Introduction

Imaginarium Politicum

Arthur Bradley and Antonio Cerella

> Picture men dwelling in a sort of subterranean cavern with a long entrance open to the light on its entire width. Conceive them as having their legs and necks fettered from childhood, so that they remain in the same spot, able to look forward only, and prevented by the fetters from turning their heads. Picture further the light from a fire burning higher up and at a distance behind them, and between the fire and the prisoners and above them a road along which a low wall has been built, as the exhibitors of puppet shows have partitions before the men themselves above, above which they show the puppets.[1]

In Plato's cave, we enter what is perhaps the original political *imaginarium* (from the Latin *imaginatio* + the suffix *-ium* "a place associated with a specified thing" or a "device associated with a specified function" --- AB and AC.) It is already well known, of course, that the Greek philosopher's celebrated allegory in Book VII of the *Republic* has provoked numerous political readings over the centuries by Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Arendt, amongst others. Yet, as more recent commentary makes clear, this allegory can also be read in aesthetic terms, as a reflection upon the promise and threat posed by images (*eikones*), representations (*eidolon*) or reflections (*phantasmata*). To take up some contemporary interpretations, for instance, Plato's cave has recently been construed as a kind of theatre, gallery, cinema --- or even a form of virtual reality.[2] If Socrates's *dramatis personae* are famously said to be prisoners in a "subterranean cavern [*katageiō oikēsei spēlaiōdei*]" (*Republic*, 514a3), recall, they are also a crowd of spectators who are compelled to sit in a darkened room and watch what the philosopher calls an elaborate "puppet show [*thaumata*]" which has been specially curated or choreographed for them by mysterious puppet-masters to imitate the experience of truth itself. In this sense, Plato's captives are also --- and quite literally --- a captive audience: "such prisoners," Socrates informs Glaucon, "would deem reality to be nothing else than the shadows of the artificial objects" (515c).

To be sure, Plato is also the first philosopher in the history of western thought to articulate an explicit theory of the imagination itself: what he calls "imagination" (*phantasia*) is a form of knowledge that emerges out of sensation (*aisthesis*), rather than from the pure intellectual contemplation of the Ideas (*Sophist*, 264a), and which is broadly equivalent in status to something like opinion or judgement (*doxa*). [3] If imagination's origin in sense experience does not mean it is intrinsically suspect or falsifying, this secondary status vis-à-vis the contemplation of truth does leave it permanently prone to abuse, particularly when it falls into the hands of figures like the Sophists, the Homeric poets or the puppet-masters of the cave allegory in Book VII of the *Republic*. In the case of that classic Platonic thought enemy the Sophist --- who famously manipulates rhetoric for his own ends rather than for the pursuit of truth --- imagination becomes a weapon for philosophical deceit, ruse, and subterfuge: "everything will be of necessity full of images and likeness and *phantasia*" (26oc).

If Plato famously finds no place for the poets in his ideal republic --- because they allegedly "know nothing of the reality but only the appearance" (*Republic*, 601b) --- we might thus be tempted to read his allegorical cave as a dystopian parody or inversion of the polis which starkly dramatizes the political threat posed by unregulated *phantasia.* To read it in this context, Plato's cave could even be said to represent a new addition to the list of flawed models of government --- timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, tyranny and so on --- given in Book VII which we might tentatively name *phantocracy*: a rogue state in which imagination, not truth, rules. Yet, of course, a certain *mis-en-abyme* arguably haunts this allegedly triumphal political unmasking or demystification of the illusions of imagination: Plato's cave is neither an ideal nor a real place, of course, but *itself* a work of the imagination. For Socrates, Glaucon --- and, by extension, the reader as well --- must undertake a thought experiment which requires him to *imagine himself* as a spectator upon the captive spectators of this *marionettentheater*: "Picture men [*ide gar anthrōpous*] dwelling in a sort of subterranean cavern" (*Republic*, 514a3). In order to see Plato's cave-dwellers for the slaves that they are, we must surrender ourselves to the very power that enslaves them: imagination.

