In this particular volume the issue of art as interference and the strategies that it should adopt have been reframed within the structures of contemporary technology as well as within the frameworks of interactions between art, science and media. What sort of interference should be chosen, if one at all, remains a personal choice for each artist, curator, critic and historian.
Headless and Unborn, or the Baphomet Restored

Interfering with Bataille and Masson’s Image of the Acephale

by
Leon Marvell
School of Communication and Creative Arts
Deakin University
leon@deakin.edu.au

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates Bataille and Masson’s drawing of the Acephale, the escutcheon of Bataille’s esoteric cabal and the journal (Acéphale) that espoused his vision of a violently sacralised society. Masson’s drawing of the acephalic monster is the emblem of Bataille’s negative Absolute, and is therefore the final image, a talisman to wipe out all other images. I unearth a hitherto unsuspected connexion between the Acephale and a magical text, one of the Papyri Graecae Magicae. Noting that the Acephale is an ‘emblem’, I point towards the tradition of the emblematic books, a tradition that began with Horapollo’s Hieroglyphica. I then propose that Caillois’s ‘objective ideograms’ and the idea of mantic decapitation was in part responsible for the production of Masson’s image. Capitalising on these imaginal connexions, I conclude by re-imagining the image of the Baphomet, and in particular Eliphas Levi’s famous drawing of the ‘Goat of Mendes.’ I suggest that the Baphomet is the secret twin of the Acephale, and that it is Levi’s aim to make his Baphomet the ultimate hieroglyphic emblem, the supreme condensation of the mysteries of the occult tradition. Thus the Baphomet is the necessary occult complement to the headless monster of Bataille and Masson.

A MONSTROUS EMBLEM

At a certain period in European intellectual history, a comparatively large number of artists and intellectuals – arguably the most important thinkers and artists of the times – were all involved to a greater or lesser degree in the envisioning of a new myth that might lead European civilization out of the gathering darkness of fascism, a myth they hoped would provoke the total and radical transformation of society and culture.

Two principle groups were involved: the Surrealists, constellated around the ideas and political interventions of André Breton, the foremost ideologue of the Surrealist movement, and a group of ‘dissident’ surrealists that included Georges Bataille, Roger Caillois and Michel Leiris, key figures in the radical boys club, the Collège de Sociologie, which coalesced in 1936. Hovering between these two camps were a number of artists and intellectuals who appeared to loath to choose between the two encampments, or who periodically aligned themselves first with one, then the other. Overriding these vacillating allegiances and the petty clash of personalities was the unifying dream of finding a new myth through which society could be transformed. This dream was at first principally fomented within two vectors of cultural intervention: the journal Minotaure and the political activities of a group of engagés known as Contre-Attaque.

Minotaure saw its first issue in 1933. The editorial philosophy of Minotaure was summed up by the publisher and editor in this way: “Starting from the fact that it is impossible in our era to isolate the plastic arts from poetry and science, the review proposes to associate these three domains.” Thus “the plastic arts, poetry, music, architecture, ethnology, mythology, spectacle, psychology, psychiatry and psychoanalysis” were all to be included within its pages in an effort to showcase “the most audacious intellectual activity of the day.” In effect this was the reinvention of an experiment
that Georges Bataille had began several years before with the publication of Documents, a journal that had sought provocation through a violent juxtaposition of ideas and images, the pages exploiting a paratextual arrangement of essays (on gnostic gems, ethnography, jazz, the big toe, and Buster Keaton, for example) and images from contemporary visual artists, photographs of slaughterhouses and pictures of African and Oceanic art. Documents appeared the year that La Révolution surréaliste ceased publication, Bataille no doubt hoping that it would symbolically represent a final, devastating salvo in Bataille’s ongoing critique of Surrealism and of André Breton in particular.

