Journal of Inorganic and General Chemistry

Zeitschrift für anorganische und allgemeine Chemie

Synthesis and Ligand Properties of Silsesquioxane-Caged Phosphite T₇Ph₇P

Marc [Hunsicker](http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0185-5601),^[a] Johannes Krebs,^[a] Michael [Zimmer,](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0406-236X)^[a] Bernd [Morgenstern](http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8360-4218),^[b] [Volker](http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5337-5613) Huch,^[a] and David [Scheschkewitz](http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5600-8034)*^[a]

Dedicated to Professor Michael Veith on occasion of his 80th birthday

The synthesis of the phosphorus-capped heptaphenylsilsesquioxane T_7Ph_7P is reported. We show that, unlike previous examples, it readily forms Lewis acid-base adducts with boranes of different steric demand and the $FeCO₄$ fragment. All complexes were characterized by multinuclear NMR and IR spectroscopy in solution and the solid state. The molecular

Introduction

Trisubstituted phosphanes and phospite esters are ubiquitous as reagents in organic chemistry, $[1]$ and as ligands in transition metal complexes.[2] The inherent Lewis basicity associated to the lone pair of electrons leads to the facile formation of adducts with suitable electron deficient Lewis acids.^[3] The strength of this donor-acceptor interaction can be tuned by the electronic nature of the substituents. Framework phosphanes with the donor-center in an oligocyclic bridgehead position can offer additional control of the ligand properties due to their structural rigidity.

In this context, the incompletely condensed $T_7R_7(OH)_3$ silsesquioxanes of type **I** have proven to be valuable precursors for the incorporation of various heteroelements into the cubic framework.[4] Feher and coworkers reported the synthesis of the heterosilsesquioxane **IIa** in which a phosphorus atom closes the T_7 Cy₇ backbone (Scheme 1).^[5] So far only limited information is available on its coordination chemistry and that of related

© 2024 The Author(s). Zeitschrift für anorganische und allgemeine Chemie published by Wiley-VCH GmbH. This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made. structures of the adducts with BPh₃ and B(C_6F_5)₃ were determined from XRD suitable single crystals. The relative conformation of the Ph and C_6F_5 rings in T₇Ph₇P-B(C_6F_5)₃ suggests favorable π -interactions, stabilizing the adducts to such a degree that attempts to activate H_2 or CO₂ were unsuccessful.

Scheme 1. a) Corner capping of partially condensed silsesquioxanes **Ia-c** (**a**: R=Cy, **b**: R=^{*i*}Oct, **c**: R=^{*i*}Bu **d**: R=Ph) with PCI₃ to heterosilsesquioxane cages with a phosphorus vertex **IIa**,**b**,**c**[5,8,11] and **1** (this work). b) Treatment of the phosphorus capped heptaphenylsilsesquioxane **1** with various Lewis acids generates Lewis acid-base adducts **2** to **5** (**2**: E=BPh₃; **3**: E=B(C₆F₅)₃; **4**: E=BCl₃; **5**: **E**=Fe(CO)₄).

compounds: **IIa** reportedly forms a 1:1 adduct with AlMe₃ according to NMR spectroscopic evidence, although the lack of suitable single crystals prevented full characterization. The steric demand of the cyclohexyl groups^[5,6] may prevent coordination of **II a** to transition metal centers as it did not induce catalytic activity when added to $[Rh(\text{aca})(CO)_2]$ under hydroformylation conditions.[7] In contrast, the heptaisooctyl-substituted **IIb** reported by Marciniec and coworkers acted as inhibitor towards Karstedt's catalyst in hydrosilylation reactions and was proven to coordinate to the platinum center by ³¹P NMR.^[8]

In the context of the functionalization of polyhedral silsesquioxanes, $[9]$ we explored their interconnection by donor/ acceptor interactions. In particular, we were interested in the phenyl-substituted version of **II** in view of its intermediate steric bulk and the somewhat reduced electron density^[10] compared to the cyclohexyl derivative **II a**. Herein, we report on the synthesis of the phenyl-substituted cage phosphite T_7Ph_7P and its conversion to Lewis pairs with several boron-centered Lewis acids as well as with the iron tetracarbonyl fragment.

eine Chemi

Results and Discussion

Journal of Inorganic and General Chemistry

Synthesis. In adaption of the reported corner capping reaction of the partially condensed cyclohexyl-substituted **Ia**, T₇Ph₇(OH)₃ **Id** was treated with triethylamine and a slight excess of $PCI₃$ (1.1 eq) in toluene at 0°C. Filtration after five minutes of stirring followed by removal of the volatiles and washing with minimal amounts of toluene yielded the colorless phosphite T_7Ph_7P 1 in 41% yield. Phosphite T₇Ph₇P 1 gives rise to a ³¹P NMR singlet at 86.3 ppm, in C_6D_6 almost identical with those of **II a** (86.1 ppm),^[5] **II b** (84.6 ppm)^[8] and IIc (84.7 ppm).^[11] The phenyl groups of 1 produce two uniform multiplets in the ¹H NMR spectrum in C_6D_6 between 7.85 to 7.79 ppm and 7.15 to 7.00 ppm.

