

**THE MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY “1 DECEMBRIE 1918” OF ALBA IULIA
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PHILOLOGY**

PHD THESIS

ABSTRACT

**Scientific coordinator,
PhD Professor Mircea Braga**

**PhD student,
Danciu Petru Adrian**

**ALBA IULIA,
2018**

**THE MINISTRY OF NATIONAL EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY “1 DECEMBRIE 1918” OF ALBA IULIA
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PHILOLOGY**

**THE MITOGEN OF ZMEU, BETWEEN PHENOMENOLOGY
AND HERMENEUTICS:
A POSSIBLE HISTORY**

Abstract

**Scientific coordinator,
PhD Professor Mircea Braga**

**PhD student,
Danciu Petru Adrian**

**ALBA IULIA,
2018**

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	7
CHAPTER I	
RESEARCH METHOD	18
I.1. Homo religiosus	19
<i>I.1.1. Ethnology and folklore.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>I.1.2. Sociology and anthropology</i>	<i>27</i>
<i>I.1.3. Theology and history of religions.....</i>	<i>33</i>
I.2. Homo symbolicus	39
<i>I.2.1. Hermeneutics</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>I.2.2. Phenomenology</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>I.2.3. Imaginary</i>	<i>51</i>
I.3. Homo alteritas	56
<i>I.3.1. The degradation of the symbol</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>I.3.2. The demonization of the cosmos</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>I.3.3. The altered alterity</i>	<i>67</i>
I.4. Conclusions.....	71
CHAPTER II	
DECONSTRUCTION AND NOMINAL RECONSTRUCTION IN THE SEMITE MITHOLOGICAL IMAGINARY	73
II.1. The name from “I am” to “let there be”	74
<i>II.1.1. The creation, “the mirror” or the script of the Name</i>	<i>75</i>
<i>II.1.2. The script between the magic of hunting and the punishing magic</i>	<i>77</i>
<i>II.1.3. The divine possession, the symbiont of names</i>	<i>79</i>
<i>II.1.4. “The mayhem of the god” or the name theft</i>	<i>81</i>
<i>II.1.5. “The point”, between immortality and naming</i>	<i>85</i>
II.2. The Logos or the generating Name	87
<i>II.2.1. The divine verb or the “solidified” Name</i>	<i>87</i>
<i>II.2.2. The impropriation of the verb and the nominal malleability</i>	<i>89</i>
II.3. Shamash	91
<i>II.3.1. The imaginary potentiated in nominal constructs</i>	<i>91</i>

<i>II.3.2. The contexts modifying the construct</i>	93
<i>II.3.3. The syncretism, the “alchemical” process of captivity</i>	96
<i>II.3.4. Shamash or Samael “unveiled”</i>	98
II.4. Samael, “the poison” of creation	101
<i>II.4.1. The sacred imaginary and the hermeneutics of the historic mechanism</i>	103
<i>II.4.2. Theological immersions in the demonological imaginary</i>	105
<i>II.4.3. The gnostic nihilism, the lack of symbiosis between the created entity and Name</i>	107
<i>II.4.4. The “legion” type personality; the nominal variants</i>	109
II.5. Smăul	111
<i>II.5.1. Moesia and the first gnostic wave – the Alexandrine dualism</i>	112
<i>II.5.2. The heresy, a Christian-Gnostic syncretic construction</i>	120
<i>II.5.3. Smăul, a fairy-tale transcript of the mythical Shamash</i>	125
<i>II.5.4. The second gnostic wave – the Bogomil dualism</i>	128
II.6. Conclusions	139

CHAPTER III

THE MOTIV OF THE DRAGON IN THE <i>BOOK OF TOBIT</i>	141
III.1. The motif of <i>zmeul</i> in the <i>Book of Tobit</i>	142
<i>III.1.1. “Tobit”, a fairy-tale construct</i>	142
<i>III.1.2. Zoo-magic or the reverberations of the Animism</i>	144
<i>III.1.3. Asmodeu, the symbolic construct of <i>zmeu</i></i>	149
<i>III.1.4. Sarra, a virgin prostitute or the disorder of the beginning</i>	154
<i>III.1.5. Asmodeu, between Demon-mania and demonology</i>	157
III.2. The orality, the vehicle of the popular imaginary	160
III.3. The captivity of sexuality between theology and demonology	162
<i>III.3.1. The spiritual migrationism</i>	163
<i>III.3.2. The phenomenology of the idolatrous migrationism</i>	164
<i>III.3.3. The salvation of sexuality through fairy-tales</i>	165
<i>III.3.4. The offensive of sexuality</i>	167
III.4. The <i>Book of Tobit</i>, a directing pattern for the popular imaginary	170
<i>III.4.1. The syncretic defragmentation of the myth and the imaginary reconstruction</i>	170
<i>III.4.2. Periodisation and construction</i>	172
<i>III.4.3. The fairy-tale, between non-canonical aspect and tolerance</i>	174
<i>III.4.4. The superstitious act, from disapproval to integration</i>	175

III.5. Conclusions	177
CHAPTER IV	
THE FAIRY-TALE RITE, THE EXPRESSION OF ALTERITY	180
IV.1. The fairy-tale people, between desire and power	181
<i>IV.1.1. The chosen one and the function of the sacrifice</i>	<i>185</i>
<i>IV.1.2. The “passive” involvement of the magical players</i>	<i>189</i>
<i>IV.1.3. The victim, the schemer and the peacemaker.....</i>	<i>195</i>
IV.2. The alterity	200
<i>IV.2.1. The sociopathic Zmeul</i>	<i>203</i>
<i>IV.2.2. Me-You-That one.....</i>	<i>207</i>
<i>IV.2.3. You, as a proof-event of the temporality of the Self.....</i>	<i>212</i>
<i>IV.2.4. The alterity as effect of the sympathetism</i>	<i>214</i>
IV.3. The story of a rite	216
<i>IV.3.1. The death of a ritual</i>	<i>217</i>
<i>IV.3.2. The religiosity of the profane or the sacrophagous spirituality</i>	<i>227</i>
IV.4. Conclusions	229
CONCLUSIONS	233
REFERENCES	236
1. Direct sources	236
<i>1.1. Ancient texts – sacred character</i>	<i>236</i>
<i>1.2. Ancient texts – profane character</i>	<i>237</i>
<i>1.3. Apocryphal and gnostic texts</i>	<i>237</i>
<i>1.4. Collections of studies on Romanian beliefs, fairy-tales and legends.....</i>	<i>238</i>
2. Historical sources	239
<i>2.1. Archaeology</i>	<i>239</i>
<i>2.2. Culture and civilisation</i>	<i>240</i>
<i>2.3. Dualism and Kabbalah</i>	<i>242</i>
<i>2.4. Christianity/ patristics</i>	<i>244</i>
<i>2.5. History of religions and folklore</i>	<i>246</i>
<i>2.6. Socio-ethno-anthropology and folklore</i>	<i>250</i>
3. Demonology	252

3.1. <i>The popular demonology: Witchcraft</i>	252
3.2. <i>The literary demonology</i>	253
3.3. <i>The sciences of the paranormal and occultism</i>	257
3.4. <i>Angelology</i>	258
4. The symbol/ imaginary	258
5. Dictionaries	259
6. Miscellanea	260

If philology, in its etymology, sends to the one loving the beautiful words, where the beautiful is the creation, the logos and the knowledge, we will accept from the start that philology has been predisposed, long before becoming a science, to an inter-cultural opening, because the beauty of the creation is to be found in all aspects exposed by the human logos. Even if the fairy-tale belongs, as genre, to the philological research, the research of its origins will not belong completely to the philological science. The philologist has to go beyond the imposed limits of his/her own science and later bring in these limits the results of the research. The results could offer possible explanations to a construction (the fairy-tale) with undisputed mythical origins

Our research is mainly preoccupied by this aspect, under the title of *The mitogen of zmeu, between phenomenology and hermeneutics: a possible history*. In the field of medical research, the mitogen is the substance that induces the duplication of DNA or the cellular division. It is a chemical and exterior agent, favouring the cellular division. In a mythical sense, the mitogen is the index (Greek, *genos*) or the vector that gives birth to the mythical directing. It is “the living” part of the construction, in which the archetype represents primitive or symbolic models. More concretely, the mitogen is the god revealing a personal history (archetypes) that becomes a myth by the process of retelling. As long as it remains in the spatial and temporal limits of a religious culture, the mitogen is mixed up with the myth, being one and the same. When a spatial and temporal breach is produced due to the dissolution of the culture, which previously supported the existence of the mythical story through a cult, the mitogen abandons the myth (the personal history), migrating through synthetic assumption in other religious cults. We followed this type of history during our research, starting from known aspects, the Romanian folkloric fairy-tale, passing phenomenologically and hermeneutically through several sources toward what we considered to be the origins of the fairy-tale mitogen, *zmeul*.

We research is structured on four chapters. The first two chapters are dedicated to the research methodology: in the first chapter, we depict the importance of the “auxiliary” sciences for our research, while the second chapter presents a spiritual methodology of the approached themes, thus, the first two parts of our work represent an introduction in the research and an incipient explanation of the sense of various themes of the sacred imaginary. The following chapters are related, on one hand, to the syncretic formula of the mitogen as initiator of the fairy-tale directing, and, on the other hand, remark that the archaic expression on which the mitogen of *zmeu* is juxtaposed is, in essence, a matriarchal myth of the nature in the last stasis of its existence, a decadence integrated by the fairy-

tale in its directing, by the presence of the savior hero. After these general lines, we further detail the content of each chapter as follows.

For a construction as simple as possible of the research method (Chapter I), we considered as efficient to structure it depending on the three phases of the scientific discourse, where the man has the central role through his vision on the sacrality, favouring the syncretism and, implicitly, the continuous mutations of the mitogen. Thus, we identified *homo religiosus* (I.1), *homo symbolicus* (I.2) and *homo alteritas* (I.3). We dedicated to each section fields of the sciences that are components in our research. Thus, the first section (I.1) presents in pairs contributing sciences, as *ethnology and folklore* (I.1.1), *sociology and anthropology* (I.1.2), *theology and history of religions* (I.1.3).

After a brief view on what meant, in time, the ethnological research (pp. 21-22) in its relation to theology (until the 16th century), we concluded that ethnology becomes the object of the first syncretic philosophical-historical reflections on the so-called wild thinking of the primitive man or on the relation of Other with the indigenous. This generated the idea that the stranger is the depositor of the myth that, once disseminated, is adopted and, depending on the content, maintained fragmentary in the local sacred formulas (rite and tale). We called this a process of *folklorization of the mythical elements* (p. 23), a phenomenon specific to the populations with limited elements of own mythology, mostly open to syncretism.

The syncretic acceptations are permanently reported to the already existing archetypes, thus, for the syncretic structures, there are more important the archetypes to which the mitogens must be reported. The permanent mutations suffered by mitogens are gathered in a fairy-tale directing (p. 24), where the ancient gods can be saved, even if they are strangers for the indigenous populations where they find a religious asylum. Important political changes, as the Aurelian retreat, facilitate the liberation from profound mythological beliefs especially for the Roman army and administration. What was not saved in the so-called folkloric creation was simply forgotten or, less serious, “abandoned” in the official formulas of the funerary stones, e.g., found in the archaeological sites. What we call today folklore (magical-religious) is nothing more than the movement of rethinking the local spirituality consolidated by accepting selectively the foreign religious beliefs and ideas (an aspect present even in the case of the early Christian faith). Such a fertile bed, “loosened” by successive deposits, is predisposed to continue to accept the novelty, including the rebirth of the model and directing of the folklore fairy-tale with the characters of zmeu raping young virgins. Obviously, we shall not forget the fact that the complete disappearance of some traditions is originated in the interruption of the transmission of initiating information between ages, the “loss” of the elders through the young people who forget after leaving the village. We are referring to the dissolution of

traditions due to the incapacity to connect again the old aspects to the new ones, where the fairy-tale suffers the most.

In our sociological and anthropological observations, we started from the idea of the dual vision on the religiosity, according to which the sacred and the profane are in contact and live in proximity to each other, a defining closeness through their separating limit, without excluding the interpellations generating a reciprocal contamination. This complex structure generates the *tradition* or the *popular gnosis*, transmitted from a generation to another.

Once the sacred geography is known through its characters and rules, the profane learns to invoke (evoke) or to exorcise, depending on the situation, the manifested presence of the sacredness, alive through its creatures. This gives the sense and the function of the initiation rites, the knowing of the myth and of the necessary rites. But knowledge means more than this. If what, as myth or rite, has in profane the function of knowledge or practical applicability, the behavioural patterns matter in the sacredness. The success belongs to the intelligent one, who knows how *to listen* (learn) and to the wise one, who applies correctly what he learned. The customs from the sacred world are vital for the success of the fairy-tale hero. It is a reality met not only in the fairy-tales with *zmeu* characters abducting virgins, but also in the legends. In the profane, the sacredness (when manifested) is perceived as *numinous* (p. 28), an axial opener of meanings and a consumer of manna, the potency “extracted” by sacrality from the profane, because this latent force of the profane is completely ignored. Thus, all is hylic is defined as profane.

