

THE FRACTAL – ARCHETYPE OF *HOMO ZELOTYPUS* IN THE LITERATURE OF JEALOUSY

**Crinela Letiția JURJ (BORCUT), PhD, Technical University of Cluj-Napoca - Northern
Baia-Mare University Centre**

Abstract: Sequence of our PhD thesis entitled “Jealousy-archetypal dimension of the human being. Manifestations in the Romanian Literature” (publicly sustained on October 25th 2013 at Baia Mare), the present study suggests to shed the light on the unique and innovative manner by which we may approach the emotion of jealousy, researched manifold until now in its polymorphism and polytrophism. Taking into consideration the premise of reality’s relativity, of its objectivity, as well as the necessity of the reference model, we suggest the archetypological perspective as being capable of bringing a plus of decantation of this emotional reality, respectively of seeing it as a veritable archetypal dimension of the human being, the archetype of “homo zelotypus” with its two bipolar dysfunctions (“crudus” and “mollis”) which we suggest as being its archetypal representative image. In a first sequence of the study, we call into question this common concept of eight literary texts that have approached the jealousy theme and have served as a support for our research, so that in a second section the study highlights the idea of the jealousy archetype functioning in the holographic universe of literature, as well as the way in which this archetype structures itself in a fractal shape, revealing some recurrent elements of its own fractality, generally (as Benoît Mandelbrot, its discoverer proposes), jealousic fractality, in particular. Hence, the establishment of the concept “fractal archetype”. A third section defines and configures the fractal-archetype “homo zelotypus” within the existential scaffolding proposed by two American researchers from C.G. Jung Institute of Chicago, respectively from the Institute for the Study of Global Spirituality, focusing the personal idea of interference between archetypal levels: level 1 (first degree archetypes or “basic”/“primary emotions”: „homo ludens”, „homo eroticus”, „homo improvidus”, „homo aemulator” etc.) with level 2 (second degree archetypes or the resultants of the interference inside level 1: „homo zelotypus”, „homo vindex”, „homo avarus” or „homo fastidiosus” etc.) and/or with level 3 (third degree archetypes or statutory archetypes of human being: „homo eruditus”, „homo belicosus”, „homo deus”, „homo universalis” etc.).

Keywords: jealousy, fractal-archetype, homo zelotypus, interference, archetypology

1. Introduction

Seen from an overwhelming plurality of angles, jealousy has raised over time live, lit commentaries. Either *emotion* or *affection*, *passion* or *feeling*, *malady* or *syndrome*, *anthropopatism* or *emotional pathemic state*, *resentment* or *experience*, jealousy has involved in discussions and disputes psychologists, philosophers, literary men, psychotherapist doctors, as well as people of faith. But because reality is relative, however we are trying to take it, as

the physician Stephan Hawking¹, we forward an original perspective of the concerned theme: jealousy is an *archetypal* dimension of the *human being*. We therefore consider it, in its phylogeny, in its instinctuality, in its congeniality, thus debating with the hypothesis of the American cognitive research according to which it would be a simple acquisition made at an early age². Archetypology, modern method specific to comparative and universal literature may give into account, we believe, the reality of this complex emotion alongside any of the modern neurosciences or alongside philosophy or religion – at least at the same extent – because, considering it a ”model” which ”realism depends on” the idea of jealousy, the perspective proves to be original, innovative. We may consider a discussion of the genesis of archetypology as a modern method specific to the field of comparative and universal literature as being superfluous. That is why we will not oppugn it³. Some questions may still linger: which is the stage where this science stands on since over the American continent it is already blurred by the neurocognitive sciences and whether it may have chances of revival. We will try hereinafter few questioning, possible answers.

Seen as a pattern/ a formative born scheme, as an abstract pre-formed entity which would potentially and virtually include actualisable images by human individual experience, the *archetype* proves its existential configuration according to its own dialectic on the anthropological canvas of peoples’ literature, activating a certain number of fundamental types as similar themes of motives present in the worlds’ literature. Therefore, for example, the prototypal, archetypal jealous configuration from Moravia’s *Conjugal Love (El Amor Conyugal)* or the 20th century Rebrenu’s *Ciuleandra*, we also find it in the 17th century Shakespeare’s *Othello* and in the 19th century Tolstoy’s *Anna Karenina* in the 20th century Camil Petrescu’s *The Last Night of Love, the First Night of War (Ultima noapte de dragoste, întâia noapte de război)*, as we find it – by lecturer archeology- in the Jewish *Old Testament* or in Greek mythological literature, Egyptian or Latin-American peoples. It, the archetype, is present by *universality*, crossing spaces and times under the acting empire of reality. It owns the fundamental role of structuring by orientating/directing the human energy in the direction of *certain* behaviour, thus identifying with that ”*pattern of behaviour*” which Jung talked about at some point (1994: 6).