The alternative use of $T_7Ph_7(ONa)_3$ results in the formation of several unidentified byproducts with overlapping ¹H NMR resonances in the aromatic region, unlike in case of T₇ⁱOct₇(ONa)₃ from which Marciniec et al. obtained near-quantitative yields of T₇[']Oct₇P.^[8] These byproducts give rise to several ³¹P NMR signals between 180 and -21 ppm after stirring overnight (see Figure S36). Resonances at -19 and -26 ppm were reported by Copéret et al. for the grafting of T₇[']Bu₇P to OH-terminated silica and rationalized by the formation of phosphonates through OH transfer from the surface to the P center.[11]

In an initial attempt to elucidate the geometric constraints between the phosphite and a boron-centred Lewis acid, we prepared Lewis acid-base complex 2 by treatment of T_7Ph_7P with a slight excess of triphenylborane in toluene. Stirring for 35 minutes at room temperature and isolation of the resulting precipitate by filtration yields the colorless product in 51% yield (reaction of Ph₃BPCI₃ adduct with T₇Ph₇(OH)₃ resulted in much lower yields of 2). ¹H NMR spectra confirm a new species, although the ¹¹B and ³¹P NMR spectra in C_6D_6 do not show any signals (*vide infra*).

Next, tris(pentafluorophenyl)borane was used as Lewis acid component to increase acidity and steric demand of the borane in the hope to induce frustration. Reaction of a 1:1 stoichiometric ratio of T_7Ph_7P **1** and $B(C_6F_5)$ ₃ in toluene for 30 minutes, however, results in the formation of a new adduct as well, as evidenced by its uniform ¹H NMR spectrum and ¹¹B and ³¹P NMR signals at -14.9 ppm and 37.1 ppm, respectively, in C_6D_6 solution. The adduct **3** was isolated by crystallization at room temperature from a hot-saturated toluene solution in 42% yield. In order to increase steric demand of the Lewis acid even more, a mixture of T_7Ph_7P and tris(4-bromo2,3,5,6-tetramethylphenyl)borane in toluene was stirred at room temperature, and indeed no adduct formation took place according to NMR monitoring.

Initial attempts to obtain the boron trichloride adduct T₇Ph₇P-BCl₃ 4 by combining toluene solutions of BCl₃ and 1 led to inseparable mixtures with about 35% of a major product (^{11}B) NMR at 1.4 ppm). In an improved procedure, careful layering a concentrated toluene solution of 1 with a stock solution of BCl₃ in toluene affords **4** as a microcrystalline colorless product in 43% yield.

Stirring a twofold excess of $Fe₂(CO)₉$ (in order to assure complete conversion) and the cage phosphite **1** in toluene results in the immediate formation of a new species at room temperature as well. The $Fe(CO)₄$ adduct 5 shows a single resonance at 124.1 ppm in the $31P$ NMR spectrum and is thus downfield shifted by $\Delta\delta$ = 37.8 ppm. Various alkoxy- and amino-substituted phosphite iron carbonyl complexes (in $CH₂Cl₂$ or CDCl₃) showed ³¹P NMR signals, downfield shifted by Δδ between 20.2 and 55.1 ppm compared with the free ligands.[12] The adduct **5** was isolated by extraction from the dried product mixture with toluene in 47% yield. Unlike in case of **2** and **3**, single crystals of **5** could not be obtained despite crystallization attempts from a saturated toluene solution at room temperature, or from storing slightly more diluted solutions at reduced temperatures between $+4^{\circ}$ C and -27° C.

Crystal structure discussion. Single crystals of the borane adducts **2** and **3** suitable for XRD were obtained from toluene at 4° C and room temperature, respectively.^[13] The free phosphite ligand 1 and its Fe(CO)₄ adduct 5 precipitated in amorphous form, the microcrystals of the BCl₃ adduct 4 proved unsuitable for XRD.

The molecular structures of adducts **2** and **3** in the solid state confirm the anticipated constitutions as borane adduct (Figure 1, left). Both structures show approximate C_3 symmetry. Notably, while the B-bonded phenyl groups of **2** are staggered with respect to the adjacent phenyl groups of the cage phosphite without clear-cut stabilizing interactions, the perfluorinated phenyl groups of **3** adopt an almost eclipsed conformation (Figure 1, right). The centroids of the phenyl and pentafluorophenyl groups of adduct **3** are 4.1794(6) Å apart on average, which is significantly farther than the corresponding distance calculated for the π -stacked benzene-dimer (3.914 Å) ,^[14] but intriguingly close to those in Lewis adducts of the type Ph₃E-B(C₆F₅)₃ with similar eclipsed conformations (E=P: 4.169 Å, As: 4.215 Å).^[15a,b] The authors concluded a certain attractive interaction between the aromatic rings in the arsenic case, which was supported by DFT calculations.^[15b] The average angle between the planes of the C_6H_5 and C_6F_5 rings of 7.8(4)° in **3** is much closer to coplanarity than in the abovementioned phosphorus and arsenic Lewis adducts with angles of 24.49° (P) and 22.64° (As). We tentatively attribute the near-coplanarity in **3** to the much smaller distortions from the idealized tetrahedral structure of the Lewis base required for effective $π$ stacking. A theoretical study investigating non covalent interactions (NCI) in several Lewis adducts and FLP systems also found weakly stabilizing effects of π stacking between the aromatic rings in $Ph_3P - B(C_6F_5)_3$.^[15c] Stephan et al. reported parallel alignment of phenyl and C_6F_5 groups in an ethylene bridged P-B adduct and interpreted it as π stacking effect.^[15d] **TAAC**

