

OVID'S EPISTLE FROM SAPPHO TO PHAON (*HEROIDES* 15)

ALBERT R. BACA

San Fernando Valley State College

For Martin Sichterl

There is today agreement that the epistle from Sappho to Phaon (*Heroides* 15) is a genuine work of Ovid's and that the place it has as the last of the single letters (1-15) and before the double-letters (16-21) is the correct one. I agree that the letter is by Ovid, but I hope to show in this paper that the epistle Sappho to Phaon does not, and cannot, belong to the collection of imaginary letters from heroines and heroes from mythology we commonly—but not with complete accuracy—refer to as the *Heroides*.

When Ovid refers to the *Heroides* he is content to designate this work by the rather general term of *epistula*, although he was quite aware that the *Heroides* is more than letters, that it is, in fact, a wholly new genre. Neither Ovid nor any ancient literary critic coined a Latin expression for this new genre which attains the accuracy of the Italian "epistole (h)eroice," the French "épîtres héroïques," the German "Heldenbriefe," and the English "heroical(l) Epistles."¹ This is how Ovid speaks of the *Heroides* in the *Ars Amatoria* (3.345-46) when he is recommending authors and books a lover should have in his arsenal:

Vel tibi composita cantetur Epistula voce:
Ignotum hoc aliis ille novavit opus.

In the *Amores* (2.18) we learn which letters Ovid was recommending, for there we have an abbreviated catalog of the *Heroides* in which nine of our fifteen letters are mentioned (21-26):

¹ Cf. the discussion by H. Dörrie, *Der heroische Brief* (Berlin 1968) 7-9. G. Luck, "Ovidiana," *Philologus* 106 (1962) 145-46 writes: "Zwar paßt der Titel Heroidum Epistulae ja nur auf die Briefe 1-14; aber man nimmt auch sonst an, daß 15-21 in einer erweiterten Auflage hinzukamen. Da sich die Kunstform nicht änderte, brauchte der Dichter auch den bereits bekannten Titel des Werkes nicht zu ändern." Cf. too M. Pohlenz, "Die Abfassungszeit von Ovids Metamorphosen," *Hermes* 48 (1913) 3, n. 1.

Aut, quod Penelopes verbis reddatur Ulixi,
 Scribimus et lacrimas, Phylli relictas, tuas,
 Quod Paris et Macareus et quod male gratus Iaso
 Hippolytique parens Hippolytusque legant,
 Quodque tenens strictum Dido miserabilis ense
 Dicat et Aoniae Lesbis amata lyrae.

A few lines farther in the poem, Ovid states that his friend Sabinus composed answers to the letters of the heroines and mentions six of them (29–34):

Candida Penelope signum cognovit Ulixis;
 Legis ab Hippolyto scripta noverca suo.
 Iam pius Aeneas miserae rescripsit Elissae,
 Quodque legat Phyllis, si modo vivit, adest.
 Tristis ad Hypsipylum ab Iasone littera venit;
 Det votam Phoebos Lesbis amata lyram.

Let us note that in these two passages the Penelope letter is mentioned first, and the Sappho letter last; otherwise, the order is quite different in both passages and corresponds only broadly with that of the *Heroides* as we have it today. As Jacoby has dryly noted, we cannot expect Ovid to be a bibliographer and give us precise lists, so that conclusions drawn from these two passages should be guarded. Still, it seems to me, it is not unreasonable to state that the Sappho epistle belongs to the earliest group of letters Ovid released for reading and/or publication.² The whole collection of the *Heroides* proper, that is, the single epistles 1–15, was published sometime between the years 19 to 2 B.C.

At a later date, then, Ovid was inspired by Sabinus' example to write a series of double-letters whose stylistic and metrical characteristics link them not with the works of his first period—the two editions of the *Amores*, the *Medea*, the *Heroides* 1–15, the *Remedia*, and the *Medicamina*—but with the *Metamorphoses* and the *Fasti*.³ The double

² For the question of dating, see A. Palmer and L. Purser, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Heroides* (Hildesheim 1967) intro. p. ix. F. Jacoby, "Zur Entstehung der römischen Elegie, *RhM* 60 (1913) 71, n. 2, was the first, so far as I have been able to discover, to note the significance of the order of the *Heroides* as they are given in *Amores*; he writes: "Aber indem er bei seinen, wie bei Sabinus Briefen an erster Stelle Penelope, an letzter Sappho nennt, weist er luce clarius auf unsere Sammlung, die eben mit einem Briefe der Penelope beginnt, mit einem der Sappho schließt."

