.37, 131.10, 129.73, 129.71, 128.55, 127.33, 124.21, 122.33, 109.68, 81.56, 50.43, 38.28, 26.60, 11.90.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 356 (14) [M+Na] ${ }^{+}$, 334 (100) [M+H]+, 296 (31), 266 (20), 238 (42), 194 (14) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{NO}_{3} \mathrm{Na}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}$: 356.1257. Found: 356.1256.

## 3-((1,1-Dimethyl-3-octyl-1 H-benzo[e]indol-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)-4-hydroxycyclobut-3-ene-1,2-dione (43)


$45(4.00 \mathrm{~g}, 8.98 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 148) was dissolved in ethanol ( 40 mL ) in a 100 mL Schlenk tube and heated to reflux. Then an aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( 2.20 mL , $40 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) was added via syringe. After boiling for 15 min , the solvent was evaporated under reduced pressure. Due to crystallization problems of the crude product in a small amount of ethanol the residue was dissolved in ethanol ( 300 mL ) and water ( 500 mL ). Upon acidification with concentrated hydrochloric acid ( 10 mL ) of the basic solution the protonated product precipitated and was filtered. The brick stone coloured residue was dissolved in boiling ethyl acetate ( 70 mL ) and precipitated by the addition of hexane $(150 \mathrm{~mL})$ to yield 43 ( $2.6 \mathrm{~g}, 5.9 \mathrm{mmol}, 66 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $177^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $34 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.12\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{\prime \prime}-8\right.\right.$ " $\left.)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.92\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.90\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-4 "\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.51$ (C(8")H,1H, m), 7.49 (C(4")H, $1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-\right.$ $5 ")=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.34\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6 "\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-8 "\right)=7.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.57\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, s), $3.96\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{*}-2^{*}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.82\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.7-1.6\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}\right.$, m), 1.4-1.1 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.78\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}\right.$,
$\left.\mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=6.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 191.86, 190.75, 173.54, 167.39, 140.29, 130.82, 130.08, 129.62, 129.42, 128.07, 127.12, 123.20, 121.88, 110.58, 81.15, 48.83, 42.12, 31.14, 28.70, 28.58, 26.38, 26.17, 26.05, 22.02, 13.90.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 440 (8) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 418$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}, 380\right.$ (46), 279 (20).
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}: 418.2377$. Found: 418.2374.

## 1,1,2-Trimethyl-3-octyl-1H-benzo[e]indolium iodide (44)



1,1,2-Trimethyl-1 H-benzo[e]indole ( $60.3 \mathrm{~g}, 288 \mathrm{mmol}$, FEW Chemicals), 1-iodooctane ( $100 \mathrm{~mL}, 416 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{ABCR}$ ) and 1-butanol ( 60 mL ) were combined in a 250 mL Schlenk tube in which the suspension was heated to reflux $\left(120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ for 18 h . Subsequently, the reaction mixture was chilled just below $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and then poured into diethyl ether ( 1.2 L ). The precipitate was filtered and washed with cold diethyl ether. Recrystallization from boiling acetone ( 800 mL ) and subsequent recrystallization of the distillation residue of the mother liquid yielded in total 44 ( $86 \mathrm{~g}, 0.19 \mathrm{~mol}, 65 \%$ ) as ecru crystals.

Decomposition onset: $194^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $4 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.37\left(\mathrm{C}(9) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(9-8)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.30\left(\mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5-\right.$ 4) $=9.0 \mathrm{~Hz}), 8.21(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.78\left(\mathrm{C}(8) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8-9)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(8-$ 7) $\left.=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(8-6)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.70\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}\right.$, ddd, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-8)=7.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(7-$ $9)=0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}), 4.63\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $3.02\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 2.0-1.8 (C(2') $\mathrm{H}_{2}$,
$2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $1.77\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.5-1.4 (C(3') $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.35-1.1 (C(4') $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 8 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.8-0.7\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime}-7^{\prime}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d 6 ): 196.03, 138.33, 136.77, 132.87, 130.53, 129.53, 128.25, 127.05 $(2 x C), 123.30,113.32,55.35,47.99,30.98,28.45,28.30,27.38,25.75,21.86,21.54$, 14.41, 13.75.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 448 (0.4) [M-H] ${ }^{+}$, 322 (100) [M-I] $]^{+}$, 224 (1) [ $\left.\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{~N}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{I}]^{+}$: 322.2529. Found: 322.2508.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{23} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NI}: \mathrm{C}, 61.75 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.76 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.13 ; \mathrm{I}, 28.36$. Found: C, 61.20; H, 6.34; N, 3.10; I, 28.16.

## 3-((1,1-Dimethyl-3-octyl-1 H-benzo[e]indol-2(3H)-ylidene)methyl)-4-ethoxycyclobut-3-ene-1,2-dione (45)



Figure 4.9: Molecular structure of 44 and picture of the isolated product after drying.

44 ( $14.4 \mathrm{~g}, 32.0 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 147), freshly distilled 30 ( $4.00 \mathrm{~g}, 23.5 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 130) and ethanol ( 32 mL ) were combined heated to reflux until the starting materials dissolved. Then the reaction mixture was allowed to cool to $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ when triethylamine ( 3.90 mL , 28.2 mmol ) was added via syringe. The colour changed immediately from light yellow to brown and then to dark green. The reaction mixture was heated to reflux overnight. The solvent was removed under reduced pressure followed by the purification of the
crude product with column chromatography (ethyl acetate:hexane $=1: 9 \rightarrow 5: 5$ ) to yield in 45 ( $7.2 \mathrm{~g}, 16 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%$ ) as an orange crystalline powder (Figure 4.9).

Melting point: $72-76^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $276^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $17 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.09\left(\mathrm{C}\left(9^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(9^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.87\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime \prime}-7{ }^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.83\left(\mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(5^{\prime \prime}-4\right.\right.$ ") $\left.=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.52\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-\right.\right.$ $\left.\left.7^{\prime \prime}\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\right)=1.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.37\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{ddd}^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-6 "\right)=8.1 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-8 "\right)=7.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime \prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\right)=0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.21\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime \prime}-5^{\prime \prime}\right)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.45\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.92$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \dagger-2 \dagger)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 3.94\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{*}-2^{*}\right)=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.90$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.85-1.75\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.56\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \dagger-1 \dagger)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, 1.5-1.2 (C(3*) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.87\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{*}-7^{*}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 192.63, 187.03, 173.21, 170.23, 139.76, 132.34, 130.71, 129.64, 129.48, $128.49,127.08,123.67,122.10,109.74,80.74,69.77,49.77,43.06,31.64,29.16$, 29.02, 26.86, 26.64, 26.59, 22.49, 15.90, 13.99.

MS: 484 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{K}]^{+}, 468$ (5) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 446$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 390(5)\left[\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{32} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right]^{+}, 360$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}\right]^{+}, 307$ (5) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{99} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}, 262$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{NO}\right]^{+}, 223$ (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 148.8$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{3+}, 111.6(3)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}, 89.3(0.4)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{5+}, 74.4(0.8)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{6+}, 63.8(0.7)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{7+}$, $55.8(0.4)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{8+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{29} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{NO}_{3}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 446.2690$. Found: 446.2684.

## 1,4-Bis(2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indol-5-yl)benzene (46)



Benzene-1,4-diboronic acid ( $4.00 \mathrm{~g}, 24.1 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{ABCR}$ ), $32(15.5 \mathrm{~g}, 65.1 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 132), tetrahydrofurane ( 200 mL ) and water ( 50 mL ) were combined in a 500 mL Schlenk tube and degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. After that, tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)-palladium(0) ( $1.25 \mathrm{~g}, 1.08 \mathrm{mmol}$, Merck) was added and the solution was heated to reflux for 60 h . The reaction mixture was then cooled to rt and quenched by the addition of dichloromethane ( 200 mL ). The ensuing emulsion was stirred for 30 min . The organic layer was separated and washed with water ( $5 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). After drying and filtering through a silica gel bed ( 5 cm ), the filtrate was concentrated under reduced pressure. The remainder solely contained 46 ( $6.2 \mathrm{~g}, 15 \mathrm{mmol}, 62 \%$ ), which was used without further purification.