The special of the function of material of material of the special of the spec

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Figure 1. Left: molecular structures of the BPh₃ adduct **2** and B(C₆F₅)₃ adduct **3** in the solid state. Co-crystallized solvent molecules, disordered phenyl groups and hydrogen atoms are omitted for clarity. Thermal ellipsoids at 50% probability. Right: top-views of BPh₃ adduct 2 and $B(C_6F_5)$ ₃ 3 down the boron-phosphorus bonds. Blue: phenyl groups on the first substituents attached to phosphorus in both complexes. Red: phenyl groups of BPh₃. Green: aromatic rings of the C₆F₅ moieties on boron. Selected bond lengths and angles for 2: P1-B1: 1.9604(2) Å, P1-O1: 1.5636(1) Å, P1-O4: 1.5652(1) Å, P1-O8: 1.5625(1) Å, B1-C1: 1.629(2) Å, B1-C7: 1.632(2) Å. B1-C13: 1.626(2) Å, O1-P1-O4: 106.34(6)°, O8-P1-O4: 105.05(6)°, O8-P1-O1: 105.39(6)°, C1-B1-C7: 114.62(1)°, C13-B1-C7: 112.54(1)°, C13-B1-C1: 113.47(1)°. Selected bond lengths and angles for **3**: P1-B1: 1.994(4) Å, P1-O6: 1.547(2) Å, P1-O10: 1.545(2) Å, P1-O11: 1.550(2) Å, B1-C1: 1.638(5) Å, B1-C7: 1.638(5) Å, B1-C13: 1.641(5) Å; O6-P1-O11: 106.32(1)°, O10-P1-O11: 106.81(1)°, O10-P1-O6: 107.25(1)°, C1-B1-C7: 114.0(3)°, C1-B1-C13: 112.3(3)°, C7-B1- C13: 115.0(3)°.

The staggered conformation of the triphenylborane adduct **2** with angles of 71.7(6)° on average between the planes of adjacent phenyl groups of the PP h_3 and the cage phosphite moieties is best described as a threefold T-shaped interaction between electronically similar benzene rings. The average distance between the centroids of 4.9654(7) Å is substantially longer than in **3** and similar to the distance in the T-shaped benzene dimer (4.913 Å) .^[14] The boronphosphorus bond lengths of **2** and **3** are at the short end of the range of typical Lewis-acid base adducts (for **2**: 1.9604(2) Å, for **3**: 1.994(4) Å). In comparison, the reported $Ph_3P-B(C_6F_5)_3^{[15a]}$ and $(MeNCH_2CH_2)_3N$ P $-B(C_6F_5)_3^{[15f]}$ adducts display P $-B$ bond lengths of 2.180 Å, and 2.096 Å, respectively. Phosphite-borane adducts without aromatic substituents at phosphorus also feature significantly longer P—B distances, for instance 2.0209 Å in $(MeO)_3P$ —B(C₆F₅)₃.^[15e]

Due to a lack of single crystals of the free ligand **1**, an unbiased comparison of the steric shielding provided by the substituents with that in T₇Cy₇P IIa is difficult. Nonetheless, some trends can be derived from the available solid state structures. Feher and coworkers determined a Tolman cone angle of \sim 167°,^[5] by using solely the H-P-L angles as basis for the calculation. A more refined method was introduced shortly thereafter by Mingos et al,^[16] in which the van der Waals radius of the hydrogen atoms is accounted for when determining the P-L-H angles. According to the latter approach, Tolman cone angles of θ = 181.1° for **2** and θ = 174.3° for **3** are obtained from solid state structures truncated to the free T₇Ph₇P ligand. Both cone angles are smaller than that of **IIa** (θ = 189°) recalculated by the same method. As discussed by Sigman and Doyle et al., $[17]$ the reactivity of a (phosphine or phosphite) ligand can only be vaguely rationalized on grounds of the Tolman cone angle. The percent buried volume $\%V_{\text{bur}}^{[18a]}$ parameter (determined with the Sambyca open-source application^[18b] using a distance of 2.28 Å between the phosphorus atom and the center of the putative sphere) is larger for **IIa** (23.8%) than for the phosphite ligands of **2** (23.0%) and **3** (22.2%). This confirms the general trend of the Tolman cone angles and is keeping with other distance values in the %V_{bur} calculation, such as the 2.0 Å chosen by Nolan and coworkers,^[18a] albeit at inherently larger values of $%V_{\text{bur}}$. Overall, the change from cyclohexyl to phenyl, and from phenyl to pentafluorophenyl is 3–4% irrespective of the steric parameter, reflecting the anticipated higher steric bulk of the cyclohexyl substituent and the different conformations of the aromatic groups in **2** and **3**.

The induced and allgement

Journal of Inorganic and General Chemistry

NMR spectroscopy. In C_6D_6 solution, the free cage-phosphite 1 gives rise to a diagnostic $3^{1}P$ NMR signal emerging as a singlet at 86.3 ppm along with a satellite doublet with a coupling constant of 37.2 Hz attributed to coupling to the silicon atoms of the silsesquioxane. This compares well with the reported cyclohexyl and isooctyl-substituted congeners (86.1 $(^{2}J_{P,Si} = 35.8$ Hz) and 84.6 ppm, respectively).^[5,8] The corresponding CP/MAS spectrum shows two signals of approximately equal intensity at 83.8 and 82.1 ppm, most likely because of at least two symmetry-independent environments in the solid state as previously discussed by Erker et al. for boronphosphorus frustrated Lewis pairs.^[20] The BPh₃ (2) and BCl₃ complexes (**4**) do not show 31P NMR signals in solution, presumably due to coalescence phenomena of temperature dependent processes. Unfortunately, the low solubility of both adducts was prohibitive of VT NMR studies that could have shed further light on this aspect. In the $31P$ CP/MAS NMR spectra, however, the BPh₃ adduct **2** exhibits a broad signal at 48.1 ppm (full width at half maximum FWHM=340 Hz, Figure S9), and the BCl₃ adduct 4 a quartet centered at 8.3 ppm, in accordance with the $I=3/2$ spin of the $11B$ nucleus. Further signals of minor intensity are strongly concealed by overlap but may be attributable to the ¹⁰B isotopomer $(I=3)$ and/or impurities (Figure S26 and S27). The estimated coupling constant of $1_{P,B} = \sim 300$ Hz suggests an exceptionally strong donor-acceptor bond in **4** as a result of relatively small steric encumbrance.

