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The reaction of anthraquinone and the dianion of bis(1,3dithiolyl)diphosphonate reagents 2 and 3 afford the cyclophane derivatives 4 and 5, the cyclic voltammetry and X-ray crystal structures of which are reported.

There is considerable current interest in polycyclic ring systems which fold to form concave clefts ${ }^{1}$ or saddle-like surfaces. ${ }^{2}$ In this context the 9,10 -bis(methylene)-9,10-dihydroanthracene building block has received limited attention, although crystallographic and theoretical studies have shown that bulky substituents attached to the methylene sites enforce a folding of the central anthracenediylidene ring into a boat conformation, and, hence, the molecule adopts a saddle shape. ${ }^{3}$ Bis(1,3dithiole) substituents placed at these methylene sites, e.g.

compound $\mathbf{1 , 3}$ provide especially interesting electron donors with extended $\pi$-conjugation; ${ }^{4}$ they are characterised by a single, two-electron redox wave to yield a thermodynamically stable dication at $E^{\text {ox }} c a .+0.40 \mathrm{~V}$ ( $v s . \mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{AgCl}$ ) in the cyclic voltammogram (CV). ${ }^{3 a-c, 4 b, 5}$ Methyl substituents slightly lower the oxidation potential relative to methylsufanyl substituents ( $c f$. compounds 1a and 1b).

We have now incorporated this structural moiety into cyclophane structures, ${ }^{6}$ and herein we report the synthesis and characterisation of the first bridged 9,10-bis(methylene)-9,10-dihydroanthracene derivatives, viz. compounds 4 and 5. The synthesis of $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$ was achieved by a two-fold olefination reaction, under high dilution conditions, of anthraquinone using reagents $\mathbf{2}$ and $\mathbf{3}$ (Scheme 1), ${ }^{7}$ which were deprotonated by LDA at $-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, following literature precedents for other 1,3-dithiole phosphonate ester reagents. ${ }^{8}$ Compounds $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5} \dagger$ were isolated as single isomers, and the cis configuration was confirmed by X-ray structure analysis. $\ddagger$

Compound 4 gave a mixture of amber block- and needle-like crystals, which were characterised as monoclinic ( $\alpha$ ) and orthorhombic ( $\beta$ ) polymorphs, respectively, of cis-4. Two symmetrically independent molecules in the $\beta-4$ structure adopt very similar conformations (Fig. 1), while that of $\alpha-4$ is significantly different. In each case, the conformation of the hexamethylene bridge is rather strained and asymmetric: torsion angles around the $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{C}$ bonds range from 144 to $180^{\circ}$ in $\beta-4$ and from 58 to $176^{\circ}$ in $\alpha-4$, where two methylene groups are disordered. The bridge aggravates the U-bend of the bis(dithiolylidene)benzoquinone system: the dihedral angle between the outer $S(1) C(16) C(17) S(2)$ and $S(3) C(19) C(20) S(4)$ moieties is reduced from $77^{\circ}$ in non-bridged molecule $1^{3 b}$ to $54^{\circ}$ in $\beta-4$ and to only $46^{\circ}$ in $\alpha-4$, mostly through increased folding of both dithiole rings along the $S(1) \cdots S(2)$ and $S(3) \cdots S(4)$ vectors ( 24 and $13^{\circ}$ respectively in $\alpha-4,24$ and $20^{\circ}$ in $\beta-4$, vs. 17 and $8^{\circ}$ in


Scheme 1 Reagents and conditions: i, LDA (2.2 equiv.), anthraquinone, $\mathrm{THF},-78^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 30 \mathrm{~min}$, then raise to $20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

1b). On the other hand, folding of the anthracene system along the $\mathrm{C}(9) \cdots \mathrm{C}(10)$ vector in $\mathbf{4}\left(37-40^{\circ}\right)$ remains the same as in $\mathbf{1 b}$ $\left(38^{\circ}\right)$.