Decomposition onset: $239^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $29 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.68(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.61\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(7^{\prime}-6^{\prime}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.58\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime}-7^{\prime}\right)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(6^{\prime}-4^{\prime}\right)=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.53\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{\prime}-6^{\prime}\right)=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.31\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}\right.$, $6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.37\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1\right.\right.$ ") $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 188.30 C(2'), 153.26 C(7a'), 146.34 C(3a'), 140.07 C(5'), 137.86 C(1), 127.50 C(2), 126.58 C(6'), 120.06 C(4'), 120.02 C(7'), 53.73 C(3'), 23.16 C(1"), 15.50 C(1*).

MS: 393 (87) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 378$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 361 (46) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 196.6 (6) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}$, 189.1 (7) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{++}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 393.2325$. Found: 393.2330.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{~N}_{2}$ : C, 85.67; H, 7.19; N, 7.14. Found: C, 85.39; H, 7.12; N, 6.99.

## 5,5’-(1,4-Phenylene)bis(1,2,3,3-tetramethyl-3H-indolium) bis(4-methylbenzenesulfonate) (47)


$46(4.50 \mathrm{~g}, 11.5 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 149) and methyl p-toluenesulfonate ( $50.0 \mathrm{~g}, 268 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were added to a 100 mL Schlenk tube. The reaction mixture was heated to $130^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 60 h . Then the brown suspension was cooled to rt, filtered and the residue was washed several times with cyclohexane. To yield 47 ( $7.7 \mathrm{~g}, 9.1 \mathrm{mmol}, 79 \%$ ) as a light brown coloured powder the filtration residue was dried in the vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $40 \%$. (Decomposition above $85^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was also proven by DSC).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-$ NMR (DMSO-d $\mathrm{d}_{6}$ ): $8.26\left(\mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 8.00\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.95(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}$, $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.46\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \dagger-3 \dagger)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.09\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \dagger) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3 \dagger-2 \dagger)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $4.01\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.79\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, $2.27\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.60\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}\right.$, 12H, s).
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 196.17, 145.76, 142.58, 141.74, 140.58, 138.55, 137.63, 128.07, 127.84, 127.24, 125.51, 121.62, 115.63, 54.14, 34.74, 21.78, 20.81, 14.08.

MS (ESI-TOF+): 421 (100) [M-TsOH-TsO-$]^{+}, 407$ (8) [M-TsOH-TsO-- $\left.\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 326$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}, 250(4)\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}, 211.6(68)\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{TsO}^{-}\right]^{++}, 211.1$ (100) [M-2.TsO$]^{-+}$, 203.6 (73) $\left[\mathrm{M}-2 \cdot \mathrm{TsO}^{-}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{++}$.

HR-MS (ESI-TOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{~N}_{2}$ [M-TsOH-TsO $\left.{ }^{-}\right]^{+}$: 421.2638. Found: 421.2641.

## 2,3,3-Trimethyl-5-(4,4,5,5-tetramethyl-1,3,2-dioxaborolan-2-yl)-3Hindole (48)



Water free potassium acetate ( $31.3 \mathrm{~g}, 0.319 \mathrm{~mol}$ ), bis(pinacolato)diborone ( 40.0 g , 0.158 mol , CombiPhos Catalysts Inc.), 32 ( $25.0 \mathrm{~g}, 0.105 \mathrm{~mol}$, page 132), dioxane (2 L) and dichloro[1,1'-bis(diphenylphosphino)-ferrocen]-palladium(II) ( $3.19 \mathrm{~g}, 3.91 \mathrm{mmol}$, CombiPhos Catalysts Inc.) were added to a 3 L round bottom flask, which was then connected to the rotary evaporator apparatus. During slow rotation the reaction proceeded at a bath temperature of $85-90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and a pressure of 850 mbar . As the mixture was heated the colour changed from red to orange and finally to dark brown. After 2.5 h the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo to 500 mL , filtrated through a silica gel bed ( 12 cm ) and the solvent of the filtrate was removed completely at rotary evaporator. The orange residue was purified by column chromatography (hexane:acetone, 100:0 $\rightarrow 90: 10$ ). For further purification the product was sublimated at high vacuum ( $145^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 0.02 \mathrm{mbar}$ ) to yield 48 ( $24 \mathrm{~g}, 85 \mathrm{mmol}, 81 \%$ ) as light pink crystals.

Melting point: $125-135^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $243^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: 0\%.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.79\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6-4)=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.72\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-\right.$ $\left.6)=1.1 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{5} \mathrm{~J}(4-7)=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.52\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=7.7 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{5} \mathrm{~J}(7-4)=0.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.28$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.35\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.30\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 189.37, 156.25, 144.70, 134.68, 127.19, 119.13, 83.46, 53.27, 24.67, 22.81, 15.30. $\mathrm{C}(5)$ signal is not visible, since the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-{ }^{11} \mathrm{~B}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}-{ }^{10} \mathrm{~B}$ couplings split the signal to zero.

MS: 286.2 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 235$ (15), 143 (2) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}$.
HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{BN}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 286.1973 . Found: 286.1969.

Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{17} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{~B}: \mathrm{C}, 71.60 ; \mathrm{H}, 8.48 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.91 ; \mathrm{O}, 11.22$; B, 3.79. Found: C, 71.45 ; H, 8.25; N, 4.87. Boron disturbs the oxygen measurement.

## 5,5'-(9,9-Bis(2-ethylhexyl)-9H-fluorene-2,7-diyl)bis(2,3,3-trimethyl$3 H$-indole) (49)



48 ( $8.80 \mathrm{~g}, 30.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 152), 2,7-dibromo-9,9-bis-(2-ethyl-hexyl)-9H-fluorene ( $6.81 \mathrm{~g}, 12.4 \mathrm{mmol}$, racemate) and tetrahydrofuran ( 250 mL ) were placed in a 500 mL Schlenk tube. All solutions and solvents were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. An aqueous potassium carbonate solution ( $4.30 \mathrm{~g}, 31.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ in 50 mL ) was prepared in a separate 100 mL Schlenk tube and transferred via syringe into previous reaction mixture. Next, tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium(0) ( $1.18 \mathrm{~g}, 1.02 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added and then the reaction mixture was heated to reflux for 48 h . After that the suspension was cooled to rt and quenched with dichloromethane ( 100 mL ) under vigorous stirring for 30 min . The organic layer was diluted with dichloromethane ( 400 mL ) and washed with water ( $10 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $2 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The solvent of the combined and dried organic layers was distilled under reduced pressure. The residue was purified by column chromatography (hexane:methyl tert-butyl ether, $50: 50 \rightarrow 0: 100$ ) to yield 49 ( $6.3 \mathrm{~g}, 8.5 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%$ ) as a light yellow powder.

