Bottle him!
Have you bottled her?
Samuel Beckett¹

He sat naked in his rocking-chair
of undressed teak.
The corner in which he sat
was curtained off from the sun.
Seven scarves held him in position.
Only the most local movements were possible.
Samuel Beckett²

“The first volume of The Funambulist Papers is almost published, and I was coming back to you to know if your text for the second one will still be ready to be published around December as we originally talked about,” wrote Léopold Lambert in an October 2013 E-mail. “Taking the risk of being a bit redundant,” he continued, “I’d like to insist on the importance of addressing the question of the body, [...] as the essays will come from very different people and it would therefore be great to have [one] object of investigation with so many different approaches.” Also sprach der Seiltänzer: thus spoke the tightrope-walker, and in this way — ambulatorily, via agchibasien — was the funis (‘thread’) furnished for the present foray (this very brief essay).⁴

Let us begin, then, by binding the body with a tightrope, the better to parse its particular parts and inspect its peculiar prospects, as if submitting the latter to the hands of Hans Bellmer, perverse belle-mère of this essai qua petit papier (this petit traité akin in some

---

³ Email conversation with Léopold Lambert (October 2013).
The Temple of Man by René Schwaller (1957)
ways to Bellmer’s *Petit Traité* and *Petite Anatomie de L’Inconscient Physique*). The binding of the body in the works of both Bellmer and Francis Bacon is like that (the binding) of a butcher, or more frightening still of a murderer (‘sacred,’ or ‘profane’, sacrificial or straight-out homicidal). Writing explicitly of this webbing, constricting or binding in the work of Bellmer, Peter Webb wove together the following concrete and conceptual coordinates of these cases/encasements:

In Paris in 1946 [Bellmer] had made studies of women in relation to his [Donatien Alphonse] Sade and [Georges Albert] Bataille projects. Soon after that he had taken photographs of [...] Unica Zürn naked on a bed and in a chair, tied up with string which creates extraordinary folds and shapes in her flesh. The inspiration for these images


6 Compare this with the opening description in Samuel Beckett’s first published novel, *Murphy* (a novel having to do with its titular protagonist’s Greek homonym, Μορφή — i.e.
comes from the photograph of a murder-victim described in [his Petite Anatomie de L’Inconscient Physique]: ‘A man, in order to transform his victim, had tightly bound her thighs, shoulders and chest with tight metal wire, criss-crossing in all directions, causing blisters, irregular spherical triangles running along the folds of the flesh, unsavoury lips, creating multiple breasts in unspeakable settings.’

Switching for a moment from this Webb excerpt to an excerpt from a study by Peter Kollar, one could note here that this binding is the bindu (बिंदु), the point, of architecture — or more precisely the architectural gesture: its pointing (in this case its pointing toward — to ward and precinct — ‘man’). ‘Architecture ‘takes hold’ of man, whereas other forms of art have to be ‘taken hold of’ by him,” writes Kollar, condensing in one line a whole thread from the Vastu-Shastra. A binding or building-like ‘hold’ that, at first glance, might appear more loose and à-l’aise than the bindings of Bellmer — but that is in fact just as rigorous (nevermind rigorously mortal), as Gilles Deleuze amongst others has shown — “the ‘cage motif’ which Bacon employs in the form of a glass box or podium, as a shrine [or contemplative temple], as bedposts or simply as cordoned-off space” (“motifs such as ropes, cages, podiums, glass boxes, curtains or rondelles”) is and are used both “to isolate” a body “loaded with emotionality, pain, existential fear and psychological depth [that would otherwise overwhelm — indeed destroy — the work]” and to conduct all “attention” — indeed transduce all tension[s] — “with regard to the essential figure” being figured.