³ B. Latta, *Die Stellung der Doppelbriefe im Gesamtwerk Ovids* (Marburg 1963). W. Kraus cogently calls the *Heroides* a "parergon" to the *Metamorphoses* and *Fasti* in his article, "Die Briefpaare in Ovids Heroiden," *WS* 65 (1950) 77.

letters can be assigned to the years 4-8 of our era, and thus belong to the works composed before Ovid was exiled by Augustus. It became the better part of discretion for Ovid to cease writing love-poetry, even imaginary love letters in which the sacredness of the union of man and woman is fervently celebrated, while he was exiled in Tomis.

Still, Ovid did not totally abandon the genre he had created: he continued to exploit the possibilities of the tearful and sad letter in the *Tristia* and the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, works which share with the *Heroides* the exploitation of the plangorous *querela* theme.⁴ The path to the letters of the exile period was indicated by the terms Ovid used in the *Heroides*. Thus, he calls the letter to Phyllis, in a significant use of synechdoche, "*lacrimas* (30)," and Sabinus' letter from Jason to Hypsipyle a *tristis littera* (33). Then, the adjectives Ovid uses to describe the heroines, *relicta* (30), *miserabilis* (33), and *misera* (31), are precisely those which characterize Ovid at Tomis. The modulation the *querela* theme underwent in the letters of the exile period is really quite slight: instead of letters from heroines separated from their lovers we have some from Ovid, that most cosmopolitan of poets, separated from his beloved Rome on the savage shores of the Black Sea.

Editors have received little help from Ovid as to a title for the *Heroides*; he can blithely refer to them by the following: *litterae*, *epistulae*, *poemata*, and *carmina*.⁵ In an effort to draw a distinction between the *Heroides* and the letters of the exile period, editors used the following titles found in our MSS: *liber heroidum*, *liber epistularum*, *liber heroidum sive epistularum*, and *liber heroidum epistularum*.⁶ The title of Planudes' translation of the *Heroides*, *μετάφρασις τῶν Οὐιδίου ἡρωίδων ἐπιστολῶν*, corresponds to the last of these. Dörrie employs

⁴ Cf. my article, "The Themes of *Querela* and *Lacrimae* in Ovid's *Heroides*," *Emirita* 39 (1971) 195-201 and E. J. Kenney, "The Poetry of Ovid's Exile," *Proc. of the Cambr. Phil. Soc.* 191 (1965) 31-49.

⁵ The *Heroides* are *epistulae* in *Ars Amatoria* 3.345, *Vel tibi composita cantetur Epistula voce*; *poemata* in *Tristia* 2.519, *Et mea sunt populo saltata poemata saepe*; and *carmina* in *Tristia* 5.7.25, *carmina quod pleno saltari nostra theatro*. Cf. S. G. Owen, *Ovidius Tristium Liber Secundus* (Amsterdam 1967) 210-71. For this dramatic aspect of the *Heroides*, see M. P. Cunningham, "The Novelty of Ovid's *Heroides*," *CP* 44 (1949) 100-106.

⁶ Cf. Luck, *loc. cit.*

the designation *Heroidum Epistulae* in his history of this literary genre. Hopefully, others will continue his example.⁷

The fact that the Sappho epistle has had a textual descent separate from the other letters indicates, it seems to me, that this letter was removed from the expanded collection of imaginary letters at a later date, probably when the double letters were added to the first group. We know that Ovid re-edited the *Amores* for publication by reducing the number of books from five to three; Ovid states that he did this so that the reader's task would be lessened (*Amores* 1.1.4): *levior demptis poena duobus erit*. Ovid's words show us that he had an eye for the artistic effect of his work and that he could subtract when cutting was necessary.⁸ Thus, it was most probably Ovid himself who removed the Sappho letter from the *Heroides* so as to make a collection which opens with a letter by a heroine from the most distant literary past, Homer's Penelope, and closes with a pair of letters from the most recent literary past, the Hellenistic story of Acontius and Cydippe; the unity of the *Heroides* resides in this procession of figures from the mythological past, taken from the literature of epic and drama, which the real figure of Sappho upsets and, we might even say, destroys. But is not only that Sappho was a real person which makes *Heroides* 15 out of place in the collection: there are other facets of the poem which, when taken together with this fact, make it easier to understand why Ovid—or a perceptive editor—removed and so started the Sappho epistle on a separate textual tradition.

