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## A. Synthetic procedures

General considerations: Oxygen- and moisture-sensitive experiments were carried out under a dry oxygen-free nitrogen atmosphere using standard Schlenk techniques. Solvents were dried by standard methods. The NMR spectra were recorded on Bruker spectrometers ( 300 MHz ) referenced to residual solvent signals as internal standards. Elemental analyses were performed at BioCIS (Elementar Vario/Perkin Elmer 2400 series). Commercially available compounds 1,8-Dichloroanthraquinone , 1,2-bis(4-pyridyl)ethane (bpe), 4,4'-azopyridine (azopy) were purchased and used as received. 1,4-Di(4pyridyl)piperazine (bipy-pip) was prepared as previously described. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{Te}_{2}$ was preliminary prepared and stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an argon flushed round bottom flask according to literature. ${ }^{2}$


1,8-Dibromoanthracene (1) - This compound was synthesized from 1,8-dichloroanthraquinone in four steps using known methods in literature. ${ }^{3}$

1,8-Bis((trimethylsilyl)ethynyl)anthracene (2) - 1,8-Dibromoanthracene was ( $770 \mathrm{mg}, 2.3 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was placed in an oven dried 100 ml round bottom flask. Anhydrous trimethylamine ( 50 ml ) was added under argon followed by TMS-acetylene ( $0.81 \mathrm{ml}, 5.72 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.5 \mathrm{eq}$ ). $\mathrm{PdCl}_{2}\left(\mathrm{PPh}_{3}\right)_{2}(162 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}$, 0.1 eq.) and $\mathrm{Cul}(43 \mathrm{mg}, 0.23 \mathrm{mmol}, 0.1 \mathrm{eq}$.) were then added to the reaction mixture under argon and the mixture was refluxed overnight. The reaction mixture was cooled down to room temperature and the precipitate formed was filtered off. Trimethylamine was evaporated using rotary evaporator under reduced pressure and the crude solid residue was subjected to flash column chromatography on silica gel for purification (eluent: petroleum ether/ethyl acetate) to afford $\mathbf{2}$ ( $640 \mathrm{mg}, 73 \%$ ) as a yellow-green solid. $R_{f}=0.5$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate $1: 0.1$ ); ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} N \mathrm{NR}\left(300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}\right): \delta 9.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.44$ $(\mathrm{s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.01(\mathrm{~d}, J=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.81(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.9,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.44(\mathrm{dd}, J=8.5,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 0.41(\mathrm{~s}, 18 \mathrm{H}) .{ }^{4}$

1,8-Bis(telluromethylethynyl)anthracene (BTMEA) : Compound 2 ( $200 \mathrm{mg}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol}$ ) was dissolved in dry methanol ( 25 ml ) and a suspension of AgF ( $144 \mathrm{mg}, 1.13 \mathrm{mmol}, 2.1$ eq.) in methanol ( 15 ml ) was added, giving an immediate precipitate of the silver acetylide 3. CAUTION. Silver acetylides are known to be explosive and should be handled with care, avoiding grinding. Reaction was continued for another 2 h and solvent was evaporated using rotary evaporator under reduced pressure. The obtained yellow solid was dried under vacuum and suspended in dry THF ( 25 ml ).

Besides, $\mathrm{Me}_{2} \mathrm{Te}_{2}(154 \mathrm{mg}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol})$ was dissolved in dry THF ( 10 ml ) and treated with $\mathrm{Br}_{2}(1 \mathrm{M}$ solution in dry $\mathrm{CH}_{2} \mathrm{Cl}_{2}, 0.54 \mathrm{ml}, 0.54 \mathrm{mmol}$, 1eq.) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, resulting in the formation of MeTeBr . This dark red solution was brought to room temperature and added to the silver acetylide $\mathbf{3}$ suspension. The reaction mixture was stirred for 2 h . The precipitate was filtered through a Celite ${ }^{\circledR}$ pad and the filtrate was concentrated using rotary evaporator. The crude product ( $55 \mathrm{mg}, 20 \%$ ) was pure enough to use directly off the flask as red solid, $R_{f}=0.35$ (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate, $1: 0.2$ ). $\mathrm{Mp}: 142{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C} .{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, C D C l_{3}$ ): $\delta 9.35(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.44(\mathrm{~s}, 1 \mathrm{H}), 8.01(\mathrm{~d}, \mathrm{~J}=8.5 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}), 7.81(\mathrm{dd}, J=6.9,1.1 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H})$, 7.44 (dd, $J=8.5,6.9 \mathrm{~Hz}, 2 \mathrm{H}$ ), 5.33 (DCM) 0.41 ( $\mathrm{s}, 18 \mathrm{H}$ ). ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ NMR ( $300 \mathrm{MHz}, \mathrm{CDCl}_{3}$ ): 131.8, 131.4, 130.8, 129, 127.4, 125, $124.1,121.8,109,50.2,-13.75$.



