

**THE MYTH OF OEDIPUS IN THE ROMANIAN FOLK TALE LOSTRÎȚA¹:
DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE GREEK MYTH
AND THE ROMANIAN TALE**

Maria DĂRĂBANȚ²

Abstract

The present paper focuses on the myth of Oedipus as presented in the Romanian folk tale Lostrîța. Although the two narratives run in parallel for the main events, there are some distinctions worth mentioning in the attempt to see how West meets East over a universally acknowledged myth. At closer reading, we are bound to discover that some of the differences present in the Romanian story have a universal aspect as they transcend limits that might be imposed by geographical boundaries or cultural belonging. From this point of view, we can say that the Romanian variant is profoundly rooted in the universal wisdom shared by both the ancient and modern man. By capitalizing on this aspect of universality, the paper attempts to shed light on a Romanian folk creation that might otherwise go unnoticed.

Keywords: Oedipus; myth; wisdom; symbol; universality

1. Introduction

The myth of Oedipus is one of the oldest myths of humankind, which has shaped morality and aesthetics alike by impacting human behaviour and mindset, philosophy and literature, psychology and sociology and therefore has endured over time.

Considering the scope and significance of the Oedipus myth, it was extremely rewarding to discover a Romanian folk tale containing the myth and to detect both similarities and differences between the Greek and Romanian variants, by means of comparative analysis.

Apart from the story as such, and its modern psychoanalytical implications, there is a whole array of interpretations which focus on the symbolic, even metaphysical, components revealing unexpected perspectives of universal wisdom and understanding. To this purpose, the writings and insight of Vasile Lovinescu into the

¹ Disambiguation: No connection with Vasile Voiculescu's story, identical in title.

²Maria Dărăbanț, The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, m.darabant@yahoo.co.uk

Romanian folk tale were of great help and guidance into, what I believe to be, a territory insufficiently chartered academically.

2. Frame of reference

The myth of Oedipus can be traced back to ancient times and anonymous creation³, but it is particularly known through Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, which, in its turn, was made famous by Aristotle who praised the dramatic skill of the author and indicated it as a model to be followed. Thus, critics consider the play to be rather creating canon than belonging to one. (Rix, 1999: 134)

The motifs present in the myth of Oedipus can be identified, with slight variations and under different iconic characters, in several ancient mythologies; Uranus (Father Sky) is the son and husband of Gaia (Mother Earth) and is castrated (therefore symbolically killed) by Kronos, who will marry his own sister, Rhea. Afraid of being deposed by one of his children, he starts eating them (time 'eats' everything). The salvation comes from Zeus, his son, who manages to overthrow his father with help from his mother. Zeus will also marry his sister, Hera. (Kernbach, 1996: 66-68) Persephone, Zeus' daughter, procreates with him, the fruit of their love being Zagreus. (Lovinescu, 1993: 47) In Egyptian mythology, Isis is the wife and sister of Osiris (Kernbach, 1996: 145). Actually, the entire Greek and Roman mythology oscillates between Eros and Thanatos which go hand in hand (Kernbach, 1996: 64), as is the case with the myth of Oedipus whose very originality consists in combining parricide and incest which are two facets of the same mystery. (Lovinescu, 1993: 46)

In modern times, the myth generated the Oedipus complex, the corner stone concept in psychoanalysis. David Osman detects an archaic presence of this complex, prior to Freud's *Totem and Taboo* (1913), as a sense of inherent guilt for the demise of the elderly. The crime, even though not perpetrated, but still pressing inwardly because of the power and force of the youth, needs to be expiated through religious ritualistic endeavour.

...this exercise of powers is psychically associated with the diminution of one's elders, recasting them in myth, legend and ritual into all-powerful entities, transported to a lofty sphere where they thrive in majesty and immortality, may be seen as restitutive. Thus, among the functions religion performs for the devout is the provision of a remedy for the supposedly deleterious consequence of separation-individuation and its emancipation of the individual. (Osman, 2003: 981)

³ It is part of the oral tradition of Greek mythology.