Decomposition onset: $123^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $15 \%$. (Decomposition above $125^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was also proven by DSC).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.77\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.6-7.5\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}\right.$,
$\left.\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 2.33\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.10\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.40\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.0-0.7 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(3^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.65-0.5\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 14 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: [189.13, 189.09, 189.07], [151.78, 151.75, 151.71], [151.34, 151.30, 151.27], [145.92, 145.89, 145.86], [140.22, 140.18, 140.15], [139.70, 139.64, 139.57], [139.66, $139.56,139.43]$, [126.95, 126.89, 126.82], [126.25, 129.24, 126.22], [123.06, 122.91, 122.73], [120.29, 120.28, 120.25], [119.93, 119.91, 119.89], [119.63, 119.59, 119.55], [55.09], [53.80], [44.50], [34.74], [33.83, 33.81], [28.20, 28.16], [27.19, 27.17], [23.20, $23.17,23.14]$, [22.74], [15.13, 15.12, 15.11], [13.98], [10.43, 10.41]. The chemical shifts are expected to be different in a racemic diastereomeric mixture. In this particular case three stereoisomers are present: an enantiomeric pair ( $R, R$ and $S, S$ ) and the meso$R, S$ form. The probability that two ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ are present in the same molecule is very low, let alone for them to be in mirror position to each other. This results in a symmetry reduction and the stereosiomeric $(R, R)$ and $(S, S)$ pair is no longer enantiomeric. The theoretical frequency of $(R, R)^{*}:(\text { meso-R,S })^{\star}:(S, S)^{\star}$ is therefore $1: 2: 1$, except for those carbons located on the $\sigma$ plain as well as those with increased flexibility.

MS: 706 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 690$ (25) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 493$ (10) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}, 479$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{31} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 478 (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{35} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}, 464$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}, 463$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}, 353$ (5) [ $\left.\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}\right]^{++}, 235$ (1) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{3+}, 176(2)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{51} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 705.5142$. Found: 705.5154.

## 5,5'-(9,9-Bis(2-ethylhexyl)-9H-fluorene-2,7-diyl)bis(1,2,3,3-tetramethyl-3H-indolium) bis(4-methylbenzenesulfonate) (50)



49 ( $6.30 \mathrm{~g}, 8.94 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 153 ) and methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate ( $33.5 \mathrm{~g}, 180 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were placed in a 100 mL Schlenk tube. The reaction mixture was heated to $110^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight and then to for 3 h to $130^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The dark blue reaction mixture was cooled to $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ prior to pouring into cyclohexane ( 700 mL ) under vigorous stirring. The dark oil was separated from cyclohexane and extracted again with cyclohexane ( 500 mL ). The oily residue was dissolved in ethanol ( 200 mL ) and added dropwise to fresh cyclohexane ( 600 mL ). The very light blue precipitated product 50 was filtered and dried (5.62g, $5.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 55 \%$ ).

Decomposition onset: $305^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $37 \%$. (Decomposition was also proven by DSC).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$-NMR: $8.22\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.05\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=4.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, 8.03-7.95 ( $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 7.83\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(4^{*}-3^{*}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $7.45\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2 \ddagger-3 \ddagger)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.09\left(\mathrm{C}(3 \ddagger) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3 \ddagger-2 \ddagger)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.01$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.79\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.27\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \ddagger \ddagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.22\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, m), $1.60\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.0-0.6\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{\star *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{\star *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1+) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 0.6-0.4 (C(2**)H, C(2†) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 14 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: [195.75, 195.72, 195.70], [151.43, 151.38, 151.32], [145.84], [142.48, $142.43,142.40$ ], [141.68, 141.63, 141.56], [141.39, 141.36, 141.33], [140.52, 140.48, 140.44], [137.49], [137.17, 137.11, 137.01], [128.00], [126.87], [126.26, 126.17,
126.07], [125.47], [122.88, 122.75, 122.63], [121.32, 121.30, 121.26], [120.63, 120.61, 121.60], [115.57, 115.50, 115.44], [55.01, 55.00], [54.03, 54.01, 53.99], [43.03], [34.68], [34.31], [33.26, 33.18], [27.40, 27.33], [26.86, 26.83], [22.14], [21.82, 21.79, 21.76], [20.76], [13.99], [13.77], [10.36, 10.32]. The chemical shifts are expected to be different in a racemic diastereomeric mixture. In this particular case three stereoisomers are present: an enantiomeric pair ( $R, R$ and $S, S$ ) and the meso- $R, S$ form. The probability that two ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ are present in the same molecule is very low, let alone for them to be in mirror position to each other. This results in a symmetry reduction and the stereosiomeric $(R, R)$ and $(S, S)$ pair is no longer enantiomeric. The theoretical frequency of $(R, R)^{*}:(\text { meso- } R, S)^{*}:(S, S)^{*}$ is therefore $1: 2: 1$, except for those carbons located on the $\sigma$ plain as well as those with increased flexibility.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 734 (38) [M-TsOH-TsO $\left.{ }^{-}\right]^{+}, 368$ (69) [M+H-2•TSO$]^{++}, 367$ (100) [M-2. $\left.\mathrm{TSO}^{-}\right]^{++}$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{53} \mathrm{H}_{69} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{TsOH}-\mathrm{TsO}^{-}\right]^{+}: 733.5455$. Found: 733.5442.

## 1,4-Bis(2-ethylhexyloxy)benzene (51)



Hydroquinone ( $11.0 \mathrm{~g}, 99.9 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), potassium hydroxide ( $12.1 \mathrm{~g}, 215 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), potassium iodide ( $3.50 \mathrm{~g}, 20 \mathrm{mmol}$ ), 2-ethylhexyl bromide ( $39.65 \mathrm{~g}, 205 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) and ethanol (100 mL ) were suspended and heated to reflux for 4 d . After the reaction the ethanol was distilled under reduced pressure. The residue was dissolved in dichloromethane (500 mL ) and extracted with an aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( $6 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL}, 15 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ), water ( $4 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( 250 mL ). The product 51 ( $20.0 \mathrm{~g}, 45 \mathrm{mmol}, 45 \%$ ) was isolated by distilling the chloroform.

Melting point: $2-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Boiling point: $317^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $0 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 6.83(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.8-3.7\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{a}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{b}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.75-1.65 (C(2')H, 2H, m), 1.55-1.2 (C(3') $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.95-0.85\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}\right.$, $12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: $153.42 \mathrm{C}(1), 115.34 \mathrm{C}(2)$, $71.18 \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right)$, $39.45 \mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right), 30.52 \mathrm{C}\left(3^{\prime}\right)$, $29.08 \mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right)$, 23.84 C(1"), 23.06 C(5'), 14.08 C(6'), 11.09 C(2").

MS (EI+): 334 (10) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 222$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 110$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{6} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 71$ (8) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{11}\right]^{+}, 57$ (15) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}\right]^{+}, 55(7)\left[\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{7}\right]^{+}, 43$ (15) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{7}\right]^{+}, 41$ (11) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}$, 29 (7) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS (EI+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{38} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 334.2867. Found: 334.2866.

## 1,4-Dibromo-2,5-bis(2-ethylhexyloxy)benzene (52)



51 ( $18.00 \mathrm{~g}, 53.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 156) was dissolved in dichloromethane ( 150 mL ) and glacial acetic acid ( 150 mL ). To the yellowish solution, N -bromosuccinimide ( 20.1 g , 113 mmol ) was added and the suspension was boiled for 36 h . The colour of the solution changed to dark red. The reaction was quenched by pouring it on ice (2 L). The organic layer was separated and additionally the water layer was extracted with dichloromethane ( $2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The combined organic layers were extracted with aqueous sodium thiosulphate solution ( $4 \times 350 \mathrm{~mL}, 5 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{v}$ ), water ( $4 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine $(3 \times 250 \mathrm{~mL})$. The separated dark brown organic layer was filtrated through a silica gel bed $(8 \mathrm{~cm})$ before distilling the solvent in vacuo. The light yellow residue was then purified by column chromatography (hexane) to yield 52 ( $14 \mathrm{~g}, 25 \mathrm{mmol}, 45 \%$ ) as a colourless oil.

Melting point: -70 to $-65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $336^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: 0\%.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.08(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 3.9-3.8\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{a}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{b}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.8-1.7\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.6-1.25 (C(3') $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.0-0.8\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}\left(2^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}\right.$, $\mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: $150.17 \mathrm{C}(1), 118.17 \mathrm{C}(2)$, 111.05 C(3), 72.52 C(1'), 39.42 C(2'), 30.44 C(3'), 29.02 C(4'), 23.86 C(1"), 23.01 C(5'), 14.07 C(6'), 11.14 C(2").