The Sappho epistle begins, we should note, in a very unusual fashion with a series of questions (1-4):

Ecquid, ut aspecta est studiosae littera dextrae,
Protinus est oculis cognita nostra tuis?
An nisi legisses auctoris nomina Sapphus,
Hoc breve nescires unde veniret opus?

⁷ Palmer-Purser, intro. p. x, consider the problem of nomenclature pedantic. One could also fault the MSS for employing the fem. pl. instead of the masc. pl., but see the explanation by J. Tolkiehn, *Quaestionum ad Heroides Ovidianas Spectantium Capita VII* (diss. Leipzig 1888) 7-9, that Ovid used titles loosely, for example in the case of the *Halieuticon* which has a section on terrestrial animals, and in the *Heroides*.

⁸ Th. Birt, "Animadversiones ad Ovidii heroidum epistulae," *RhM* 32 (1877) reasons from the division into books of the *Amores* and *Ars* that Ovid disliked (p. 395) *uno ore profundere omnia*, and therefore published the *Heroides* in three books, i.e., 1-5, 6-10, and

Only one other epistle begins with a question, the letter from Oenone to Paris (5.1-2):

Perlegis? an coniunx prohibet nova? perlege: non est
Ista Mycenaea littera facta manu.

If only from an epistolary point of view, these prescripts are unusual, since in the letter from Arethusa to Lycotas (4.3), Propertius had shown how the ordinary prose prescript, e.g., *Cicero Attico salutem dicit*, could be adapted to elegy: *Haec Arethusa suo mittit mandata Lycotae*.⁹ This is the pattern followed by Ovid many times, for example, in the Penelope letter (1.1):

Haec tua Penelope lento tibi mittit, Ulixee,
and in the Phyllis letter (2.1):

Hospita Demophoon, tua te Rhodopeia Phyllis,
or in Laudamia's (13.1-2):

Mittit et optat amans, quo mittitur, ire salutem
Haemonis Haemonio Laudamia viro.

Ovid could vary this formula, as in the Phaedra to Hippolytus letter, but the prose prescript is still discernible (4.1-2):

Qua, nisi tu dederis, caritura est ipsa, salutem
Mittit Amazonio Cressa puella viro.

The question to what degree these and the remaining prescripts are or are not genuine is still a question very much *sub iudice*, but is one that need not detain us here.¹⁰ One fact, however, which emerges from an examination of all the prescripts, from the indisputably genuine to the most suspected, is this: not one is interrogative, that is, all follow the declarative form of the prose prescript. This observation lends all the more support to Dörrie's argument that the introductory

11-15, from which collection (p. 394), "interierat Sappho ultima libri elegia." All this is ingenious, but Sedlmayer's cautionary admonitions (see note 24) should be kept in mind when the question of the place of the Sappho epistle arises.

⁹ For Ovid's knowledge of Propertius' letter, see J. N. Anderson, *On the Sources of Ovid's Heroides* (Berlin 1896) 7. For the history of the development of the epistolary form in elegy, see Dörrie 73, n. 1.

¹⁰ E. A. Kirfel, "Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroides Ovids," *Noctes Romanae* 11 (Bern 1969) carefully weighs the virtues of the introductory distichs given in the MSS.

distichon to the Oenone epistle preserved in *MS E*_s should be printed in texts of this poem. Not only does it have "color Ovidianus" but also provides this poem with a necessary introduction.¹¹

Thus, the Sappho epistle is the only one of the *Heroides* which retains an interrogative beginning.¹² Clearly, if this poem had remained with the other *Heroides*—that is, if it had not been dropped from the second, expanded edition—it would have been subject to the same influences of the Oenone letter and would have been provided with a prescript over whose genuineness scholars would today be disputing. The unshakable fact remains, however, that none of the *MSS* nor any of the *editiones principes* hint at a distichon similar to that of the Oenone letter. We can therefore posit with some confidence that if the writer of the introductory distichon to the Oenone epistle had had the Sappho epistle before him, he would have written a few introductory verses along the lines of the prescript. The lack of such a distichon shows how definitively the two poems were separated.¹³