Resuming the idea of *a model which the reality of the research perspective depends on*, we will state that *the archetypological model* proves to be one of the most plausible and

¹ The reputable English physician proposes in *Marele Plan* (Translation from English by Anca Vişinescu and Mihai Vişinescu, Humanitas Publishing, Bucharest 2012, page 34) the idea of ”model-dependent realism” to describe the necessity of a *reference system* capable of objectify the observed reality, starting from the scientifically proved premise that changing the view/perception angle of an observed reality, its data is changed, which relativizes it, being part of a whole.

² Paul Hauk in *Gelozia. Cum apare și cum poate fi învins acest monstru al vieții sentimentale*, Translation by Alexandru Szabo and Mihai N. Vasile, Polimark Publishing, Bucharest, 1997, pg. 48-49: ”We are accustomed to be jealous and possessive persons. But we do not have this kind of behaviour *by birth*, and this is not our nature. Never say <<This is me. I cannot change. I have always been a jealous person>>. Rather say : <<I have learnt to appreciate myself and compare myself to the others after my own behavior. I have learnt to believe that I must be the best. I have learnt to judge myself through those who accept me. Therefore, if I analyze these ideas, and convince myself that they are nonsense, I put an end to the habit of jealousy>>” (s.n., C.B.).

³ The necessity of its birth in a moment of ”identity hermeneutic crisis” of the comparative literature caused by ”the decline of the positive mentality” and with it, of the ”scientific” procedure already obsolete, the hope that it brings along by the comparative demarche based on ”a sufficient reason and an efficient instrument” are all pertinently captured by the famous comparatist from Cluj Corin Braga in his well-known specialty demarches *10 studii de arhetipologie* (1999), respectively *De la arhetip la anarhetip* (2008).

unexpected solutions, coming from the field of literary analytical psychology: there where cognitive psychology said what it had to say, without adjusting very much the things, where social constructivism washed its hands considering it “a simple personal acquisition” without taking into consideration its obvious universality⁴ - spatial and temporal – and where literature’s critique also tried other interpretative perspectives (for example, the semioticians Algirdas Greimas și Jacques Fontanille etc.), literary analytical psychoanalysis/psychology – more or less traditional – seems to still have the sufficient energy to discern the resorts and the functioning mechanism of this complex emotion.

Such a vision may seem bold, but as Jung claimed at some point, as long as the way of thinking of *homo psihologicus* (the field of emotion existence) concerns, the entrance on the archetypes territory is inevitable. To be able to have such a conversation from this perspective, we must endorse the neurosciences vision, according to which jealousy is a *conglomerate of primary emotions*, an emotional *complex* consisting of either fear, wish of possession, mistrust (René Descartes, 1999: 98-99), or of fear, suspicion and competition (Alfred Adler, 1996: 214), or of hate and envy or fury, anxiety, guilt, shame and sadness (Richard Lazarus, 2011: 341). Because it is a real psychic structure extremely complex which assumes a multitude of primary emotions as a *sine qua non* condition of existence, energies that will “constellate” the *archetype of jealousy*.

2. The holographic Universe. The Archetype. The fractal structure of the archetype: *the fractal archetype*.

The modern holist conception over the Universe brings along an entire ideology called “holographic theory” or “holographic paradigm” or “holographic analogy” or “holographic metaphor”⁵, phrases that coherently capture the new scientific vision – that of the *hologram* whereon the entire Universe underlies and which can be extrapolated to a *super-hologram*. Focusing on the scientific definition of the hologram⁶ and trying to equalize the “sub-atomic particles” of quantum Physics with the “narrative or dramatic particles” of literature (let’s conventionally name so the novels that approach the jealousy theme), observing their *relative* separation, the distance interposed, let’s say, between Romanian *Ciuleandra* and Moravia’s Italian novel - *Conjugal Love/ El Amor Conyugal*, or between Tolstoy’s 19th century novel

⁴ At the scientific meeting in 2001 between Dalai-Lama and a group of world scientists where they discussed on the topic of destructive emotions, the researcher Jeanne Tsai stated that the strongest area of disagreement for the American couples of European origin, as well as for those of Chinese origin is the same: “They are all concerned about jealousy. They were all concerned about the fact that their partner spends too much time with other persons.” (Daniel Goleman, *Emoțiile distructive. Cum le putem depăși? Dialog științific cu Dalai-Lama*, Second Edition, Translation from English by Laurențiu Staicu, Curtea Veche Publishing, Bucharest, 2011, pp. 364-365).