Boiled down in the alchemic of retrospection, we can see that what was primarily at stake in this drawn out intellectual contretemps between two heavy hitters was the nature and relevance of images, of representation itself. Breton was committed to the championing of the importance of images from the very first Manifeste du Surréalisme of 1924. Conversely, Bataille, by the early 1930s, seemed to be not so sure that images, art and literature had any relevance at all anymore. The rise of Fascism with its emphasis on spectacularity and the illusory fascination of imagery – what we might call today the rhetoric of the image – had led to a crisis of faith in representation itself.

Most of the usual suspects that had been associated with Documents had subsequently become associated with Minitoûre. Soon Minitoûre was effectively being edited by André Breton and his close friend Pierre Mabille, a surgeon, writer, scholar of alchemy and Haitian voodoo. Minitoûre was a kind of high-rent ‘neutral ground’ where dissident Surrealists, existing Surrealists, ex-Dadaists and members of the (soon to be formed) Collège – primarily Bataille, Leiris, Patrick Waldberg and Callois – all contributed. The title of the journal indexed one of the key mythologems around which many of the writers and artists postulated their ideas in the divining of a new myth. In foreshadowing the lineaments of this future myth, they looked to the past, and the minotaur seething in the heart of its crepuscular labyrinth was one of the key players.

Contre-Attaque was a small group of revolutionary intellectuals who had provisionally banded together to present a double front: to aggressively denounce the ever-expanding threat of fascism, and to agitate for what they regarded as a concomitant radical transformation of society and culture. In April of 1936 Georges Bataille resigned from the group. This break with Contre-Attaque is doubly significant in that previous to this severing, Bataille’s participation in the group represented a rapprochement between himself and André Breton, but it also signaled his violent frustration with the manner in which intellectuals had pursued their aims in the recent past. Bataille’s solution to this perceived impasse was to create a secret society formed of like-minded errangers, all of whom were seemingly dedicated to following the hoof-prints of the minotauroù fondu del temple sacré.

Boiled down in the alembic of retrospection, we can see that what was primarily at stake in this drawn out intellectual contretemps between two heavy hitters was the nature and relevance of images, of representation itself. Breton was committed to the championing of the importance of images from the very first Manifeste du Surréalisme of 1924. Conversely, Bataille, by the early 1930s, seemed to be not so sure that images, art and literature had any relevance at all anymore. The rise of Fascism with its emphasis on spectacularity and the illusory fascination of imagery – what we might call today the rhetoric of the image – had led to a crisis of faith in representation itself.

Most of the usual suspects that had been associated with Documents had subsequently become associated with Minitoûre. Soon Minitoûre was effectively being edited by André Breton and his close friend Pierre Mabille, a surgeon, writer, scholar of alchemy and Haitian voodoo. Minitoûre was a kind of high-rent ‘neutral ground’ where dissident Surrealists, existing Surrealists, ex-Dadaists and members of the (soon to be formed) Collège – primarily Bataille, Leiris, Patrick Waldberg and Callois – all contributed. The title of the journal indexed one of the key mythologems around which many of the writers and artists postulated their ideas in the divining of a new myth. In foreshadowing the lineaments of this future myth, they looked to the past, and the minotaur seething in the heart of its crepuscular labyrinth was one of the key players.

Contre-Attaque was a small group of revolutionary intellectuals who had provisionally banded together to present a double front: to aggressively denounce the ever-expanding threat of fascism, and to agitate for what they regarded as a concomitant radical transformation of society and culture. In April of 1936 Georges Bataille resigned from the group. This break with Contre-Attaque is doubly significant in that previous to this severing, Bataille’s participation in the group represented a rapprochement between himself and André Breton, but it also signaled his violent frustration with the manner in which intellectuals had pursued their aims in the recent past. Bataille’s solution to this perceived impasse was to create a secret society formed of like-minded errangers, all of whom were seemingly dedicated to following the hoof-prints of the minotauroù fondu del temple sacré.

Directly following his break with Contre-Attaque, Bataille traveled to the Spanish coastal town of Tossa de Mar to visit the on again/off again Surrealist artist André Masson, a friend and associate of both Bataille and Breton. It was good timing for a soul in tumult: the Spanish Civil War was just breaking out.