MS (Magnet $\mathrm{El}+$ ): 494 (17) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}(\mathrm{A}+4), 492$ (33) [M] ${ }^{+}(\mathrm{A}+2), 490$ (17) [M] ${ }^{+}(\mathrm{A}), 382$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{2}{ }^{81,81} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]^{+}, 380$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{2}{ }^{79} \mathrm{Br}^{81} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}, 378$ (2) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{19} \mathrm{O}_{2}{ }^{79,79} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]^{+}, 270$ (49) [ $\left.\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}{ }^{81,81} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]^{+}, 268$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}{ }^{81} \mathrm{Br}^{79} \mathrm{Br}\right]^{+}$, 266 (49) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}{ }^{79,79} \mathrm{Br}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 113 (18) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{8} \mathrm{H}_{17}\right]^{+}, 83$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{H}_{11}\right]^{+}, 71$ (45) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{11}\right]^{+}, 69$ (16) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{5} \mathrm{H}_{9}\right]^{+}, 57$ (70) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{9}\right]^{+}, 55$ (28) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{4} \mathrm{H}_{7}\right]^{+}, 43(61)\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{7}\right]^{+}, 41(42)\left[\mathrm{C}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}, 29(27)\left[\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5}\right]^{+}, 27(8)\left[\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{3}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS (Magnet El+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}: 490.1077$. Found: 490.1080.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{36} \mathrm{O}_{2} \mathrm{Br}_{2}$ : C, 53.67 ; $\mathrm{H}, 7.37$; $\mathrm{O}, 6.50$; $\mathrm{Br}, 32.46$. Found: C, 53.61; H, 7.19; O, 6.48; Br, 32.21.

## 5,5'-(2,5-Bis(2-ethylhexyloxy)-1,4-phenylene)bis(2,3,3-trimethyl-3Hindole) (53)



In this reaction all solvents and solutions were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. $48(8.80 \mathrm{~g}, 30.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 152$), 52(6.11 \mathrm{~g}, 12.4 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 157 ) and tetrahydrofuran
$(250 \mathrm{~mL})$ were combined in a 500 mL Schlenk tube. An aqueous potassium carbonate $(4.30 \mathrm{~g}, 31.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ in 50 mL$)$ was transferred via a syringe into the tetrahydrofuran solution. After that, tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium(0) ( $1.03 \mathrm{~g}, 0.891 \mathrm{mmol}$, Merck) was added before heating the reaction mixture to reflux for 56 h . The reaction was quenched by the addition of dichloromethane ( 100 mL ) at rt . This was stirred for 30 min vigorously. The organic layer was diluted with dichloromethane ( 500 mL ) and washed with water ( $4 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( $1 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). The solvent of the combined and dried organic layers was distilled under reduced pressure. 48 and 53 have very similar elution properties on silica gel. In order to remove the residual 48 the orange residue was dissolved in a suspension of ethanol:water (1000:350 mL) and silica gel ( 15 g ). The suspension was stirred overnight at rt. After filtration, the filtrate was concentrated to the half its volume under vacuum and then cooled to $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Orange $0.3-1$ cm long needle like crystals precipitated, were filtered and dried to yield 53 (4.8 g, 7.4 mmol, 60\%).

Decomposition onset: $373^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $32 \%$. (Decomposition was also proven in DSC).
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 7.60\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-6)=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.57\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.49$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6-4)=1.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.02\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 3.84\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$, $2.32\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.7-1.5 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.45-1.1 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 28 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), ~ 0.9-0.75\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 188.57, 151.93, 150.30, 144.72, 135.70, 130.67, 128.83, 123.07, 119.03, 115.90, 71.65, 53.63, 39.58, 30.43, 28.93, 23.82, 23.10, 23.08, 22.92, 15.17, 13.95, 10.97.

MS: 649 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 634$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 536$ (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{36} \mathrm{H}_{44} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 424 (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{28} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}$, $325(5)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}, 217(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{3+}, 162(2)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{4+}, 108(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{6+}, 93(1)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{7+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{44} \mathrm{H}_{61} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 649.4728. Found: 649.4724.

## 5,5’-(2,5-Bis(2-ethylhexyloxy)-1,4-phenylene)bis(1,2,3,3-tetramethyl-3H-indolium) bis perchlorate (54)



In a 50 mL Schlenk tube $53(1.22 \mathrm{~g}, 1.88 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 158 ) was dissolved in melted methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate $(7.08 \mathrm{~g}, 38.0 \mathrm{mmol})$ at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The solution was stirred for 3 d before chilled and poured as lukewarm black oil into cyclohexane ( 250 mL ). The oily phase was separated and washed with cyclohexane ( 300 mL ). The supernatant was decanted and the residue was dissolved in hot ethanol ( $200 \mathrm{~mL}, 60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). To induce the precipitation the product was converted to the bis perchlorated derivative by adding to this solution a saturated ethanolic sodium perchlorate solution ( 50 mL ). The mixture was cooled to rt and $54(1.4 \mathrm{~g}, 1.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 83 \%)$ was harvested by filtration and subsequent drying in a vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $286^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Spontaneous decomposition. Residue: $27 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 7.99\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-6)=0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.97\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-\right.$ $6)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.81\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6-4)=0.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.16\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 4.02 C(1††) $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.0-3.8\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, $2.79\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.7-1.5 (C(1") $\mathrm{H}_{3}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}, 14 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 1.4-1.1 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{\star *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(1 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 16 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$, 0.9-0.7 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{C}(2 \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 195.91, 149.77, 141.08, 141.06, 138.91, 129.81, 129.08, 124.26, 115.46, 114.64, 70.83, 53.91, 38.90, 34.66, 29.96, 28.39, 23.39, 22.45, 21.78, 14.01, 13.91, 10.90 .

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 678 (15) [M-H-2.ClO- $]^{-}$, 340 (100) [M+H-2.ClO $\left.{ }_{4}^{-}\right]^{++}, 339$ (100) [M$\left.2 . \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{++}$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{46} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}: 677.5041$. Found: 677.5042.

## 5,5’-(Perfluoro-1,4-phenylene)bis(2,3,3-trimethyl-3H-indole)


$48(8.80 \mathrm{~g}, 30.9 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 152), 1,4-dibromotetrafluorobenzene (freshly sublimated at $140^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $0.02 \mathrm{mbar}, 3.82 \mathrm{~g}, 12.4 \mathrm{mmol}, ~ A B C R$ ) and tetrahydrofuran ( 250 mL ) were placed in a 500 mL Schlenk tube and degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles. In a separate 100 mL Schlenk tube an aqueous solution of potassium carbonate (4.30 $\mathrm{g}, 31.1 \mathrm{mmol}$ in 50 mL ) was prepared and degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles which was then dripped into the tetrahydrofuran solution. In order to start the reaction, tetrakis(triphenylphosphine)palladium(0) ( $1.03 \mathrm{~g}, 0.891 \mathrm{mmol}$, Merck) was added and the reaction mixture was heated to reflux for 72 h . The reaction was quenched by cooling to rt and adding dichloromethane ( 100 mL ) while stirring vigorously for 30 min . The organic layer was diluted in dichloromethane ( 500 mL ) and washed with water $(5 \times 500 \mathrm{~mL})$ and brine ( $2 \times 300 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). After removal of the solvent under vacuum, the raw product was purified by column chromatography (chloroform) to yield 55 ( 0.50 $\mathrm{g}, 1.0 \mathrm{mmol}, 8 \%$ ) as an orange powder, which was immediately used in the next reaction. Unfortunately the aliquot was exidentely wasted before the analysis could be compleated.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: ~ 7.8-7.6(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.5-7.3(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 2.3\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right)$, $1.4\left(\mathrm{C}(1 ")_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right)$.
${ }^{19}$ F-NMR: - 139.16 (C(2')F, 4F, m).