## B. Co-Crystallization experiments:

BTMEA•bpe : To a solution of BTMEA ( 10 mg ) in EtOAc ( 0.5 ml ) was layered with 4,4'-bipyridine ( 3.6 $\mathrm{mg}, 1$ equiv.) dissolved in EtOAc ( 0.5 ml ). Slow evaporation of solvent resulted in the formation of red prism shaped crystals. Mp : $137-138^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Te}_{2}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 55.40 ; \mathrm{H}, 3.78 ; \mathrm{N}, 4.04$ found: C , 56.27; H, 3.90; N, 4.43.

BTMEA•bpy-pip : To a solution of BTMEA ( 10 mg ) in EtOAc ( 0.5 ml ) was layered with (bipy-pip) bispyridine-piperazine ( 4.7 mg , 1 equiv.) dissolved in EtOAc ( 0.5 ml ). Slow evaporation of solvent resulted in the formation of red shaped crystals. Mp: 193-194 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; Anal. Calcd for $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Te}_{2}$ : $\mathrm{C}, 54.56$; H, 4.03; N, 7.47 found: C, 54.24; H, 3.79; N, 7.07.

BTMEA•azopy : To a solution of BTMEA (10 mg) in EtOAc ( 0.5 ml ) was layered with azobipy ( $3.6 \mathrm{mg}, 1$ equiv.) dissolved in EtOAc ( 0.5 ml ). Slow evaporation of solvent resulted in the formation of red plate shaped crystals. Mp: $122-124{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; crystals were obtained together with starting compounds, hindering the isolation of a bulk sample for elemental analysis.

BTMEA•(bpen) $2_{2}$ : To a solution of BTMEA $(10 \mathrm{mg})$ in EtOAc $(0.5 \mathrm{ml})$ was layered with bpen ( $3.6 \mathrm{mg}, 1$ equiv.) dissolved in EtOAc ( 0.5 ml ). Slow evaporation of solvent resulted in the formation of orange prism shaped crystals. Mp: 138-139 ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; crystals were obtained together with starting compounds, hindering the isolation of a bulk sample for elemental analysis.
C. Crystallography Details about data collection and solution refinement are given in Table S1. Data collections were performed at RT on an APEXII Bruker-AXS diffractometer equipped with a CCD camera for all compounds. Structures were solved by direct methods using the SIR97 program ${ }^{5}$ or by dualspace algorithm using SHELXT ${ }^{6}$ and then refined with full-matrix least-square methods based on $F^{2}$ (SHELXL-2014) ${ }^{7}$ with the aid of the WINGX program. ${ }^{8}$ All non-hydrogen atoms were refined with anisotropic atomic displacement parameters. H atoms were finally included in their calculated positions. Crystallography data (in cif format) have been deposited with CCDC with deposition numbers CCDC-2059424-2059427.