Within the same religious frame, but crossing cultural boundaries, Huayiu Wang binds Oedipus myth with the Chinese dragon worshipping, the dragon being like a Freudian receptacle of ambivalence (Wang, 2015: 266-69). In his turn, Paul Diel equates the harmed feet with a harmed soul, Oedipus symbolizing the insecure, indecisive person who behaves as wobbly as he walks (Diel quoted in Chevalier and Gheergrant, 1993: 368). On the other hand, Alan Dundes detects, in the myth of Oedipus, what he calls a “projective inversion” by which the son’s desire to kill the father turns into the father’s desire to do the same to his son, thus transferring the element of guilt to the victim (Dundes, 2007b: 282). Actually, the element of guilt separates the ancient approach from the modern one. In Sophocles’ play, Oedipus is ignorant of his mistake and therefore exempt from responsibility - Aristotle calls it *hamartia*, whereas starting with Voltaire, guilt becomes a central issue (Rix, 1999: 134-35).

For Mircea Eliade, the myth is a “paradigmatic model” which “relates” a sacred event that happened, at the beginning of times, *ab initio* (Eliade, 1968: 95). It is to be noted that he uses a verb that creates imagery while capturing scared, primordial events via the materialism of words. Imaginal psychology⁴ considers image and imagery as an epistemological tool, equally important to other “fundamental functions of human personality” (Vrbata, 2014: 136). Actually, imagery in myths translates into symbols, the basic unit of encoding and decoding meaning. The power of symbols is also remarked by Mircea Eliade who says that the world becomes “transparent” through symbols (Eliade, 1968: 130).

Alan Dundes considers cultural artistic outcomes to be “symbolic systems” incorporated, more or less consciously, into folklore, therefore “Folklore *means* something”. (Dundes, 2007b: 275) He deliberately emphasizes the word “means” as a synecdoche for the importance of semiotics in the study of folklore, and he continues by saying that it can mean different things to different people. For Dundes, folk tales should be approached in a synchronic way, anchored in their own time, bearing their own social relevance, rather than in a diachronic way, a tendency which he criticizes to some extent (Dundes, 2007a: 90).

To use the same term, a completely diachronic perspective is offered by Vasile Lovinescu, greatly influenced by René Guénon and the *Traditionalist School*, whose conviction is that tales and folk stories or folk poems and ballads contain archaic wisdom encoded in literary creations, whether anonymous or not, which is passed on to future generations (Lovinescu, 1996: 71). He also points out that the symbolism of Romanian folk stories is so obvious that it can hardly go unnoticed even for the profane eye (Lovinescu, 1996: 65).

⁴ The term “imaginal psychology” is used nowadays to replace what was known as “archetypal psychology”.

A more *polis*-oriented view considers that myths are crucial guidelines in the axiological system transmitted from one generation to another (Steadman and Palmer, 1997: 341-2). In particular, the myth of Oedipus as reflected in Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*, presents "sets of ancestral instructions prescribing proper kinship behavior". (Steadman and Palmer, 1997: 343) This is consistent with the cathartic effect, which is a key element of the Greek tragedy, and the fact that it appears in modern comments proves that the need for hygienic social relationships is an ongoing process.

3. Differences and similarities between the romanian tale Lostrița and the Greek myth

The Romanian folk tale where the myth of Oedipus can be encountered is called *Lostrița (The Huchen)*. The tale was picked up by Nicolae Labiș from a peasant in the village of Baia and transmitted further on to his professor, Vasile Popa, from Fălticeni (Lovinescu, 1993: 48). Although not universally known and with little public circulation, there are clues in the story that hint at pre-Christian origins, which places it in the early Romanian history⁵. The general framework of the myth can be found almost unaltered in the Romanian story however, there are some differences worthwhile noting.

3.1 Characters

The first major difference that can be detected between the Romanian tale and the Greek myth has to do with the characters involved. In the Romanian variant we encounter common people, therefore any doubts that may occur in the Greek story as to intrigues aimed at dethroning Laius, Oedipus' royal father, are completely groundless here. Thus, from the very beginning we can see that the element of *hubris*, present in the Greek tragedy and associated, by default, with the figure of Oedipus (Trumbull, 2010: 343), is virtually inexistent in the Romanian story.

The fact that the characters are commoners also results in the inexistence of lineage; they are as if suspended in life, they come from nowhere, they appear into the story spontaneously as there is no ancestry that can be traced back on either of the spouses. By contrast, we know that Laius, Oedipus' natural father, committed a vicious crime in his youth, thus the karmic law is bound to reach both him and his family. Nothing is being said about an existent sinful heritage of the peasant couple in *Lostrița*, yet the reader finds out that their fate is sealed and the child who is due at the very beginning of the story is going to commit patricide as well as incest with his mother.

⁵ Presumably the 3rd century BC.