## 5,5’-(Perfluoro-1,4-phenylene)bis(1,2,3,3-tetramethyl-3H-indolium) bis perchlorate (56)



In a 50 mL Schlenk tube 55 ( $400 \mathrm{mg}, 0.861 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 161) was dissolved in melted methyl $p$-toluenesulfonate ( $10.0 \mathrm{~g}, 53.7 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The solution was stirred for 3 d before cooling and the lukewarm dark oily reaction mixture was poured into cyclohexane ( 250 mL ). The oily phase separated which was washed with fresh cyclohexane (300 mL ). The supernatant was decanted and the residue was dissolved in hot ethanol (100 $\mathrm{mL}, 60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). To induce the precipitation the product was converted to the bis perchlorated derivative by adding to this solution a saturated ethanolic sodium perchlorate solution $(25 \mathrm{~mL})$. The mixture was cooled to rt and 56 ( $0.45 \mathrm{~g}, 0.65 \mathrm{mmol}, 75 \%$ ) filtered and dried in a vacuum oven.

Decomposition onset: $304^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Spontaneous decomposition. Residue: $2 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-$ NMR (DMSO- $\mathrm{d}_{6}$ ): 8.13 (C(7)H, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.10(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.78$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.03\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.82\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.59$ (C(1") $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 197.89, 145.12, 143.39, 142.59, 131.31, 127.80, 125.44, 119.25, 116.17, 54.66, 35.18, 22.00, 14.57.
${ }^{19}$ F-NMR (DMSO-d $\mathrm{d}_{6}$ ): -143.5 (C(2*)F, 4F, s).
MS (ESI-QTOF+): 495 (7) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}, 494$ (41) $\left[\mathrm{M}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}, 493$ (100) [M-H$\left.2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}, 398(3)\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$, 322 (14) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{16} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$, $248(47)\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{++}, 247$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{M}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{++}$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~F}_{4} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}: 493.2261$. Found:
493.2284.

## Anthracene-1,5-diamine (59)



In a 250 mL beaker, copper(II) sulfate pentahydrate ( $4.00 \mathrm{~g}, 16.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in water ( 100 mL ). Thereupon, zinc dust ( $200 \mathrm{~g}, 3.06 \mathrm{~mol}, \mathrm{ABCR}$ ) was added, the water was decanted and the zinc-copper-alloy was dispersed with water ( $2 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ). This activated zinc powder was then placed in a 3 L flask together with 1,5-diamino anthraquinone ( $60.0 \mathrm{~g}, 252 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{ABCR}$ ) and an aqueous sodium hydroxide solution $(1.8 \mathrm{~L}, 4 \mathrm{~N})$. While heating the reaction mixture to reflux for 48 h under a continuous argon stream, the red starting material turned into a highly yellow-greenish fluorescent product (Figure 4.10). Thereafter, the reaction mixture was cooled to rt, carefully filtered, washed with a sodium hydroxide solution ( $200 \mathrm{~mL}, 10 \mathrm{~N}$ ) and the residue was immediately suspended in dimethyl sulfoxide ( 600 mL ).


Figure 4.10: Picture of the reaction mixture lightened with an UV-lamp (356 nm).

To separate the product from the excess of zinc the suspension was filtered. Most of the side products present in this reaction stuck to the silica when TLC was performed. Therefore the dark brown dimethyl sulfoxide filtrate was filtered through a silica gel bed ( 12 cm ). The filtrate was concentrated under vacuum ( $90^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 10 \mathrm{mbar}$ ) to 100 mL . This concentrate was added dropwise to water $(2 \mathrm{~L})$ while stirring. The precipitate was filtered and dried in a vacuum oven to yield 59 ( $45 \mathrm{~g}, 0.22 \mathrm{~mol}, 87 \%$ ) as a yellow powder.

Caution: Firstly, during the reaction hydrogen gas is evolved! Risk of explosion if heated under confinement! The reaction mixture has to be flushed continuously with an argon stream.

Secondly, after the reaction, the zinc dust is highly reactive. Specially, the filtration residue after the first filtration with dimethyl sulfoxide is critical which must be immediately added to water to prevent auto-ignition.
Thirdly, due to the light sensitivity of the anthracene derivate the reaction was performed with dimmed light and the product was stored in darkness.

Decomposition onset: $325^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $16 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.54(\mathrm{C}(10) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.25\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4-3)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-\right.$ 2) $=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.17\left(\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-4)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-2)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.60(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd}$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2-3)=7.1 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(2-4)=0.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.78\left(\mathrm{C}(1) \mathrm{NH}_{2}, \mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{NH}_{2}, 4 \mathrm{H}\right.$, br).
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 144.39 C(1), 131.62 C(4a), 126.15 C(3), 123.25 C(10a), 120.81 C(10), 116.40 C(4), 105.61 C(2).

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 273 (8) [M+H+Zn] ${ }^{+}$, 209 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$, 195 (4) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right.$: 209.1073 . Found: 209.1073.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{2}$ : C, 80.74; H,5.81; N, 13.45. Found: C, 79.25 ; $\mathrm{H}, 5.60$; $\mathrm{N}, 12.93$; rest is Zn salt.

## 1,5-Dihydrazinylanthracene (60)



In a beaker at rt, 59 ( $21.8 \mathrm{~g}, 105 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 163) was mixed with hydrochloric acid ( $800 \mathrm{~mL}, 32 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) and stirred for 1 h . The grey suspension was cooled in a 3 L glass reactor with jacked cooling to $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Over a time period of 3 h a cold solution of sodium nitrite ( $16.0 \mathrm{~g}, 232 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in water ( 70 mL ) was dripped in. Afterwards, the brown-yellow solution was allowed to warm to $-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ while stirring for 2 h . To eliminate the excess of nitrite a cold solution of urea ( $45.0 \mathrm{~g}, 750 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in water ( 100 mL ) was added at once, causing a very vigorous gas evolving. The reaction mixture was stirred at $-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 h and subsequently cooled to $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. At this temperature, a cold solution of tin(II) chloride dihydrate ( $100 \mathrm{~g}, 441 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in water ( 150 mL ) was put in at once. The consequent exothermal reaction heated the reactor content up to $-8^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The brown suspension was stirred at $-15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight, then kept for 2 h at $-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and finally allow to warm to $+1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ within 2 h . Thereupon, the entire reactor content was centrifuged. The supernatant was decanted and the remnant was washed with hydrochloric acid ( $3 \times 2.5$ $\mathrm{L}, 16 \%$ ) and centrifuged anew. The brown residue was then dissolved in water ( 6 L ) and filtered before basified with aqueous sodium hydroxide solution (32\%) to pH 12 13. The precipitate was centrifuged, washed with water ( $4 \times 2 \mathrm{~L}$ ) and finally dried in a vacuum oven to yield 60 ( $15 \mathrm{~g}, 59 \mathrm{mmol}, 56 \%$ ) as a brown powder.

Decomposition onset: $155^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $52 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.50(\mathrm{C}(10), 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.45(\mathrm{C}(1) \mathrm{NH}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}) 7.3-7.2(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{H}$, $4 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 6.85\left(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2-3)=6.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2-4)=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 146.85 C(1), 131.28 C(4a), 126.19 C(3), 122.11 C(10a), 119.86 C(10), 117.51 C(4), 101.89 C(2).

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 239 (11) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 222$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\right]^{+}, 209$ (17) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}, 207$
(7) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 194 (50) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{15} \mathrm{~N}_{4}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 239.1291 . Found: 239.1304.