The structure of $\mathbf{5}$ contains two independent molecules, one of which shows disorder that can be rationalised as either a varying degree of molecular bending or a rocking of the molecule as a whole. In the other (ordered) molecule (Fig. 2) the pentamethylene bridge adopts a nearly all-trans conformation (C-C-C-C torsion angles $164-177^{\circ}$ ) and enhances the folding of the anthracene moiety (by $43.4^{\circ}$ ) and both dithiole rings (by 29.4 and $22.6^{\circ}$ ), thus narrowing the dihedral angle between the $\mathrm{S}(1) \mathrm{C}(16) \mathrm{C}(17) \mathrm{S}(2)$ and $\mathrm{S}(3) \mathrm{C}(19) \mathrm{C}(20) \mathrm{S}(4)$ planes to $34.7^{\circ}$. The cavity is essentially empty in the solid state structures of both 4 and 5 .

The solution electrochemistry of compounds $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$ was studied by cyclic voltammetry and differential pulse voltammetry. Both compounds display an irreversible two-electron oxidation wave at $E^{o x}+0.69 \mathrm{~V}$ (compound 4) and +0.74 V (compound 5) [vs. $\mathrm{Ag} / \mathrm{AgCl}$, electrolyte $\mathrm{Bu}_{4} \mathrm{~N}^{+} \mathrm{ClO}_{4}{ }^{-}(0.1 \mathrm{M})$,


Fig. 1 Molecular structure of 4 in the $\beta$-polymorph ( $30 \%$ displacement ellipsoids).


Fig. 2 Molecular structure of 5 ( $50 \%$ displacement ellipsoids).
MeCN , room temperature, scan rate $100 \mathrm{mV} \mathrm{s}^{-1}$, i.e. the oxidation wave of the bridged systems $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$ shows a significant positive shift ( $\Delta E^{0 \times} c a .300 \mathrm{mV}$ ) compared to the non-bridged analogues, e.g. $\mathbf{1},{ }^{3 b}$ recorded under the same conditions. This is explained by the rigidity of $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$ (imparted by the bridge) restricting the conformational change which is known to accompany oxidation of the 9,10 -bis( 1,3 -dithiol2 -ylidene)-9,10-dihydroanthracene system. ${ }^{3 a}$ The slightly higher oxidation potential of 5 compared to $4\left(\Delta E^{\circ \times x} 50 \mathrm{mV}\right)$ is also consistent with oxidation becoming progressively harder as the strain in the system increases, as observed previously for strained tetrathiafulvalenes. ${ }^{9}$ A second oxidation wave is observed at $E^{\text {ox }}+1.0 \mathrm{~V}$. Simulation of the data suggest an ECE process where dication formation is followed by a chemical reaction to form a new electroactive species, which gives rise to the oxidation wave at more positive potentials. The UV-Vis absorption spectra of $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$ display a significant blue shift in the two longest wavelength bands compared to the non-bridged analogues [ $\lambda_{\text {max }}(\mathrm{MeCN}) 1 \mathbf{1 a}:^{3 b, 8} 235,369,433 \mathrm{~nm} ; 4: 264,356$, $416 \mathrm{~nm} ; 5: 264,352,412 \mathrm{~nm}$ ]. The further small blue shift (4 nm ) for these two bands in compound 5 compared to $\mathbf{4}$ is again consistent with the more folded structure of 5 .
In summary, double olefination reactions of anthraquinone have afforded novel bridged 9,10 -bis(methylene)- 9,10 -dihydroanthracenes, paving the way for studies on a new family of conformationally strained cyclophanes with interesting redox and structural properties.
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## Notes and references