In this special issue of *Textual Practice*, we seek to explore what we call our "*imaginarium politicum*" --- which can heuristically be defined here as the deep intimacy between politics and the image, political representation and artistic representation, the political power to represent and the aesthetic representation of power --- across select sites, scenes and signatures from modern political philosophy, art, film, and literature. It is now very well documented by contemporary political theorists that politics and aesthetics exist from their very origin in a deep proximity which goes well beyond, say, any Burkean or Kantian political aesthetics in the form of the sublime or beautiful or Benjaminian aestheticization of the political under fascism. As Jacques Rancière is only the most recent thinker to testify, "politics is a question of aesthetics, "a matter of appearances." [4] To propose a simple, apparently even tautological, hypothesis that will be teased out differently in the essays that follow, this special issue seeks to propose that *sovereign is he who is seen* --- which is to say he who appears, is beheld or made manifest *as* sovereign both to themselves and others --- whether in the purely philosophical sense of "appearance" as the centre of a particular distribution or arrangement of sensible experience; the more political sense of an object of legitimacy, believability or recognition; or the aesthetic sense of a site of artistic, symbolic or theatrical representability.[5] If a sovereign must be seen in order to be sovereign, then what follows also seeks to propose that we can begin to construct a typology or taxonomy of sovereignty's diverse forms of appearance: the spaces, places and architecture of power; the insignia and regalia of power; the images, icons, artefacts and relics of power; the rhetoric, grammars, tropes and metaphors of power; the acts, gestures, rituals and ceremonies of power; the shows, spectacles, displays and dramaturgies of power; the mythologies, allegories, phantasmagoria, heuristic fictions and thought experiments of power, and so on. Finally, this special issue insists that what we call these forms of appearance should not thereby understood as merely an aesthetic or decorative façade upon some allegedly raw or naked *realpolitik* because they co-constitute, and are co-extensive with, political power itself. In what follows, we gather scholars from the fields of philosophy, political theory, art history and theory, literature, film, and media studies to enter our *imaginarium politicum.* What does it mean to speak of the political as a privileged place for the making or production of images, imaginaries, and the imagination itself? What if the image is not merely the locus for "the beautiful" or a screen for the "ideological" but something which can think, reason, and even rule over us? What, to recall Plato's allegory of the cave once more, might our own modern political *imaginarium* look like?

In many ways, Plato's cave reveals that the *imaginarium politicum* is as old as political theory itself. It is only the first of a series of heuristic fictions of the conceptual, political, and philosophical origins of sovereignty which will, of course, go on to include such celebrated thought experiments as Descartes's evil genius, Hobbes's state of nature, and Rawls's veil of ignorance. At the same time, the subfield of political philosophy of the imagination (*phantasia, imaginatio*) inaugurated by Plato obviously has a long and complex afterlife in the work of such figures as Aristotle, Descartes, Pascal, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, Cassirer, Husserl, and Sartre where it is variously understood as a mere after-effect of perception (Hume); a mental faculty for synthesising sensuous intuitions with concepts (Kant); and an index of existential freedom (Sartre). To pursue this history into political modernity, we will also bear witness to the emergence of something called the social, political, or psychoanalytic "imaginary" --- whatever we understand by that overdetermined signifier --- in such vastly different theoretical figures as Sartre, Lacan, Althusser, Castoriadis, Lefort and Anderson. If it is clearly impossible to even begin to do justice to the long and diverse history of the relationship between politics and the image here, what many of the above signatures perhaps nonetheless arguably share is a certain desire to emancipate the field of the imagination from its long-standing position as a philosophical "slave" --- whether of thought (Plato); perception (Hobbes, Hume); the transcendental synthesis (Kant) or of political economy (Marx and Engels) --- to which it is condemned from at least Book VII of the *Republic* onwards. In modern political philosophy, particularly, what we call the "imagination" is no longer relegated to a regional question of aesthetics or ideology but begins to emerge as a (perhaps even *the*) political faculty *par excellence.* What, then, is the history of our political *imaginarium*?