The source of this piece of information is extremely peculiar as we are allowed to eavesdrop on a conversation between none other than God and Saint Peter. The otherworldly pair is walking the Earth (as they often do in Romanian tales) and is hosted over night by, probably, the poorest family in the village considering that the only space they can offer is the porch. There is symbolic significance attached to the porch as a transitional *locus*, neither inside, nor outside the home or, as Mircea Eliade puts it, the “frontier that distinguishes and opposes two worlds” and where ‘the sacred’ and ‘the profane’ can communicate (Eliade, 1968: 25).

The man’s wife is in labour and, as a sign of gratitude for having offered shelter to the incognito pair when no one else would, Saint Peter asks God to bestow good fortune on the newborn. But God cannot do that because the fate of the child has already been decided⁶. It is here that Vasile Lovinescu detects the first pre-Christian element of the story because God himself cannot undo the pre-established destiny of the child (Lovinescu, 1993: 52).

The fact that, in the Romanian tale, the transcendental materializes into two⁷ *personae* who behave, up to a certain point, like any other mortal, is profoundly significant for the direct relationship that the Romanian peasant has had with Divinity. Equally intriguing is the role that God plays as a mere messenger of what appears to be a higher authority - hence the pre-Christian affiliation remarked by Vasile Lovinescu. We can only presume that *that* authority is Destiny, which brings us full circle to the Greek approach.

3.2 Infancy

When hearing (actually, overhearing) the discussion between the two ‘old men’, the Romanian peasant knows exactly what he has to do; the next day, after their guests leave, he snatches the child away from his mother and practically impales him, diapers and all, in the wooden fence around the house; then, he runs away. His gesture is profoundly ritualistic as it reminds us of the wooden stake being drawn through the body of the, so called, *moroi* believed to be, in Romanian folklore, vampires, the ultimate evil walking the earth. On the other hand, there is a symbolic meaning to the gesture because the pillar, according to Mircea Eliade, can be identified to the *axis mundi*, the Center of the World, the sacred space connecting two different cosmic worlds (Eliade, 1968: 37).

⁶ In the original: “Soarta-i soartă și s-a mântuit.” (Lovinescu, 1993: 49)

⁷ It is to be noted that, whenever walking the Earth in Romanian tales, God is never alone, but accompanied by Saint Peter. Actually, duality is one of the main features of materialization; in this particular situation, not the ethical duality of ‘bad’ and ‘good’, but rather the epistemological one, ‘the one who knows and ‘the one who does not know’.

In the Greek variant, baby Oedipus is also physically harmed as his feet are pierced and bound together, the very name Oedipus, actually, meaning “swollen foot” (Chevalier and Gheergrants, 1993: 368). To be noted that in both stories the element of fixation is present, only the method differs, in the attempt to stop the evil from spreading in the world.

It is worth remarking that neither of the fathers questions the bad omen and they both decide to sacrifice their sons, thus dodging the fate. This is a contradiction between absolute acceptance of faith and denying it. Had they been more consistent in their beliefs, the tragedy would not have happened. But of course, this is the voice of reason and no great tragedies conformed to it. In the Romanian story, however, the divine message is questioned by the mother, a true representative of the pragmatic feminine. She even acts upon her maternal feelings and ‘dis-impales’ the baby who has suffered only superficial wounds. She takes him back into the house, breastfeeds him and everything seems to be restored to normality. This is where God and Saint Peter appear in a dream, reinforcing the warning. To make sure that all doubts have been dissipated, they even leave a poppy in the garden as a material sign that what she has experienced is not ‘just’ a dream (which reminds us of Coleridge’s flower).

Here again we have differences between the two stories; in the good old Greek tradition, king Laius seeks for the divine message through the Oracle of Delphi, whereas the Romanian peasant receives it unwillingly, he is almost forced into it and, when his wife hesitates, the prophecy is ‘dreamed down’ into her acknowledging it. The interference of the divine with the human life in the two stories is relevant to the cultural space to which each story belongs, the Western, forward and hands-on approach, versus the softer, laid-back attitude of the Eastern mind. Hence the need for the divine to take action and intervene directly in the latter, which is rather contradictory as one would expect the ‘implacable destiny’ to take its course no matter what – that is what ‘implacable’ is for.