Boiled down in the alembic of retrospection, we can see that what was primarily at stake in this drawn out intellectual contretemps between two heavy hitters was the nature and relevance of images, of representation itself. Breton was committed to the championing of the importance of images from the very first Manifeste du Surréalisme of 1924. Conversely, Bataille, by the early 1930s, seemed to be not so sure that images, art and literature had any relevance at all anymore. The rise of Fascism with its emphasis on spectacularity and the illusory fascination of imagery – what we might call today the rhetoric of the image – had led to a crisis of faith in representation itself.

Most of the usual suspects that had been associated with Documents had subsequently become associated with Minitoûre. Soon Minitoûre was effectively being edited by André Breton and his close friend Pierre Mabille, a surgeon, writer, scholar of alchemy and Haitian voodoo. Minitoûre was a kind of high-rent ‘neutral ground’ where dissident Surrealists, existing Surrealists, ex-Dadaists and members of the (soon to be formed) Collège – primarily Bataille, Leiris, Patrick Waldberg and Callois – all contributed. The title of the journal indexed one of the key mythologems around which many of the writers and artists postulated their ideas in the divining of a new myth. In foreshadowing the lineaments of this future myth, they looked to the past, and the minotaur seething in the heart of its crepuscular labyrinth was one of the key players.

Contre-Attaque was a small group of revolutionary intellectuals who had provisionally banded together to present a double front: to aggressively denounce the ever-expanding threat of fascism, and to agitate for what they regarded as a concomitant radical transformation of society and culture. In April of 1936 Georges Bataille resigned from the group. This break with Contre-Attaque is doubly significant in that previous to this severing, Bataille’s participation in the group represented a rapprochement between himself and André Breton, but it also signaled his violent frustration with the manner in which intellectuals had pursued their aims in the recent past. Bataille’s solution to this perceived impasse was to create a secret society formed of like-minded errangers, all of whom were seemingly dedicated to following the hoof-prints of the minotauroù fondu del temple sacré.

The figure of the acephalic “monster” (as Bataille called it) is described by Masson in this manner:

“I saw him immediately as headless… but what to do with this cumbersome and doubting head? – irresistibly it finds itself displaced in the sex, which it masks with a ‘deaths head’. Automatically one kneads a blazing heart (a heart that does not belong to the Crucified, but to our master Dionysus). The pectorals starr’d according to whim… (What to make of the stomach? That empty container will be the receptacle for the Labyrinth that elsewhere had become our ralling sign. This drawing, made on the spot, under the eyes of Georges Bataille, had the good luck to please him. Absolutely."

Absolutely – not provisionally, not temporarily, not just for today, but forever, outside of space and time. I don’t believe I am making too much of Masson’s concluding statement here. It is inarguable that a great part of Bataille’s mission in life was to define an Absolute that was the very inversion of the Absolute as previously, endlessly discussed in the West. Masson’s drawing of the acephalic monster is the emblem of this negative Absolute, and of Bataille’s quest. In his introductory essay in the first issue of the journal Acéphale Bataille is uncompromising in his rejection of the Absolute as conceived of in the past. What he is calling for is an absolute rupture:

“It is time to abandon the world of the civilized and its light. It is too late to countenance being reasonable and educated – which only leads to a life without appeal. Secretly or not, it is necessary to become totally Other or cease to be."

The last sentence is perhaps a snide reference to Breton’s Naissance and its famous concluding line: “La beauté sera convulsive ou ne sera pas,” and thus Bataille levels his scimitar squarely at Breton and what Bataille considered Breton’s barely sublimated yearning for the light. This light is that of the intellectus, the light which streams through the Western philosophical imaginary ever since Plato’s philosopher first struggled out of the cave to apprehend the true sun. The light of the sun, the light of the world that had existed up until the appearance of the acephalic monster, is the manifestation in the phenomenal world of the light of the Absolute beyond it: civilization and its light are one. The Acéphale signals an end to all that. The Acephale thus becomes a substitute god, a substitute for the Absolute. No more the light of god, no more the light of the image. Masson’s emblematic Acéphale is therefore the final image, the talisman that will wipe out all other images.