In his study of the *Heroides*, Kirfel has called the opening lines of the Sappho epistle "kunstvoll," and says this concerning the allusive manner in which Sappho identifies herself: "Ovid spielt hier mit der Nennung des Namens, indem er den Brief mit drei Fragen . . . beginnen läßt und den Namen der Absenderin in die zweite Frage kleidet."¹⁴

No Roman neoteric mastered the magical combination of humor and learning to be found in Callimachus so well as Ovid: the *Metamorphoses* is the proof of this statement. And although the Sappho epistle is a tearful elegy, Ovid does indulge in intellectual play, not only in the way Kirfel has noted, but also in the manner Ovid hints at the identity of the most *docta* of all women poets by the adjective

¹¹ Dörrie, "Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I: Philologische-historische Klasse* 5 (1960) 208. *MS E*_s, we should note, has a distich to *Heroides VII* which Dörrie accepts as genuine and prints in his "probe-Edition" to this poem in this article. Kirfel 61–64 rejects the distichon. Cf. J. Vahlen, *Über die Anfänge der Heroiden des Ovid*, *Abh. Preuss. Akad.* 1881, 37 = *Gesammelte Schriften* 2 (Berlin 1923).

¹² The unusual opening with *ecquid* occurs again in the *Epistulae ex Ponto* 2.10.1–2.

¹³ M. Sicherl has kindly read the manuscript of this article and comments here that the prescript may have been lost in a manner analogous to the loss of distichs within the poems. He cites Dörrie, "Untersuchungen . . .," 214–19, and 210 f. of his own article, "Vermeintliche Versinterpolationen in Ovids *Heroides*," *Hermes* 91 (1963).

¹⁴ Kirfel 102–103.

studiosae in the first line of the poem. This combination of play and intellect is purely Alexandrian. In the fifteenth chapter of his book, *The Discovery of the Mind*, Snell aptly characterizes the way in which learning is employed by Callimachus; I quote him here for the light this sheds on Ovid's procedure: "Er war Gelehrter; seine große und erlesene Gelehrsamkeit ist überall auch in seine Dichtung eingegangen, doch hat er sie nicht dazu benutzt, ein "Lehrgedicht" zu schreiben, wie man vollends erwarten konnte . . . sondern nur dazu, viele bunte und interessante Dinge hervorzuziehen."¹⁵

The Alexandrian nature of the beginning is further marked by the apology Sappho, i.e., Ovid in the *persona* of Sappho, makes in these lines (5-8):

Forsitan et quare mea sint alterna requiras
Carmina, cum lyricis sim magis apta modis,
Flendus amor meus est: elegiae flebile carmen;
Non facit ad lacrimas barbitos ulla meas.

The literary apology in writers of the Augustan age derives ultimately from Callimachus, as Wimmel has shown.¹⁶ The apologies in Ovid's works explain with much wit why he turned from the writing of epic and tragedy to love-poetry; the purpose of the Sappho apology is to explain why he did not—like Horace—write lyric poetry. Sappho, i.e., Ovid, says her instrument was not suited *ad lacrimas*, a term which is synonymous with the lament of a heroine, as we observed in a parallel use of the term in the *Amores* (2.18.22).

Another unique feature of the Sappho epistle is the explicit, erotic language of two passages. The first passage is vss. 45-50:

¹⁵ B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (Hamburg 1955) 359. R. Heinze, "Ovids elegische Erzählung," in *Richard Heinze: Vom Geist des Römertums* (Darmstadt 1960) makes valuable observations on the differences in narrative technique in epic and in elegy. One of these differences is that in elegy there is more room for what is "lebendig" and "beweglich" (p. 360). When Heinze remarks (p. 375), that Callimachus in his elegiac poetry tells a story in such a way that the reader never forgets the teller of the story, then we know how Alexandrian Ovid was in the portrayal of the inner life of the heroines.

¹⁶ The function of the artistic apology, stemming from the prologue of the *Aitia*, forms the substance of W. Wimmel's *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960). For Ovid's apologies, see pp. 300-307.