“It is a very simple technique,” states Deleuze ("elementary, my dear Watson," as Holmes-sweet-Holmes ne’er did say): “putting the Figure inside a cube, or rather, inside a parallelepiped of glass or of ice; sticking it onto a rail […] as if on the magnetic arc of an infinite circle; or combining all these means — the round area, the cube and the bar — as in Bacon’s strangely flared and curved armchairs.” This architectural technique, the yantra (‘literally the ‘vessel of yoking’, […] [the] device, sacred diagram, […] [that is] the foundation of the temple” according to the Vastu-Shastra), “do[es] not consign the Figure to immobility but, on the contrary, render[s] sensible a kind of progression, an exploration of the Figure within the place or upon itself.”

with form[s] and formation[s], with [meta]morphosis and morphogenesis), an excerpt of which appears as an epigraph of the present paper.

uppercase F in ‘Figure’ (and here, in addition, scare-quotes\textsuperscript{13}) serves to distinguish it from normative figuration[s]: an important distinction, since the ‘Figure’ in this case is, as Gilbert Simondon — formative influence (speaking of forms and formation) on monsieur Gilles Deleuze — puts it in his treatise On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects, “the [F]igure of a [G]round,” as opposed to a figure distinct and distinguished from ground (hence we have here a “distinction” by way of indistinction, or again a “clarification” by blurring).\textsuperscript{14}

The ‘Figure’ here is, in its figuration of the ground or ground-figuration, an indistinct “\textit{quidam quelconque}”\textsuperscript{15}: “[a] quidam, [an] ‘unknown’,” which might be described as “a vast pre-individual field,\textsuperscript{16} an omnipresent yet essentially amorphous figure […] that, like the [in]famous ‘compound ghost’ of T.S. Eliot’s fourth and final Quartet, is both ‘intimate and unidentifiable.’ Identities emerge from this field ‘only in specific contexts’,” with and in the specific confines of ropes, cages, podiums, glass boxes, curtains or rondelles (as above,\textsuperscript{17} so below\textsuperscript{18}), each one “but a fragment, a particular façade, of the larval being” qua quidam quelconque “hovering vastly over the[ir] shoulders.”\textsuperscript{19} In the Vastu-Shastra this ‘Figure’ is the Vastupurushamandala, the subject of the present essay and of Stella Kramrisch’s landmark treatise The Hindu Temple.\textsuperscript{20}

“\textit{The Vastupurusha} is the \textit{Anthropocosmos} [qua Pharaonic \textit{pr-aA}]”\textsuperscript{21} wrote Schwaller in “The Hindu Temple” subsection of The Temple of Man.\textsuperscript{22} Although anthropoid, this ‘Figure’ (the Vastupurusha qua \textit{pr-aA} or \textit{Anthropocosmos}) is not human — hence Schwaller’s observation that it “is anthropomorphized but never humanized;” Kollar calls it

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[17] See the epigraphs at the beginning of this essay.
\item[18] Hear ‘here’.
\item[21] The word Pharaoh (\textit{pr-aA}) literally means ‘Great House’, i.e., an architectural principle; it is the principle (according to René Schwaller) of the \textit{Anthropocosmos} qua Vastupurusha.
\item[22] Schwaller, \textit{Le Temple de L’Homme}, 728.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
“superhuman,” and indeed it is in many respects Übermenschlich.23 “This is the raison-d’être of [architectural] symbolism in traditional civilizations, where the main preoccupations are directed toward [...] the knowledge and the attainment of certain states which are ‘superhuman’: symbolism is used to communicate, as far as this is possible, the nature of the states in question.”24 “In civilizations where the tradition is no longer effective or has become largely unrecognizable, symbolism is lost,” argues Kollar, “or what is worse, is subverted, since the chief preoccupation of the people shifts to the strictly human, even to the base-material or ‘subhuman’ level; traditional symbolism hence becomes ‘superfluous’ since all that is ‘worth’ communicating can be communicated in human terms.”25

The Übermenschlich Anthropocosmos qua pr-aA\Vastupurusha is, according to the Vastu-Shastra a primal, primeval and pre-individual unity (what Simondon would call a “primitive magical unity”).26 “Ac-