Furthermore the Acéphale does not represent this totally Other world without light, it invokes it. The acephalic monster of Masson and Bataille is a talmasonic, incantatory machine. Bataille’s introduction in the first issue of the journal Acéphale is entitled La Conjuration Sacrée. There are several possible translations of this: Sacred Conspiracy, Sacred Confederacy, or Sacred Conjuration. All these meanings are possible and all, I would suggest, are necessarily present. It is the last possible meaning, sacred conjuration, that I want to run with here.

The acephalic man mythologically expresses sovereignty committed to the destruction and death of God, and in this the identification with the headless man merges and melds with the identification with the superhuman, which is entirely ‘the death of God.’

The acephalic man mythologically expresses sovereignty committed to the destruction and death of God, and in this the identification with the headless man merges and melds with the identification with the superhuman, which is entirely ‘the death of God.’
I will make no comment on the obvious Nietzschean aspirations here, it is the identification that Bataille emphasizes which I want to dilate upon now. Bataille’s day job was as an archivist/paleographer/numismatist at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, and as such he had access to a large and prestigious collection of rare books and manuscripts. I suggest that among these recondite texts Bataille had discovered a particular text in the collection of Greco-Egyptian magical texts collectively known as the Papyri Graecae Magicae.

The Papyri Graecae Magicae were collected in the 19th century by an enterprising and avaricious diplomat in Alexandria, shipped to Europe and subsequently sold to various libraries, including the British Museum and the Bibliothèque nationale de France. It has been hypothesized that these papyri were originally the collection of one man, a magician, ‘who was also a scholar, probably philosophically inclined, as well as a bibliophile and archivist concerned about the preservation of the material.’

A man, in other words, remarkably similar to Georges Bataille. His well-known interest in Gnosticism may have inclined him to search out similar material, and inevitably he would have come across the magical texts of the Greco-Egyptian magician.

If this seems far-fetched, one only has to remember that in the early 1930s in Paris, many of the foremost intellectuals and artists of the time – at least, those of the particular persuasions and allegiances of which I am writing – were regularly attending the soirées of occultist Maria de Naglowska, the self-styled “satanic woman” and hierarchess of the Order of the Golden Arrow.

André Breton, Man Ray and his friend the American adventurer William Seabrook regularly attended her evenings of occult weirdness, and certainly Bataille would not have been outdone in this. It is quite possible that Naglowska’s demonstrations of magical rituals and her ideas on ritual practice were a direct inspiration behind Bataille’s formation of his secret society of the Acephale. It is certainly true that Bataille seemed to be emulating Naglowska when he attempted to drag his fellow Acéphalistes into the depths of the forest…for ritual sacrifice.

Amongst the Papyri Graecae Magicae there is one text that stands out from the standard magical spells that provide solutions for petty objectives, the spells for keeping a lover for ever, or for getting bugs out of the house. This text is Papyri Graecae Magicae V. 96 – 172, named by its English translator as the “Stele of Jeu the Hieroglyphist.”

The ritual begins in this way:

_The ritual begins in this way:_

_I summon you, the Headless One, who created earth and heaven, who created night and day, / you, who created light and darkness; you are Osaoronophris whom none has ever seen…you have distinguished the just and the unjust; you have made female and male; / you have revealed seeds and fruits; you have made men love each other and hate each other._

The being that is summoned is explicitly named Acéphale (Ἀκέφαλος), the Headless One, in this ritual. What makes this ritual even more unusual, unusual in terms of the entire Greco-Egyptian magical corpus in fact, is that after the standard banishing of demons from the ritual chamber, the magician invokes the “Holy Headless One” into himself, thus becoming the one who “makes the lightning flash and the thunder roll… the one whose mouth burns completely…the one who begets and destroys.”