The $B(C_6F_5)$ ₃ and Fe(CO)₄ adducts **3** and **5** in C_6D_6 show ³¹P NMR resonances in $\mathsf{C}_6\mathsf{D}_6$ solution at 37.3 (broad quartet, ${}^1\mathsf{J}_{\mathsf{P},\mathsf{B}}\!=\!150$ Hz) and 124.1 (singlet with a satellite doublet, $2I_{PSi} = 27.4$ Hz) ppm, respectively. The solid-state 31P NMR isotropic shifts of the adducts **3** and **5** match the solution data reasonably well (**3**: 32.8 ppm, 1 J $_{\text{P,B}}$ $=$ 150 Hz; 5: 120.2 ppm). The $\binom{1}{P,B}$ coupling constant of about 150 Hz (3) is comparable to the $B(C_6F_5)_3$ adduct of Verkade's base $(^1J_{P,B}$ 130 Hz).^[15f] The ¹¹B NMR spectrum in C_6D_6 of **3** shows a broad singlet at -14.9 ppm, while 4 displays a doublet at 1.4 ppm with a $^{1}J_{B,P}$ = 300 Hz, the same as observed in the ^{31}P CP/MAS spectrum. In solution, no signal for the BPh₃ adduct 2 could be observed, whereas in the solid state two singlets at -4.0 and -7.3 ppm are found with no discernible splitting due to coupling with the ^{11}B nucleus. As in case of **1**, the occurrence of two signals is most likely due to differing solid state environments, as the FWHM of the ³¹P signal in the solid state is clearly insufficient to conceal a $^{1}J_{P,B}$ coupling constant of 420 Hz (corresponding to $\Delta\delta$ = 3.3 ppm of the two CP-MAS 11B NMR signals of **2**). The 13C NMR spectrum of the iron carbonyl adduct **5** shows two singlets at 213.2 and 213.0 ppm, in agreement with the corresponding 13 C CP/MAS isotropic shift at 211.4 ppm (broad singlet).

Only the $B(C_6F_5)_3$ and $FeCO_4$ adducts **3** and **5** are sufficiently soluble in C_6D_6 for the acquisition of ²⁹Si NMR spectra in solution. For **1**, **2**, and **4**, 29Si CP/MAS solid state NMR spectra were obtained instead. The silicon atoms of all compounds give rise to broad, overlapping resonances between -77.1 and -83.2 ppm in the expected region of phenylsubstituted $T₇$ silsesquioxane backbones without discernible indications for $2J$ coupling to the $31P$ nucleus. Phosphite **1**, $B(C_6F_5)$ ₃ adduct **3** and $FeCO_4$ adduct **5** give rise to two isotropic shifts in a ratio of 2:1 each, BPh₃ adduct 2 displays three signals (in a ratio of $1:1:2$) and $BCI₃$ adduct 4 shows two barely resolved signals in approximate 1:1 ratio. In contrast, the $B(C_6F_5)_3$ adduct **3** displays three signals at -76.7 , -77.6 and -80.1 ppm $(3:1:3)$ in C_6D_6 solution, the latter as a doublet with a coupling constant of 27.9 Hz, which is again attributed to $2J$ coupling to phosphorus. The presence of a doublet was furthermore confirmed by a second ²⁹Si NMR experiment at a frequency of 59.62 MHz (before: 79.49 MHz), which produces a $^{2}J_{P,Si}$ coupling constant of 28.2 Hz (see Figures S15 to S17). The iron carbonyl adduct **5** shows two singlets at -76.3 , -77.4 and a doublet at -81.3 ppm (3:1:3, ² J_{Si,P}: 27.9 Hz) in C_6D_6 .

The IR spectrum of **5** (ATR) shows a distinct broad signal at 1938 cm^{-1} , and two smaller bands at 1985 and 2064 cm^{-1} for the carbonyl groups, which are at slightly higher wavenumbers compared to $(PhO)_3P$ -Fe $(CO)_4$ (v = 1961, 1996, 2070 cm⁻¹, pentane solution; 1945, 1985, 2051 cm^{-1} (chloroform solution))^[12,19a] and in reasonable agreement with IR bands reported for $Ph_3P-Fe(CO)₄$ $(1945, 1979, 2044 cm^{-1}$, heptane solution).^[19b]

Reactivity. In more recent years it was discovered that even classical Lewis adducts may exhibit FLP reactivity.^[15f] Based on computations, it has been proposed that certain adducts should even be more reactive than FLPs.^[21] We therefore investigated the $B(C_6F_5)$ ₃ adduct **3** and the non-coordinated mixture of T_7Ph_7P and tris(4-bromo-2,3,5,6-tetramethylphenyl)borane with regards to small molecule activation. As adduct **3** contains the most Lewis acidic borane and features the smallest $\mathbb{1}_{P,B}$ coupling constant, we treated it with dihydrogen, carbon dioxide and phenylacetylene to gain insight into potential FLP type reactivity. Unfortunately, the adduct proved to be too unreactive; even at elevated temperatures of up to 120°C no reaction took place in either case. From a thermodynamic point of view, even small structural deviations from reactive FLPs can inhibit reactivity completely.^[22] The apparent π interactions between the aromatic systems may stabilize the adduct to a degree that completely prevents any FLP reactivity. Even Lewis pairs with a relatively small tendency towards dissociation were shown to activate phenylacetylene, such as $Ph_3P-B(C_6F_5)_3$.^[23] Nonetheless, a mixture of **1** and tris(4-bromo-2,3,5,6-tetramethylphenyl) borane resulted in the consumption of the phosphite, when treated with dihydrogen. However, the ¹H NMR spectrum in C_6D_6 shows an intractable mixture of signals in the aromatic region, whereas the methyl substituents of the duryl groups and the ¹¹B NMR resonance of the starting material remain unchanged. Signals between -14 and -20 ppm in the $31P$ NMR spectrum suggest the presence of similar (by-) products to the synthesis of phosphite 1. The obtained spectroscopic information does not allow for any conclusions on the nature of the product(s). In this case, either the phosphites **PAAC**