Haec quoque laudabas, omnique a parte placbam,
 Sed tunc praecipue, cum fit amoris opus.
 Tunc te plus solito lascivia nostra iuvabat
 Crebraque mobilitas aptaque verba ioco,
 Et quod, ubi amborum fuerat confusa voluptas,
 Plurimus in lasso corpore languor erat.

The expression *amoris opus* introduces allusions to the sexual act the phases of which are marked by words, e.g., *lascivia*, *mobilitas*, *voluptas*, *languor*, whose technical meanings in the *sermo amatorius* are given by Pichon in his dictionary.¹⁷ The frankness of language in this passage cannot be paralleled in the *Heroides*, an observation which led Gruppe to consider these lines an interpolation first, and then to doubt the authenticity of the entire epistle on their account.¹⁸ De Vries counters Gruppe's objections by citing *Heroides* 11.35 ff. in the Canace to Macareus letter, saying that this is *multo etiam obscenius*.¹⁹ True, incest may in itself be more obscene, but the sexual act itself is not hinted at as it is in the Sappho epistle. Gruppe was correct in calling attention to the unusual nature of this passage, but one need not necessarily agree with his conclusions.

The second passage with uniquely frank language occurs in vss. 128-35:

Saepe tuos nostra cervice onerare lacertos,
 Saepe tuae videor supposuisse meos.
 Oscula cognosco, quae tu committere linguae
 Aptaque consuevas accipere, apta dare.
 Blandior interdum verisque simillima verba
 Eloquor, et vigilant sensibus ora meis.
 Ulteriora pudet narrare, sed omnia fiunt,
 Et iuvat, et siccae non licet esse mihi.

De Vries has carefully pointed out the elements of the *sermo amatorius* of this passage, and was justifiably impatient with the poor scholar

¹⁷ R. Pichon, *Index Verborum Amatorius* (Hildesheim 1966).

¹⁸ O. Gruppe, *Minos* 491, quoted in De Vries, *Epistula Sapphus ad Phaonem* (Lugduni-Batavorum 1885) 57. P. Lieger, "De epistula Sapphus," *Jahresbericht: Ober-Gymnasium zu den Schotten* (Wien 1902) 17, thinks Ovid could not have written 45 ff. and 126 ff. asking, "Num credibile est ipsum Ovidium eandem puellam finxisse paucis versibus post nimis fere pudicam?" His study of the poem leads him to the conclusion, (p. 19) that the poem is by Ovid but that it was "... a posteriore quodam poeta retractatum et auctum."

¹⁹ *Op. cit.* 85.

who did not understand what *oscula linguae committere* could possibly mean. Still, De Vries opts for the emendation *et sine te sic libet* for the last line of this passage, although he is well aware that the adjective *sicca* has a well-established technical meaning in the *sermo amatorius*.²⁰ There is no reason to reject the reading *sicca* which is not only the *lectio difficilior* but also fits in well with the tone of the language in its own passage and that of vss. 45–50 which have, so to speak, prepared the reader for terms of this sort. Neither the heroines nor the heroes of the *Heroides* speak in the forthright terms of these two passages: the reader must turn to the seventh poem of the third book of the *Amores* for a poem with the directness of language of the Sappho epistle.²¹

From antiquity to its rediscovery in the Renaissance, the Sappho epistle suffered the obscurity of its most frequent carrier, the *Corpus Tibullianum*. This fact will draw our attention to the well known familiarity of Ovid's with the writers of the literary circle of Messalla whose works make up the *Corpus*. The exact nature of Ovid's participation in Messalla's circle is not clear, but, whether one believes that Lygdamus was Ovid, or Ovid's brother, or merely that Ovid attended literary meetings in Messalla's house, there remains the unshakable fact that a link of some sort, either familial or literary, existed between Lygdamus and Ovid.²² It is not, therefore, surprising that the epistle from Sappho, once dislodged from the *Heroides* proper and wandering like Leto in search of a firm abode, came to rest among the poems of the *Corpus Tibullianum*.²³ The affinity between the Sappho epistle and the *Corpus* is close, since the epistle is a love-elegy employing the themes of *discidium* and *querela*, a standard feature of the poems of the *Corpus*. Clearly, Lygdamus and Ovid were working

²⁰ Cf. Prop. 2.12.17 and Martial 11.81.2.