There have been voices accusing (rightfully I might add) king Laius of lack of reasoning, therefore breaking with the Western, Aristotelian tradition when he chooses an irrational solution to his problem (Barstow, 1912: 2). It not completely devoid of sense to attribute this blindness of wisdom to the wrath of Gods as Pentheus, one of Laius’ ancestors, banished the ‘irrational’ cult of Dionysus from Thebes. By contrast, in the Romanian story there is the element of doubt as to the veracity of the sign, but it is blown away by the insistence of the Divine to enforce the law of destiny, as if God Himself were but a tool of the Dharma, the big cosmic law. Apparently, we have another contradiction here as the Dharma is given by God and therefore God functions as a tool for Himself. Vasile Lovinescu considers this to be a sign of the power rather than weakness, as God is beyond *will* and *manifestation*. An almighty God is almighty only in the material world of humans and, implicitly, as perceived by humans (Lovinescu, 1993: 53). Therefore, it is only

within the correct referential frame, that the true meaning of the Divine gesture can be understood.

Despite the horrid decision of their fathers – the human bestowed fate is nothing as compared to the cosmic one - both babies escape death and begin a journey which could have been an initiation one, had they remained close to their roots, not necessarily space-close, but mind-close. Baby Oedipus is taken to Mount Cithaeron, while the peasant baby is placed in a basket to float down the river, just like baby Moses. Both the mountain and the river have symbolic meaning, the former being associated with the *axis mundi* (already mentioned in the paper), while the latter meaning purification and regeneration (Eliade, 1968: 131). Therefore, they are symbolic of the potential spiritual becoming of both heroes, by producing the perfect neophyte, detached from the previous mundane frame and with a completely dissolved identity. This idea is purported by the fact that, in this phase of the story, they both lose their names and receive descriptive aliases.

3.3 Reunion

An ‘ellipsis’ follows in the Romanian folk tale, and we meet the same characters several years later, but within a new social status. Meanwhile the peasant has acquired fortune and now he has a name, Vasile Lipan. He returns to his wife, who also has a name, Maria, and rekindles the sacred fire of his home in an attempt to set things on the right track again. He has not been a wanderer by choice, but by force, therefore his true nature of family man surfaces. Together, they set up a prolific household and build a big, new house with a splendid colony of bee hives at the rear.

The newfound peace is not going to last as the hives are attacked each night by a bear. Lipan needs help, so he hires a strong, young man seeking for work and who is willing to face the beast and defend his master’s property. This is where fate closes in on its victims, as the young man is none other than the abandoned child, now thirty years of age. As everybody else in this second part of the tale, he also has a name, but not the real one as his identity is still unknown; he goes by the alias, Ion Adusu (the ‘one who was brought’). At this moment the old family is reunited, but within a different pattern.

In Oedipus’ case, the reunion happens due to the reiteration of the same, three-step sequence: prophecy, panic, flight. In order to avoid the gruesome prediction of the Delphi Oracle, and convinced that king Polybus, who adopted him is, in fact, his true father, Oedipus flees Corinth and finds himself at the entrance of the city of Thebes. Ignorance has struck again generating the same reaction and the same mistake. The subtle dichotomy of cause and effect has no linear paradigm, but rather quantic traits, therefore, by trying to distance himself from his fate, Oedipus gets closer to it.

3.4 The Beast

The moment of encounter with the beasts means reaching ‘the point of no return’ for both heroes. While Oedipus is faced with a mythical creature, the Sphinx, with the body of a lioness, the head of a woman and the wings of an eagle, Ion Adusu is supposed to fight a bear. Apparently, we are going to witness two different clashes, one of the wits and one of the muscles. In fact, both heroes are supposed to reinstate the divine order. The Sphinx, in Greek mythology, is a creature of the Dark, set on destruction, while the bear, as Vasile Lovinescu points out, is symbolic for the class of the worriers (kṣhatrya). The fact that he attacks the bee hives, symbolic for the sacerdotal class, the highest spiritual authority, is a sign of the inferior attacking the superior (Lovinescu, 1993: 60). So, in both cases, we have a disruptive force meant to create chaos and the providential hero meant to restore order. Again, this is but the game of appearances, because encountering the beast proves to be a means of continuing the story, not of ending it gloriously.

When on watch, Ion is attacked by the bear and he courageously kills the beast, thus defending his master’s property and, implicitly, honour. Unfortunately, the next morning the truth comes to light (in both senses of the word) as the bear is not the real bear, but Lipan wearing a bear skin in order to test the courage of his new man servant (the same paradigm appears in another Romanian tale, *Harap-Alb*).

In his turn, Oedipus also kills his father unknowingly, but there is a big difference between the two situations. Ion thought he was killing a beast, and a rather dangerous one, aggressive and menacing the household he was supposed to defend, whereas Oedipus knew he was killing a man, a human being, which is a criminal act, unmitigated by anonymity.