$\dagger$ Both compounds 4 and 5 gave mass spectrometric and elemental analytical data consistent with their structures. Selected data for 4: yellow crystals, $22 \%$ yield; $\mathrm{mp} 286-288^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (decomp.); $\delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 1.11(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H})$, $1.32(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}), 2.10(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.23(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.68(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.35(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.49$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$. For 5: yellow crystals, $10 \%$ yield; mp 294-296 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ (darkens at 250 $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) ; \delta_{\mathrm{H}}\left(\mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right) 0.85(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 1.12(\mathrm{~m}, 4 \mathrm{H}) 1.97(\mathrm{~s}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 2.17(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 2.61$ $(\mathrm{m}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.30(\mathrm{~m}, 6 \mathrm{H}), 7.36(\mathrm{~m}, 2 \mathrm{H})$.
$\ddagger$ Crystals of $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$ for X-ray analysis were grown from $\mathrm{MeCN}-\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}$. X-Ray experiments were performed with a SMART CCD area detector (Mo- $K_{\alpha}$ radiation, $\lambda=0.71073 \AA$ ). Absorption corrections by numerical integration, structure solutions by direct methods and least-squares refinement against $F^{2}$ of all data were performed using SHELX-97 programs (G. M. Sheldrick, University of Göttingen, Germany, 1997); CCDC 186/1377. See http://www.rsc.org/suppdata/cc/1999/1835/ for crystallographic data in .cif format.
Crystal data for $\alpha-4: \mathrm{C}_{28} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~S}_{6}, M=554.85$, monoclinic, space group $P 2{ }_{1} / c$ (No. 14), $T=295 \mathrm{~K}, a=18.139(2), b=11.041(1), c=14.406(2)$ $\AA, \beta=109.05(1)^{\circ}, U=2727.1(5) \AA^{3}, Z=4, D_{\mathrm{c}}=1.351 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}, \mu=0.52$ $\mathrm{mm}^{-1}, 24278$ reflections ( 6247 unique) with $2 \theta \leqslant 55^{\circ}, 384$ variables, $R=$ 0.035 on 4325 data with $I \geqslant 2 \sigma(I), w R\left(F^{2}\right)=0.092$, max. residual $\Delta \rho=$ 0.22 e $\AA^{-3} ; C(25)$ and $C(26)$ are disordered over two positions (A and B) with occupancies 82.3 and $17.7(6) \%$. For $\beta-4$ : orthorhombic, space group Pna2 $1_{1}$ (No. 33), $T=295 \mathrm{~K}, a=19.231$ (2), $b=9.520(1), c=30.089(3)$ $\AA, U=5509(1) \AA^{3}, Z=8, D_{\mathrm{c}}=1.338 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}, \mu=0.51 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}, 31379$ reflections ( 9683 unique) with $2 \theta \leqslant 50^{\circ}, 384$ variables, $R=0.049$ on 5758 data with $I \geqslant 2 \sigma(I), w R\left(F^{2}\right)=0.099$, max. residual $\Delta \rho=0.22$ e $\AA^{-3}$; absolute polarity determined from anomalous X-ray scattering [Flack parameter $-0.15(9)$ ]. For $5: \mathrm{C}_{27} \mathrm{H}_{24} \mathrm{~S}_{6}, M=540.82$, triclinic, space group $P \overline{1}$ (No. 2), $T=120 \mathrm{~K}, a=10.944(4), b=14.591(5), c=16.924(7) \AA$, $\alpha=71.18(1), \beta=89.65(2), \gamma=85.66(1)^{\circ}, U=2550(2) \AA^{3}, Z=4, D_{\mathrm{c}}=$ $1.409 \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~cm}^{-3}, \mu=0.55 \mathrm{~mm}^{-1}, 23433$ reflections ( 11538 unique) with $2 \theta$ $\leqslant 55^{\circ}, 678$ variables, $R=0.048$ on 7045 data with $I \geqslant 2 \sigma(I), w R\left(F^{2}\right)=$ 0.104 , max. residual $\Delta \rho=0.46 \mathrm{e}^{\AA} \AA^{-3}$.
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