The immersion of the sacredness in profane generates the centre, while the relation of the man with the centre generates the first manifestation of the personal cult (shamanic), the Totemism and the Animism. The presence of the sacredness affects the time, hence the idea of *sacred time* (p. 30), nothing more than a *divine act* or an *eonic* “time”. The myth and the rite coagulate around all personal experiences in relation with the sacredness, expressed in what will become an imaginary field for everything resulting from the contact of the sacredness with the profane and vice versa. In the first type of contract, we are talking about religion (religious phenomenon), while in the second type we are talking about magic. From the perspective of the non-initiated person, both variants are returns to the origins, with the sincere desire to obtain communication and relation. Practically, the folklore tradition is not faith in the Christian sense of the word (Cf. *Ioan*, 20, 29), but experienced *reality* (p. 32). This resolves the difficult duty of the sociology to define correctly the religion, since each meeting with the sacredness through fairy-tale does nothing else than showing the permanence of the shared gnostic initiation (with the sense of *knowledge*) of the essential religious beliefs in the profane spatial temporality melt symbiotically in the sacral-axial notion of centre. The listener learns that what is moral for the profane space is custom for the sacred space, as long as success is defined as a

“two-way street”, the hero returning in the end to the profane condition, after knowing and respecting the rules of sacredness. The fairy-tale is, thus, an initiatic travel (disregarding the theme) with a finality representing the return in the profane of the world where the man see himself living happily ever after.

It is a somehow contradictory perspective in relation with the aspirations of the contemporary Christianity, since the problem of the salvation is approached not as a life into sacredness, but rather as a compulsory journey for the recovery of the sacredness, at least in the directing variants of the fairy-tales with the *zmeu* character raping the virgins (I.1.3). If the theological (Christian) motif is not in accordance to the fairy-tale magical-religious thinking, it means that we have to find its origins somewhere else. The shamanic model (pp. 33-34) offers a practical perspective of the return into profane of the soul raped by the demonical creatures in order to re-establish the equilibrium of *this* world. All these rebounders (shamans) are the possessors of the practical gnosis, a reason for them to believe in it. Faith is not for them a condition for the perspective of knowledge, but the reverse. Therefore, the comparison of the similar fairy-tale directing models is not enough without passing to the research of the possible sources of inspiration. If the “shamanic model” can be taken in consideration, the “gnostic” model will be the base of all the models and rules establishing the relation between worlds (pp. 34-36), although the fairy-tale construct will never represent the hero in all his thinking, since the explanations of the narrators are present. Even in these circumstances, the hero is described as a good listener, a good “student”, familiar, through the lack of any wonder, to the basic realities of the fantastic to limit between the world and the sacredness.

Once inside the sacredness, the limits of the philological explanations are to be felt without reporting the descriptions of the narrator to the fantastic proposed by the historical-religious research. These descriptions are doubled by the personal imaginary, not in a degree over the already consecrated the mythical representations from the magical-religious sacredness of the rural world. All these prove the capacity of the profane to store and report knowledge to the personal potency, to which the sacredness is dependent to, a proof that not the motif of the death, but the motif of the failure is the scariest motif in the folklore Romanian fairy-tale (pp. 37-38). This sends to the accent put on the knowledge of symbols, the only presences of the concrete in relation of the man with the sacredness. This is how *homo symbolicus* is born.

Reported to the folklore fairy-tale with the character of *zmeu* raping virgins, the knowledge of the sacred constructions of *homo symbolicus* (I.2) can be accessed through three types of analysis: hermeneutical (I.2.1), phenomenological (I.2.2) and imaginary related (I.2.3), all exceeding the space of the autochthonous religiosity. This is the reason for which we give to the hermeneutics a first role, since the exceeding of the analysis of the contemporary research cannot be done without the

observation and the identification of the components participating to the formation of the fairy-tale directing, which is a “binding agent” transmitting unaltered a double message, for the profane world and for all those already familiar with the notions of the folklore sacredness. If hermeneutics is called, to quote Mircea Eliade, to decipher and explain all the experiences of the man in the sacred field (p. 40), the observation of the similarities with the myths of the old civilisations should not surprise us in this case. We deal with a decoding process of the magical-mythical symbols from our folklore fairy-tale (pp. 41-42), an essential process in the attempt to reconstruct as a whole, in the form explained by the given, the “mystery” of the fairy-tale with the character of *zmeu* raping virgins.

The hermeneutics of the fairy-tale will give his entire attention to the items liberated by the myth, those mythemes, which, before included in the fairy-tales, have generated myths. The same science will observe what was preserved and what was lost in the qualities of the ancient gods, correlating the entire scientific approach toward new connections. It is an ample process of un-enchanting of the entire route (in the limits proved by the research) of the mitogen from myth to its acceptance in the fairy-tale, where it loses the role of myth-creator in order to become a simple item in a foreign structure, where the polarity of its attributes is more changed than its function of main character. It is important for our research that the mitogen is rescued. How? The answer to this question will have to come from phenomenology.

The role of the fairy-tale phenomenology is observable in the permanent attempt to discover the constructions generating the phenomenon of the fairy-tale, meaning what is formed as chain of facts and ideas, constituting the fairy-tales directing, all in their historical relation with the myths generating magic-religious values syncretic entering in the indigenous folkloric sacredness. The phenomenology tends to contain the formatting “whole” of the fairy-tale, in order to depict the logic of the essences, used to find the red thread of the fairy-tale narration. The phenomenological research represents a constant and difficult process of spiritual archaeology, remarked every time the researcher has to descend in the “empty basins” of religion, where, most of the times, is confronted to a “rarefied history” of the sacredness and where the only “binder” able to connect and reconstruct “a vase from its pieces” (as we will further observe the modifications of some mythical constructions from the perspective of other beliefs; the case of Shamash – Samael) is the *imaginary* or the *intuition* of the researcher reported to the profane history of the ancient historical monuments, in order to remain in the limits of the scientific research (pp. 47-48). Of course, phenomenology is not a delirium of the sublime similarities (R. Girard), since, with lucidity, it does not force the logic to create connections where they do not exist and it does not renounce to see the similarities in the “strata” (various moments of transmitting the myth) through which the item is liberated by its own myth (nothing else than the personal sacred history of the god in the profane). We can explain only

phenomenologically the way how a mythical historicity is transformed in a fairy-tale one, a reason to place phenomenology in the continuity and, in the same time, above the hermeneutics (pp. 49-50). Phenomenology understands the *religious fact* (J. M. Velasco) as permanence of the mytheme accepted syncretic inside the fairy-tale after its liberation from the myth as item (p. 50). Due to the fact that the fairy-tale directing must be constituted under the form of a collective acceptance of the sacredness, the *imaginary* has the role of constructing the *fairy-tale directing*, accepting the mytheme and expressing it as entity.

The imaginary has the power to transform a “notion” in a living organism. It reanimates the “notion”, somehow remodelling the creators after the image of the creation (p. 51). The fairy-tale has not the pretention of the myth to be a creator of spiritual and material worlds. In a large sense, the fairy-tale does not indent to be esoteric (secret), but exoteric (discrete) in its directing exposition, since it already “speaks” the sacred language of the indigenous population. Its large contribution is the inclusion of the foreign elements in this language. From this point of view, this narration is a promotor of the *sacred neologisms* and remains in the same time in the modest spectre of not-formation, a first trump card of its permanence in front of the founding myths, permanently replaced by other variants (pp. 52-53). After the syncretic processing of the mythemes, while their mythical reverberations fade in the functional-ritual space of a foreign orality, the *fairy-tale imaginary* is born and grows through continuous exposition, capable in the same time to transmit a double message, esoteric and exoteric, depending on the existing gnosis of the listener. Knowing the constituting attributes of the sacredness generates in the imaginary field multiple variants of the fairy-tale directing, giving birth to constructs, and well-formed structures, capable to observe even the possible presence of an indigenous matriarchal cult in which, by “adoption”, *zmeu* will receive an important role.

It is the moment when the problem of alterity enters in the discussion. If *homo alteritas* (I.3) is, in the case of the myth, a consequence of the fall of the man from his relation with the gods in the configuration of the fairy-tale world, the sin of Adam does not appear and the alterity is strictly reported to the specie. It is necessary between the two models, to analyse the motifs leading to the *degradation of the symbol* (I.3.1), the moments that produce the *demonization of the cosmos* (I.3.2), and, somehow conclusively, to the *altered alterity* (I.3.3), in the special context of fairy-tale directing.

The degradation of the symbol is the direct consequence of the gradual weakening of the ritual field of the human players (believers), a situation leading inevitably to their estrangement from the mythical knowledge. The process is similar in Christianity, where we meet believers that do not know the gospels, even if they are practicing the cult. The presence to the acts of the cult is, thus, not a guarantee for the symbolic knowledge, the only one capable to put in relation the faith and the

theological gnosis. The degradation of the symbol can be assimilated to the act of forgetting a specific typology (theological and cult-related) to approach the sacredness, without the consequence of the creation of an atheist vision on the world, but rather an heretical vision (p. 57), generated by the absence of the hierophany. If a religious system does not produce added value for maintaining the intimate relations with the divinity, it takes steps backwards, while the cult and the supporting myth are taking steps back in front of the personal religious movements, some of them managing to become religious movements.

Another moment is provoked by the political conflicts solved many time by force, when the defeated populations receive the imprisonment similar to the deities they used to glorify. Thus, the indigenous gods lose their attributes that are identical to those of the conquering gods and either transform in demons, or simply disappear. Practically, long before separating the good from the bad, we must recognise the “cannibalistic” formula of the sacredness (the consummation of the name – cf. II.1.4) that eats its own children, in order to rebuild gradually, *in integrum*, the image of a unique god or, at least, a monotheist god (p. 58). We present as example the philosophy of Zoroastrianism, the Greek philosophy, the Egyptian Hermeticism or the gnostic dualism (pp. 59-61). The more intense is the “translation” of the symbol in the monotheist sphere, the more acute is the crisis of the symbol, not only related to what is defined as “pagan”, but also in the intimate relation between them, since the symbol is not monovalent, even it seems to be. E.g.: the symbol of the centre maintains its monovalent character only if we wish to see him in relation to a group (Elohim) or as unique divine good creator (YHWH). Seen as bad creator (Demiurge/ Samael), or generated by the body of a primary demon (Tiamath), the symbolic senses of the centres are radically changes, as in the case when, if two brothers appear in the centre – the motif of twins (Fârtatul and Nefârtatul), we have a polyvalence we consider we do not have to associate immediately to the gnostic dualism, even it is introduced in our space through Bogumilism.

The symbolic confusion due to the religious crisis as well as their permanently affirmed supremacy (in the case of the monotheism) provokes the gradual demonization of the cosmos. We do not find many founding myth containing the idea that the world is created from the body of a god-demon sacrificed, a datum that cannot be changed by the soul as pure divine essence, generating the challenge of the Christian eschaton where the materiality is spiritualised. It is also the reason to depict a “five stages” evolution (1. The cosmogonic stage of the Iranian dualism; 2. The stage of the Egyptian Monothelism; 3. The stage of the Gnostic dualism; 4. The stage of the Christian monotheism; 5. The stage of the profane rationality), among which we consider that only four are of interest for our research (p. 63). In essence, the world *is not perfect* and *cannot be perfect*, because it only mirrors the ineffable that is impossible to be reproduced. All that falls spiritually under the

incidence of desire risks to become a demon, as the Semite demonology is full of such creatures, it is mostly haunted by the beings of infertility (pp. 64-65), probably because they were the first to realise that the reproduction of the ineffable in the created space is a utopia. Could this mentality be the one that gave sense to the belief of the Gnostics that the reproduction is only a sin desecrating the divine world by the descent of the innocent souls into hylic and necessity?

On the other hand, the present of the Succubus and Incubus demons does nothing else than estranging the sexuality from the aim of the creation, its rape becoming a subject of debate in the beliefs of the Semite demonology, a fact remarked in the seriousness with which the Judaic tradition (QBLH) discusses the theme. The rites of fertility are not excluded from this classification, diverting, from the perspective of the demonology in the monotheist systems, beliefs that had no common point with the demonical sexuality. It is the case of *zmeu* surprised in its movement of demonising the sacred space (p. 68).

If alterity brings us face to face, not necessarily in conflict, with the other, the altered alterity presents the last as invader and predator of all that is potency, the added value we mentioned earlier, of the living creatures in the material (profane) world. Thus, *zmeul*, as well the Incubus, no matter the specificity of the manifestations (p. 67), does nothing else than *to desire the consummation* of what belongs to the sacredness: *the unlimited potency of the living, incubated in materiality*.

For the fairy-tale, the promotor of the altered alterity is the Destiny, through its avatar, the hero that saves the virgin, standing in the way of the completion of the raping ritual. The Destiny exacerbates the crisis of the sacredness and the virgin, instead being sacrificed, becomes the sacrifice in the act of marriage. Her potency, instead being dispersed from the sacredness into the nature (materiality) created (in a profane way), will build the universe of the family, being consumed by giving birth to children (p. 69). The altered alterity must be put in connection to the act of “revolt”, identical to the sudden detachment from the customs or the cyclical manifestations of the sacred player, *zmeul*. If the Destiny provokes the altered alterity (the conflict between hero and *zmeu*), it is maintained in relation, as *coincidentia oppositorum*, by the magic sympathetism generated by the virgin on them.