Now that the first part of the ominous prophecy has been fulfilled, there comes the second. Both heroes marry the widowed wives, still in ignorance of their true identity. To be remarked that in the Romanian tale, Ion is reluctant to replace his former master despite the vehement insistence of Maria Lipan. He even leaves the house, but eventually returns for two reasons; firstly, he finds the key of the entire household misplaced into his pocket and secondly, his foot gets hurt by a little pebble in his peasant shoe. While the first reason, represented by the key, is a classical, mainstream symbol, the second one may have unexpectedly fresh connotations as it can be seen as a precursor of the “butterfly effect”. No matter what the underlying reading may be, the second part of the prophecy becomes *fait accompli*.

To be noted that both couples, Oedipus – Jocasta and Ion – Maria, have very happy marriages, their household thrives and the first couple even procreates. But for the sarcasm, we could say, ‘a match made in Heaven’. Ion perfectly fills the shoes of

his predecessor and, being preoccupied by the welfare of the household, decides to endow it with the one thing that it lacked above all, a water source. So, he starts digging a well and, when he is 30 meters deep (probably not coincidentally his age), he strikes water. The well is symbolic for new beginnings therefore, we are in the presence of shifting cycles (Lovinescu, 1993:67). They all celebrate in style and nothing significant happens for the next ten years (another ellipsis, another shortcut in time).

3.5 Revelation

The mystery unravels on Saint Elijah holiday, early in the morning, which is, symbolically speaking, the perfect moment for big changes. The two spouses speak about the past and Ion tells his wife what made him leave the monastery (perfect place for a neophyte) where he had been raised and travel the world. It was a dream in which a beautiful huchen appeared and asked him to help her get back to her pond; in return she advised him to start upriver in order to find his parents. A similar dream precedes his digging for water, as it was a huchen that indicated the place for the well, under a nut tree. The fish is symbolic for the Saviour in Greek mythology and will be, later on, incorporated into Christianity as a symbol of Jesus Christ. So, this is the third time (including Mary's dream to abandon the newborn) that Divinity intervenes in this tale in order to make sure the heroes do not stray from their faith.

When Ion told his spiritual father about the huchen in the dream the latter was surprised to hear the direction being 'upstream', which was exactly where the baby had come from, floating in a basket. All this information is enough for Mary to put two and two together; she realizes the full dimension of the tragedy and, in despair, she throws herself right into the fountain. They search for her body in the well, but all they can find is a huchen.

Just like Oedipus, but without self-inflicting blindness, Ion leaves everything behind and runs away, while the whole estate collapses to ruins. The village where the tragedy took place comes to be known, in time, under the name of *Huchen*. But, as this is not an etiological myth, the name is not to be found in real geography, which means that the whole story happened into a mythical space, a "sacred" one, as Mircea Eliade would have called it.

4. Symbolism of the Romanian tale as decoded by Vasile Lovinescu

A symbolic element which is typical for the Romanian tale is the fish, present from the very beginning in the title. 'Lostrita' (the huchen) and 'lipanul' (the grayling) belong to the salmon family, or Salmonidae. The most important characteristic of their behaviour is that they swim upstream in order to spawn. According to Vasile Lovinescu, this is the key to decoding the symbolism of the whole story and the myth, respectively.

Oedipus myth symbolizes returning to the roots, reversing action and annihilating creation and causality. Suppressing the father means reversing the natural order of manifestation, a rewinding of the world, a backward journey, a *regressum in utero* (Lovinescu, 1993: 46). This happens when one cycle ends and another one is about to begin, incest being the force generating the new cycle. As mentioned before, the myth makes sense only from a dual perspective, the two sides of the same coin.

As opposed to Steadman and Palmer who see in the myth of Oedipus a didactic enterprise for future generations through cathartic fear (already mentioned in the present paper), Lovinescu points to the antisocial aspect of the myth as both parricide and incest weaken creation (Lovinescu, 1993: 47). Denying and retracting creation is the only way to be re-integrated with origins, with primordality.

The signs accounting for this theory can be found in a series of symbols along the story, which Lovinescu highlights as follows: the household is the spiritual center of the microcosmos that it represents, the fountain dug by Ion is a *Fons Juventutis*, or the Fountain of Life, while the nut tree under which it is dug symbolizes the *Tree of Life* (Lovinescu, 1993: 67). All these elements are aligned on a vertical axis, thus eliminating duality and allowing re-integration into the sexless prototype (Lovinescu, 1993: 76). To be noted the presence of Tiresias, iconic for androgyny, into the Greek story.