23 Ibid., 27, emphasis in the original. Kollar, Symbolism in Hindu Architecture, ix.
24 Kollar, Symbolism in Hindu Architecture, ix.
25 Ibid.
According to the many myths of Hindu tradition, the fall from unified being into separate existence" — or to wax Levinasian, from existence to existents — "has something frightening, asuric and undetermined in its nature. ‘Once there was some existing thing not defined by name, unknown in its proper form in blocked heaven and earth; seeing that, the Devas seized it of a sudden and laid it on the earth face-downward. In the same position as they were when they seized it, the Devas stayed on it where it lay. Brahma made it full of gods and called it Vastupurusha’. [...] Only after this can ‘the existing thing undefined by name, unknown in its proper form’ receive its name, Vastupurusha, and its proper form, the square, [fourfold, or quadrature].”

Here we have a mythic recounting or accounting of “the fundamental procedure from unity to quadrature,” from formless (i.e. unformed) chaos to a formal, four[fold]-element cosmos. The diagrammatic form (/mandala) of the existent (/vastu) entity (/purusha) reflects the quaternity of its elemental existential composition qua deposition — being fourfold like the four chymoi, stoicheia, purusharthas (humours, elements, “[anthropological] ends”) etc. — but in a ‘man’ner distinct from the later post-Pythagorean/post-’Pitha-guru’ and more importantly post-Purushan — hence human-all-too-human — models/mandalas such as those of Aristotle, the Stoics, and the whole Patristic Tradition that followed in the[ir] aftermath.

---


29 Ibid., 52.

Whereas figures such as those outlined by Marcus Vitruvius Pollio in *De Architectura* (his *Ten Books on Architecture*, circa 15 BC — specifically section 1:2-3 of *Book Three*, the book on temples and architectural orders), made famous after its revival in the Renaissance by Leonardo’s *mandala* (viz. 'Vitruvian Man' by Leonardo da Vinci, circa 1490), are based on a body with outstretched arms and legs, limbs extended to their maximum range (e.g., “the so-called ‘metrical relief’ in the Ashmolean Museum” which “shows the top-half of a man’s body with his arms stretched-out full”31), the V² or Vedic Vision by contrast is compact, compacted, confined by (rather than configuring) the *mandala* as such — unextended, in other words, rather than in a state of extension. Extension in the Vedic Vision (the V² *Vastupurusha mandala*) gives rise to the building that is based on, and grows out from, the basic *mandala* — a building that stands, according to Schwaller, as an extensive “symbol” of the latter; the *mandala* itself remains purely intensive (hence its association in this essay with the bound figures of Bacon and Bellmer, not to mention Beckett).32

Extension in the Vedic Vision takes the form of a *dismemberment* moreover, following Book Ten of the *Rig Veda*: as Rykwert explains, “the ninetieth hymn of the *Rig Veda* suggests the creation of the cosmos and of society through a sacrificial dismembering of *Purusha*, the first man.”33 The creation of the cosmos and of society is in other words (in the words of T.S. Eliot, author of *The Waste Land*, during the composition of that poem, in an essay for *The Egoist*) “a continual self-sacrifice, a continual extinction” of *Purusha* — *Avast*! — into a *Vastu*: an existent form, an existent formulation. *Purusha* as such is a pre-existing, pre-individuated “impersonality”: an “impersonality [...] surrendering [indeed *sacrificing*] itself wholly to the work to be done.”34 A *Vastu*, then, is its “objective correlative, in other words, a set of objects, a situation [or] a chain of events which shall be the formula for [its] *particular* [manifestation]” and its manifested *Grundstimmung*: its ultimate architectural effect qua affect.35

31 Ibid., 99.

32 Architecture in both the Vedic and Pharaonic traditions is “symbolic” according to Schwaller; that is, it is a matter of making symbolic structures—“symbols” as such—that articulate a vast synthesis, manifesting manifold dimensions of the diagrammatical *Vastupurusha*. At the beginning of his treatise on *The Temple of Man*, Schwaller confesses that within [t]his text he is obviously “obliged to use words, which, although they define the idea, are by that very fact misleading. Indeed to speak of the esoteric is necessarily to be esoteric. [...] So, what can we do? We have to use words, but our aim is much higher; only the symbol can translate the synthetic sense of thought. It is a question of evoking that which can no longer be defined. It is thus a ‘feeling’ that we must bring into being, an ‘unexpressed intuition’, a ‘certainty’ for which the word-that-would-not-limit-it is lacking.” Schwaller, *Le Temple de L’Homme*, 16.