## 1,5-Bis(2-(3-methylbutan-2-ylidene)hydrazinyl)anthracene (61)



In the dark 60 ( $12.0 \mathrm{~g}, 50.4 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 165) was mixed with 3-methyl-2-butanone (1 L) and heated to $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Afterwards, the excess of 3-methyl-2-butanone was evaporated under reduced pressure. The concentrate was dried in the vacuum oven overnight at rt . An aliquot was taken for analysis and the rest of the crude product was immediately used without further purification. According to NMR the residue was still wet, so no yield is stated at this point.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.73$ (C(10)H, 2H, s), 8.66 (C(1)NH, 2H, s), 7.51 (C(4)H, $\left.2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4-3)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-2)=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.35\left(\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-4)=7.9 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-\right.$ 2) $=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz}), 7.33\left(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2-3)=7.4 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(2-4)=1.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.61\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{h}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(3^{\prime}-4^{\prime}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.12\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.17\left(\mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(3^{\prime}-4^{\prime}\right)=6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 155.32 C(2"), 141.72 C(1), 131.45 C(4a), 126.09 C(3), 122.26 $C(10 a), 120.46 C(10), 119.17 C(4), 105.73 C(2), 36.89 C\left(3^{\prime}\right), 20.45 C\left(4^{\prime}\right), 14.12 C\left(1^{\prime}\right)$. MS (ESI-QTOF+): 290 (76) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{20} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\right]^{+}, 222$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\right]^{+}, 209$ (7) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$, $207(26)\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{11} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 194 (19) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{12} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}\left(\mathrm{No} \mathrm{M}{ }^{+}\right.$detected. Cleavage of one hydrazone unit yields in the $290 \mathrm{~m} / \mathrm{z}$ fragment).

## 2,3,3,8,9,9-Hexamethyl-3,9-dihydro-1,7-diazadicyclopenta[a,h]anthracene (62)



In the dark 61 (entire residue, page 166) was intermixed with glacial acetic acid (350 $\mathrm{mL})$. The Fischer Indole Synthesis was performed at reflux temperature ( $118^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) for 12 h before the acetic acid was distilled under reduced pressure. The residue was basified with ammonium hydroxide solution ( 100 mL ) and filtered. The remnant was elutriated in boiling acetonitrile ( 300 mL ) and filtered hot. The filtration residue was dried and yielded 62 ( $8.5 \mathrm{~g}, 25 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%$ calculated from the used hydrazine 60) as yellowbrown powder.

Decomposition onset: $282^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $42 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 9.10(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 8.07\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4-3)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.67$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-4)=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.38\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.36\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 188.58 C(2), 148.07 C(6b), 140.90 C(5a), 131.76 C(3a), 125.75 $C(4)$, 124.87 C(6), 121.59 C(5), 120.16 C(6a), 54.95 C(3), 21.88 C(1"), 15.38 C(1').

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 358 (39) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{NH}_{4}\right]^{+}$, 341 (100) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}^{+}\right.$: 341.2012 . Found: 341.2011.

## 1,2,3,3,7,8,9,9-Octamethyl-3,9-dihydro-1,7-diaza-dicyclopenta[a,h]anthracene-diium bis(perchlorate) (63)



In the dark 62 ( $2.50 \mathrm{~g}, 7.34 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 167) was intermixed with methyl ptoluenesulfonate $(20.0 \mathrm{~g}, 107 \mathrm{mmol})$ and heated to $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 48 h . The reaction mixture was then cooled to rt and poured in cyclohexane ( 300 mL ). A black oil precipitated which was emulsified with cyclohexane ( $2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) under stirring vigorously. The supernatant was decanted. The dark brown residue was then dissolved in hot ethanol ( 200 mL ) and a saturated solution of sodium perchlorate was added dropwise which resulted in the anion exchange to the better crystallisable bis(perchlorate). In order to isolate the crude product the gel like precipitation was centrifuged. The remnant was elutriated in boiling water ( 100 mL ), filtered and washed with cold ethanol ( $2 \times 15 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) to yield $63(3.1 \mathrm{~g}, 4.9$ mmol, 67\%) as a brown powder.

Decomposition onset: $297^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: 0\%.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 9.65(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 8.70\left(\mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(5-4)=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.10$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4-5)=8.7 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.62\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 2.91\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.64$ (C(1") $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, 12 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 196.18, 143.01, 135.86, 132.75, 132.42, 122.65, 120.34, 99.54, 54.26, 40.20, 20.82, 14.26.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 369 (100) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{HClO}_{4}-\mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}, 355$ (14) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{25} \mathrm{H}_{27} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}, 341$ (3) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{25} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\right]^{+}, 186$ (1) $\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{++}, 185(4)\left[\mathrm{M}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{++}$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{HClO}_{4}-\mathrm{ClO}_{4}^{-}\right]^{+}$: 369.2325. Found: 369.2326.

## 2-((2-Hydroxy-3,4-dioxocyclobut-1-enyl)methylene)-3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindoline-5-carboxylic acid (64)



In a 500 mL three neck round bottom flask 66 ( $10.0 \mathrm{~g}, 22.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 171), chloroform ( 100 mL ) and ethanol ( 100 mL ) were mixed and heated to reflux before an aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( $5 \mathrm{~mL}, 40 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) was added dropwise via syringe. Immediately, the colour changed from orange to dark brown and after 5 min the reaction mixture was concentrated in vacuo. The black oily residue was dissolved in chloroform $(200 \mathrm{~mL})$ and extracted with saturated aqueous citric acid ( 200 mL ). The protonated product precipitated between the layers of the organic and the aqueous phase and was filtered. Owing to the good water solubility of the product the residue was not washed with pure water; hence, the dried product contained $33 \%$ citric acid. $64(5.50 \mathrm{~g}, 8.7$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 38 \%$ ) was isolated as orange powder and was immediately used in the next reaction.

Decomposition onset: $142^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $24 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 7.86(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}+\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.10\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, $5.59\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 3.84\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{* *}-2^{* *}\right)=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.76$ (citric acid $\mathrm{C}(\alpha) \mathrm{H}_{a}$, $2.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{2} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{a}-\mathrm{b})=15.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 2.65 (citric acid $\mathrm{C}(\alpha) \mathrm{H}_{b}, 2.1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{2} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{~b}-\mathrm{a})=15.4 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), 1.61 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.56\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1{ }^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.4-1.1 (C(3**) $\mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{br}\right), 0.80\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=6.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 412 (100) [M+H]+, 358 (82), 279 (72), 208 (39), 194 (65), 159 (83).
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{24} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 412.2118$. Found: 412.2111.

## 5-Carboxy-2,3,3-trimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium iodide (65)



2,3,3-Trimethyl-3H-indole-5-carboxylic acid ( $29.8 \mathrm{~g}, 147 \mathrm{mmol}$, Intatrade) were mixed with butanol ( 100 mL ) and 1-iodooctane ( $67.2 \mathrm{~g}, 280 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) in a 500 mL round bottom flask. The reactor content was heated to reflux for 1 d before cooling to rt. In order to precipitate the product, the reaction mixture was subsequently dropped into diethyl ether ( 700 mL ) while stirring. Compound $65(43 \mathrm{~g}, 92 \mathrm{mmol}, 69 \%)$ was harvested by filtration as a light brown coloured powder.

Decomposition onset: $201^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: 6\%.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.39(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 8.17\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.10$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.48\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{* *}-2^{* *}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.90\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}\right.$, $3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.83\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.58\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1\right.\right.$ ") $\left.\mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 1.5-1.2\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.84\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=6.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 199.43, 166.42, 144.23, 142.26, 131.68, 130.44, 124.42, 115.75, 54.49, 47.97, 31.15, 28.58, 28.47, 27.18, 25.90, 22.02, 21.84, 14.56, 13.94.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 442 (2) [M-H] ${ }^{+}$, 338 (18) [M-H-I+Na] ${ }^{+}$, 316 (100) [M-I] ${ }^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{I}]^{+}: 316.2271$. Found: 316.2271.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{20} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{NO}_{2} \mathrm{I}: \mathrm{C}, 54.18 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.82 ; \mathrm{N}, 3.16$. Found: C, 53.09; H, 6.68; N, 3.17.