⁵ <http://sorin302.blogspot.ro/2011/04/o-ipoteza-universul-holografic.html>.

⁶ “A photographic hypostasis realized with the help of a laser. For the realization of the hologram (let’s call it “the literary reality”), the object that will be photographed is first <<wrapped>> in a laser ray (for example *the authorial experiential gaze* over a reality submitted to perception – possible interpretation, C.B.). Then, the second laser ray (for example, *artistic talent*) is directed to the light reflected by the first ray, and the interference course resulted – the intersection area of the two rays – is registered on film. When the film is developed, we will only see turbulences of light and dark lines without any sense; but if this film is lit by a third laser ray (for example *the lecturer regard* with its attribute – possible interpretation, C.B.), a 3D image of the initial object will appear”. Reported to a normal photo, the holographic hypostasis contains inside all the information owned by the whole. Therefore, a first characteristic of the hologram (“everything is contained in each part”) which leads to a holographic principle: “in each part we may find the entire and omnipresent centre of the Universe”. That is why we consider that literature owns all the attributes of a holographic Universe.

Anna Karenina and the 20th one - Robbe-Grillet's *Jealousy/ La Jalousie*). This distance between them is a relative, illusory one, perceiving only a part, a fragment of their reality (space or time, for example) we see the truncated "reality". In the holographic Universe thus perceived, these works are inter-connected, forever connected ones to the others: "everything interferes, intertwine in the name of a unifying principle of diversity".

They are, in fact, just „different angles” of a profound reality, primary, holographic and perfectly indivisible, „variants” of one and the same *invariant*, imagistic “extensions” of a single essential thing: *the archetype*. Namely, the *jealousic* one. In this holographic Universe where things seem to be separated, the distance is illusory, because they, the things, maintain the inter-connection, regardless of the interval between them. It is this new scientific science, extremely adequate to understand in an *undiscovered* light even the archetypes. In fact, one of the most reputable specialists of the psychological field, doctor Stanislav Grof makes a statement around 1985 to which we subscribe by becoming aware of the fact that *in this way* we may do the *update* of the field of archetypology, fallen, as we have already stated (in the American area, for example), in desuetude: “only a holographic model can explain things such as archetypal experiences, meetings with the collective unconscious and other unusual phenomena, experienced during the states of modified conscience”⁷

Taking into consideration a certain vision where „everything is contained in each part”, and every part reflects the whole (it can rebuild it), the aimed things in our study receive a much more adequate understanding – they sit better in their matrix: the literary work that deals with the jealousy theme are in an inter-connection thanks to it (regardless of the geographic/temporal distance), creating a “sign network” sustained by several characteristics of which the first, fundamental: that of systemic correlation between information. It is the characteristic that makes an unedited introduction in another new systemic vision: that of Mandelbrotien fractality. According to its discoverer, Benoît Mandelbrot, fractality presumes the advantage of capturing another facet of unitary thinking – called “*unitas ordinis*” by Andrei Pleșu (2003: 40), together with theologians and philosophers of all time, except the postmodernist ones -, primarily evading the static approach of atomist theories. These two apparently dichotomous visions (a holist one, with repugnant division in units/pieces/fragments, specific to traditional thinking, another – on the contrary, fragmentary, founded on the principle of divisibility, discontinuity) happily meet under the sign of literary hermeneutics, both giving simultaneous sense exactly through the tension of one to the *unity* of disparity, of *different* fragments, of the other to the radiography of the universal *patterns*, of fragmentations, fracturations, irregularities, in the same propensity, in fact, to the unity, thus “holotropic” , as Stanislav Grof calls it: “in our daily state of consciousness we are not truly entire; we are fragmented and we identify ourselves only with a small fraction of what we truly are.” (1998: 13). Taking into consideration the manifestation, “the implementation in the act” of jealousy’s “holotropic state” and the vision that the Czech psychiatrist builds about the modified states of consciousness, we may observe several feature correspondences, because “holographic states are characterized by a transformation specific to consciousness , associated to perception changes in all the sensorial areas, intense and frequently unusual emotions, as well as profound changes in the thinking