²¹ Compare the similarity of *Heroides* 15.127–32, with *Amores* 3.7.7–12.

²² For Messalla's literary circle and Ovid's relation to it, see Schanz-Hosius, pp. 22, 186–87; Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* 65, col. 157; H. Dessau, *Röm. Kaiserzeit* 1 (Berlin 1924) 527–28.

²³ The article "Albius" in Pauly-Wissowa's *RE* 2 col. 1328, traces the slim threads of evidence for knowledge of Tibullus from antiquity through the Middle Ages. B. Ripsati, *Introduzione allo studio di Tibullo* (Milan 1945) 276 ff., continues the task from the Renaissance on. The Sappho epistle was so closely associated with Tibullus, that one MS (Codex Chisianus H. 4.121) names him as its author. See H. S. Sedlmyer, "Epistula Phaonis ad Sappho," *WS* 10 (1888) 167.

in the same tradition; not only Ovid but Lydgamus too had listened to Apollo's words on how to soften hard hearts (*Corp. Tib.* 3.4.75-76):

Ergo ne dubita blandas adhibere querellas:
Vincuntur molli pectora dura prece.

It becomes easier, with the relationship between Ovid and the Messallan circle in mind, to understand why two Parisian codices (17903 and 7647), containing works by Tibullus and Ovid, give several verses of the Sappho epistle after *Heroides* 14 (Hypermetra) and before 16 (Paris): someone who knew the passage in *Amores* 2.18 where Sappho's epistle is mentioned last of the single letters put them there. When the entire epistle was brought to the shores of light after the sleep of centuries, scholars used the evidence of these two codices and the statement in the *Amores* as grounds for printing the Sappho epistle with the other heroic letters.²⁴ My contention in this paper is that the mighty Codex Parisinus preserves the correct tradition through its omission of the Sappho epistle which, on the grounds I have given, was omitted when the *Heroides* was published.²⁵

²⁴ Cf. the discussion by B. L. Ullman, "Classical Authors in Certain Medieval Florilegia," *CP* 27 (1932) 13, for the role of Heinsius (and Scaliger) in placing the Sappho epistle where it is now in the *Heroides*. R. Sedlmayer, *Prolegomena Critica ad Heroides Ovidianas* (Vindobonae 1878) cautions against placing too much reliance on the evidence of the Parisian excerpts and those of Vincent of Beauvais for numbering the Sappho epistle as number fifteen. All that can be concluded from these, he writes (p. 33), is this: "... per se patet ut diversos locos in his libris ita in illo libro deperdito quintum decimum locum ei a librario vel a redactore quodam tributum esse neque quicquam amplius inde colligi posse. Ad quod si addideris in nullo codice hanc epistolam revera ad Ovidium referri auctorem, iam intelleges eam ex codicum quidem ratione plane eodem loco habendam esse ac reliqua carmina Pseudo-Ovidiana, dico Nucem, Pulicem, Cuculum cett., quae una cum Nasonis scriptis edi consueverunt."

²⁵ G. Luck, *Untersuchungen zur Textgeschichte Ovids* (Heidelberg 1969) 15-16, contends that the MS tradition before P contained the Sappho epistle in the fifteenth place and that it was detached from the "model" for P. At a later date, he reasons, the writer of P found the Sappho epistle at the beginning of the archetype. Luck therefore asks why the scribe did not reproduce the Sappho epistle as number one and answers his own question saying "Vielleicht, weil er ihn *als gesondertes Werk* ansah; diese Auffassung ist textgeschichtlich bezeugt, denn *es gibt Handschriften*, die den Sappho-Brief mit Werken anderer Dichter, z.B. mit *Tibulls Elegien*, verbinden. The italics are mine. Cf. H. Dörrie, "Die dichterische Absicht Ovids in den *Epistulae Heroidum*," *Antike und Abendland* 13 (1967) 53: "Wahrscheinlich hat Ovid, der ja seinen Gedichten gegenüber kritisch war, diese *epistula Sapphus* nicht mit den anderen publiziert, vielleicht sie sogar von der Veröffentlichung ausgeschlossen."