## 2-((2-Ethoxy-3,4-dioxocyclobut-1-enyl)methylene)-3,3-dimethyl-1-octylindoline-5-carboxylic acid (66)



65 ( $15.0 \mathrm{~g}, 33.8 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 170) and $30(7.20 \mathrm{~g}, 42.3 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 130) were suspended in ethanol ( 40 mL ) and heated to reflux for 15 min . After cooling to $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, triethylamine ( $11.7 \mathrm{~mL}, 84.6 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added. While boiling the solution for 15 h the colour changed from light yellow to brown and finally to dark green. The solvent was distilled under reduced pressure and the residue was dried in high vacuum overnight. For purification the crude product was dissolved in chloroform ( 200 mL ), extracted with saturated citric acid ( $2 \times 150 \mathrm{~mL}$ ), washed with water ( $3 \times 200 \mathrm{~mL}$ ) and brine ( 150 mL ). The solvent of the combined and dried organic layer was removed under vacuum. The crude product was recrystallized with a chloroform:toluene (50:200 mL ) mixture to yield 66 ( $11 \mathrm{~g}, 25 \mathrm{mmol}, 74 \%$ ) as an bright orange solid.

Decomposition onset: $210^{\circ}$ C. Residue: $31 \%$. According to DSC 66 melts (186 $192^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) just before decomposition.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.09\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}\right.$, dd, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6-4)=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.97 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-\right.$ $6)=2.3 \mathrm{~Hz}), 6.89\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.3 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.49\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 4.91\left(\mathrm{C}(1 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{q}\right.$, $\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(1 \dagger \dagger-2 \dagger \dagger)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 3.83\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{* *}-2^{* *}\right)=7.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 1.75\left(\mathrm{C}\left(2^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{~m}\right), 1.65$ $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}+\mathrm{C}(12) \mathrm{H}_{3}, ~ s\right), 1.55 \quad\left(\mathrm{C}(2 \dagger \dagger) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \quad \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{* *}-2^{\star *}\right)=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$, 1.5-1.2 $\quad\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{\star *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}\right.$, $\left.\mathrm{C}\left(4^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{~m}\right), 0.88\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{* *}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{* *}-7^{* *}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 192.1, 188.76, 188.47, 173.68, 171.23, 167.39, 147.52, 140.87, 131.47, $123.85,122.93,107.72,83.27,70.25,47.30,43.16,31.71,29.20,29.09,27.03,26.96$, 26.33, 22.57, 15.90, 14.06.

MS: 462 (31) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{Na}]^{+}, 440(100)[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 422(39)\left[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right]^{+}, 355(16)\left[\mathrm{C}_{22} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NO}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 256 (12) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{18} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}\right]^{+}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{26} \mathrm{H}_{33} \mathrm{NO}_{5}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}: 440.2432$. Found: 440.2427.

## 4-((3-Ethyl-1,1-dimethyl-1 H-benzo[e]indolium-2-yl)methylene)-2-((1,1,3,6,6,8-hexamethyl-7-methylene-7,8-dihydroindolo[7,6-g]indol-2(1H,3H,6H)-ylidene)methyl)-3-oxocyclobut-1-enolate (68)



To generate the activated intermediate of $57(3.40 \mathrm{~g}, 6.55 \mathrm{mmol}$, Thomas Geiger [23]), it was deprotonated in an emulsion of toluene ( 35 mL ) and aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( $10 \mathrm{~mL}, 40 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) at ambient temperature for 30 min under vigorously stirring. The organic layer containing the bis enamine 67 (figure 2.16 on page 37) was separated, dried with sodium sulfate and placed in a Dean-Stark apparatus. In this reactor 42 ( $2.20 \mathrm{~g}, 6.40 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 145), 1-butanol ( 70 mL ) and quinoline ( 20 mL ) were added and the mixture was heated to reflux overnight. The entire reactor content was poured on ice ( 1 L ). The precipitation was filtered and the residue was purified by column chromatography ( A : ethylacetate:triethylamine $=$ 95:5; B: chloroform:triethylamine $=95: 5 ; \mathrm{A}: \mathrm{B}=100: 0 \rightarrow 25: 75$ ) to yield in $68(1.9 \mathrm{~g}, 2.2$ $\mathrm{mmol}, 35 \%)$. According to NMR the product contained about $15 \%$ of the eluent additive 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoroisopropanol because of incorporation into the crystal structure.

Decomposition onset: $187^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $28 \%$. Release of incorporated solvent above $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 8.24\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.17\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.03(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d}$,
$\left.{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.02\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.93\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.71\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.62$ $(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}), 7.56\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.46\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.45\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 5.88$ (2H, br), 5.16 ( $1,1,1,3,3,3$-hexafluoroisopropanol, $\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 0.7 \mathrm{H}$, hep, ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{H}-\mathrm{F})=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}$ ), $4.27\left(2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{q},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=7.2 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.14\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.10\left(1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}=2.0 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.07(3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s})$, $1.96(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.72(6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 1.35(9 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m})$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 180.90, 177.49, 170.17, 164.15, 142.33, 139.26, 133.34, 132.02, $130.92,129.83,129.74,127.96,127.45,124.24,122.28,122.22,120.80,120.47$, 119.39, 118.03, 113.26, 111.16, 104.57, 104.53, 87.17, 85.77, 77.21, 67.27, 66.90, $50.65,48.35,45.70,43.58,38.25,35.71,30.04,26.53,26.09,12.12,11.75$.

MS: 634 (97) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}, 633$ (100) $[\mathrm{M}]^{+}, 619$ (11) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{41} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}, 411$ (6) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\right]^{+}$, 317 (5) $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{++}$.

HR-MS: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{43} \mathrm{H}_{43} \mathrm{~N}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{2}[\mathrm{M}]^{+}$: 633.3350. Found: 633.3351.

## 2,7-Dimethylpyrido[2,3-g]quinoline (69)



69 was prepared by the Doebner-Miller reaction, a Skraup Quinoline Synthesis variation, from 1,4-benzene-diamine ( $5.00 \mathrm{~g}, 46.2 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) which was dissolved in hydrochloric acid ( $450 \mathrm{~mL}, 6 \mathrm{~N}$ ). The solution was heated to reflux where over a time period of 30 min cold crotonaldehyde ( $7.78 \mathrm{~g}, 111 \mathrm{~mol}$ ) was added dropwise. In addition, the reaction mixture was refluxed for 4 h before the dark brown reaction mixture was allowed to cool to rt and it was filtered. To initiate the precipitation of the product the dark filtrate was basified with aqueous sodium hydroxide solution ( $350 \mathrm{~mL}, 32 \% \mathrm{w} / \mathrm{w}$ ) and cooled to $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Next morning the violet needles were filtered and yielded 69 ( $1.6 \mathrm{~g}, 7.6 \mathrm{mmol}, 15 \%$ ) after drying.

Decomposition onset: $263^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $9 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 9.09\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4-3)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 8.06(\mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 7.61$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-4)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.70\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 158.70 C(2), 146.19 C(5a), 131.60 C(4), 131.13 C(3), 122.51 $C(5)$, 122.47 C(5a), 24.51 C(1').

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 209 (37) [M+H] ${ }^{+}$, 172 (100), 159 (12), 122 (24).
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{14} \mathrm{H}_{13} \mathrm{~N}_{2}[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 209.1073. Found: 209.1077.