Chapter two discusses all that seemed important to us in what we call the deconstruction and nominal construction of the Semite mythological imaginary. The chapter presents five subdivisions, the first two (II.1. *The name from “I am” to “let there be”* and II.2. *The Logos or the generating Name*) is an introductory structure aiming to explain the magical-religious and spatial-temporal (eonic) importance of the creation act in the name and by the creating word, offering a clear vision on the importance of change in significance, by the later modification, with a magical-punishing role

on the deiform nominal attributes, also part of the second chapter in our presentation (II.3. *Shamash*; II.4. *Samael*, “*the poison*” of creation; II.5. *Smăul*).

All that is or intends to be as being must be in relation with another existence or creation, a reason to have a name, in order to be differentiated. It is in the same time the reason for which the name determines the existence only in relation of self-determination with the created world (II.1), and the reverse, in relation with the primary existence (p. 74). In the Semite creation, the names of the deities are related to the created existence, even if they are gods of the sky or of the primordial abyss or gods of the previous inferno. Hence, we propose the concept of creation as “mirror” or “script” of the divine Name (II.1.1). When written, the name “coagulates: to become a seal of the expressed truth. Once revealed in the divine speaking, the name not only “coagulates” the materiality or brings the non-existing aspects in creation, but also unites later the one hearing/ reading the name to the one speaking it. The creating names bring the magical sympathetism necessary to the communication between the named (created) things and the first zoomorphic representations, the drawn name. “Taken” from the nature, the script of the name, identical to the contour of the animal, will receive practical use in the magic of hunting and also in its “extension” – the punishing magic (II.1.2). The last one will be inspired by the first, since the act of hitting the drawing/ the name will be used for private aims. The script of the victim’s name will be hit (presenting the disease as consequence) or, more serious, erased (causing the death). In the monotheist religions, the name of the sinners are not written in the *Book of Life*, while in other religions the divine protections is assured from the days of this life, because the name of the god is painted or worn on the body as charm (pp. 78-79).

The world of the magic proved that it is not enough for the world to be created by the pronunciation of the divine names, if the created life does not acknowledge the name rationally, ensuring the protection. This is our reason to discuss *the possession of the sacredness as symbiosis of the divine name with the soul of the man* (II.1.3). Protection is the consequence of the disorder manifested on the divine names and, implicitly, on the materiality brought to existence. Thus, the maintenance of the being is achieved through the insertion of the divine names (a superior stage of the tattoos) in the personal names, ensuring a “protecting shell”, this time starting from the interior to the exterior of the human being (p. 79), since the death can mean the passage of the essence into nothingness.

We meet in the Romanian fairy-tales, quite often, the name of the hero but never the name of *zmeu*. The message is that the essence of the hero (his soul) survives the challenges/ death, but *zmeu* dies because it has no essence. On the other hand, what is not named, even if it exists, is a creature of the “chaos”, subject to ordination only because it acted in the created world. Thus, as *coincidentia*

oppositorum, the chaos becomes sacred, a sacrality forced to feed itself from the potency of the nature. It seems that, before becoming gods of the nothingness, some gods had names of powerful creatures. This is our reason for which we introduce the idea of *maiming the god* by the theft of *the name of the conquered one* (II.1.4). The victories of the gods were numbered among the successes of the military campaigns, when the pantheon of the conquered one was destroyed through assimilation, forgetting or demonization of the attributes remained in the constitution of a god once considered a creator. The stripped gods started later the revolt for “conquering the sky”, undermining the confiscated powers, explaining in one acceptance the origins of the gods of the infertility (pp. 81-82) or of the *maimed gods* (crippled, blind, etc.). The deities are transferred from the public cult in a private sectarian cult, often associated to the demonic sacredness (pp. 83-84).

Returning to the creating value of the name, we affirmed that the entire construction of the name starts from the first point, the centre or the name affirmed in the formula “let there be”. It is eloquent for this aspect the Bogomilic myth of creation (II.1.5, pp. 85-86), where in the name of Fârtatul appears the first terrestrial form, the hole, because Nefârtatul is the one taking the potency from the mud of the abyss. They develop as creation when touching the name (the surface of the water) and the earth becomes the centre. In the same way, the Destiny creates a new form of cult using the saving Hero, re-writing the notion of centre around the family and the profane space. Everything is happening in the discrete power of *logos*, also a generating name (II.2). Regarding this aspect of magical-religious metaphysics, we propose as research two themes: why the divine verb solidifies the materiality (II.2.1) and is possible for this verb to be impropriated and, if possible, in which degree can we discuss a nominal malleability (II.2.2)?

If the things are created by the power of the logos-name, the fairy-tale develops this idea in the magical act, meaning that, by knowing the real name of the things, the fairy-tale player calls them and uses them by his will. Everything happens because the logos is solidified as things (II.2.1), an alchemical construction (p. 88) that, using the law of the sympathetism, will be in relation with the speaking of the one who knows “to speak” (has the knowledge). The magical imaginary recognizes the sympathetism logos (divine/ creator) – word (human/ evoking). The wizard is only a knowing “hacker” and a manipulator of the laws of creation in its both senses, sacred and profane. Ontologically, the things appears by *pronouncing* divine names, but the transformation of the *things* (from simple) in *objects* (to composed) represents the process of scientific desecration, where the magical properties of the things are destined to satisfy the profane needs (II.2.2 – pp. 89-90), being in the same time a loss of the primary values, a reason for the monks to renounce to the accumulation of objects. In fairy-tales, the hero prefers the magical things, but never abuses their properties, in the detriment of the desire for richness. The half of kingdom promised by the father of the princess will

be received only after returning in the profane world, a sign of the consistent importance of the objects, the things with creating potency.

Once established the relation between the names of power and the created world, we approached in the second chapter the symbolic dimensions of the sacred nominal roots *SM*, starting from the Semite name Shamash (II.3). We started with the analysis of the religious history of the name (II.3.1) and continued with the research of the Semite origins of the fairy-tale name of *Zmeu* (p. 91): Shamash (SMs) – Samael (SMel) – S(z)meu (SMeu). The history known as creating god of the world starts for Shamash in Larsa, a wealthy citadel in the South of Babylon, entering in conflict with its capital during the maximum political and military ascension, animated by the young god Marduk (II.3.1). The conflict between the two gods is initiated after the stubbornness of Hammurabi, the first rule-maker of Babylon, in renouncing to Shamash and favouring Marduk (II.3.2). After the death of Nabuccodonosor, the conflicts between the two sacerdotal classes evolved, a tense context when the Jews will be taken prisoners and held captive in Babylon (p. 94). This section of the research discusses the meeting of the Judaism with the Assyrian-Babylonian demonology, the crisis and the accommodation period of the monotheism to the extreme pressure of the Babylonian polytheism (pp. 95-96), inevitably generating syncretism inside the captive faith of monotheism (II.3.3). The conflict Marduk-Shamash offers the occasion for the monotheism to affirm its sense of real belief in a unique God, the creator character of Shamash being possible to be seen as blasphemy to the divine potency. There are no evidences on Marduk, because the most influent Jews were living in Babylon. The revenge on the Semite polytheism was complete in the demonization of Shamash through Samael, a situation that was not strange to the Jewish apologetic mentality (pp. 97-98). Subordinated as demon and lacking its creating attributes, Shamash, the Sun god, transformed in Samael, also named “the poison of God”, keeping the destructive aspect of the merciless heat of the star: the afternoon sun (the demon for the following monks) or Nergal (pp. 100-101), the destructive variant of Shamash. For the folkloric Jewish demonology, Shamash was nobody else than Samael, now “discovered” (II.3.4) in front of the power of YHWH. The root of the name (*SM*) is revealing for this aspect. By affirming the creating divinity, Samael is useful for the later speculations of the Jewish-Gnostic demonology, facilitating the process of demonization of the cosmos. But, before arriving to that point, the Jewish demonology had to clarify the relation between Satan and Samael, unable to resolve the dilemmas of the power (pp. 99-101). If Satan remains a personal theologian of the divine powers, Samael (*the poison of the creation* – II.4) is involved actively in the history of the national angels, continuing his career as an enemy of Israel (II.4.1), similar to Lilith and Asmodeu (p. 102), beyond the Babylonian imprisonment, in Judeo-Christianity, this time as angel of Edom (Rome – p. 103). As angel of the nations (Roman Empire), Samael has duties but also rights in front of YHWH. Disregarding the fact

that the immersion and the ascension, in front of the tutelary gods, are concepts taken from the Assyrian-Babylonian polytheist religions, the Judaism will overtake selectively only the beings considered to be decayed, as Lilith or Asmodeu and Samael, a Shamash “striped” from his attributes, using all these names for the apologetic affirmation of the ultimate truth: the absolute power of the monotheist theology “embodied” in the guiding presence of YHWH (II.4.2). This is the reason for which not Satan, but Samael will be for the Jewish-Gnostics the real enemy of God, at least in this world.

The problem of the gnostic creation resides in the lack of consistency in creation *in the name of the real creator* (II.4.3). As *Prince of the World*, the ignorant Samael is the expression of the nihilism impossible to convert because it lives in the permanent illusion of his own creation and imagination (p. 107). We are talking about a *demonological imaginary* born from the image projected as creation of one’s own insanity, because the truth is known. Insanity functions as a veil with a transparency that seems to present the truth, but lies because it does not know the truth. This “construction” will serve as part in the mechanism of the fall of the first parents (p. 110). Tempting Sophia, Samael becomes, in Gnosticism, the hylic man, projecting his self as god: “the sun of this world” (pp. 108-109). All his constructions have no individual personality, but a “legion” type personality (II.4.4). His main aim is *to consume the essence* or the *life* (soul) caught in the illusion of the joy of the body, hence the confusion between Samael and YHWH (p. 111).

The historical context creates the premises for the dissemination of the Gnostic ideas and makes possible the later appearance of Smău (II.5). We depict three favourable *moments* for the formation and the insertion of *zmeu* in the Romanian folkloric tradition. A first “wave” is the Gnostic one, specific to the Alexandrine dualism (II.5.1), exceeding the model of the angel Samael and developing the model of the creator Demiurge (Ialdabaoth). The Gnostic experience of Abraxas type was brought in Dacia by Legion V Macedonica (pp. 113-115), and also by Legion XIII Gemina (p. 115), an archaeological discovery showing the presence of the elements of the Jewish-Gnostic magic practice (pp. 115-118). The royal blazonry of the lion-sun of the Legion XIII could be a reference to the Lion Abrasax (Samael, the Archon of Rome), but also to Mithra, or to both of them, because the symbol represents the *Unconquered Sun* (p. 118). There are no proofs of Christians as members in the two legions and no iconic representations of Christian art until after the 3rd century. It is almost sure the fact that the Gnostic workshops end their activity after the second half of the 3rd century (p. 119). This does not mean the disappearance of the Gnosticism, rather its syncretic assimilation in the folkloric beliefs, a dimension of the popular ecumenism making possible the acceptance of the other two “stages” of our analysis. A second favourable moment for the mentioned construct is offered by *heresy*, a product mainly belonging to the Christian-Gnostic

syncretism.(II.5.2), considered a *forerunning* phenomenon for Christianity (p. 120). Heresy will exceed the popularity of the Gnostic dualism. For Romanians, Macedonia Was the source of the most anti-Trinitarian movement, among which is well-known the Arianism. Between the 4th and the 5th centuries, the disputes against the heresy reach the South of Danube. Macedonia, Serbia and Bulgaria form a region where the excommunicated heretics are united in an anti-Christian “country” (pp. 121-122). Practically, the rural world is deprived by the dogmatic Christianity and the pagan celebrations were accepted by the Church, a phenomenon that was not met in the central areas of the Imperium. Thus, next to names of celebrations, we maintained names of demonical creatures as *drac* or *zmeu*, a proof for the syncretic assimilation of the old demiurgic creator (p. 123). In addition, all the archaeological discoveries show the presence of the dualism in Dacia until the end of the 3rd century. After the victory of the Christianity against Arianism and Semi-Arianism, sometime after the first half of the 4th century, we are in the consistent presence of the Christianity in the north of Danube. The “transition” period favours the assimilation of all the foreign elements in what we can consider to be symbiotically formulas in the indigenous beliefs, creating a predisposition for malleable directing structures, e.g. the future fairy-tale directing (pp. 124-125).

Before passing to the presentation of the last “gnostic wave”, we consider important to highlight an aspect we never met considered from this perspective, as favouring environment for the formation of the future fairy-tale directing. For this reason, we considered as real the appearance of Smău from the transcript of the mythical Shamash (II.5.3), similar to the way in which, more than a thousand years before, Shamash was demonological reinterpreted, according to the Jewish monotheism, as Samael. Practically, in Dacia, between the 4th and the 10th century, we find a void of religious authority. The presence of the Christianity is not enough to stop a spiritual movement that is pagan in its indigenous essence, and later gnostic and heretic in its exterior influences. There are no centres for the theological education of the priests and their Christianity can be considered symbolical in this aspect. If there would be sufficient proofs, the Christianity practiced by them could be judges as part of the present dogma. A series of gnostic symbols are assimilated by the locals (pp. 126-127). In this context of free interpretation, after the 4th century, Samael is accepted in the absence of the gnostic presence as Smeu/ Zmeu, maintaining, depending on the reading, the symbolic root SM from Samael in S(ZM), Smeu. The similarity of the symbolic root cannot be a “phonetic accident” (pp. 127-128), because it is also met in the name of the giant, later demon, Asmodeu (aSModai), the son of Samael, presented by the apocryphal *Tobit*, well-known on our territories.