Masson’s emblem of the Acephale holds a flaming heart in its right hand, and the Headless daemon in the Stele of Jeu the Hieroglyphist says that its name is a “heart encircled with a serpent, come forth and follow.” In his text Sacred Conspiracy/Confederacy/Conjunction Bataille writes:

_...he holds a steel weapon in his left hand, flames like those of a Sacred Heart in his right. He is not a man. He is not a God either. He is not me but more than me: his stomach is the labyrinth in which he has lost himself, loses me with him, and in which I discover myself as him, in other words as a monster._

A magician who has invoked a Headless daemon into himself is of course no longer a man and not a god, but something that is neither one nor the other. He is himself but more than himself. He is, in other words, an Acéphalic monster, as Bataille avers in the above passage.

If all this seems circumstantial, I totally agree – yet this hitherto unsuspected connexion is certainly not unlikely, and moreover possesses a high degree of imaginal logic, if I may use the term. Allow me to proceed a little further in my interference with Masson and Bataille’s Acephale.

I have consistently called this image an “emblem.” I have done this in order to point towards a tradition in which I believe the Acephale is the final arrival. This is the tradition of the emblematic books, a tradition that was kick-started when the text of Horapollo’s Hieroglyphica was purchased by Cosimo d’Medici from a Byzantine monk in 1422. The translation of this text (which was originally written, incidentally, in the same period as the texts of the Papyri Graecae Magicae) caused as much an intellectual furor as Ficino’s later translations of the Corpus Hermeticum and Plato’s dialogues. The Hieroglyphica purported to explain ancient Egyptian hieroglyphs as emblematic figures containing layers of embedded meanings. The translation of the Hieroglyphica set in motion an entire industry that led to the production of hundreds of emblematic books, and possession of these collections was considered de rigueur by the learned in the 16th and 17th centuries. In the hands of a few dedicated publishers (such as Theodor de Bry, who published books by Robert Fludd and Michael Maier, both notable Hermetics) the hieroglyphic and graphic tradition of the emblem developed into an efflorescence of Hermetic publishing, which would have a defining influence on alchemy.

Allegorical images accompanied by a few cryptic lines of prose or verse, emblems presented to the learned a kind of pictorial riddle containing a solution of a moral nature. But emblems which could easily conceal more than one meaning constituted ideal vessels for the secret transmission of esoteric information, and as such, were adopted by the alchemists.

Allegorical representation in the form of personification – an ingenious method of encapsulating an abstract idea in the form of a human figure – has probably the longest tradition in the history of Western culture. Emblematic personification was a method in which a host of interconnected, often difficult ideas were subsumed into the one, easily comprehensible image. Examples that are still with us today would include the personification of Justice as a blindfolded woman carrying a sword and a set of scales, and the medieval figure of Fortuna, a woman turning a giant wheel, the symbolism of which perhaps only survives through a certain television game show.

Considering that hermetic emblems were “allegorical images accompanied by a few cryptic lines of prose
or verse,” the cover of the first issue of Acéphale is a perfect example of such an emblem – an hieratic figure beneath which we can see a few cryptic lines: The Sacred Confederacy, or Nietzsche Against the Fascists. Indeed, I would insist that the form and function of this cover serves the very same purpose as the emblem in the hermetic and alchemical books, images of the purpose of which is to accomplish much more than mere representation.

Masson and Bataille’s figure of the Acéphale is also an emblem with a special purpose: it is a magical machine that begins the apocalyptic annihilation of images altogether.