The strengthenial control of the streng donor ability is too low due to the aforementioned electronwithdrawing effect of the $T₇$ backbone, or the boron center is too sterically encumbered to engage in FLP reactivity. Consequently, phosphite **1** does also not react with small molecules on its own in a straightforward manner, as had been observed with more electron-rich phosphines.^[24]

Zeine Chemie

Conclusions

Journal of Inorganic and General Chemistry

We presented first insights into the donor abilities of phosphite T7Ph7P **1** and the properties of adducts with boron-centered Lewis acids. Despite large ligand cone angles, the phenyl-substituted **1** coordinates to Lewis acidic boranes of different steric demand, unlike the previously reported cyclohexyl derivative. The short bond length of $B(C_6F_5)$ ₃ adduct **3** (1.994(4) Å) indicates that even larger Lewis acids may be accommodated, suggesting the propensity of **1** for a rich coordination chemistry, unlike the cyclohexyl substituted **IIa**. The inability of adduct **3** to engage in FLP type chemistry is tentatively explained by the attractive π stacking between the aromatic substituents of the ligand and the Lewis acid. Cage phosphite **1** does not form a Lewis adduct with tris(4-bromo-2,3,5,6 tetramethylphenyl)borane, indicating a latent FLP in solution yet no according reactivity was observed.

Experimental Section

General. All manipulations were conducted under a protective argon atmosphere using standard Schlenk techniques or a glovebox. Nonchlorinated solvents were dried over Na/benzophenone (in the presence of tetraglyme in case of aromatic and aliphatic solvents) and distilled under argon atmosphere. Deuterated solvents were dried by reflux over potassium and distilled under argon atmosphere prior to use. Chlorinated deuterated solvents were refluxed and distilled over P_4O_{10} and stored under Argon atmosphere. NMR spectra were recorded on either a Bruker Avance III 300 NMR spectrometer (¹H: 300.13 MHz, ¹³C: 75.46 MHz, ²⁹Si: 59.63 MHz, ¹⁹F: 282 MHz) or a Bruker Avance III 400 spectrometer (¹H: 400.13 MHz, ¹¹B: 128.38 MHz ¹³C: 100.61 MHz, ²⁹Si: 79.49 MHz, ³¹P: 161.98 MHz) at 300 K. Melting points were measured in sealed NMR tubes under Ar atmosphere. Elemental analysis was carried out with an elemental analyzer Leco CHN-900. T₇Ph₇(OH)₃ was obtained from Hybrid Plastics, Inc. and dried under vacuum prior to use. Phosphorus trichloride was obtained from commercial sources and distilled prior to use. Tris(pentafluorophenyl)borane was obtained from BLD Pharm. Boron trichloride was obtained from Praxair Deutschland and condensed into toluene before use. Triphenylborane was obtained from abcr and used as received. Diiron nonacarbonyl was obtained from Sigma Aldrich and used as received. Triethylamine was obtained from Sigma Aldrich and distilled over CaH₂ prior to use. **PAAC**

The main determined the state and the state a

Preparation of T_7 **Ph₇P** 1. A suspension of 10.35 g of T_7 Ph₇(OH)₃ in 100 mL toluene is treated with 4.65 mL of NEt₃ and stirred for 10 minutes at room temperature. Then it is cooled down with an icewater bath for 20 minutes and 1.1 mL of \overline{PCl}_3 are added. The mixture is stirred for five minutes in the ice bath, then filtered into an equally cooled flask. Another 20 mL of toluene are used to wash the residue. The resulting filtrate is again washed with 20 mL toluene. The mixture is evaporated to dryness to obtain 4.40 g (41%) of a colorless powder (m.p. 200 °C, decomposition). ¹H NMR (400.13 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 7.85-7.79 (m, 14H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.15–7.00 (m, 21H, *o*,*p*-Ar-*H*, overlapping with toluene H). ³¹P NMR (161.98 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 86.3 (s, ²)_{P,Si}=37.2 Hz for
²⁹Si satellites, (SiO)₃*P*) ppm. **CP/MAS ²⁹Si NMR** (79.49 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K)

 77.7, 83.2 (each br, (RO)3*Si*-Ar) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 31P NMR** (161.98 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 83.8, 82.1 (each br, (SiO)3*P*) ppm. **Elemental Analysis**: Calc. for C₄₂H₃₅O₁₂PSi₇: C: 52.59, H: 3.68, Found: C: 54.90, H: 4.12.