The second gnostic wave was marked on the Romanian territories by the dualism of the Bogumilism (II.5.4). Between the 12th and the 14th centuries, waves of heretics are forced to pass the Danube, injecting massively their oral creations in the Romanian folkloric beliefs (pp. 129-130),

marking fundamentally the spiritual “geography”, even the Christianity was stable in 10th and 11th centuries. Moreover, the void of Christian influence for five centuries, between the Aurelian retreat and the 14th century must be associated with the political and state formation of the voivodships, weak imitations of the feudal states from the Western Europe. The leaders of these systems become almost fantastic characters in a moral utopian tale fed by the court Christianity, the leader posing in a fairy-tale protector and guarantor of everyone’s well-being (pp. 131-132). Practically, the social “environment” of the fairy-tale has its beginnings during this period. Our territories are safe from the hysterical witch-hunting, despite the fact that evil women appear in all our folkloric fairy-tales. They are not captured, judged and punished; instead they die fighting the hero, a sign that there is no image of the “good” witch inside a locality, but the image of a witch *living in the nature*, in relation with the nature, even if not inside the sacredness, but in its vicinity. Thus, we may propose the idea of the existence of old cults of fertility and, implicitly, the impossibility to relate them as obedient to the ignorant profane (pp. 133-134), who is to them a piece of “consumption good” (Cf. Chapter IV, where we propose the recovery of such ritual).

Because the Bogumilism is a spirituality manifested in the permanence of the orality, dualist initial scenarios attract and harmonise by reformation various mythemes, some taken from local mythologies foreign to the gnostic conceptions, as the hedgehog and the bee, which survive, due to the malleability of the popular imaginary, in time and to the Christianity that became more and more systematically in its cult manifestation. The effects of the Bogumilism on our territories should not be reduced to the introduction of some new teachings. They must be rather seen as an opening to the freedom to transfer freely deities, demons, totemic creatures, elementals (vâlve) or hybrids in directing creation imagined or inspired by apocryphal works (as *Enoch – the myth of the giants, Incubus and Succubus* or *Tobit – the myth of the incubus demon, of the “raped” virgin and of the saving hero/exorcist*– p. 136). There is no other period more prolific for the attributive constructions around the local beings or for the beings from elsewhere, thus we conclude that these are the times for the formation of the image of zmeul, a spirit of the air (*zburătorul*), an incubus (p. 138) and, implicitly, an enemy of the man. Finally, starting with the 17th century, Dimitrie Cantemir mentions the crystallised myth of Flyer (p. 137), a proof that the presence of zmeu was recognised in the popular demonology. We will try as follows to understand the manner in which its presence will be integrated in the *local mythology*, mainly in the folklore fairy-tale with *zmeu* characters raping virgins. We are referring to a “recovery” of Samael as Zmeu, impossible to reconstruct in a fairy-tale directing without a ritualist local fundament, an aspect discussed in the last chapter of our research.

We take in consideration the directing model creating fairy-tales, identified in the biblical apocryphal text of the *Book of Tobit* (Chapter III). The work, an apocryphal text for the Jewish canon,

is born in the Babylonian exile, as effect of compiling the Semite demonology and angelology (III.1), a mixture where the dualist equilibrium of forces, present in avatars (Asmodeu vs. Rafael), is maintained by the divine will, identical to Destiny. Through characters and actions (III.1.1), the book *Tobit* will become a directing model for the fairy-tales with *zmeu* raping virgins. From the powerful players of the spiritual magic to the daemons or the familiars of the zoo-magic (III.1.2), real *gnostic masters* (pp. 145-14), the apocryphal text offers the exorcising *method* of the evil from the created profane world (pp. 146-148). The demon Asmodeu becomes a behavioural model for the *zmeu* from the Romanian fairy-tale (III.1.3). it is perceived by the folkloric demonological imaginary as a larva being, attached by the creating potency of the human sexuality. It is interesting the appearance of the “insane virgin”, Sarra, accused to taint the habitual space of the family. The death of the seven men before the night of the wedding does not highlight only the violence of the demon, but also the “agreement” of Sarra to evil, by admitting her own guilt (pp. 150-151), that of being mesmerised by the presence of Asmodeu. The admittance of the guilt is the way to eliminate the sin. She is the prototype of the “crazy virgins”, from the fairy-tales, who want to live in community but detached from the social and religious habits. Her relations with Asmodeu forces her to a blind obedience to the laws of the sacredness and, because the human being cannot live concomitantly between the sacred and the profane, the feeling of futility comes after the feeling of abandonment, and the *hope* for salvation is replaced by the idea of suicide.

Sarra does not represent the disorder or the lack of equilibrium, and she is not futile, as long as she attracts the attention of the sacredness. Beyond her statute of *virgin prostitute*, she is a construction of *coincidentia oppositorum*, important to Asmodeu, the player of the sacredness, because she is the embodiment in potency of the *disorder of the beginnings* (III.1.4), sleeping forces capable to rejuvenate not only the profane (their depositor), but also the sacredness. We find here the motif of the rite that we are trying to recover in the last chapter. Biblically, if Eve (“the mother of all living”) discovers through her name (Hebr. EVE = “life”) the presence of all this potency captured in materiality and the relation with the snake derails them, Sarra, at her turn, does nothing more than to confirm that, for the Semite demonology, the women, at least those who are *not obedient*, are “predisposed” to some incestuous relations to players of the sacredness attracted through the impossibility to control their impulses (pp. 155-156). To understand the motif of the demonical sexuality, we reviewed partially the apocryphal history of the demon Asmodeu (III.1.5), an evil spirit, a “giant” of his historical origins (a *hybrid* being) drawn by the divine justice in the water of the flood, which did nothing else than liberating its body. Frustrated that he can no longer fulfil his bodily desires, Asmodeu becomes an incubus (pp. 157-159). The magic-religious construct of “*zmeu*”

borrowed the hunger of the god, but not his history, since the Romanian belief considers that giants and *Zmeu* characters are separated beings, in fact, the same existence in two different historical stages.

What coagulates all these elements in a fairy-tale directing, a construct entirely formed from mitogens, is the field of the folkloric imaginary, manifested through *the creating logos of the folkloric orality* (III.2). beyond the exterior influences, Judeo-Gnostic or heretical, we are in the presence of a clear process of *over-script* of the history of all these characters, a fact that leads to the appearance of the re-writing of the destiny by bringing them together as an emulated whole as fairy-tale directing, in the book *Tobit*, everything in the historical and religious context of the mentioned centuries (2nd-14th), when the freedom of expression of the sacral imaginary is complete through the manifestation of the syncretism, with no opposition to it. This is specific to the Romanian territories, because in the rest of the Christian world, starting with the 4th century, the sexuality (III.3) is religiously polarised between theology (virtue) and demonology (sin). To clear this fact, a natural consequence of the mythical visions on everything involving sex, we started from the idea that the Christian religion produced the feeling of spiritual migrationism (III.3.1) by “infesting” the desert with another type of spirituality, the Christian spirituality. Once “inhabiting” the heart of the desert, the monks start to fight the spirits residing in the desert, those previously banished from the profane. (III.3.2) Practically, they follow at least a part of these demons in the desert and banish them again into the profane world. The explosion of the sin in the profane is a result of the return of the spirits in a world that, becoming Christian, belonged to them less and less. The old practices were called sins by Christianity disregarding the intention. For the folkloric fairy-tale, the reflection of all these fights is limited to the act of saving the sexuality (“pagan”) in the fairy-tale directing (III.3.3), because Christianity considers all the superstitions and beliefs preserved here as fabrications. The ascendance of the sin provokes millennial hysteria later repressed in the madness of hunting witches and heretics, etc. The constant demonization of sexuality, the main manifestation of sin, gives birth to a powerful offensive against it (III.3.4), from the violent preaching to the Spanish Inquisition in the 11th century (p. 168), based mainly on the theological demonology of St. Augustine, according to whom succubus (the feminine demons) and incubus (the masculine demons) are *officially* present (pp. 168-169).

The book *Tobit* becomes a directing model for the popular imaginary, because it is accepted as canon text in both monotheist systems. The work is known in our territories and the constructions of the popular magic-religious imaginary extract from here directing ideas, thus the fairy-tale mitogens are influenced by the behavioural models of the force characters (III.4). The transformation of the biblical tale in fairy-tale is a syncretic process (III.4.1), a credible result tolerated by the Christian monotheism. We refer to a malleability specific only to syncretism, imposed exclusively through the constant liberation of the mitogens through the “mythical strata”, saved as fairy-tale structure in the

rural Christian space of cult, impossible to be dogmatically controlled nowadays (pp. 170-171). This is the reason for which we define the fairy-tale imaginary as a local spiritual act of re-writing and continuous adaptation to the permanence of the exterior sacral factors (the christening in stages, geographically and dogmatically). Thus, we will pass from periodisation to the fairy-tale construction (III. 4.2), beyond the already mentioned Jewish-Gnostic-Christian specificities, because the fairy-tale needs to survive beyond the myth in the Christian times, through the act of the tale opened to the ideal symbiosis in an eternal (re)telling. As a start, we recognised the six mitogens borrowed for the construction of various directing types as well of the “secondary heroes” or of the four stages in the construction of the folkloric fairy-tale we are discussing (p. 173). Such “ecumenical” symbiosis projects the fairy-tales between non-canon and the tolerance of Christianity (III.4.3). Born from an apocryphal text, the fairy-tale with *zmeu* raping virgins does not seem to have suffered, in our opinion, the strike of the canonical decisions, even the Church is indirectly striking him through a tough attitude related to superstitions. From a dogmatically point of view, in the fairy-tale, the good not only beats the evil, it beats him for eternity. Liturgically, love is proved through self-sacrifice. The virgin becomes a married woman and it is not used on the altars of the pagans. Such a hero does not die and receives the reward of eternity near the dear people (p. 174). As addition to the recovery of the “lost sheep”, the man is the only one capable to correct the mistake of the woman. These are the reasons for the toleration of the fairy-tale in the Romanian Christian environment. The problem of the superstition I discussed in the end of the chapter (III.4.4), in relation to the integrating fairy-tales and to the disapproving Christianity. We are referring to the religious tolerance of the Christianity, put in relation with the diplomacy of the fairy-tale and its oral permanence, away from its written preservation, a reason for endless apologetic debates. The renunciation to the direct transmission of the ancient history of the mitogens accepted in the fairy-tale direction makes the fairy-tale to be perceived as an unserious narration, permanently changing the included myths. Christianity will renounce to the tough attitude projected on heresies and the fairy-tale superstition is seen as teaching, not entirely wrong, of the local population, intending the common moral good. The fairy-tale takes part of the moral preventive role of the Christian teachings, which are stranger to the cultural local fund. In fact, beyond the forced Christian interpretations, the fairy-tale transmits the history of a matriarchal cult, whose sad history hides behind all the mitogens of the religions and of the mentioned directing.

The last chapter (IV) is dedicated to the recovery of a possible history, but, more than this, to the recovery of a ritual, the supreme expression of alterity in the pre-Roman world. To understand the functional structure of this ritual, we used our knowledge related to alterity, meaning the recovery of the myth from the fight of the antagonist players, positioned between desire and the possibility of

possession (IV.1). As starting point for the recovery, we mention that the rape of the virgin starts a rite of nature that intends the capture of her vital forces (EVE – life), with the aim to rejuvenate the world that grows old at the end of each cycle/year (p. 184). This life “energy” is found in “sacrifice”, a single virgin capable to rejuvenate the world together with the goddess. The virgin receives at her birth the potency that germinates the body before puberty (a reason for some populations to develop the rite of the sexual initiation), chosen as function of the sacrifice (IV.1.1), a potency that, once reached, disturbs her existence. When “the fruit is ripen”, the virgin has the maximum potency, manifested somewhere to the limit of “madness” (pp. 185-186), a “possession” from which she can be “liberated” only through rite (“exorcism”). The uncontrolled expansion of this vitality from the profane into sacredness produces, according to the law of the magic sympathetism, the call and the connection with the magic player, *zmeu*/ flyer, the only one fully capable to understand the process that must be reintegrated in the rite in order not to be lost in the profane. Not only he, but the entire nature, has advantages in the potency liberated in a “controlled” (ritualist) manner from the virgin. The virgin is the chosen one, without knowing it.