## 1,2,6,7-Tetramethylpyrido[2,3-g]quinoline-1,6-diium bis(perchlorate) (70)



69 ( $250 \mathrm{mg}, 1.20 \mathrm{mmol}$, page 173) and methyl p-toluenesulfonate ( $4.47 \mathrm{~g}, 24.0 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) were intermixed and heated to $130^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction was monitored by NMR. The first nitrogen atom was alkylated within hours but to methylate the second one took days. After heating for 60 h a ratio between 70 and mono alkylated intermediate of 9:1 was reached. At this point the reaction was terminated by cooling to room temperature and pouring the reactor content into cyclohexane ( 200 mL ). The black oil was suspended in fresh cyclohexane ( 200 mL ) and the supernatant was decanted. The remnant was dissolved in ethanol ( 100 mL ) and heated in a beaker to $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before a saturated ethanolic sodium perchlorate solution ( 50 mL ) was added. The product precipitated and after cooling to rt 70 ( $0.30 \mathrm{~g}, 0.69 \mathrm{mmol}, 58 \%$ ) was obtained by filtration and drying as a grey powder.

Decomposition onset: $329^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $13 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{DMSO}-\mathrm{d}_{6}\right): 10.07\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(4-3)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 9.19(\mathrm{C}(5) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}), 8.57$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{H}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-4)=8.4 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.63\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right), 3.19\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR (DMSO-d ${ }_{6}$ ): 162.32 C(2), 140.81 C(5a), 138.82 C(4), 128.08 C(5), 125.75 $C(4 a)$, 124.77 C(3), 40.97 C(1"), 23.04 C( $1^{\prime}$ ).

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 237 (25) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{ClO}_{4}-\mathrm{HClO}_{4}\right]^{+}, 223$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{ClO}_{4}-\mathrm{HClO}_{4}-\mathrm{CH}_{3}\right]^{+}, 119$
(38) $\left[\mathrm{M}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}\right]^{++}$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{16} \mathrm{H}_{18} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\left[\mathrm{M}-2 \cdot \mathrm{ClO}_{4}\right]^{++}$: 119.0730. Found: 119.0729.

## Tris-(tri(p-tolyl)-phosphine)-palladium(0) (71)



Palladium(II) chloride ( $0.234 \mathrm{~g}, 1.32 \mathrm{mmol}$, Alfa Aesar), tri(p-tolyl)phosphine ( 2.00 g , 6.57 mmol ) and dimethyl sulfoxide ( 12 mL ) were placed in a Schlenk tube. The reaction mixture and all other solvents were degassed by freeze-pump-thaw cycles before used. The reaction mixture was then heated to reflux $\left(135^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. The initial colourless suspension turned to a light brick stone solution. It was then allowed to cool to $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ before hydrazine hydrate ( $0.28 \mathrm{~mL}, 5.75 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was added via syringe. Immediately, the colour changed to light yellow and the product started to crystallize. After cooling to rt , the reaction mixture was filtered under argon atmosphere. The residue was washed with absolute ethanol ( 8 mL ) followed by absolute methanol $(25 \mathrm{~mL})$ under argon. The ensuing residue was dried in high vacuum ( $10^{-3} \mathrm{mbar}$ ) for 1 h to yield 71 ( $1.0 \mathrm{~g}, 1.0$ mmol, 76\%).

Decomposition onset: $175^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $20 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right): 7.56\left(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}, 18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(2-3)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{C}(2) \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{P})=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 6.83$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(3) \mathrm{H}, 18 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(3-2)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 2.03\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 27 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{13}$ C-NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right): 137.84(\mathrm{C}(4), \mathrm{s}), 137.12\left(\mathrm{C}(1), \mathrm{d},{ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{C}(1)-\mathrm{P})=14.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 134.46(\mathrm{C}(2)$,
$\left.\mathrm{d},{ }^{2} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{C}(2)-\mathrm{P})=17.6 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 129.03\left(\mathrm{C}(3), \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(\mathrm{C}(3)-\mathrm{P})=12.1 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 21.20\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right), \mathrm{s}\right)$.
${ }^{31}$ P-NMR $\left(\mathrm{C}_{6} \mathrm{D}_{6}\right):$ 19-15 (P, br).
MS (ESI-QTOF+): 1017 (2) [M-H] ${ }^{+}$, 983 (11) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{63} \mathrm{H}_{65} \mathrm{NaO}_{3} \mathrm{P}_{3}\right]^{+}$, 759 (92) $[\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{H})(\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{p}-$ tol $\left.)_{2}\left(\mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)\right]^{+}, 715(80)\left[\mathrm{Pd}(\mathrm{H})\left(\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{tol})_{2}\right]^{+}, 663\right.$ (59) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{42} \mathrm{H}_{42} \mathrm{NaO}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}\right]^{+}, 395$ (81) [ $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{p}-$ tol $\left.)_{4}\right]^{+}, 343(100)\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{21} \mathrm{NaOP}\right]^{+}, 321$ (100) $\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{OP}^{+}, 305(74)\left[\mathrm{C}_{21} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{P}\right]^{+}\right.$.

HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{63} \mathrm{H}_{62} \mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{Pd}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{H}]^{+}$: 1017.3094. Found: 1017.3080.

## 5-Bromo-2,3,3-trimethyl-1-octyl-3H-indolium iodide (72)



Indole 32 (10.0 g, 42.0 mmol , page 132), 1-iodooctane ( $20.2 \mathrm{~g}, 84.0 \mathrm{mmol}, \mathrm{ABCR}$ ) and 1-butanol ( 10 mL ) were placed in a 50 mL Schlenk tube. The suspension was heated to $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and stirred overnight. After cooling to rt the reaction mixture was poured into diethyl ether ( 600 mL ) and stirred for 30 min . Subsequently, the brown precipitate was filtered. The ensuing residue was recrystallized from boiling chloroform ( 150 mL ). The crystalline product was harvested by filtration. The evaporated remnant of the mother liquid was recrystallized accordingly to yield in total 72 ( $12 \mathrm{~g}, 21 \mathrm{mmol}, 50 \%$ ) as light brown crystalline powder.

Melting point: $160-167^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Decomposition onset: $200^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Residue: $14 \%$.
${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{NMR}: 8.19\left(\mathrm{C}(4) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(4-6)=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.97\left(\mathrm{C}(7) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{d},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(7-6)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 7.83$ $\left(\mathrm{C}(6) \mathrm{H}, 1 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{dd},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}(6-7)=8.8 \mathrm{~Hz},{ }^{4} \mathrm{~J}(6-4)=1.5 \mathrm{~Hz}\right), 4.44\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{t},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(1^{\prime}-2^{\prime}\right)=7.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$,
$2.85\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{*}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 3 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.86-1.75 (C(2') $\left.\mathrm{H}_{2}, 2 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 1.55\left(\mathrm{C}\left(1^{\prime \prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, 6 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{s}\right)$, 1.46-1.18 $\left(\mathrm{C}\left(3^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(4^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(5^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(6^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, \mathrm{C}\left(7^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{2}, 10 \mathrm{H}, \mathrm{m}\right), 0.84\left(\mathrm{C}\left(8^{\prime}\right) \mathrm{H}_{3}, \mathrm{t}^{3} \mathrm{~J}\left(8^{\prime}-7^{\prime}\right)=6.8 \mathrm{~Hz}\right)$. ${ }^{13}$ C-NMR: 196.87, 144.12, 140.35, 131.80, 126.88, 122.76, 117.46, 54.39, 47.85, 31.11, 28.53, 28.41, 27.14, 25.82, 21.98, 21.79, 14.31, 13.90.

MS (ESI-QTOF+): 476 (1) [M-H] ${ }^{+}$, 350 (100) [M-I] ${ }^{+}$.
HR-MS (ESI-QTOF+): calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{~N}^{79} \mathrm{Br}[\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{I}]^{+}: 350.1478$. Found: 350.1481.
Elemental analysis: calculated for $\mathrm{C}_{19} \mathrm{H}_{29} \mathrm{NBrl}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 47.72 ; \mathrm{H}, 6.11$; $\mathrm{N}, 2.93$; $\mathrm{Br}, 16.71$; I, 26.54. Found: C, 47.16; H, 6.10; N, 2.91; Br, 16.69; I, 26.45.
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