As exactly the same figure was reproduced on the cover of the journal Acéphale in each successive issue (there were only three issues), and as only a single line of text on the cover changed with each successive issue (The Sacred Confederacy, or Nietzsche Against the Fascists, for example) – thus serving the function of an allegorical figure with a “few cryptic lines of prose” – one can say that this emblem was envisioned as belonging to that unchanging Other world of the sacral, standing outside of the pornography of images with which we are daily bombarded, and thus serving as the herald of the sacred darkness that would subsume all representations. A more recent agent provocateur, Jean Baudrillard, in describing a similar vision of violent iconoclasm, notes:

Obscenity begins when there is no more spectacle, no more stage, no more theatre, no more illusion, when everything becomes immediately transparent, visible, exposed in the raw and inexorable light of information and communication. We no longer partake of the drama of alienation, but are in the ecstasy of communication. And this ecstasy is obscene. 7

If one additionally recalls Fredric Jameson’s despair at the “pornography” of images which miscegenate around us at an astounding daily rate, then the figure of the Acéphale must be regarded as a daemonic buzzbomb sent to devastate the endless plain of representation.

THE BAPHOMET RESTORED

One kinde of Locust...stands...in a large erectnesse... by Zoographers called mantis.

— Sir T. Browne, Pseudodoxia Epidemica, 1646.

These thoughts about Bataille and Masson’s hieratic emblem can take a further speculative détournement. Following the momentum of my reasoning, it should be acknowledged that the headless monster of Bataille and Masson no doubt finds at least some of its provenance in the writings and ideas of Bataille’s colleague, Roger Caillois.

As is well known, Caillois’ essay Mimicry and Legendary Psychasthenia, originally published in Minotaure in 1935, has had a surprising influence on 20th century thought, not the least being that it was partly responsible for Jacques Lacan’s development of the idea of “the mirror stage.” This more famous essay was a development of an earlier essay devoted to a discussion of the praying mantis as the supreme representative of what Caillois called “objective ideograms.” Published the year before. For Caillois, the predatory sexual activities of the mantis were evidence of the “over-determination” of the universe: that interconnected causal chains of affective influence stretched from even the mineral and insectoid worlds into the psyche of humankind.

([1]It is utterly unthinkable that causal series could be totally distinct. This also contradicts experience, which constantly demonstrate their numerous intersections and sometimes supplies overwhelming, crushing expressions of their unforthnable solidarity. Although their meaning is hidden and ambiguous, such expressions never fail to reach their destination. In short, these are objective ideograms, which concretely realize the lyrical and passionnal virtualities of the mind in the outside world.)

The phrase “passional virtualities” is a clue as to the origin of Caillois’ strange meditation on the interconnectedness of all things, and of the anthropomorphic resonances produced through the study of the mantis. Caillois had recently read Toussenel’s L’Esprit des bêtes, zoologie passionelle, first published in 1853. Toussenel was a follower of Charles Fourier, the utopian socialist who proposed ingenious ways to reform industrial society based on “attractive labour” – that is, industry based on the erotic predilections of individual workers. Clearly, this work on “passional zoology” was not your average 19th century biological textbook.

Influenced by Toussenel’s ideas, Caillois sought to demonstrate the “existence of a certain kind of lyrical objectivity,” a continuity of affect, which could be para-scientifically illustrated by, and condensed into, a single figure – in this case, the praying mantis in its various forms. Caillois’ attempts to demonstrate the “systematic over-determination of the universe” and his exhaustive description of the mantis, the objective ideogramme of the “continuity between nature and the mind,” would without doubt have been a latent presence in the minds of both Bataille and Masson. I suggest that the defining attribute of the Acéphale group’s emblem, namely, that it is headless, is an effect produced by Caillois’ essay – one might even say an over-determination produced by Caillois’ mantis. The sexual cannibalism of the female mantis is discussed at length by Caillois. The fact that the female mantis chews the head off the male while engaged in coitus is something that, as Caillois avers, one can never really forget.

It is obviously impossible to ‘prove’ that the idea of mantis decapitation was in part responsible for the production of Masson’s emblem, but if one provisionally entertains Caillois’ proposal of the continuity between nature and psyche, and of the consequent complexification of casual chains, then I do not consider this an untenable proposition. It has, at the very least, an imaginal logic, as I have suggested earlier. For my purposes this imaginal logic can be pursued further with one more step.