On the other hand, the saving hero feels the reverse. In the fairy-tale, the desire to act is affirmed through expressions as “to try my luck”, abandoning himself as avatar in the “hands” (protection) of the Destiny (pp. 187-188). If the virgin is born with the potency of life, the hero receives the “gift of choosing”, because the Destiny knows that *zmeu* characters are periodically raping virgins. The “gift” disappears after saving the virgin, while her potency does not disappear. They will live happily ever after. The happiness means the consummation of the sexual act and the birth of children. The halo of the hero can be interpreted as messianic only when the idea of recovery finds no other connection excepting the reductive connection with the Christianity. The chosen man will not succeed without the “passive” involvement of the magic players (IV.1.2), entities of the sacredness obedient to the Destiny (p. 189). They will never involve directly in the fight between the young man and *zmeu* and, quite often, their positive response, in acts, appears only after the hero hunts them or saves their life. The contact and the relation with these elemental beings of the natures makes them, at least for a time, *totemic* (p. 190); the relation with them is part of an animist cult developed according to the spiritual “eco-system” of each one. The living presence of the amulets (parts from the body of some of them) only indicates the strong belief of the indigenous populations in the support received from nature through *valve*, as long a proper respect is manifested. The elementals transmit gnosis of the nature to those who do not take advantage of the “accident” (the hero does not kill and do not eat the fish, does not shoot the vulture, the wolf, etc.). It is a test from the Destiny that verifies the ethical norms of the hero in the sacred space (p. 191). The hero is rewarded for showing “mercy”. We have no knowledge about failures in tests, a sign that the test is the modality used by Destiny to put the players in relation

(friendship or contract) another category of magic players is represented by the “animated” objects and weapons (pp. 192-193). If the profane is the “storage” of the sacredness, the sacredness is the energy that models after its will the unlimited potency (the malleability) of the materiality. This is why an apple can contain a palace, a nut can contain objects, a horn can set a table, and the mace or the arrow never miss the target. The *word*, the precise magical language, and not the small talk (p. 195), is the only one controlling these processes, which are rare or unimaginable in the profane world. The three main characters of the fairy-tale are important depending on the time when they find their role in the fairy-tale directing. Thus, the “victim” is the virgin, the “schemer” is *zmeu* and the “peace-maker” is the saving hero (IV.1.3). the first and the last characters belong to the profane world only in the degree their existence started in the profane world. Both are touched by various characteristics of the sacredness, creating the necessary compatibility to enter in the relation, an antagonistic relation, with the lonely *zmeu*, an attentive observer of our world. He is not looking only for the perfect sacrifice, but also for the perfect wife (p. 197), as well as, many times, we find the mortals as husbands for fairies or mothers of *zmeu*. The “unnatural” aspect does not reside in the Romanian folkloric imaginary in the “extra-mundane” relations. We must search for it in a different place: in the old rite of the nature, which was exclusively feminine, that will receive the opposition of the Destiny, through the masculine avatar, who is the “peace-maker”, the saving hero (pp. 198-199). Peace can be imposed not only by the one managing to manipulate the best the laws of the both worlds. We all know who he is.

The problem of alterity (IV.2) develops depending on the way in which the characters of the fairy-tales are “predisposed” as directing. In other words, because it is transmitted orally, the fairy-tale will be exposed to the permanence of the directing modifications and this is why the fairy-tale characters can nuance through their attributes various types of interactions, revealing in the same time as tale forms of the indigenous magic imaginary. The essential role belongs to the narrator, the keeper of the local magic gnosis, since the story has to find landmarks in the spiritual life of the locality, doubled by the capacity of transforming in imagination the knowledge in fairy-tale directing. This explains partially the difficulty of reconstructing the original myth of *zmeu* raping virgins, because the original attributes of god Shamash were lost long before arriving on our territories (pp. 201-202). Still, the gnostic vector, Samael, will be “adopted” as foreign god in our spirituality, due to his insatiability for materiality (pp. 202-203). There is no other character to replace him so the mad Samael (“the poison of God”) becomes the sociopath *zmeu* or the “drool of the devil” (IV.2.1), as long his relation with the world is much more intimate than in the gnostic vision. If Samael is the vector of the ontological disequilibrium (p. 204), *zmeu* receives in the fairy-tale an existential meaning by the attempt of recovery, therefore the rape is the preliminary gesture of the rite, putting

pressure on the virgin, the keeper of vital forces not only for the profane, but also for the sacred space (pp. 204-205). The process will be *stopped* brutally only by the presence of the hero, with the role of “Satan” to the rite. Thus, we see the relation *me* (virgin) – *you* (zmeu) – *that* (hero) as a description of the circularity of the Destiny beyond the ritualist space (IV.2.2). *Zmeu* is central for this vision, he is the order of the “chaos”, menacing to master the “me” (pp. 210-211) or the virgin-soul (p. 208), the chosen one of *zmeu* (p. 211), while the presence of the hero, the chosen of the Destiny, stops the “therapeutically” sense of the rite. The fight between the players is not between good and evil, but between profane and sacred (p. 209). The fairy-tale is consequently presenting the advantage of not being classified by Christianity as reminiscence of the gnostic systems. The hero is the only “artificial” character of the fairy-tale, compared to the virgin that can exist no matter her spiritual state and independent of the presence of *zmeu* or of the hero. *Zmeu* has existed long before the birth of the virgin. Because he is an “object” (avatar) of Destiny, the hero has success (mechanically) in all his acts. It is the only way to explain the victory against *zmeu*, disregarding the oppositions impossible to overcome (pp. 211-212). Transforming *zmeu* in nothingness, the hero will liberate the soul of the virgin by the presence of the sacredness, taking advantage by the success of the rite (p. 212). It is an explanation for the happiness next to the virgin until the end of their days (IV.2.3), in a temporality to the limit between profane and sacredness (pp. 213-214).

In the fairy-tale with *zmeu* raping virgins, the alterity functions not only because there is one of the effects of the magic sympathetism (IV.2.4) simply translated through the notion of “necessity”. In general, it appears only as effect of the journey from sacred to profane and the reverse (p. 215). It is not the case of *zmeu*, when indicating a rite (IV.3) whose history we tried to identify not only in mythemes but mostly in the fairy-tale directing. Leaving aside the apocryphal of *Tobit*, the fairy-tale we are interested in speaks of the dissolution of a ritual of the nature, due to the revolt of the profane active inside the saving hero (pp. 216-217), expected by *zmeu*. *The death of a ritual* (IV.3.1) is the concluding direction in which our research goes. Thus, after showing that the fairy-tale is a coagulant association of several mitogens around a (fairy-tale) religion, we will discuss further the reason why this type of fairy-tale survived beyond the proven diplomacy of the orality that exposed pagan elements in a Christian imaginary. Raping, seclusion and the “consummation” of the sacrifice are not sufficient to speak of a ritual and neither is the liberation performed by the hero. The death of *zmeu* appears as a consequence of the divine justice, in spite the fact that there is other reason for these aspects. Because the generating reason of the intrigue is the insatiable *desire* of *zmeu*, we must not reduce not to a simple urge. If the explosive sexuality of the virgin is provoked by the *abyssal* potency existing from the birth and captive in materiality, then the desire exceed the spectre of sexuality. We give our attention to the mother of *zmeu*, a deity of nature that does not appear in the creating myths

of Samael. She is the supreme promoter of the nature rituals and the main vector that has advantages in the liberated potency. The mother of *zmeu* is the prototype of the God-Mother, so ancient in the space of the Balkans (pp. 218-219), to be found around the winter solstice under the form of an old goddess, wanting the rejuvenation. She is not allowed to enter the profane world and sends her magic player, the *zmeu*. On the 22nd of September (the autumn equinox), the virgin is raped (p. 220). An entire astral structure, though uncomplicated, is opened to analysis. The effect of the sacrifice does not animate only the goddess, but also the functions of the sacred and of the profane (p. 221).

The entire rite is described as an alchemical process where the virgin imprisoned in the “alchemical recipient” (castle), gradually loses her will, with the aim of “letting go freely” the received potency (p. 222). The presence of the hero is possible only in the moments when the virgin remains alone, while the mother of *zmeu* backs away fearing the indisposition of her son, returning from hunting. Practically, the hero avoids meeting the goddess, the equivalent of the destiny for the sacredness, where any fair-play fight will only bring his death. But the situation is not similar to meeting the *zmeu*. The heroic transformation is possible only by avoiding the goddess. The hero finds the virgin in the penultimate stage of the rite, *acceptio*, a reason for her to accept the hero as “saviour” (p. 225). Due to the accumulated gnosis, synonymous to magic, the hero dislocates the ritualist sense, raping the virgin for *him* (p. 227), thus he becomes an *opportunist*, a *trickster* in the face of the sacredness (p. 226). The killing of the magic player (*zmeul*) and of the goddess (the mother of *zmeu*) is a consequence of the disorder the profane hero introduces in their world. Following the fugitives, because the magic science of the hero, who splits the sacred space, is not familiar to her, the goddess does not manage to stop them and to exit the eonic space of the inter-sacral conflicts. In conclusion, we have two types of knowledge specific to the two types of existence (IV.3). We highlight the existence of a religiosity of the profane in opposition to the sacrophagous spirituality, more precisely a magic religiosity – scientific – showing an action developed through knowledge, constructed as offensive against the sacred spirituality lacking a defensive side until that moment. The consequence is the salvation of the virgin by the saving hero, the “beneficiary” of all the advantages of a good woman, “prepared” by the sacred ritual. For the profane, humility is the last stage, sufficient for this process. The fairy-tale with *zmeu* characters raping virgins tells the story of a cult in front of a religion.

Each chapter is followed by conclusions, while the general conclusions are present at the end of our thesis, followed by references, classified in six sections, including 379 scientific works.

KEY-WORDS: Imaginary, mythic genre, mythic analysis, folklore, fairy-tale related, demonology, Gnosticism, dualism, Christianity, Judaism, Shamash, Samael, Zmeul (Dragon), Asmodeu.

SELECTIVE REFERENCES

1. *Apologeți de limbă latină*. Colecția „Părinți și Scriitori Bisericești”, vol. 3. Traducere de pr. Nicolae Chițescu, Eliodor Constantinescu, Paul Papadopol și prof. David Popescu. București, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1981.

2. *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură*. Tipărită sub îndrumarea și cu purtarea de grijă a Prea Fericitului Părinte Teoctist, Patriarhul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, cu aprobarea Sfântului Sinod. București, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1988.
3. *Gândirea asiro-babiloniană în texte*. Studiu introductiv de Constantin Daniel. Traducere, notițe introductive și note de Athanasie Negoită. București, Editura Științifică, 1975.
4. *Gândirea feniciană în texte*. Studiu introductiv de Constantin Daniel. Traducere, notițe introductive și note de Athanasie Negoită. București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1979.
5. IAMBlichos, *Misteriile egiptenilor*. Traducere din limba greacă, studiu introductiv, note și comentarii de Tudor Dinu. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2003.
6. *Noul Testament*. Ediția a IV-a neschimbată. Tradus și adnotat de pr. dr. Emil Pascal. Paris, Éditions du Dialogues, Société D'Éditions Internationales, 1992.
7. *Scripta Aramaica*, vol. 1. Studiu introductiv, traduceri din limba aramaică, notițe introductive și note de Constantin Daniel. București, Editura Științifică și enciclopedică, 1980.
8. *Septuaginta*. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes editum Alfred Rahlfs. Duo volumina in uno, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
9. *Septuaginta*, vol. 3. Volum coordonat de Cristian Bădiliță, Francesca Băltăceanu, Monica Broșteanu. În colaborare cu pr. Ioan-Florin Florescu. Traducerea din greacă de Ștefania Fercedău și Francisca Băltăceanu. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2005.
10. *Zoharul. Cartea Splendorii*. Traducere și îngrijire ediție de Ilie Iliescu. București, Editura Herald, 2001.
11. PLATON, *Republica. Cărțile VI-X*, vol. 2. Ediție bilingvă. Traducere, comentarii și note de Andrei Cornea. București, Editura Teora, 1998.
12. PLOTIN, *Enneade I-II*. Ediție bilingvă. Traducere și comentarii de Vasile Rus, Liliana Peculea, Alexander Baumgarten, Gabriel Chindea. Introducere de Vasile Muscă. București. Editura IRI, 2003.
13. *Apocalipse apocrife ale Noului Testament*. Traducerea textelor și îngrijire ediție de Gheorghe Fedorovici, Monica Medeleanu. București, Editura Herald, 2007.
14. *Apocalipsa lui Pavel*. Ediție bilingvă. Traducere de Smaranda Bădiliță, Cristian Bădiliță. Introducere de Cristian Bădiliță. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1997.
15. *Cartea înțelepciunii lui Solomon*. Traducere și îngrijire ediție de Alexandru Anghel. București, Editura Herald, 2006.
16. *Două Apocalipse intertestamentare. Apocalipsa lui Ilie și Apocalipsa lui Avraam*. Studiu introductiv, traducere și note de pr. Remus Onișor. Alba-Iulia, Editura Reintregirea, 2005.