⁷ <http://sorin302.blogspot.ro/2011/04/o-ipoteza-universul-holografic.html>.

process (...) In the holotropic states, we perceive the intrusion of other existential dimensions, which may be very intense, even overwhelming. Still, in the same time, we topically remain perfectly oriented and we do not lose completely the contact with the surrounding world. We simultaneously perceive two very different realities” (1998: 13). Of course, it may be an excessive imagination. It is too much. And still, every jealous, be they real or “imaginary” (literary characters, paper copies of people) declaim in the “jealousy scenes” a *sideslip* from reality, a *different* experience, in a *different* time and space. Time gets condensed or dilated, space moves its limits so far well fixed into reality.

Seen thus, as a „holotropic state”, of contacting *such* a reality, parallel to the „real” one, the *jealousic archetype*⁸ develops an obvious *fractal structure* in the sense that its discoverer, Benoît Mandelbrot offered: a simple form whereon we may build/develop the fractal object by identical remarks. That is the reason why we proposed the term *fractal archetype*⁹, the most representative miniature imagistic illustration of the fractal archetype is offered by Liviu Rebreanu by his characters from *Ciuleandra*, Policarp Faranga and Puiu, his son, as well as by a key-topos: the native village of Mădălinei Crainicu, Vărzari. Starting from their onomastics (the patronymic and the first name), both Falanga characters (father and son) make the image representation of the fractal structure. Thus, “Policarp” – more carpal, phalange¹⁰ (finger) bones, Puiu – the “offspring” that identically resumes (onomastically, most obviously homothetic, at the structure level) the paternal configuration; Vărzari – toponym that refers to the layered representation of a plant made of enveloping peels/leaves finally configuring a cabbage. These are the most obvious structural images that are illustratively developed by the fractal jealousic archetype, namely, systemically building a specific structure, going on the coordinates of its own fractality.

Thus, among the principles that govern “the fractal jealousic paradigm” are the world re-configuring *detail*, “the non-literality”, “the contemplation omnipresence”, “the intern homothety”, or in other words, the auto-similarity by auto-generation, respectively “the fractal dimension” by which one tries a certain quantification of the irregularity/roughness degree of the archetypal jealousic form. Regarded in its poetics, the jealousic fractal-archetype structures a form founded on the *ad nauseam* obstinate *detail*, vectored by a *verbalized regard*: everything falls under the monophthalmic/multiophthalmic empire of the jealous seduced by detail and obstinate, that is why, to outsource the satisfied curiosity: from the details concerning the characters’ exterior aspect to those of their interior landscape, from the chronotopes’ specificities where they move and which differentiate them to the re-unifying, generalising proximities, which attest the whole from which they descended. There is everywhere this huge, gigantic and curious *regard* that sustains the fluidity of the told story (the case of *Ciuleandra*, *Last night of Love...*, of *Adele*, of *Anna Karenina*, of *Conjugal Love*

⁸ The term “jealousic” is proposed in our PhD thesis “*Jealousy-archetypal Dimension of Human Being. Manifestations in the Romanian Literature*”, p. 27, thesis publicly sustained on October 25 2013, Baia Mare. Although in the Romanian language meaning “about agar” (this being defined as “solid environment for bacterial culture, obtained by agar dissolution into water; <fr. *géluse*”), we propose a new, original connotation: “*about jealousy*”, or which contains jealousy, envy, malevolence feelings; which approaches/exalts/reflects jealousy.”, going into the slipstream of the “erotic” term, the one that refers to the sense “which contains/concerns love feelings; which approaches/reflects the theme of love”.

⁹ Already cited PhD thesis, p. 91.

¹⁰ The term “faranga” consonant reference by un-rhotacization to “phalange”.

etc., naturally culminating with the scholastic regard of the New French novel which will surprise – reducing and clichéing – in a specific jealousic paradigm, every insignificant, useless, futile detail of re-figurative life, in Robbe-Grillet's *Jealousy*, for example).