In his essay Caillois mentions various folk names for the mantis such as “Pray-to-God” and “Pray-to-the-Devil.” At one point he mentions that the predatory sexuality of the mantis could be “correlated with the medieval concepts of the incubi and succubi.” In a further note he suggests that the mantis ideogram can be observed operating in Bodin’s De la Demonomanie des sorciers of 1580 and “other demonographers of the period.” Yet oddly enough, despite Caillois’ synoptic studies of the mantis both entomological and etymological, he neglects to mention probably the most interesting etymological curiosity associated with the insect. The word ‘mantis’ comes from an ancient Greek word that has the meaning of ‘seer’ or ‘prophet, diviner’ (μαντικός). It’s Proto-Indo-European root form is the origin of our mantis, a person inspired by a ‘divine frenzy’, one who is ωτό τοῦ βοτό μαντεύει, “possessed by a god,” as Herodotus says in his Histories (Book 4, 79). Caillois could easily have made this observation when he mentions Bodin’s Demonomanie, as the ‘demonomanie’ in the title clearly shows this ancient connexion.

Yet he does not, so this is where I come in.
I have noted the idea of demonological possession in relation to Bataille’s conception of the Acéphale and the ancient magical text, the Stele of Jeu the Hieroglyphist earlier in this essay. Capitalising on the etymological/magical connexions between the mantis and demonomania, I will now invoke my final image.

In 1307 King Philip the Fair ordered that his once-trusted Crusaders, the Knights Templar, all be arrested and interrogated about their activities in the Holy Land and elsewhere. The Templars were tortured, tried and condemned, and many of their number summarily executed. Following the trials, Philip arrogated the considerable wealth of the Templars to his own fortunes. Considering that the confessions of the knights were all extracted under torture, Philip’s epithet must now be regarded as perversely ironic (of course, the epithet ‘fair’ [le beau] was in reference to his appearance, not his character. Yet it is still true that even in his own time, he was regarded as a particularly unfair monarch.)

Among the list of wrong doings of which the Knights Templar were accused was the charge of idolatry. Specifically they were charged with worshiping an idol in the form of a decapitated head. This bearded head was called Baphomet, and it was supposedly kept secret somewhere within the Knights’ temple in Paris. There has been considerable debate as to the nature of this head. Was it a sculptured head? A mumified man skull, like that of the hand of St. John the Baptist in the form of a decapitated head. This bearded head of Mendes' in his Doctina et Rituel de la Haute Magie, published in 1854. Possessing the attributes of the baphometic gargoyles, and symbolising the secrets and rites of the European occult tradition, Levis description and defense of this figure aims to rescue it from associations with the demonic and, indeed, the satanic.

Levi states that the Baphomet, “a chimera, a malformed sphinx, a synthesis of deformities” symbolises the ‘astral fire,’ the ‘Great Magical Agent,’ the ‘odic force’ and the “devil of M. Eudes de Mirville,” this latter a reference to the now forgotten author of Pneumatologia: Des esprits et de leurs manifestations fluidiques, published a few years before Levi’s magnum opus. Levi asserts that “the frontispiece to this Rituale reproduces the exact figure of the terrible emperor of night, with all his attributes and all his characters,” this bightened emperor being none other than the “Baphomet of the Templars, the bearded idol of the alchemist, the obscure deity of Mendes, the goat of the Sabbath.” He furthermore announces, “let us state boldly and precisely that all inferior initiates of the occult science and profaners of the Great Arcanum, not only did in the past but do now, and will ever, adore what is signified by this alarming symbol.”

The Grand Masters of the Order of the Templars worshipped the Baphomet, and caused it to be worshipped by their initiates; yes, there existed in the past and there may be still in the present, assemblies which are presided over by this figure, for them it is that of the god Pan, the god of our modern schools of philosophy, the god of the Alexandrian theurgic school and of our own mystical Neo-platonists… the god of Spinoza and Plato, the god of the primitive Gnostic schools; the Christ also of the dissident priesthood.