17. *Evangelhia după Toma*. Ediție bilingvă. Traducere din limba coptă, studiu introductiv și note de Gustavo-Adolfo Loria-Rivel. Ediție îngrijită de Ioan-Florin Florescu. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2003.
18. *Evangheii gnostice*. Traducere, studiu introductive și note de Anton Toth. București, Editura Herald, 2005.
19. *Faptele Apostolului Toma*. Cuvânt introductiv de Francis Burkitt. Traducere din limba greacă, note și comentarii de Simion Voicu. București, Editura Herald, 2009.
20. *Imnuri gnostice*. Traducere și cuvânt înainte de Simion Voicu. Comentarii și note de G. R. S. Mead. București, Editura Herald, 2010.
21. *Învățătura tainică a lui Iisus cel înviat către Toma Apostolul*. Traducere, cuvânt introductiv, note și postfață de Remus Rus. București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2002.
22. *Marele Duh Nevăzut. Evanghelii gnostice și creștine*. Traducere, studiu introductiv și note de Toth Anton. București, Editura Herald, 2001.
23. *Pistis Sophia. Cărțile I-II*. Traducere și îngrijire ediție de Alexandru Anghel. București, Editura Herald, 2007.
24. *Testamentul Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos*. Ediție bilingvă, latină-română. Traducere, note și studiu introductiv de pr. dr. Nicolae Achimescu. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1996.
25. *Testamentul lui Solomon. Regele, demonii și zidirea Templului*. Traducere inedită din greaca veche și studiu introductiv de Ștefan Colceriu. București, Editura Humanitas, 2010.
26. *Basmele românilor. Petre Ispirescu, vol. 1*. București, Editura Curtea Veche Publishing, 2010.
27. *Basmele românilor. Ion Pop-Reteganul, vol. 3*. București. Editura Curtea Veche Publishing, 2010.
28. *Basmele românilor. N. D. Popescu, Mihai Eminescu, vol. 5*. București, Editura Curtea Veche Publishing, 2010.
29. *Basmele românilor. Tudor Pamfîle și Constantin Rădulescu-Corin, vol. 9*. București, Editura Curtea Veche Publishing, 2010.
30. *Basmele Românilor. Petre Ispirescu, vol. 10*. București, Editura Curtea Veche Publishing, 2010.
31. BUȘE, Ionel. *O hermeneutică simbolică a basmului românesc*. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Alfa Press, 2000.
32. CĂLINESCU, George, *Estetica basmului*. București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1965.
33. COATU, Nicoleta, *Legende populare geografice*. Ediție îngrijită, cuvânt înainte, note, glosar și bibliografie de Nicoleta Coartu. București, Editura Sport-Turism, 1986.
34. COSMA, Dr. Aurel, *Studii de folklor românesc*, București, 1942.

35. COSMA jr., Aurel, *Mitologia românească. Cosmogonia. Originea omenirii. Lumea spiritelor*. Ediție îngrijită și prefață de I. Oprea. București, Editura Vestala, 2015.
36. Ion Creangă. Antologie, prefață, tabel cronologic și bibliografie de Constantin Ciopraga. București, Editura Eminescu, 1977.
37. *Legendele cosmosului*. Ediție critică și studiu introductiv de Tony Brill. București, Editura „Grai și suflet – Cultură națională”, 1994.
38. NIȘCOV, Viorica, *Cele trei rodii aurite. O istorie a basmelor românești în texte*. Prefață, antologie, bibliografie și traducere de Viorica Nișcov. București, Editura Minerva, 1979.
39. PAPAHAĞI, Tache, *Paralele folclorice*. Traduceri din poezia populară greacă. Introducere, note de folclor, filologie și etnografie urmărite comparativ. Ediția a doua, augmentată. București, Editura Minerva, 1970
40. *Poveștile lui Făt-Frumos. Basme fantastice*. Ediție îngrijită de Ioan Șerb, prefață de Valeriu Filimon. București, Editura Minerva, 1974.
41. SCHULLERUS, Adolf, *Tipologia basmelor românești și a variantelor lor*. Conform sistemului tipologiei basmului întocmit de Antti Aarne. Traducere din limba germană de Magda Petculescu. Ediție îngrijită și prefață de I. Oprea. București, Editura Saeculum I.O., 2006.
42. TEODORESCU, G. Dem, *Basme române*. Ediție îngrijită, prefață și rezumate în limba franceză de Stanca Fotino. București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968.
43. VORONCA, Elena Niculiță-, *Datinile și credințele poporului român adunate și așezate în ordine mitologică*, vol. I. Ediție îngrijită de Victor Durnea. Studiu introductiv de Lucian Berdan. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1998.
44. ADAM, Jean-Pierre, *Arheologia între adevăr și impostură*. București, Editura Meridiane, 1978.
45. BĂRBULESCU, Mihai, *Interferențe spirituale în Dacia Romană*. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1984.
46. BENNASSAR (coord.), Bartolomé, *Inchiziția spaniolă, secolele XV-XIX*. Traducere din limba franceză de Camelia Roman. Control științific și adnotări de Victor Kernbach. București, Editura Politică, 1983.
47. BLOCH, Yigal, *Judeans in Sippar and Susa during the First Century of the Babylonian Exile: Assimilation and Perseverance under Neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid Rule*, în „Journal of Ancient Near Eastern History”, nr. 1 (2)/ 2014.
48. DĂNILĂ, pr. Nicolae, *Materiale arheologice paleocreștine descoperite pe teritoriul Eparhiei Aradului*, în „Mitropolia Banatului”, anul XXXVII, nr. 3/ mai-iunie 1987.
49. GRAMATOPOL, Mihai, *Dacia Antiqua. Perspective de istoria artei și teoria culturii*. București, Editura Albatros, 1982.

50. *Inscripțiile dacice romane. Oltenia și Muntenia*, vol. II. Culese, traduse în românește, însoțite de comentarii și indici de Grigore Florescu și Constantin C. Petolescu. București, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1977.
51. IORGA, N., *Istoria românilor*, vol. I-2. București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1980.
52. KELLER, Werner, *Arheologia Vechiului și Noului Testament*. București, Editura Psychomassmedia, 1995.
53. KRAMER, S. N., *Istoria începe la Sumer*. Traducere de Cornel Sabin. București, Editura Științifică, 1962.
54. LHOTE, Henri, *Frescele din Tassili*. Traducere de Modest Morariu. București, Editura Meridiane, 1966.
55. LIPIN, L., A. Belov, *Cărțile de lut*. București, Editura Științifică, 1960.
56. MACREA, Mihai, *Viața în Dacia Romană*. București, Editura Științifică, 1969.
57. MOGA, Iulian, Alexey Belousov, Ștefan Teofil Grosu, *Zeul cel Preaînalt și frica de divinitate. Documente epigrafice din Europa și Anatolia*. Cuvânt înainte de Iulian Moga. Introducere de Alexey Belousov. Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2012.
58. NEGOIȚĂ, Athanasie, *Manuscrisele de la Marea Moartă*. București, Editura Științifică, 1993.
59. PAUL, MacKendrik, *Pietrele dacilor vorbesc*. Traducere de Horia Florian Popescu. București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1978.
60. PÂRVAN, Vasile, *Contribuții epigrafice la istoria creștinismului daco-roman*. București, 1911.
61. PÂRVAN, Vasile, *Dacia. Civilizațiile antice din țările carpato-danubiene*. București, Editura Științifică, 1972.
62. PÂRVAN, Vasile, *Getica*. București Editura Meridiane, 1982.
63. PROSTASE, D., *Problema continuității în Dacia în lumina arheologiei și numismaticii*. București, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1966.
64. SANIE, Silviu, *Classica et orientalia*, partea a IV-a, în „Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche și Arheologie”, (XXXVII), nr. 1. București, 1986.
65. SANIE, coord. Silviu dr., Dumitru Vitcu, *Studia et acta historiae iudaeorum romaniae*, vol. I. București, Editura Hasefer, 1996.
66. SLUSANSCHI, D., *Studii și cercetări de istorie veche și arheologie*, în „Studii și Cercetări de Istorie Veche și Arheologie”, (XXXII), nr. 4. București, 1981.
67. TODOR, D., *Arheologia română*. București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1970.

68. *Arhitectură și geografie sacră. Mircea Eliade și redescoperirea sacrului*. Filme realizate de Paul Barbăneagră. Traducere și adaptarea textelor de Mihaela Cristea, Marcel Tolcea. Cuvânt înainte și glosar de Marcel Tolcea. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2000.
69. BA SARRAB, pr. prof. dr. Mircea, *Ermeneutica biblică*. Oradea, Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române, 1997.
70. BRILLANT, Maurice, *Misteriile din Eleusis. Originea și natura lor. Ritualul de inițiere*. Traducere de Maria Genescu. București, Editura Herald, 2009.
71. BOULANGER, André, *Orfeu, legături între orfism și creștinism*. Traducere de Dan Stanciu. București, Editura Meta, 1992.
72. COHEN, A., *Talmudul*. Traducere din franceză de C. Litman. București, Editura Hasefer, 1999.
73. CONSTANTINESCU, Gabriel, *Marginalii la Talmud*. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1999.
74. CULIANU, Ioan Petru, *Călătorii în lumea de dincolo* Traducere de Gabriela Oișteanu și Andrei Oișteanu. Prefață și note de Andrei Oișteanu. Cuvânt înainte de Lawrence E. Sullivan. Traducere de Sorin Antohi. București, Editura Nemira, 1994.
75. CULIANU, Ioan Petru, *Mircea Eliade*. Ediție revăzută și augmentată. Traducere de Florin Chirițescu și Dan Petrescu. Cu o scrisoare de la Mircea Eliade și o postfață de Sorin Antohi. București, Editura Nemira, 1995.
76. CULIANU, Ioan Petru, *Experiențe ale extazului. Extaz, ascensiune și povestire vizionară din elenism până în Evul Mediu*. Prefață de Mircea Eliade. Traducere din limba franceză de Dan Petrescu. Cu o postfață de Eduard Iricinschi. București, Editura Nemira, 1998.
77. CULIANU, Ioan Petru, *Studii românești. Fantasmеle nihilismului. Secretul doctorului Eliade*, vol. I. Traducere de Corina Popescu și Daniel Petrescu. București, Editura Nemira, 2000.
78. CULIANU, Ioan Petru, *Studii românești. Soarele și Luna. Otrăvurile admirației*, vol. II. Traducere de Maria-Magdalena Anghelescu, Corina Popescu și Dan Petrescu. Notă asupra ediției de Tereza Culianu-Petrescu. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2009.
79. CUMONT, Franz, *Misteriile lui Mithra*. Traducere și îngrijire ediție de Alexandru Anghel. București, Editura Herald, 2007.
80. CUMONT, Franz, *Religiile orientale în păgânismul roman*. Traducere din limba franceză de George Scrima. București, Editura Herald, 2008.
81. DANCIU, Liliana, Danciu, Petru Adrian, *Les axes de la création et la naissance de l'imaginaire comme langage mythique*, în „Tric Trac: Journal of World Mythology and Folklore”, vol. 9, nr. 1/2016.
82. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, *Teologia Numelor Divine. Egiptul Antic*. Caransebeș, Editura Dalami Print, 2005.

83. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, *The hedgehog, between the possessive mother and the stepfather. Hermeneutical perspective upon the romanian mythological imaginary*, în „Journal of Romanian Literary Studies”, nr. 8/ 2016.
84. DANIELÉLOU, Alin, *Erotismul divinizat. Arhitectura și sculptura templului hindus*. Prefață de Jean-Louis Gabin. Traducere de Nicolae Constantinescu. București, Pro-Editura, 2003.
85. ELIADE, Mircea, *Încercarea labirintului*. Traducere și note de Doina Cornea. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1990.
86. ELIADE, Mircea, *Eseuri. Mituri eternei reînțarceri. Mituri, vise mistere*. Traducere de Maria Ivănescu, Cezar Ivănescu. București, Editura Științifică, 1991.
87. ELIADE, Mircea, *Istoria credințelor și ideilor religioase. De la epoca de piatră la Misterele din Eleusis*, vol. I. Ediția a II-a. Traducere și postfață de Cezar Baltag. București, Editura Științifică, 1992.
88. ELIADE, Mircea, *Istoria credințelor și ideilor religioase. De la Gautama Buddha până la triumful creștinismului*, vol. II. Traducere de Cezar Baltag. București, Editura Științifică, 1992.
89. ELIADE, Mircea, *Istoria credințelor și ideilor religioase. De la Mahomed la epoca Reformelor*, vol. III. Traducere de Cezar Baltag. București, Editura Științifică, 1992.
90. ELIADE, Mircea, *Meșterul Manole. Studii de etnologie și mitologie*. Ediție și note de Magda Ursache și Petru Ursache. Studiu introductiv de Petru Ursache. Iași, Editura Junimea, 1992.
91. ELIADE, Mircea, *Tratat de istoria religiilor*. Cu o prefață de Georges Dumézil și un Cuvânt înainte al autorului. Traducere de Mariana Noica. București, Editura Humanitas, 1992.
92. ELIADE, Mircea, *Nostalgia originilor. Istorie și semnificație în religie*. Traducere de Cezar Baltag. București, Editura Humanitas, 1994.
93. ELIADE, Mircea, *Imagini și simboluri. Eseu despre simbolismul magico-religios*. Prefață de Georges Dumézil. Traducere de Alexandra Beldescu. București, Editura Humanitas, 1994.
94. ELIADE, Mircea, *Fragmentarium*. București, Editura Humanitas, 1994.
95. ELIADE, Mircea, *De la Zalmoxis la Genghis-Han. Studii comparative despre religiile și folclorul Daciei și Europei Orientale*. Traducere de Maria Ivănescu, Cezar Ivănescu. București, Editura Humanitas, 1995.
96. ELIADE, Mircea, *Mefistofel și androginul*. Traducere de Alexandra Cuniță. București, Editura Humanitas, 1995.
97. ELIADE, Mircea, *Nașteri mistice*. Traducere de Mihaela Gheorghe Paraschivescu. București, Editura Humanitas, 1995.
98. ELIADE, Mircea, *Sacrul și profanul*. Traducere de Brîndușa Prelipceanu. București, Editura Humanitas, 1995.