35 T.S. Eliot, in *The Athenæum* (September 1919), 940-941, emphasis in the original.
Following the diagrammatics of the *Vastupurushamandala*, the particular manifestation and particular architectural affect effected by the individualization of objective correlativization “[is] such that” when all of the facts (“which must terminate in sensory experience”) “are given,” the latter affect and manifested effect “strike us” as if they were the inevitable outcome[s] of the initial gesture (the initiating diagram-mandala). Eliot likens this to the trajectory of all great tragedies (as did Nietzsche, in a way, throughout his *Philosophy in the Tragic Age*

This is moreover the symbolic crux of Marshall McLuhan’s movement, in his work, from Typographic Man to [what we might here call] Hieroglyphic Man (cf. Nandita Biswas Mellamphy, “Nietzsche’s Pharaonic Thought: Hieroglyphic Transduction,” in *Ozone: Journal of Object-Oriented Studies* 1:1, 2012), based on the architectonic of Edgar Allan Poe and reflected in the principles put forward by Baudelaire, Eliot, and long before them, Leonardo. “Baudelaire and Valéry,” he wrote, “recognized in Poe a man of the Leonardo da Vinci stature. Poe saw plainly that the anticipation of effect was the only way to achieve organic control for the creative process. T. S. Eliot, like Baudelaire and Valéry, gives his entire sanction to Poe’s discovery. In a celebrated passage […] he writes: ‘The only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by finding an ‘objective correlative’; in other words, a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that particular emotion’ or affect-effect. ‘Poe set this method to work in many of his poems and stories’: this “method of artistic [architectural] perception. […] Such is also the case in symbolist poetry.” Marshall McLuhan, *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man*, University of Toronto Press, 1962, 276-277.
of the Greeks: his Philosophie im Tragischen Zeitalter der Griechen of the late 1870s); for example in the “most successful tragedies” of William Shakespeare “you will find [for instance] that the state of mind of Lady Macbeth walking in her sleep has been communicated to you by a skillful accumulation of sensory impressions; [and] the words of Macbeth on hearing of his wife’s death strike us as if, given the sequence of events, these words were automatically released by the last event in the series.” The difference in the case of the Vastupurushamandala is that the evoked “state” or ground-mood (Grundstimmung/“mood”/“mode”/“state [of mind]”) correlates not with an initial human impulse, impetus or catalyst, but rather with a gesture that — although “anthropomorphized” — is ultimately “never humanized” and that accords instead with what Kollar calls the “superhuman,” with the Übermenschlich Anthropocosmos qua pr-A\Vastupurusha. This is the conundrum of Hamm in Beckett’s Endgame and of Hamlet in Shakespeare’s Hamlet: the correlations in these cases are beyond the bounds of the human-all-too-human, “in excess of the facts as they appear [to the latter]” and a matter instead of architectural gesture — architectural gesture, gestation and suggestion.

Each [architectural] structure, as the outcome of an [architectural] gesture, is according to Schwaller “an analyzed moment of the synthesis [or associated milieu]”: one that arises as a ‘Figure’ — in the Deleuzo-Simondonian sense, hence the uppercase F as opposed to a figure distinct and distinguished from ground; Simondon, On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects, 113-114.

38 Schwaller, Le Temple de L’Homme, 44.
39 “The [F]igure of a [G]round” as opposed to a figure distinct and distinguished from ground; Simondon, On the Mode of Existence of Technical Objects, 113-114.
Kramrisch calls “the Germ of the temple.” The ‘Figure’ in some respects “hooks” and “catches” the background, bringing [an aspect or aspects of] this background “blackground” to light as this background (“Ground”) in a sense flings it forth. Architect and theorist Paul Virilio touched on these ideas in his *Architecture Principe* and *Aube Crépusculaire* when he spoke of the concordant discordance and conjunctive disjunction of the hook and the whip, of brake-pedals/decelerators and the gear[s] of whip-lashed/far-flung acceleration. The fact that Virilio, in discussions with Deleuze, found the crossing of flinging/flailing whip and harnessing hook in the ‘Figure’ of Pharaonic metempsychosis (which Virilio then extended to Papal and Pontifical avatars) accords rather remarkably with the statements in Schwaller’s architectural study.