From the non-linearity perspective, which aims at certain diversity in the unit as a refuse of a canonic linearity came on a traditional line, in the fractalic jealousic archetype it is celebrated the homothetic fragmentarism, the sequence, the rhizome. It is mostly highlighted in the novels out of the “romantic” grid of naratorial fluidity, those that breathe through flashbacks, kaleidoscopes, through “involuntary memories” and “automatic dictation”, through massive/aggressive ruptures of time, sequencing it, making it puzzle-type: Rebreanu's *Ciuleandra*, Holban's *Ioana*, Robbe-Grillet's *Jealousy*, Moravia's *Conjugal Love*, Camil Petrescu's *Last Night*... etc. The optimal hypostasis of this characteristic is represented by “the jealousy scenes” that do not sustain continuity, fluidity, coherence, finally sense-giving, it rather disseminates the fractalic cores that fractally generate new fields of jealousic manifestation. Thus the contemplation becomes consequence and fundament of jealousic-type regard: vectored from an atomist manner to detail, the sight falls rapidly into ardour, it converts itself loyally into contemplation, therefore everything surprised around becomes a pivot of daydreaming, reflection and idolatry (eventually, turns to religion). It is the coordinate that sustains most frequently the imaginative function of jealousy, its capacity of creating *imago mundi*, of reconfiguring the existing world. In a double creating move, *jealousy* and *artistic demiurge* are constituted on the daydreaming / thinking / worship contemplation to organise around these axis, new compensatory Universes where the facets of the polymorphism of the creator and jealous self reunites through reflection.

The obstinate recurrence of several constitutive elements of the jealousic imaginary, invested here and there with auto-generative function confers this fractal-achetype auto-similarity: permanent intertextuality, specific music, linguistic sequences capturing jealousic thinking, specific green chromatics etc. The first element generating auto-similarity and implicitly auto-generating, that of intertextuality – is found in the compulsory, frequent and systemic occurrence of literary and non-literary texts to which the jealous tends to appeal to sustain the *Weltanschauung* in general, the jealousic, in particular. Thus, in Camil Petrescu's *Last night*..., Ștefan appeals to a myriad of philosophers (mostly Kant, “the greatest of all”) to instrumentalize the conceptions he wishes to inculcate, pedagogically, to the beloved being; Emil Codrescu incites discussions with relatively beloved Adela at Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* and *War and Peace*, at Cleopatra's story, at the aporia of Shakespeare's Hamlet; Silvio Baldeschi (jealousic archetype of the Writer) strongly believes in Leda's ignorance (correlative archetype of the Work), that is why he decides her cultural safeguarding on the background of its *sine qua non* necessity consciousness in his existence: throughout the evolution he problematizes the text writing, its demiurgical act, attracting Leda in this problematization game; instead, Holban's Sandu sees in Ioana a brilliant specimen of intelligence, therefore their discussions complete the jealousic discussions landscape intertextually appealing to Racine's, La Fontaine's work, to classics in general (“he met them through me”, “it's a taste that I sent”), both having the conviction that “literature allows you every liberty”; Robbe-Grillet will also intertextually contact “an African novel” that the two focused characters resume, stereotypically, in conversational kneading etc.

The *music* also constitutes itself as an organisational nucleus of fractalic archetypal-jealousic specificity: the jealous will permanently acoustically contact musical pieces that connect him to a *certain* contemplative state: in Ibrăileanu's *Adela* - "the Minuet from the seventh Sonata" and "its diffuse sounds", "the sextet Lucia de Lammermoor", "sonatas, waltzes, preludes and mazurka"; "military music sang by Carmen" etc.; in Holban's *Ioana* - music "is a precious narcotic available in trouble", thus "the critical spirit doesn't burden your emotions anymore". Therefore Sandu's conviction: "I believe that a musical piece has her own scenery", that is why he will buy the music for gramophone: "Concerto for violin and orchestra in opus 77", Brahms' second concert for piano and orchestra, but he will also appreciate the romances violin played by Hacik in the moonlight; in Moravia's *Conjugal Love* - Silvio's predisposition for "Mozart's quartet for radiogramophone"; in Rebreanu's *Ciuleandra*, the title itself directs us to the music that "orchestrated" the existential evolution of the jealous Puiu Faranga and his couple.