99. ELIADE, Mircea, *Mituri, vise și mistere*. Traducere de Maria Ivănescu și Cezar Ivănescu. București, Editura Humanitas, 1998.
100. FOUCART, Paul, *Misterele de la Eleusis*. Traducere de Maria Mățel-Boatcă. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 2005.
101. HARL, Marguerite, Gilles Dorvian, Olivier Munnich, *Septuaginta. De la iudaismul elenistic la creștinismul vechi*. Traducere din limba franceză și îngrijire ediție de Mihai Valentin Vladimirescu. București, Editura Herald, 2007.
102. HAȘDEU, B. P., *Talmudul ca profesiune de credință a poporului israelit*. August Rothling, *Evreul după Talmud*. Traducere de Dorin Manea. Bacău, Editura Vicovia, 2013.
103. HESCHEL, Abraham Joshua, *Omul nu e singur. O filozofie a iudaismului*. Traducere de Viviane Prager. București, Editura Hasefer, 2001.
104. *Insight on the Scriptures*, vol. 2. Brooklyn, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society, 1988.
105. LIPOVANU, Ioana, *Un menhir. În umbra minus-cunoașterii*. București, Editura Herald, 2001.
106. LOICHIȚA, Vasile, *Numele biblice ale lui Dumnezeu și valoarea lor dogmatică*, în „Mitropolia Banatului”, anul VI, nr. 10-12, octombrie-decembrie, 1956.
107. LOICHIȚA, Vasile, *Numele lui Dumnezeu în Testamentul Nou*, în „Mitropolia Banatului”, anul VII, nr. 4-6, aprilie-iunie, 1957.
108. LOISY, Alfred, *Misteriile păgâne și misterul creștin*. Partea I. Traducere de Dan Stanciu. F.I., Editura Symposion, 1996.
109. MATIE, M. E., *Miturile Egiptului Antic*. București, Editura Științifică, 1958.
110. MEAD, G. R. S., *Orfeu. Teogonia și misterii orfice*. Traducere din limba engleză de Stela Ghețe. București, Editura Herald, 2012.
111. MICHEL, Aimé, *Metanoia. Fenomene fizice ale misticismului*. Traducere de Radu I. Petrescu. București, Editura Nemira, 1994.
112. MIOC, Adrian, *Problema timpului în opera lui Mircea Eliade. Structura temporalității în lucrările teoretice*. Timișoara, Editura Marineasca, 2001.
113. MIRCEA, coord. Corneliu, Robert Lazu, *Orizontul sacru*. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1998.
114. MORET, Alexandre, *Misteriile egiptene*. Traducerea textelor și îngrijirea ediției de Mariana Buruiană. București, Editura Herald, 2006.
115. NEAGA, pr. Prof. dr. Nicolae, *Istoria timpurilor Vechului Testament: Solomon*, în „Mitropolia Ardealului”, anul III, nr. 9-10, septembrie-octombrie, 1958.
116. NEGOIȚĂ, pr. prof. Athanasie, *Teologia biblică a Vechiului Testament*. București, Editura „Credința Noastră”, 1992.

117. NIȚU, George, *Elemente mitologice în creația populară românească*. București, Editura Albatros, 1998.
118. OIȘTEANU, Andrei, *Mythos și Logos. Studii și eseuri de antropologie culturală*. Ediție ilustrată. Ediția a II-a, revăzută și adăugită. București, Editura Nemira, 1998.
119. OLTEAN, Dan. *Religia dacilor*. București, Editura Saeculum I.O., 2002.
120. PIPPIDI, D. M., *Studii de istorie a religiilor antice. Texte și interpretări*. Ediția a II-a. București, Editura Teora, 1998.
121. ROMANATO, Gianpaolo, Mario G. Lombardo, Ioan Petru Culianu, *Religie și putere*. Traducere de Maria-Magdalena Anghelescu. Ediție îngrijită de Dan Petrescu. București, Editura Nemira, 1996.
122. ROTENBERG, Avram, *Evreul rătăcitor. Istoria manipulării unui mit*. București, Editura Hasefer, 2003.
123. SHERBOK, Dan Cohn, *Mistica iudaică. Antologie*. Traducere de Sanda și Gheorghe Lepoev. București, Editura Hasefer, 2000.
124. SOREL, Reynal, *Orfeu și orfismul*. Traducere de Florica Bechet. București, Editura Teora, 1998.
125. TURCAN, Robert, *Culte orientale în lumea romană*. Traducere de Mihai Popescu. București, Editura Enciclopedică, 1998.
126. WIGGIS, Steve A., *Yahweh: The God of Sun?* în „Journal for the Study of the Old Testament”, vol. 21, nr. 89, 1996.
127. ADAM, Jean-Michel, Françoise Revaz, *Analiza povestirii*. Traducere de Sorin Pârvu. Iași, Editura Institutul European, 1999.
128. BREMMER, coord. Jan, Herman Roodenburg, *O istorie culturală a gesturilor. Din antichitate și până în zilele noastre*. Cu o introducere de Sir Keith Thomas. Traducere de dr. Tatiana Avacum. București, Editura Polimark, 2000.
129. BROWN, A. R. Radcliffe-, *Structură și funcție în societatea primitivă. Eseuri și discursuri*. Cuvânt înainte de E. E. Evans-Pritchard și Fred Eggan. Traducere de Roxana Călinescu și Liliana Ciobanu Harhas. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2000.
130. BRUCE, Steve, *Sociologia. Foarte scurtă introducere*. Traducere de Cristian Constantinescu. București, Editura Allfa, 2003.
131. COMAN, Mihai, *Introducere în antropologia culturală. Mitul și ritul*. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2008.
132. COPAS, Jean, *Introducere în etnologie și antropologie*. Traducere de Elisabeta Stănciulescu și Ionela Ciobănașu. Prefață de Dumitru Stan. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1999.

133. COZMA, Dr. Aurel *Studii de folklor românesc*. București, 1942.
134. DURAND, Gilbert, *Știința despre om și tradiția. Noul spirit antropologic*. Traducere de Janina Ianoși. București, Editura Ideea Europeană, 2006.
135. DURKHEIM, Émile, *Formele elementare ale vieții religioase*. Traducere de Magda Jeanrenaud și Silviu Lupescu. Prefață de Gilles Ferreol. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1995.
136. FRAZER, James George, *Creanga de aur*, vol. I. Traducere, prefață și tabel cronologic de Octavian Nistor. Note de Gabriela Duda. București, Editura Minerva, 1980.
137. FRAZER, James George, *Folclorul în Vechiul Testament*. Traducere și adaptare de Harry Kuller. București, Editura Scripta, 1995.
138. GAUCHET, Marcel, *Dezvrăjirea lumii. O istorie politică a religiei*. Traducere din limba franceză de Vasile Tonoiu. București, Editura Nemira, 2006.
139. GAVRILUȚĂ, Nicu, *Mentalități și ritualuri magico-religioase. Studii și eseuri de sociologie a sacralului*. Cuvânt înainte de Ștefan Afloarei. Iași. Editura Polirom, 1996.
140. GENNEP, Arnold Van, *Riturile de trecere*. Traducere de Lucia Berdan și Nora Vasilescu. Studiu introductiv de Nicolae Constantinescu. Postfață de Lucian Berdan. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1996.
141. GENNEP, Arnold van, *Totemismul. Starea actuală a problemei totemice*. Studiu introductiv de Lucian Berdan. Traducere de Crina Ioana Berdan. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2000.
142. GÉRAUD, Marie-Odile, Olivier Leservoier, Richard Pottier, *Noțiunile-cheie ale etnologiei. Analize și texte*. Traducere de Dana Ligia Ilin. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2001.
143. GIRARD, René, *Despre cele asunse de la întemeierea lumii*. Cercetări întreprinse împreună cu Jean-Michel Oughourlian și Guy Lefort. Traducere din limba franceză de Miruna Runcan. București, Editura Nemira, 1999.
144. GIRARD, René, *Țapul ispășitor*. Traducere din limba franceză și note de Theodor Rogin. București, Editura Nemira, 2000.
145. GIRARD, René, *Prăbușirea Satanei*. Traducere din limba franceză de Ion Doru Brana. București, Editura Nemira, 2006.
146. GROSU, Nicolae, *Științele sociologiei*. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 2003.
147. KLIGMAN, Gail, *Călușul. Transformări simbolice în ritualul românesc*. Traducere de Lucia Ofrim și Ioana Ivan. Cuvânt înainte de Mircea Eliade. Revizia științifică de Radu Răuțu. București, Editura Univers, 2000.
148. LAPLANTINE, Feançois, *Descrierea etnografică*. Traducere de Elisabeta Stănciulescu, Gina Grosu. Prefață de Elisabeta Stănciulescu. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2000.

149. MAUSS, Marcel, *Manual de etnografie*. Studiu introductiv și traducere de Cristina Gavriluță. Iași, Editura Institutul European, 2003.
150. MIHU, Achim, *Antropologia culturală*. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 2002.
151. MUREȘAN, Vlad, *Criza antropologiei și sarcina ei originară*. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Eikon, 2005.
152. OPRIȘAN, Horia Barbu, *Călușarii. Studiu*. București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968.
153. RADKOWSKI, Georges-Huert de, *Antropologie generală*. Traducere de Florin Ochină. Timișoara, Editura Amarcord, 2000.
154. RIES, Julien, *Sacrul în istoria religioasă a omenirii*. Traducere din limba italiană de Rozana Utale. București, Editura Polirom, 2000.
155. RIVIÈRE, Claude, *Socio-antropologia religiilor*. Traducere de Mihaela Zoicaș. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2000.
156. SERGÉ, coord. Monique, *Mituri, rituri, simboluri în societatea contemporană*. Traducere de Beatrice Stanciu. Timișoara, Editura Amarcord, 2000.
157. TAROT, Camille, *De la Durkheim la Mauss. Inventarea simbolicului. Sociologia și științele religiilor*. Traducere de Mihaela Zgărdău și Ion Zgărdău. Timișoara, Editura Amarcord, 2001.
158. VELASCO, J. Martín, *Introducere în fenomenologia religiei*. Traducere de Cristian Bădiliță. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1997.
159. VĂDUVA, Ofelia, *Magia darului*. București, Editura Enciclopedică, 1997.
160. WATCH, Joachim, *Sociologia religiei*. Traducere de Florin Iorga. Studiu introductiv de Nicu Gavriluță. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1997.
161. WEBER, Max, *Sociologia religiei. Tipuri de organizări comunitare religioase*. Traducere de Claudiu Baci, București, Editura Teora, 1998.
162. WILLAIME, Jean-Paul, *Sociologia religiilor*. Ediția a doua revăzută. Traducere de Felicia Dumas. Iași, Editura Institutul European, 2001.
163. WILSON, Bryan, *Religia din perspectivă sociologică*. Traducere din limba engleză de Dara Maria Străinu. București, Editura Trei, 2000.
164. ANDRU, Vasile, *Apusul misticii populare. Farmece, legări, dezlegări. Eseu de etnopsihologie*. Pitești, Editura Paralela 45, 2016.
165. ARNOULD, Colette, *Istoria vrăjitoriei în Occident*. Traducere de Mărgărita Vavi Petrescu. București, Editura Lider, 2008.
166. BERNSTEIN, dr. Albert J., *Vampirii energetici. Învăță cum să trăiești cu semenii care te secătuesc de energie*. Traducere de Cristina-Gabriela Jeleru. București, Editura Amaltea, 2006.

167. CAMUS, Dominique, *Puteri și practici vrăjitoarești. Anchetă asupra practicilor actuale de vrăjitorie*. Traducere de Muguraș Constantinescu. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2003.
168. ELIADE, Mircea, *Ocultism, vrăjitorie și mode culturale. Eseuri de religie comparată*. Traducere din limba engleză de Elena Bortă. București, Editura Humanitas, 1991.
169. GHINESCU, Irina, *Cultul Nimfelor în Dacia Romană*, în „Ephemeris Napocensis”, vol. VIII, Cluj-Napoca, 1998.
170. GINZBURG, Carlo, *Istorie nocturnă. O interpretare a sabatului*. Traducere de Mihai Avădanei. Postfață de Valeriu Gherghei. Iași, Editura Polirom, 1996.
171. GOLOPENȚA, Sandra, *Desire machines. A romanian love charms database*. București. The Publishing House of the Romanian Cultural Fondation, 1998.
172. HEDEȘAN, Otilia, *Pentru o mitologie difuză*. Timișoara, Editura Marineasa, 2000.
173. HEDEȘAN, Otilia, *Strigoii*. Ediția a II-a revăzută. București, Editura Dacia XXI, 2011.
174. IDEL, Moshe, *Evreii lui Saturn. Despre sabatul vrăjitoarelor și șabatianism*. Traducere din limba italiană de Cornelia Dumitru. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2013.
175. *Întrebări și răspunsuri*, în „Cuvântul Adevărului”, anul VII, nr. 5, septembrie-octombrie, 1929.
176. JURCAN, prof. dr. Emilian, *Mișcarea satanistă și influența ei în societatea contemporană*, în „Studii Teologice”, anul XLV, nr. 5-6, septembrie-decembrie, 1993.
177. KAPIȚA, Grigori, *Vampirii energetici. Metode de autoapărare*. Ediția a II-a revizuită. Traducere din limba rusă de Ina Arpad. Bacău, Rovimed Publishers, 2006.
178. KRAMMER, Heinrich și James Sprenger, *Malleus Maleficarum*. Traducere de Mihaela Andronic. Iași, Editura Esoteris, 2005.
179. OLTEANU, Antoaneta, *Școala de solomonie. Divinație și răjitorie în context comparat*. București, Editura Paideia, 1999.
180. MOLITOR, Ulric, *Despre vrăjitorie și prezicătorie*. Traducere de Tiberiu Dănoi și Delia Dună. Studiu introductiv de Tiberiu Turculeț. București, Editura Tornada, 1991.
181. PALOU, Jean, *Vrăjitoria*. Traducere de Ofelia Screciu. Editura de Vest, Timișoara, 1992.
182. PERCEC, Dan, Dan Negrescu, *Periplu prin malefic. Un eseu lucrat pe surse*. Timișoara, Editura Universității de Vest, 2017.
183. ȘĂINEANU, Lazăr, *Ielele sau zânele rele. Studii folclorice*. Ediție critică și prefață de I. Opișan. București, Editura Saeculum I.O., 2012.
184. TAZLĂUANU, Gheorghe I., *Comoara neamului. Descântecule*, vol. VIII. București, 1943.
185. AFLOROAEI, Ștefan, *Lumea ca reprezentare a celuilalt*. Iași, Editura Institutului European, 1994.