“Ten years ago I did this big exhibit on speed at the Cartier Foundation in Jouy-en-Josace,” Virilio explained to Sylvère Lotinger in *Crepuscular Dawn*: “and what image did I use at first? The Pharaoh. Why? Deleuze and I discussed it quite a bit.” It is a matter of allowing — indeed fostering, promoting, propelling — given gestures, given movements, while also engaging — hence harnessing or capturing

---


42 See, for instance, Paul Virilio, *Crepuscular Dawn*, Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2002, 65, where these are likened to the Pharaonic coffin/afterlife-raft complete with crossed arms bearing both whip and hook.

43 Ibid.
— them by hook or by crook, flailing and cracking the whip. Simply harnessing or simply fostering, simply catching-hold-of (be-getting) or simply letting-go-of (letting-be) would “be” ([be-]get/[let'-be]) of no avail: nothing new would come of it. The Pharaoh with “the two hands crossed on his chest […] holding on the one side a hook, and on the other a whip” (ibid.) is in this sense, like “the Pope [with his] hook or the Bishop [with his] cross” (ibid.) and like “Innocent X” — speaking of Popes — ‘X’ed or crossed by curtain-like lines, hooked by rope-rails, caught-up as was Beckett’s Murphy in the Μορφή (“Figure”) of a chair (chair = flesh in French) in Bacon’s ‘Study after Velazquez’s Portrait of Pope Innocent X’, what Deleuze describes as the “non-representative, non-illustrative, non-narrative” THERE IS (IL Y A là, ici) of a [matter-of-] ‘fact’ [qua quidam quelconque]: here (ici) there is (il y a) a ‘Figure’ flung from the ‘Ground’ as well as a ‘Ground’ flung forth and held there — hooked there, given place there — as a ‘Figure.’

“The relation of the Figure to its isolating place defines a ‘fact’: ‘the fact …, ’ ‘what takes place is …,’” writes Deleuze. In a sense, this is what makes Bacon’s Figures (not to mention those of Bellmer and/or Beckett) akin to Egyptian sculpture and/or architecture: “[indeed] there are many things that make Francis Bacon Egyptian” [and we might add here, Hindu, mightn’t we? oui, bien sûr!], states Deleuze. Bacon himself, notes the latter, publicly declared “his love for Egyptian sculpture” (and perhaps privately also that of the Hindus) what’s more. “A painting by Bacon has an Egyptian look to it” — all the more so because its anthropoid forms are inhuman: or rather, because their relation to “humankind is an accident” rather than an “essence.” The essential is not the human-all-too-human: the latter is an after-effect — albeit an after-effect that brings into being the “analyzed moment” and its analytical monument. What gives rise to this moment and this monument is that “magical diagram” or “yantra” described at length in The Hindu Temple for instance, and The Temple of Man, while only very briefly touched-upon in the present essay, as the yantra of the Vedic Vastupurushamandala and Pharaonic pr-aA qua inhuman (pre-/post-human) Anthropocosmos.

/// Published on November 21, 2013

44 What’s the matter here? (namely the hitherto-unnamed ‘matter’ qua ‘matrix’ in play: that of the now-named hence so-called Vastupurushamandala/pr-aA/Anthropocosmos ‘man’/‘lested — i.e., ‘individuated’ — in-the-flesh*-and/or-stone, or thrown on the throne*).

45 Deleuze, Francis Bacon, 100-2.

46 Ibid., 2.

47 Ibid., 123.

48 (insertez ici un clin-d’œil crépusculaire) ;-)

49 Deleuze, Francis Bacon, 135.