In terms of *specific linguistic sequences* of jealousic fractality, a certain remark becomes defining quintessentializing: the one that denies the very jealous' jealousy. Absolutely every jealous refute the idea that they might have footprints of the gloomy jealousy. Thus, Puiu Faranga: "No, not at all! Me, jealous... I, who have cheated her, shameless, even with women that didn't deserve to kiss her feet! Jealousy, no, fortunately or unfortunately, no!" Or Othello: "Think'st thou I'd make a life of jealousy,/ To follow still the changes of the moon/ With fresh suspicions? No! To be once in doubt/ Is to be resolved. Exchange me for a goat/When I shall turn the business of my soul/ To such exsufflicate and blowed surmises,/ Matching thy inference. Or Silvio Baldeschi: "Besides, I am not jealous or at least I don't think I am".

3. *Homo zelotypus* fractal-archetype in the literature of jealousy

But who/what is this *archetype fractally* configured in time and space in the holographic Universe of literature? Going toward the slipstream of some cultural syntagms already instituted that surprise as many existential archetypal dimensions - Johan Huizinga's *homo ludens*, M. Eliade's *homo faber*, Gabriel Marcel's *homo viato*, Ioan Chirilă's *homo deus* etc. - and referring to Ieronim's 14th century *Vulgata* which talked about a „*Deus zelotes*”, on one hand, in the well known dictionaries *Le Grand Gaffiot. Dictionnaire latin-français* (1934: 1700), respectively Charlton Lewis's and Charles Short's *A Latin Dictionary* (1879: 2018), on the other hand, we propose the concept of *homo zelotypus*¹¹ to denominate this fundamentally-archetypal human dimension - that of jealousy, representing it pyramidally with its bipolar malfunctions *homo zelotypus crudus* (to denominate its "strong" essence, that activates the criminal side of the jealous, illustrated for example by the character Puiu Faranga of Rebreanu's *Ciuleandra* Othello from the homonymous Shakespearean drama), respectively *homo zelotypus mollis* (for the jealous "weak", "mild" essence, which activates its suicidal side, represented, for example, in literature, by Tolstoy's character Anna Karenina). This configuration integrates into the vision that Jung relatively had at the existential archetypal scaffolding, but especially into that of his American followers Robert Moore and Douglas

¹¹ Proposition made in our already *cited* PhD thesis, p. 99.

Gillette¹² according to which the masculine psychic would be dominated by a *double quaternio* (which Jung talked about), meaning four archetypal pairs successively accessed at different ages and marking two different stages in his life: the age of the *boy*, respectively that of the *man*. The archetype garnish specific to the age of the *boy* (*the Divine Child, the Precocious Child, the Oedipal Child, the Hero.*) is in congruency with another garnish specific to the age of the *man*: *the King, the Magician, the Lover, the Warrior*. Even more interesting are the *Shadows* (*active and passive*, describing the implication degree of the self in the process of its individuation), that these archetypes assume/build, each of them, as long as they stagnate in one of the immature archetypes, although the biological age follows its course: (*The Shadows* of all already named archetypes.)

Of course, every archetype, with its sides (positive and negative, reflecting the bipolar malfunctioning), ardently and rigorously scanned and processed, preserves at a descriptive level of archetypal structure every “recommendation” that the Swiss psychiatrist categorically made: “Every archetype has a positive, bright, favourable side, that tends upwards and another one, partly negative and unfavourable, partly chthonic, therefore neutral, that tends downwards.” (1994: 132). The two authors propose, for a pertinent view of their conception two pyramidal representation batteries, justifying their option for this geometrical shape by the incumbent symbolism itself: “Although these images must not be taken as such, we consider the pyramids as universal symbols of human Self” (2008: 36-37)¹³.

Retaking into discussion *the archetypal dimension of jealousy*, as well as the existence of the archetype newly instituted - – *homo zelotypus* (the Jealous) – we observe that the discussion may be carried analogically, but with a substance remark: the jealousy archetype is a *secondary* archetype, of *second order*, let’s say, as long as it is constituted as a *mixed* emotional/instinctual archetype, *servicing* the *first order* archetypes, meaning those that *statutorily* configure the human being. Taking into consideration the generalized statement of Jacques Cosnier, according to whom there are “primary/basis emotions” (2007: 17) –this includes fear, surprise, fury, joy, sadness, love, anguish), we will consider their emplacement in this archetypal scaffolding a level lower, constituting themselves in *third degree archetypes* that will combine/derive in the resultants of second level. Here, inside the deepest underground of unconsciousness, we may find those three *homines* that configure different primary hypostasis that we usually call “states”/”emotions”/”dispositions” (*homo improvidus, homo anxiosus, homo aemulator, homo suspiciosus, homo eroticus* etc.). Their polytrophic way of interference horizontally with the others primary emotions, vertically with the secondary ones, interference that reverberates at higher levels too, the statutory ones (*homo poeticus, homo religiosus, homo belicosus, homo deus* etc.) is surprised extremely pertinent by Holban’s character Sandu from the novel *Ioana*, a reflexive capable of exploring with patience, tenacity and painstakingly the inner worlds and send signals from the inside, giving account about the “inner happenings” of his being: “As long as I am capable, vehemently, to