Preparation of T₇Ph₇P-BPh₂ 2: A mixture of 406 mg of T₇P and 117 mg of BPh₃ in 5 mL toluene is stirred for 35 minutes at room temperature. The resulting colorless precipitation is separated from the volatiles by filtration and purified by washing with 2 mL of toluene. Drying the product under reduced pressure yields 259 mg (51%) of a colorless solid (m.p. 231–233 °C, decomposition). ¹H NMR (400.13 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 7.81–7.75 (m, 14H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.47–7.45 (m, 6H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.21–7.18 (m, 9H, *o*,*p*-Ar-*H*, overlapping with C6D6), 7.13–6.96 (m, 21H, *o*,*p*-Ar-*H*, overlapping with toluene- H) ppm. ¹¹B NMR (128.38 MHz, C_6D_6 , 300 K) no signal observed. ³¹P NMR (161.98 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) no signal observed. **CP/MAS** ¹¹**B NMR** (128.38 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) -4.0, -7.3 (each s, P-*B*Ph3) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 13C NMR** (100.61 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 149.0, 138.3, 135.6, 133.3, 131.2, 128.0, 125.5, 122.6 (each s, Ar *C*), 47.4, 9.5 ppm. **CP/MAS** ²⁹Si NMR (79.49 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) -77.1, -78.2, 80.4 (each br, (RO)3*Si* Ar) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 31P NMR** (161.98 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 48.1 (br, (SiO)3*P*-B) ppm. **Elemental Analysis**: Calc. for C₆₀H₅₀BO₁₂PSi₇: C: 59.98, H: 4.20, Found: C: 60.40, H: 4.60.

Preparation of T₇Ph₇P-B(C₆F₅)₃ 3. A suspension of 458 mg of T₇Ph₇P and 273 mg tris(pentafluorophenyl)borane in 5 mL of toluene is stirred for 30 minutes at room temperature, then it is gently heated until fully dissolved. Standing at room temperature overnight affords colorless crystals, whose yield is increased by keeping the flask at 4° C for three days. Separation of the crystals from the mother liquor yields 292 mg (42%) of a colorless solid (m.p.: above 300°C, partial decomposition). **¹ H NMR** (400.13 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 7.84–7.79 (m, 6H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.77–7.74 (m, 2H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.66–7.62 (m, 6H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.14–7.003 (m, 17H, *o,p*-Ar-*H*, overlapping with toluene-*H*), 6.996–6.94 (m, 6H, *o,p*-Ar-*H*). **11B NMR** $(128.38 \text{ MHz}, C_6D_6, 300 \text{ K})$ -14.9 (s, P-B(C₆F₅)₃) ppm. ¹³C NMR (100.61 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 134.3, 134.2, 133.8, 132.6, 132.0, 131.8, 128.7, 128.5 (overlap with toluene), 128.13, 125.49, 125.46 (each s, Ar-*C*) ppm. **19F NMR** (282 MHz, C6D6, 300 K) 131.3 (s, *o*-Ar-*F*), 155.6 (dtr, J=21 Hz, 6 Hz, *p*-Ar-*F*), 163.8 (dtr, J=23 Hz, J=6 Hz, *m*-Ar-*F*) ppm. **29Si NMR** $(79.49 \text{ MHz}, C_6D_6, 300 \text{ K}) -76.7, -77.6 \text{ (each s, (SiO)}_3\text{Si-Ar}), -80.1 \text{ (d, }^2J_{\text{Si,P}};$ 27.9 Hz, (PO)(SiO)₂Si-Ar) ppm. ³¹P NMR (161.98 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 37.1 (br) ppm. **CP/MAS** ²⁹Si NMR (79.49 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) -78.3, -82.1 (each br, (RO)3*Si*-Ar) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 31P NMR** (161.98 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 32.7 (overlapping q, ¹J_{P,B}: 150 Hz, (SiO)₃P-B) ppm **Elemental Analysis**: Calc. for C₆₀H₃₅BF₁₅O₁₂PSi₇: C: 48.98, H: 2.40, Found: C: 50.50, H: 2.62.

Preparation of T₇Ph₇P-BCl₃ 4. A stock solution of 3 molar boron trichloride in toluene was added slowly to a solution of 348 mg T_7Ph_7P in 18 mL of toluene with a layer of 2 mL toluene in between without stirring. Standing overnight afforded small crystals along with precipitation, which were separated from the volatiles via filtration and purified by washing with another 5 mL of toluene. 169 mg (43%) of a colorless solid were obtained (m.p.: 160°C, decomposition). **¹ H NMR** (400.13 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 8.01–7.98 (m, 6H, m-Ar-H), 7.80, 7.77 (m, 2H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.61–7.58 (m, 6H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.14–6.94 (m, 21H, *o*,*p*-Ar-*H*, overlap with toluene). ¹¹**B NMR** (128.38 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 1.4 (d, ¹J_{P,B} = 301 Hz P-*B*Cl3) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 13C NMR** (100.61 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 133.5, 131.6, 127.7, 125.0 (each s, Ar-*C*) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 29Si NMR** (79.49 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 78.3, 79.5 (each br, (RO)3*Si*-Ar) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 31P NMR** (161.98 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 8.3 (overlapping q, ¹J_{P,B}: 310 Hz, (SiO)₃P-B) ppm. **Elemental Analysis**: Calc. for C₄₂H₃₅BCl₃O₁₂PSi₇: C: 46.86, H: 3.28, Found: C: 49.72, H: 3.82.