To take just one seminal moment from the modern history of the political philosophy of the imagination, Blaise Pascal's celebrated Fragment 78 in the *Pensées* (1670), "Imagination," contests early modern attempts to found philosophy on reason, nature, or empirical experience by insisting that what we call "the imaginary" constitutes a fictive but nonetheless entirely irreducible dimension within our apprehension of the real: "This arrogant power," he argues, "the enemy of reason, who likes to control and dominate it, has established in man a second nature to show how all-powerful she is [*elle peut en toutes choses*]."[6] Yet, intriguingly, what Pascal calls imagination is not simply an epistemological faculty, which casts doubt on the givenness of empirical or rational experience, but a political one which is capable of bestowing symbolic legitimacy upon a set of political bodies whose power would otherwise be wholly factical. For Pascal, a judge, lawyer, or doctor obtains their authority in the eyes of society, not from any essential or objective power or knowledge they may allegedly possess, but precisely from their aesthetic appearance *as* powerful in front of the tribunal of the imagination: "What but this faculty of imagination dispenses reputation, awards respect and veneration to persons, works, laws, and the great?" (*Pensées*, 3: 78, 67). If imagination may have no primary basis in reason itself, Pascal's essay concludes that this faculty perversely manages to hypostatize itself into a real, material, and autonomous existence which is every bit, if not more, "objective" than rational or empirical experience: the imaginary paradoxically becomes more real than the real. In its uncanny status as what we might call an objective or material fiction, the Pascalian Imagination can thus even be seen as anticipating modern Sartrean, Lacanian or Althusserian theories of the Imaginary.[7]

If modern philosophers increasingly concern themselves with the *political* power of the faculty of the imagination --- whether as a signifier of the subject's existential freedom (Husserl, Sartre) or the name for that subject's capture by quasi-autonomous symbolic or ideological

structures (Lacan, Althusser) --- it is worth observing that modern intellectual historians have begun to explore systematically the political valence of the image, the sign and the gesture [8] Firstly, we should acknowledge here this special issue's debt to the ground-breaking work of a group of early 20th century figures who, in their very different ways, all explore what we might call sovereignty's *kinesics* or non-verbal bodily communications: Marc Bloch on royal thaumaturgy in the Middle Age; Andreas Alföldi on Roman imperial insignia and Erik Petersen on political acclamation.[9] Yet, it was arguably only after WWII that this scholarly exploration of the symbolic meaning of crowns, orbs, sceptres, thrones, regalia, robes, courts, gestures, rituals and ceremonies began to emerge as a recognised discipline in its own right. For the German historian Percy Ernst Schramm, writing in his essay "Die Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Herrschertums im Lichte der Herrschaftszeichen" (1954), what modern intellectual history required was nothing less than a new *Wissenschaft der Herrschaftszeichen*": an objective science of the "signs" of power.[10] This call was answered by a remarkable wave of post-war scholarship which included such classic works as Ernst Kantorowicz's *King's Two Bodies* (1957); Norbert Elias's *Die höfische Gesellschaft (*1969) and Schramm's own multi-volume magnum opus *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik* (1954-78).[11] In many ways, we might even see Giorgio Agamben's *Kingdom and the Glory* (2013) --- whose own discussion of the political theology of acclamation explicitly cites not only Petersen but Alföldi, Kantorowicz and Schramm --- as the most recent contribution to this *Herrschaftszeichen.*

In pursuing this brief survey of the field, we should equally draw attention to the work of a diverse range of figures from art history and theory, critical theory, comparative literature, philosophy, theology, and related disciplines who also explore sovereignty's privileged self-representations, images, and fictions. To begin with, Louis Marin's famous thesis from his study of Louis XIV, *Le Portrait du roi* (1981) operates as a kind of axiom for this special issue: "The king is only truly king, that is, monarch, in images."[12] It is not that portraits of the Sun King are mere aesthetic imitations or extensions of his power, Marin contends, but rather that such images constitute what the latter is not afraid to call the king's "real presence": *l'image, c'est moi.* Arguably, Marin's work inaugurates a modern genre of political iconography which has now expanded to include significant works by figures like Peter Burke, Christine Buci-Glucksmann, T.J. Clark, Georges Didi-Huberman, Carlo Ginzburg and Marie-José Mondzain.[13] Secondly, we should also acknowledge a related but distinct modern body of work over the last four or so decades by such figures as Giorgio Agamben, Phillipe Lacoue-Labarthe, Claude Lefort, Jean-Luc Marion, Jean-Luc Nancy and Jacques Rancière which explores the relationship between political philosophy and the arts (fine art, theatre, literature, music).[14] For Lacoue-Labarthe, whose career-long deconstruction of the relation between the political and the aesthetic from Plato to Heidegger is another crucial precursor for this special issue, the mimetic arts famously become the disputed site of a political mythological project to construct or produce the subject for itself and others *ex nihilo.*[15] Finally, we could also point to a body of work by such figures as Stephen Greenblatt, Julia Reinhardt Lupton, Victoria Kahn, and Eric Santner which further explores the relationship between literature, aesthetics, and sovereignty If all these figures ostensibly explore the literary representation of sovereignty from Shakespeare to the present, they could equally be said to discover a certain *sovereignty of the literary* itself: what emerges from their diverse bodies of work is the extent to which political power is itself a fiction, albeit one that (like the Pascalian Imagination) cannot be unmasked or demystified, because it is intricately woven into the fabric of the real itself.[16] For Santner, to give one more example, Shakespeare's *Richard II* does not simply allow us to "'see through' the artifice of royalty and of political symbolism more generally…and gain a safe ironic distance from them," but, more radically, the play reveals that "there is more reality in