¹²Moore, Robert, Gillette, Douglas, *Rege, Războinic, Magician, Amant: redescoperă arhetipurile masculine*, Translation: Ramona Bențea, Daksha Publishing, Bucharest, 2008.

¹³ Cf. and Dumitru Constantin Dulcan who in *Inteligența materiei*, Third Edition, revised and added, Eikon Publishing, Cluj-Napoca, 2009, p. 384 speaks by extrapolation about an entire pyramidal Universe: “The metaphoric image detached for the Universe is that of the pyramid with a broad base and a single peak or of concentric circles”.

get excited and to get depressed, I cannot be called a machinery. Besides, I believe that this term is not suitable for any man. *There is a different structure of instincts, a different combination of them.*" (s.n., C.B.).

It becomes extremely interesting, in our opinion, the way that once activated ("constellated" would say Jung) in the archetypal pyramidal gear, this jealousic latency enters in interference¹⁴ with the other literary/cultural, psychological/ anthropological or ontological/metaphysical archetypal entities. Once awakened to life, its functionality will relentlessly and indelibly affect the entire functionality of the archetypal existence. Thus, in a first described register, for example, *homo zelotypus* will imperiously influence *homo poeticus*, found in a love (and jealous) relationship with his own masterpiece work, in the sense of a *inauthentic and plagiarism Writer*, (Puiu Faranga from Rebreanu's *Ciuleandra*) or in the sense of a *Writer of definite value* like Silvio Baldeschi from Moravia's *Conjugal Love* who absolves his Masterpiece of the "conjugal" skidding sin. These are only two of the functions that "jealousy" ("zelotypia", for Greeks and Latinos) develops – that of *cognition* and the *soteriological* one, to the extent that Puiu, although collapsed into the reality, he saves him metaphysically, and Silvio is redeemed by the forgiveness that is given to the Wife-Opera, by the novels' ending (having the discussion in an onto-metaphysical register). Anyway, from here, from the basis of instinctuality it will ordinate/co-ordinate the statutory functioning of the human being. Invested by a plurality of missions, jealousy, real "*pattern of behavior*", will induct the living being either on the curing dimension (*therapeutical* function – in Holban's *Ioana*, for example), on the punishment dimension (*punitive* function – in *Anna Karenina*, for example), on the redemption dimension (*soteriological* function – in *Conjugal Love* or in Camil Petrescu's *Last Night of Love...*). There is one more function, omnipresent, of jealousy: that of "condition", of *sine qua non* quality, of complementarity of love, as the theologian Pavel Florenski supposed in *The Pillar and Foundation of Truth (Stâlpul și Temelia Adevărului)*, "that who wants to kill jealousy, kills love too". This is the reason of jealousy's existence for all time and it will most probably remain that way: activating the *homo zelotypus* inside us, we discover ourselves people that aspire to primordial Divinity, the one self-declared jealous and which warned us kindly enough: "You shall have no other gods before me!" Or else, the devolved risk - needs to be assumed. With each of its consequences - to the last one.

Bibliography

Holban, Anton, *Ioana*, în *O moarte care nu dovedește nimic. Ioana*, Editura Eminescu, București, 1974.

Ibrăileanu, Garabet, *Adela*, Editura Erc Press, București, 2009.

Petrescu, Camil, *Ultima noapte de dragoste, întâia noapte de război*, Prefață de Nicolae Manolescu, Curtea Veche, Editura Jurnalul Național, București, 2009.