Clearly it is Levi’s aim to make of his Baphomet the ultimate hieroglyphic emblem, the supreme condensation of all the great mysteries of the occult tradition. The gesture of Levi’s Baphomet, one arm pointing aloft, the other to the earth, is (evidently) the “the sign of occultism.” Levi says that one of the arms is feminine and the other masculine to represent the mystical androgyny, and that these attributes have been “combined with those of our goat, since they are one and the same symbol.” Here we have the coincidentia oppositorum, the resolution of antinomies, beloved of mystics and occultists alike.

Levi’s attempt to make of the Baphomet the ultimate emblem of all occult secrets, rather than a decapitated head that was an object of worship by the Templars, has received support from a contemporary scholar of Templar lore, Bernard Marillier, in his Essai sur la Symbolique Templière. Marillier asserts that the Baphomet was a symbol of the “rite of the severed head,” which is the “source of all the myths that relate to the primordial Tradition.”

Marillier adumbrates a list of related stories from world mythology that serve to support his theory: the head of the Medusa severed by Perseus, the heads which the Celts took from their slain enemies, various incidents of decapitation in the Grail cycle of stories, etc. All these point, he says, to a ‘mythico-initiatic’ tradition to which the Knights Templar were heirs.

The rite of decapitation is linked to a double initiation: by cutting off the head of an enemy – the initiate as conqueror – the neophyte receives both the mana contained in the head and spiritual power, and abandons his envelope of flesh for the Spirit. According to Mariller the Baphomet was not an idol at all, rather it was the hieratic emblem of “an initiation rite of the heroic-solar type”:

For the rite of symbolic decapitation, the Templars… captured the spirit and spiritual power, aligned themselves with the divine, and prepared to defeat both their visible and invisible enemies, the most formidable of which reside in the very depths of their being.

Furthermore, the neophyte, by reciting formulas and participating in dramatized scenes, identifies with the deity, allowing him to make his spiritual rebirth in intimate communion with the divine. (My italics.)

In Marillier’s interpretation of the Baphomet, the ‘divine frenzy’ – the mantic sublimation – is the summit of the ‘mythico-initiatic’ tradition which the Templars had brought from the East, and of which the Baphomet was the mysterious, ultimate emblem. Regarded in this manner, the Baphomet appears as the secret twin of, and the necessary occult complement to, the headless monster of Bataille and Masson.
The torch of illumination still burns between its antennae, and the emblem is now transfigured into its final form.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. By which I mean a sorcerous fascination – to be entranced and captured by an illusory appearance.
3. My translation of: il est temps d’abandonner le monde des civilisés et sa lumière, il est trop tard pour tenir à être raisonnable et instruit – ce qui a mené à une vie sans attribut. Secrètement ou non, il est nécessaire de devenir tout autres ou de cesser d’être.
9. McGregor Mathers, hierophant of the late 19th century Hermetic Order of the Golden Dawn, translated the daemonic of this text – inexplicably – as the ‘bornless’ one, a reference found in the title of this essay.
14. The phrase is Calixtos: I have stolen it for reasons that I hope will soon become clear.
16. Ibid., 75.
17. In point of fact the transcripts of the confessions of the Templars do not confirm that they referred to their mysterious idol by the name of Baphomet, rather one of the Templars, Gaucherant de Montpezat, refers to a ‘tête de Baphomet’ (a baphometic head), the meaning of which adjective has eluded scholars ever since.
20. The ‘Tradition’ in this case being the ‘perennial tradition’ espoused by such 20th century esotericists as René Guénon, Frithjof Schuon and Seyyed Hossein Nasr for example.
22. Ibid. “Par le rite de la décapitation symbolique, les Templiers…captaient l’esprit et la puissance spirituelle, se mettaient en phase avec le divin, et se préparaient à vaincre à la fois leurs ennemis visibles et invisibles, ceux qui gitent au tréfonds de l’être, les plus redoutables.”
23. Ibid. “Le néophyte, par la récitation de formules et le jeu de scènes dramatisées, s’identifiait à la divinité, lui permettant d’opérer sa renaissance spirituelle en intime communion avec le divin.”