Preparation of T₇Ph₇P-FeCO₄ 5. A mixture of 301 mg of T₇Ph₇P and 248 mg Fe₂(CO)₉ is stirred in 8 mL of toluene for two hours at room temperature. The volatiles are evaporated under reduced pressure using a warm water bath. The mixture is filtered with 6 mL toluene and the residue washed with another 4 mL. The resulting dark brown filtrate is reduced to dryness to obtain 168 mg (47%) of an equally dark brown solid (m.p.: 180 °C, decomposition). ¹H NMR (400.13 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K)

8.02–7.99 (m, 6H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.80–7.76 (m, 2H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.76–7.73 (m, 6H, *m*-Ar-*H*), 7.14–6.98 (m, 21H, *o,p*-Ar-*H*, overlap with toluene). **13C NMR** (100.61 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 213.2, 213.0 (each s, Fe-CO), 134.52, 134.47, 132.3, 131.7, 131.6, 129.5, 128.9, 128.7, 128.6, 128.54, 128.48, 127.51, 127.49 (each s, Ar-C) ppm. 29 **Si NMR** (79.49 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) -76.3, -77.4 (each s, (SiO)₃Si-Ar), -81.3 (d, ²J_{PSi} = 27.9 Hz, (PO)(SiO)₂Si-Ar) ppm. —77.4 (each s, (SiO)₃Si-Ar), —81.3 (d, ²J_{P,Si} = 27.9 Hz, (PO)(SiO)₂Si-Ar) ppm.
³¹**P NMR** (161.98 MHz, C₆D₆, 300 K) 124.1 (s, ²J_{P,Si} = 27.4 for ²⁹Si satellites, (SiO)3*P*-Fe) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 13C NMR** (100.61 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 211.4 (br, Fe-*C*O), 133.3, 127.6 (each br, Ar-*C*) ppm. **CP**/**MAS 29Si NMR** (79.49 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) -77.5, -83.1 (each br, (RO)₃Si-Ar) ppm. **CP**/ **MAS** ³¹**P NMR** (161.98 MHz, 13 kHz, 300 K) 120.2 (s, (SiO)₃P-Fe) ppm. **Elemental Analysis:** Calc. for C₄₆H₃₅FeO₁₆Si₇P: C: 49.02, H: 3.13, Found: C: 50.47, H: 3.63. **PAAC RESEARCH ARTICLE**
 PAAC AND CONTRACT ARTICLE
 PAAC AND CONTRACT ARTICLE
 PAAC AND CONTRACT ARTICLE INTO A PARTICULAR CONTRACT AND CONTRACT ARTICLE INTO A REPORT OF A CONTRACT AND CONTRACT ARTICLE INTO A REPORT

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the funding by Saarland University. We acknowledge the Service Center X-ray Diffraction established with financial support from Saarland University and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (INST 256/506-1 and 256/582-1). Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available in the supplementary material of this article.

Keywords: boranes **·** Lewis acid base adducts **·** phosphanes **·** phosphite **·** silsesquioxanes