¹⁴ Stephen Hawking în *Scurtă istorie a timpului. De la Big Bang la găurile negre*, Translation from English by Michaela Ciodaru, Humanitas Publishing, Bucharest, 2012, p. 76, uses this notion by reporting to two sets of waves or particles and is defined by the following terms: „the maximum of a set may concur to the minimum of the other set. Then the two sets of waves cancel each other, instead of becoming a more powerful wave, as we would expect”.

- Rebreanu, Liviu, *Ciuleandra*, în *Opere*, vol.7, ediție critică de Niculae Gheran, Editura Minerva, București, 1975.
- Moravia, Alberto, *Amorul conjugal*, Traducere din limba italiană de Cerasela Barbone, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2010.
- Robbe-Grillet, Alain, *Gelozia*, Traducere din limba franceză de Raluca Dincă, Editura Art, București, 2011.
- Shakespeare, William, *Othello*, Traducere de Ion Vinea, postfață de Leon Levițchi, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București, 1999.
- Tolstoi, Lev Nicolaevici, *Anna Karenina*, volumele I-II, traducere de M. Sevastos, Ștefana Velisar Teodoreanu și R. Donici, Editura Adevărul Holding, București, 2008.

Critical bibliography

- Adler, Alfred, *Cunoașterea omului*, Traducere, studiu introductiv și note de dr. Leonard Vasiliu, Editura IRI, București, 1996.
- Braga, Corin, *10 studii de arhetipologie*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1999.
- Braga, Corin, *De la arhetip la anarhetip*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2006.
- Cosnier, Jacques, *Introducere în psihologia emoțiilor și a sentimentelor. Afectele, emoțiile, sentimentele, pasiunile*, Traducere de Eliza Galan, Editura Polirom, Iași, 2007.
- Descartes, René, *Tratat despre sentimente. Sufletul și corpul*, Traducere, prefață și note de dr. Leonard Vasiliu, Editura IRI, București, 1999.
- Dulcan, Constantin-Dumitru, *Inteligența materiei*, Ediția a III-a, revizuită și adăugită, Editura Eikon, Cluj-Napoca, 2009.
- Gaffiot, Felix, *Le Grand Gaffiot. Dictionnaire latin-français*, Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée sous la direction de Pierre Flobert, Hachette-Livre, Paris, 2000 (1934).
- Goleman, Daniel, *Emoțiile distructive. Cum le putem depăși? Dialog științific cu Dalai-Lama*, Ediția a II-a, Traducere din limba engleză de Laurențiu Staicu, Editura Curtea Veche, București, 2011.
- Grof, Stanislav, *Jocul cosmic. Explorări ale frontierelor conștiinței umane*, traducere de Mihnea Columbeanu, Editura Antet XX Press, 1998 (anul apariției în SUA, State University of New York).
- Hauk, Paul, *Gelozia. Cum apare și cum poate fi învins acest monstru al vieții sentimentale*, Traducere de Alexandru Szabo și Mihai N. Vasile, Editura Polimark, București, 1997.
- Hawking, Stephen, Mlodinow, L., *Marele Plan*, Traducere din engleză de Anca Vișinescu și Mihai Vișinescu, Editura Humanitas, București, 2012.
- Hawking, Stephen, *Scurtă istorie a timpului. De la Big Bang la găurile negre*, Traducere din engleză Michaela Ciodaru, Editura Humanitas, București, 2012.
- Jung, Carl Gustav, *În lumea arhetipurilor*, Traducere din limba germană, prefață, comentarii și note de Vasile Dem Zamfirescu, Editura „Jurnalul Literar”, București, 1994.
- Lazarus, Richard, *Emoție și adaptare. O abordare cognitivă a proceselor afective*, Traducere din engleză de Iuliana Diaconu, Editura Trei, București, 2011.
- Lewis, Charlton T., Short, Charles, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1879

Moore, Richard, Gillette, Douglas, *Rege, Războinic, Magician, Amant: redescoperă arhetipurile masculine*, Traducere: Ramona Bențea, Editura Daksha, București, 2008.

Pleșu, Andrei, *Despre îngeri*, Editura Humanitas, București, 2003.

Jurj (Borcut), Crinela Letiția, *Gelozia – dimensiune arhetipală a ființei. Manifestări în literatura română*, teză de doctorat susținută public la 25 octombrie 2013, Baia Mare (coord. prof.univ.dr. Gheorghe Glodeanu), nepublicată.

Site

<http://sorin302.blogspot.ro/2011/04/o-ipoteza-universul-holografic.html>.