In Vasile Lovinescu's view, Ion is an initiate who frees the huchen from the earthly binds of the muddy waters in which she is trapped and releases her into a celestial dimension, into "the superior waters", thus reenacting an anabasis ritual accessible only to the chosen ones (Lovinescu, 1993: 74).

5. Conclusion

The two stories, the Greek and the Romanian one, share the basic unfolding of events, but differ with respect to some details. The existence of a literary creation, i.e. Sophocles' play, as opposed to the Romanian anonymous production shifts the focus from a social, polis-oriented approach, in the former case, to a more philosophical, symbol-bound approach in the latter case.

What made the Greek play universally acknowledged, thus becoming a canon in its own right, was its initial impact on Greek literature and therefore on a culture which was the cradle of European civilization. The consequent continual reiteration of the theme made it expand beyond the literary boundaries into scientific fields unimaginable in Sophocles' time. The process is still ongoing and, as a result, the myth of Oedipus has become a mutual reference frame for both Western and Eastern cultures.

By contrast, the Romanian story, hardly known to the Romanian public and completely unknown worldwide, benefits from an inherent universality rooted in the variety of symbols that it contains. Such evidence supports Vasile Lovinescu's theory according to which folk tales are a means of communicating ancestral wisdom in an encoded manner. The danger of codes is that they might be misunderstood, if at all. This is where the decoder intervenes and this is exactly why the paper insisted on Vasile Lovinescu's interpretations above all other ones.

I can only hope that the present paper arouses interest for further research and analysis into Romanian creations in general and folkloric ones in particular as perceived within a universal frame.

References and bibliography

- Barstow, M.** 1912. "Oedipus Rex as the Ideal Tragic Hero of Aristotle", in *The Classical Weekly*, 1 (6): 2-4. Retrieved from <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4386601>>. Accessed 29 September 2017.
- Chevalier, J. and A. Gheergrant.** 1993. *Dicționar de simboluri*, București: Editura Artemis.
- Dundes, A.** 2007a. "From Etic to Emic Units in the Structural Study of Folktales", in Bronner, S. J. (ed.). *The Meaning of Folklore – The Analytical Essays of Alan Dundes*, Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press: 90-100.
- Dundes, A.** 2007b. "Getting the Folk and the Lore Together", in Bronner, S. J. (ed.). *The Meaning of Folklore – The Analytical Essays of Alan Dundes*, Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press: 275-284.
- Eliade, M.** 1968. *The Sacred and the Profane. The Nature of Religion*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.
- Kernbach, V.** 1996. *Miturile esențiale*, București: Univers Enciclopedic.
- Lovinescu, V.** 1993. *Interpretarea ezoterică a unor basme și balade populare românești*, București : Cartea Românească.
- Lovinescu, V.** 1996. *Dacia hiperboreană*, București: Editura Rosmarin.
- Osman, M. P.** 2003. "The Role of an Early-Life Variant of the Oedipus Complex in Motivating Religious Endeavors", in *JAPA (Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association)*, 52 (4): 975-997.

- Rix, R. W.** 1999. "Was Oedipus Framed?", in *Orbis Litterarum*, 54 (2): 134, 145.
- Steadman, L. B. and C. T. Palmer.** 1997. "Myths as Instructions from Ancestors", in *Zigon-Journal of Religion and Science*, 32 (3): 341-350.
- Trumbull, D.** 2010. "Hubris: A Primal Danger", in *Psychiatry*, 73 (4): 341-51.
- Vrbata, A.** 2014. "Beyond the Myth of 'Self-Domination' (Imaginal Psychology in Pursuit of Cultural Shift)", in *Human Affairs*, 24 (1): 136-147.
- Wang, H.** 2015. "The Chinese totem of dragon and the greek myth of oedipus⁸: a comparative psychoanalytic study", in *International Communication of Chinese Culture*, 2 (3): 259-283.

The author

Maria Dărăbanț is a Business English lecturer with the Bucharest University of Economic Studies (ASE). She graduated the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures with the Bucharest University. She has an MS in Globalization and a Ph.D. in economics which focuses on Margaret Thatcher's prime-ministership. This cross-discipline approach offered her the opportunity to better understand and relate to her students and ultimately to better deliver professionally. Her interest into mythology has resurged into the present paper after many years of interdisciplinary research.

⁸ Original spelling respected.