Table S1 Crystallographic data

| Compound | BTMEA•bpe | BTMEA•bpy-pip | BTMEA•azopy | BTMEA•(bpen) ${ }_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CCDC | 2059424 | 2059425 | 2059426 | 2059427 |
| Formulae | $\mathrm{C}_{32} \mathrm{H}_{26} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{Te}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{34} \mathrm{H}_{30} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Te}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{30} \mathrm{H}_{22} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Te}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{44} \mathrm{H}_{34} \mathrm{~N}_{4} \mathrm{Te}_{2}$ |
| FW (g.mol ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 693.75 | 749.82 | 693.71 | 873.95 |
| System | monoclinic | monoclinic | monoclinic | triclinic |
| Space group | $\mathrm{P} 2_{1} / \mathrm{n}$ | $\mathrm{P} 2_{1} / \mathrm{n}$ | $\mathrm{P} 2_{1} / \mathrm{n}$ | $P \overline{1}$ |
| a (A) | 10.6599(7) | 18.3874(6) | 10.8282(19) | 10.390(2) |
| b ( ${ }_{\text {a }}$ ) | $24.9103(15)$ | 10.4516(3) | 24.258(4) | 11.252(2) |
| $c(A)$ | 11.7016(8) | 32.5186(10) | 11.763(2) | 16.357(4) |
| $\alpha$ (deg) | 90 | 90 | 90 | 98.128(7) |
| $\beta$ (deg) | 113.683(2) | 104.148(2) | 115.480(6) | 91.282(7) |
| $\gamma$ (deg) | 90 | 90 | 90 | 96.440(7) |
| $V\left(\AA^{3}\right)$ | 2845.6(3) | 6059.8(3) | 2789.3(8) | 1879.7(7) |
| T (K) | 296(2) | 296(2) | 294(2) | 300(2) |
| Z | 4 | 8 | 4 | 2 |
| Cryst. dim. (mm) | $0.23 \times 0.18 \times 0.12$ | $0.27 \times 0.04 \times 0.03$ | $0.28 \times 0.24 \times 0.03$ | $0.12 \times 0.05 \times 0.02$ |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\text {calc }}\left(\mathrm{g} . \mathrm{cm}^{-1}\right)$ | 1.619 | 1.644 | 1.652 | 1.544 |
| $\mu\left(\mathrm{mm}^{-1}\right)$ | 2.072 | 1.955 | 2.116 | 1.588 |
| Total refls | 21215 | 43376 | 34265 | 44808 |
| Abs. corr. | multi scan | multi scan | multi scan | multi scan |
| $\mathrm{T}_{\text {min }}, \mathrm{T}_{\text {max }}$ | 0.646, 0.780 | 0.910, 0.943 | 0.558, 0.938 | 0.909, 0.969 |
| Uniq refls ( $\mathrm{R}_{\text {int }}$ ) | 6490 (0.0357) | 13910 (0.0484) | 6342 (0.0499) | 8660 (0.0779) |
| Uniq refls ( $1>2 \sigma(\mathrm{I})$ ) | 4174 | 7718 | 4997 | 5529 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{1}, \mathrm{wR}_{2}(\mathrm{I} ~>~ 2 \sigma(I))$ | 0.0501, 0.1025 | 0.0576, 0.1163 | 0.0776, 0.1612 | 0.0463, 0.1113 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{1}, w \mathrm{R}_{2}$ (all data) | 0.0912, 0.118 | 0.1225, 0.1393 | 0.099, 0.1725 | 0.0867, 0.1355 |
| GOF | 1.023 | 1.018 | 1.24 | 1.019 |
| Res. dens. ( $\mathrm{e}^{-} / \AA^{3}$ ) | 0.988, -0.579 | 1.103, -0.792 | 1.051, -0.945 | 1.451, -0.601 |

## D. Theoretical calculations

Molecular structures of BTMEA and the four ChB acceptors (bipy-pip, bpe, azopy and bpen) have been optimized in gas phase (vacuum) with Gaussian09 software ${ }^{9}$ using Density Functional Theory. B3LYP functional was used, completed with D3 dispersion Grimme dispersion correction. ${ }^{10}$ The Def2TZVPP basis set was employed for all atoms, including a pseudo-potential for the heaviest Te atom taken from the EMSL library. ${ }^{11}$ Frequency calculations were performed in order to check that true energy minima were obtained. Isosurfaces of electron density ( $\rho=0.002$ a.u.) mapped with the corresponding total electrostatic potential were calculated and drawn with AIMAll software. ${ }^{12}$


Fig. S1 ESP (-0.07 a.u. :red to +0.07 a.u.: blue) on 0.002 a.u. isodensity surface of bpy-pip


Fig. S2 ESP (-0.07 a.u. :red to +0.07 a.u.: blue) on 0.002 a.u. isodensity surface of azopy


Fig. S3 ESP (-0.07 a.u. :red to +0.07 a.u.: blue) on 0.002 a.u. isodensity surface of bpen


Fig. S4 ESP (-0.07 a.u. :red to +0.07 a.u.: blue) on 0.002 a.u. isodensity surface of bpe

## E. Analyses of the ChB interactions between rectangles

Besides the short and highly directional ( $\mathrm{C} \equiv \mathrm{C}$ ) $-\mathrm{Te} \bullet \bullet \mathrm{N}$ ChB interactions leading to the formation of the supramolecular rectangles, other, probably weaker ChB interactions involving the second $\sigma$-hole on the tellurium atoms in BTMEA in the prolongation of the Me-Te bonds, have been identified in BTMEA•bpy-pip. As shown in Figure S6, one nitrogen (N2) of the piperidine central ring of bpy-pip acts as a ChB acceptor toward the second $\sigma$-hole on the $\mathrm{Te}(3)$ atom, with a $\mathrm{Te} \bullet \bullet \bullet \mathrm{N}$ distance at $3.861(6)$ $\AA$, to be compared to the van der Waals contact distance of $3.61 \AA$ A. Albeit slightly longer (See in that respect the revised vdW radii reported by Chernyshov et al.), ${ }^{13}$ its directionality is a clear indication of a secondary ChB interaction.


Figure S5. Detail of the surrounding of one of the two crystallographic independent rectangles in BTMEA•bpy-pip.
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