186. ALFONSO, M. di Nola, *Diavolul. Chipurile, isprăvile, istoria Satanei și prezența sa malefică la popoarele din Antichitatea târzie*. Traducere de Radu Gâdei. București, Editura All, 2001.
187. ANGHEL, Paul, *O istorie posibilă a literaturii române. Modelul magic*. Prefață de Ilie Bădescu. Timișoara, Editura Avgvsta, 2002.
188. BĂDILIȚĂ, Cristian, *Manual de anticristologie. Studii, dosar biblic, traduceri și comentarii*. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2002.
189. BĂDILIȚĂ, Cristian, *Metamorfozele Anticristului la Părinții Bisericii*. Traducere de Teodoriță Ioniță. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2006.
190. BOUSSET, Wilhelm *Legenda Antihristului*. Cuvânt înainte de A. H. Keane. Traducere și îngrijire ediție de Ramona Ardelean. București, Editura Herald, 2006.
191. BUNGE, ieromonah Gabriel, *Akedia. Plictiseala și terapia ei după avva Evagrie Ponticul sau sufletul în lupta cu demonul amiezii*. Traducere și cuvânt înainte de diac. Ioan I. Ică jr. Sibiu, Editura Deisis, 1999.
192. BUZALIC, Alexandru, *Demonologia creștină. Revelație, tradiție și rațiune*. Târgu Lăpuș, Editura Gutenberg, 2010.
193. CARUS, Paul, *Istoria Diavolului. Ideea de rău de la origini și până în prezent*. Traducere din engleză, note și îngrijire ediție de Iustina Cojocaru. București, Editura Herald, 2015.
194. COHN, Norman, *Demonii Europei. Demonizarea creștinilor în Evul Mediu*. Traducere de Cristina Văileanu. Târgoviște, Editura Pandora, 2002.
195. COMAN, Ioan G., *Dumnezeu nu e autor al răului*, în „Studii Teologice”, seria a II-a, anul V, nr. 1-2, ianuarie-februarie, 1953.
196. CULIANU, Ioan Petru, *Eros și magie în Renaștere 1484*. Traducere de Dan Petrescu. Prefață de Mircea Eliade. Postfață de Sorin Antohi. Traducerea textelor din limba latină de Ana Cojan și Ion Acsan. București, Editura Nemira, 1994.
197. CULIANU, Ioan Petru, *Cult, magie, erezii. Articole din enciclopedii ale religiilor*. Traduceri de Maria-Magdalena Anghelescu și Dan Petrescu. Postfață de Eduard Iricinski. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2003.
198. CUȘEU, Ion Pop-, *Magie și vrăjitorie în cultura română. Istorie, literatură, mentalități*. Iași, Editura Polirom. București, Editura Cartea Românească, 2013.
199. DANCIU, Elisabeta, *Abracadabra și gemele gnostice Abrasax*, partea I, în „Gnosis”, vol. II, nr. 11, noiembrie 2007.
200. DANCIU, Elisabeta, *Abracadabra și gemele gnostice Abrasax*, partea a II-a, în „Gnosis”, vol. II, nr. 12, decembrie 2007.
201. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, *Aldabaram*, în „Gnosis”, vol. II, nr. 11, noiembrie 2007.

202. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, *De la 2 Enoh la Apocalipsă. Doi autori, un singur roman*, în „Incursiuni în imaginar. Mit, basm, legendă. Mutații ale nucleelor narrative”, vol. 6. Alba Iulia, Centrul de Cercetare al Imaginarului Spaculum, 2015.
203. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, *Mitul enohian al îngerilor răi în viziunile lui Herma*, în „Incursiuni în imaginar”, vol. 7/ 2016.
204. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, *The hole, the prison of peoples kings and evil angels in the prophecy of Isaiah*, în „Journal of Romanian Literary Studies”, nr. 9/ 2016.
205. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, *Pazuzu and Lamasthu – the demonic couple in the babylonian mitology*, în „Journal of Romanian Literary Studies”, nr. 10/ 2017.
206. DANCIU, Petru Adrian *Adam and Lilith, a nonconformist couple. From the religious sincretism, to the demonological imaginary*, în „Journal of Romanian Literary Studies”, nr. 11/ 2017.
207. DANCIU, Petru Adrian, „Compozitul magic AGLA sau despre misterul numelor de putere”, în *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Philologica*, vol. 18, Alba-Iulia, Universitatea „1 Decembrie 1918”, 2018.
208. FLORIA, Liliana, *Adam and two Evas – An unique erotic triangle*, în „Journal of Romanian Literary Studies”, nr. 6/ 2015.
209. FORTEA, José Antonio, *Summa Daemoniaca. Trata de demonologie și manualul exorcistului*. Traducere din limba italiană de Andrei Adam-Motyka. Iași, Editura Sapiientia, 2017.
210. GEORGESCU, Ion V., *Demonologia Vechiului Testament. Satan în profeția lui Zaharia*, în „Biserica Ortodoxă Română”, anul LVI, nr. 9-10, septembrie-octombrie 1938.
211. GIARD, René, *Prăbușirea Satanei*. Traducere din limba franceză de Ion Doru Brana. București, Editura Nemira, 1999.
212. IONIȚĂ, Maria *Cartea vîlvelor. Legende din Apuseni*. Cu un cuvânt introductiv de Ion Șeuleanu. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1982.
213. LÉVI, Éliphas, *Dogma și Ritualul Înaltei Magii. Dogma*. Traducere de Maria Ivănescu. București, Editura Antet, 1996.
214. LÉVI, Éliphas, *Dogma și Ritualul Înaltei Magii. Ritualul*. Traducere de Maria Ivănescu. București, Editura Antet, 1996.
215. MUCHEMBLED, coord. Robert, *Magia și vrăjitoria în Europa din Evul Mediu și până astăzi*. Traducere din franceză de Maria și Cezar Ivănescu. București, Editura Humanitas, 1997.
216. OIȘTEANU, Andrei, *Ordine și Haos. Mit și magie în cultura tradițională românească*. Ediție ilustrată. București, Editura Polirom, 2004.

217. ORNAN, Tallay, *Expelling demons at Nineveh: on the visibility of benevolent demons in the palaces of Nineveh*, în „R.A.F”, anul XLIX, nr. 1/ 2005.
218. PETRESCU, Sorin M., Ileana Petrescu, *Elemente de magie practică în așezarea Vinča de la Balta Sărată (Municipiul Caransebeș)*, în „Gnosis”, vol. 2, nr. 9, septembrie 2007.
219. PĂDURARU, Mircea, *Reprezentarea Diavolului în imaginarul literar românesc*. Iași. Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2012.
220. POGAČNIK, Marco, *Spiritele naturii și ființele elementale. Să lucrăm cu ființele inteligente din natură*. Traducere de Daria Vasilescu. București, Editura For You, 2009.
221. POPESCU, Dumitru, *Lupta spirituală – în Apocalipsa – între cele două împărății adverse, peste milenii, și recapitularea întregii firi în Dumnezeu*, în „Ortodoxia”, anul XLI, nr. 1, ianuarie-martie, 1989.
222. REED, Annette Yoshiko *From Asael and Šemiḥazah to Uzzah, Azzaz, and Azael: 3 Enoch 5 (§ 7-8) and Jewish Reception-History of 1 Enoch*, în „Jewish Studies Quarterly”, vol. 8/ 2001.
223. REED, Annette Yoshiko, *The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, în „Journal of Early Christian Studies”, 12: 2/ 2004.
224. RIZZI, Joege Angel Livraga, *Spiritele elementale ale naturii*. Editor, Ivo Ivanovici. Traducere din limba spaniolă și corectură text de Sonia Ivanovici, Elena Tudose, Mirela Mircea, Ioana Bojan. București, Editura Noua Acropolă, 2005.
225. ȘTEFĂNESCU, Paul, *Magia Înaltă*. București, Editura Miracol, 1997.
226. TRACHTENBERG, Joshua, *Magie și superstiție la evrei. Studiu asupra religiei populare*. Traducere din limba engleză de Maria Constantinescu. București, Editura Herald, 2010.
227. VASILESCU, Dumitru, *Glossolalia*, în „Studii Teologice”, anul XVI, nr. 7-8, septembrie-octombrie 1964.
228. VASILESCU, Dumitru, *Originea și aspectele milenarismului din punct de vedere dogmatic în primele două veacuri creștine*, în „Studii Teologice”, anul XVI, nr. 5-6, mai-iunie, 1964.
229. WAITE, Arthur Edward, *Cartea Magiei Ceremoniale. Tradiția secretă din Goetia, ritualurile și misterele teurgiei goetice, vrăjitoria și necromanția infernală*. Traducere de Ioana Wenger. Iași, Editura Esoteris, 2006.
230. WALKER, D. P., *Magia spirituală și angelică. De la Ficino la Campanella*. Traducere și îngrijire ediție de Maria Genescu. București, Editura Herald, 2010.
231. ARIMUKIN, Igor, *Pe urmele unor animale rare sau nemaiîntâlnite*. București, 1968.
232. BABEȚI, Adriana, *Amazoanele. O poveste*. Iași, Editura Polirom, 2013.

233. BALTRUSAITIS, Jurgis, *Evul Mediu Fantastic*. Traducere de Valentina Grigorescu. Cuvânt înainte de Dan Grigorescu. București, Editura Meridiane, 1975.
234. BORELLA, Jean, *Criza simbolismului religios*. Traducere de Diana Morărașu. Iași, Editura Institutul European, 1995.
235. BOTH, Ioana, „*Sfășieri retorice*”: o lectură a reprezentărilor corpului în lirica eninesciană, în „*Incursiuni în imaginar. De la corpul imaginat la corupul reprezentat*”, nr. 4. Coordonare, revizie și cuvânt înainte de Gabriela Chiciudean. Alba Iulia, Editura Aeternitas, 2010.
236. CAILLOIS, Roger, *Omul și sacrul*. Traducere din limba franceză de Dan Petrescu. București, Editura Nemira, 1997.
237. CAILLOIS, Roger, *Mitul și omul*. Traducere din limba franceză de Lidia Simion. Cu o prefață a autorului. București, Editura Nemira, 2000.
238. CAILLOIS, Roger, *Abordări ale imaginarului*. Traducere din limba franceză de Nicolae Baltă. București, Editura Nemira, 2001.
239. CARLYLE, Thomas, *Filosofia vestimentației. Sartor Resartus*. Ediția a II-a. Traducere și note de Mihai Avădanei. Studiu introductiv de Mircea Mihăieș. Iași, Editura Institutului European, 1998.
240. DANCIU, Liliana, *Romanul din roman. Noaptea de Sânziene de Mircea Eliade*. Prefață de Mircea Braga. București, Editura Ideea Europeană, 2017.
241. DURAND, Gilbert, *Figurile mitice și chipuri ale operei. De la mitocritică la mitanaliză*. Traducere din limba franceză de Irina Bădescu. București, Editura Nemira, 1998.
242. DURAND, Gilbert, *Structurile antropologice ale imaginarului. Introducere în arhetipologia generală*. Traducere de Marcel Aderca. Postfață de Cornel Mihai Ionescu. București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2000.
243. *Fiziolog bestiar*. Traducere și note de Cătălina Velculescu, Viorel Guruianu, Manuela Anton. București, Editura Cavallioti, 2001.
244. MARICA, Viorica Guy, *Pictura germană între Gotic și Renaștere*. București, Editura Meridiane, 1981.
245. POULET, Georges, *Metamorfozele cercului*. Traducere de Irina Bădescu și Angela Martin. Studiu introductiv de Mircea Martin. București, Editura Univers, 1987.
246. WUNENBURGER, Jean-Jacques, *Sacrul*. Traducere, note și studiu introductiv de Mihaela Căluț. Postfață de Aurel Codoban. Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 2000.