- [1] a) W. D. Habicher, I. Bauer, J. Pospíšil, *[Macromol.](https://doi.org/10.1002/masy.200550712) Symp.* **2005**, *225*, [147–164](https://doi.org/10.1002/masy.200550712); b) L.-W. Ye, J. Zhou, Y. Tang, *[Chem.](https://doi.org/10.1039/b717758e) Soc. Rev.* **2008**, *37*, [1140–1152;](https://doi.org/10.1039/b717758e) c) N. Baral, S. Rani, P. Saikia, P. Maity, *Eur. J. Org. Chem.* **2023**, *26*, e202201238; d) S. Kumar, R. Ravi, T. Sahu, V. K. Jha, R. Baweja, A. K. Jha, *Asian J. Org. Chem.* **2024**, *13*, e202400028.
- [2] a) P. W. N. M. van Leeuwen, P. C. J. Kamer, C. Claver, O. Pàmies, M. Diéguez, *Chem. Rev.* **2011**, *111*, [2077–2118;](https://doi.org/10.1021/cr1002497) b) K. Zhao, H. Wang T Li, S. Liu, E. Benassi, X. Li, Y. Yao, X. Wang, X. Cui, F. Shi, *Nat. Commun.* **2024**, *15*, 2016.
- [3] a) I. B. Sivaev, V. I. Bregadze, *Coord. Chem. Rev.* **2014**, *[270–271](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccr.2013.10.017)*, [75–88](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccr.2013.10.017); b) R. J. Mayer, N. Hampel, A. R. Ofial, *[Chem.](https://doi.org/10.1002/chem.202003916) Eur. J.* **2021**, *27*, [4070–4080](https://doi.org/10.1002/chem.202003916); c) P. Erdmann, L. Greb, *[ChemPhysChem](https://doi.org/10.1002/cphc.202100150)* **2021**, *22*, [935–943](https://doi.org/10.1002/cphc.202100150).
- [4] F. J. Feher, D. A. Newman, J. F. Walzer, *J. Am. [Chem.](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja00187a028) Soc.* **1989**, *111*, [1741–1748](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja00187a028).
- [5] F. J. Feher, T. A. Budzichowski, *[Organometallics](https://doi.org/10.1021/om00049a051)* **1991**, *10*, 812– [815.](https://doi.org/10.1021/om00049a051)
- [6] C. A. Tolman, *Chem. Rev.* **1977**, *77*, [313–348.](https://doi.org/10.1021/cr60307a002)
- [7] J. I. van der Vlugt, M. M. P. Grutters, J. Ackerstaff, R. W. J. M. Hanssen, H. C. L. Abbenhuis, D. Vogt, *[Tetrahedron](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tetlet.2003.09.064) Lett.* **2003**, *44*, [8301–8305](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tetlet.2003.09.064).
- [8] I. Kownacki, B. Marciniec, K. Szubert, M. Kubicki, M. Jankowska, H. Steinberger, S. Rubinsztajn, *Appl. [Catal.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2010.03.041) A* **2010**, *380*, 105– [112.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2010.03.041)
- [9] a) F. J. Feher, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, *108*, [3850–3852](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja00273a062); b) G. Gerritsen, R. Duchateau, R. A. van Santen, G. P. A. Yap, *[Organo](https://doi.org/10.1021/om0200858)[metallics](https://doi.org/10.1021/om0200858)* **2003**, *22*, 100–110.
- [10] a) F. J. Feher, T. A. Budzichowski, *J. [Organomet.](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-328X(89)80022-1) Chem.* **1989**, *379*, [33–40](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-328X(89)80022-1); b) J. I. van der Vlugt, M. Fioroni, J. Ackerstaff, R. W. J. M. Hanssen, A. M. Mills, A. L. Spek, A. Meetsma, H. C. L. Abbenhuis, D. Vogt, *[Organometallics](https://doi.org/10.1021/om030522y)* **2003**, *22*, 5297–5306.
- [11] T. Alphazan, L. Mathey, M. Schwarzwälder, T.-H. Lin, A. J. Rossini, R. Wischert, V. Enyedi, H. Fontaine, M. Veillerot, A. Lesage, L. Emsley, L. Veyre, F. Martin, C. Thieuleux, C. Copéret, *Chem. Mater.* **2016**, *28*, [3634–3640.](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.chemmater.5b04291)
- [12] H. Inoue, T. Nakagome, T. Kuroiwa, T. Shirai, E. Fluck, *[Z.](https://doi.org/10.1515/znb-1987-0510) [Naturforsch.](https://doi.org/10.1515/znb-1987-0510) B: J. Chem. Sci.* **1987**, *42*, 573–578.
- [13] Deposition numbers 2353402 (for **2**) and 2353403 (for **3**) contain the supplementary crystallographic data for this paper. These data are provided free of charge by the joint Cambridge Crystallographic Data Centre and Fachinformationszentrum Karlsruhe Access Structures Service.
- [14] S. Grimme, *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* **2008**, *47*, [3430–3434](https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.200705157).
- [15] a) H. Jacobsen, H. Berke, S. Döring, G. Kehr, G. Erker, R. Fröhlich, O. Meyer, *[Organometallics](https://doi.org/10.1021/om981033e)* **1999**, *18*, 1724–1735; b) S. Ketkov, E. Rychagova, R. Kather, J. Beckmann, *J. [Organomet.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jorganchem.2021.121944) Chem.* **2021**, *949*, [121944](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jorganchem.2021.121944); c) G. Skara, B. Pinter, J. Top, P. Geerlings, F. De Proft, F. De Vleeschouwer, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2015**, *21*, [5510–](https://doi.org/10.1002/chem.201405891) [5519;](https://doi.org/10.1002/chem.201405891) d) P. Spies, G. Erker, G. Kehr, K. Bergander, R. Fröhlich, S. Grimme, D. W. Stephan, *Chem. Commun.* **2007**, [5072–5074;](https://doi.org/10.1039/b710475h) e) R. C. Neu, E. Y. Ouyang, S. J. Geier, X. Zhao, A. Ramos, D. W. Stephan, *Dalton Trans.* **2010**, *39*, [4285–4294;](https://doi.org/10.1039/c001133a) f) T. C. Johnstone, G. N. J. H. Wee, D. W. Stephan, *[Angew.](https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201802385) Chem. Int. Ed.* **2018**, *57*, [5881–5884.](https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201802385)
- [16] T. E. Müller, D. M. P. Mingos, *Transition Met. Chem.* **1995**, *20*, 533–539.
- [17] S. H. Newman-Stonebraker, S. R. Smith, J. E. Borowski, E. Peters, T. Gensch, H. C. Johnson, M. S. Sigman, A. G. Doyle, *[Science](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj4213)* **2021**, *374*, [301–308.](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj4213)
- [18] a) A. C. Hillier, W. J. Sommer, B. S. Yong, J. L. Petersen, L. Cavallo, S. P. Nolan, *[Organometallics](https://doi.org/10.1021/om034016k)* **2003**, *22*, 4322–4326; A value of 2.28 Å was chosen for the distance of the putative sphere to the P center and H atoms were included in the calculation. All other parameters were kept at their preselected values. b) L. Falivene, Z. Cao, A. Petta, L. Serra, A. Poater, R. Oliva, V. Scarano, L. Cavallo, *Nat. Chem.* **2019**, *11*, [872–879.](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41557-019-0319-5)
- [19] a) S. B. Butts, D. F. Shriver, *J. [Organomet.](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-328X(00)81158-4) Chem.* **1979**, *169*, 191– [197;](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-328X(00)81158-4) b) S. Muhammad, S. Moncho, B. Li, S. J. Kyran, E. N. Brothers, D. J. Darensbourg, A. A. Bengali, *Inorg. [Chem.](https://doi.org/10.1021/ic401836n)* **2013**, *52*, [12655–12660.](https://doi.org/10.1021/ic401836n)
- [20] T. Wiegand, H. Eckert, O. Ekkert, R. Fröhlich, G. Kehr, G. Erker, S. Grimme, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2012**, *134*, [4236–4249](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja210160k).
- [21] A. V. Pomogaeva, A. Y. Timoshkin, *ACS Omega* **2022**, *7*, [48493–](https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.2c06836) [48505](https://doi.org/10.1021/acsomega.2c06836).
- [22] T. Özgün, K.-Y. Ye, C. G. Daniliuc, B. Wibbeling, L. Liu, S. Grimme, G. Kehr, G. Erker, *Chem. Eur. J.* **2016**, *22*, 5988–5995.
- [23] M. A. Dureen, D. W. Stephan, *J. Am. [Chem.](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja903650w) Soc.* **2009**, *131*, [8396–8397.](https://doi.org/10.1021/ja903650w)
- [24] F. Buß, P. Mehlmann, C. Mück-Lichtenfeld, K. Bergander, F. Dielmann, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2016**, *138*, 1840–1843.

Manuscript received: May 10, 2024 Revised manuscript received: June 3, 2024 Accepted manuscript online: June 10, 2024