such theatrical appearances (of the court and the theatre itself) than in our everyday reality, that our inner life is deeply informed by the logic of those appearances, by some 'real' within them *qua* theatre of appearances" (*Royal Remains*, 45). In its deconstruction of the opposition between appearance and reality, actor and spectator, inside and outside, Santner's vertiginal theatre of appearances perhaps even returns us to the same *mise-en-abyme* as Plato's cave: we seemingly have no choice but to enter the *imaginarium politicum* --- even or especially when we seek to exit it.

2

In the following special issue, we thus invite philosophers, political theorists, art historians and theorists, and specialists in literature, film, and new media to imagine new political *imaginaria.* Firstly, renowned philosopher and art historian Georges Didi-Huberman presents a *lectio magistralis* on the relationship between politics and the imagination from Aristotle, through Kant, to Benjamin. To condense an essay which is itself a significant work of imaginative syncretism, Didi-Huberman's "Imagination, our Commune" proposes that the imagination is not simply one of the faculties we hold in common as human beings, but that it is, more profoundly, itself an intrinsically political thinking *of* the common: "imagination would be our common faculty," he asserts, but also "'our Commune,' with a capital C: namely, our first faculty of uprising our first 'free' power of reorganizing the world differently, more justly." In Didi-Huberman's verdict, the political *imaginarium*'s revolutionary *soulèvement* consists, not in works of new conceptualization, but in what we might call a new political *colourization* which re-assembles and re-distributes our pre-existing chromatics of power.

To turn to the next contribution, literary critic Jennifer Rust's "*Ad Salutem Publicam*: Public Health and Pastoral Government in More's *Utopia*" presents the first in what will be a series of case studies in this issue of specific political *imaginaria* from the early modern period to the present day. For Rust, Thomas More's celebrated early modern thought experiment emerges as an imaginative prototype for what Michel Foucault will famously identify as the political theological prototype for modern liberal governance: pastoral power. In what Rust nicely calls the "*otium*" of fiction, More is not only able to create a utopic extension to his own real-world efforts to politicize public health in a time of pandemic, but, more fundamentally, to do the imaginative work necessary to synthesize medical and spiritual care in a new biopolitical theology of pastoral government.

It is Nicolas Poussin's preparatory drawings for his *Massacre of the Innocents* that provides the point of departure for art historian and theorist Helen Hills's reflections upon the ethics, aesthetics and politics of departure itself. To re-trace the steps of her essay, "Those Who Flee and Those Who See: Poussin's Drawing and Withdrawing", Hills offers a contrapuntal re-reading of Marin's *Portrait of the King* (1981) which focuses, not on Hyacinthe Rigaud's immaculately "finished" paintings of the omnipotent masculine sovereign, but upon Poussin's --- unfinished or rather unfinishable --- drawings of the impotent, and apparently marginal, insignificant figure of the fleeing woman. In Hills's collection of fugitive pieces, she explores how Poussin's drawing of the woman, who looks back upon the horror that she flies from, articulates what we might call an equally fugitive ethics or politics of bearing-witness or responsibility which, in turn, implicate the viewer herself.

For political theorist Miguel Vatter, Aby Warburg's famous lecture on the frescoes in the Palazzo Schifanoia at Ferrara (1912) become the platform for a reflection on the place of the esoteric field of astral theology and politics in Renaissance culture. To briefly sketch his highly original essay "Aby Warburg and Astral Theology: A Tale of Three Spheres," Vatter's Warburg seeks to squarely locate "a theology of the stars" (which brings together Greek, Babylonian, Egyptian, Indian, and Chaldean elements to imagine a divine relation between human beings and the spheres) inside Warburg's cosmopolitan reading of the Renaissance and his aesthetic theory more widely. If Renaissance art is the privileged site of the "rebirth" of the Greek gods, Vatter argues, this re-naissance is only achieved via a plural astral theology that is transmitted through Hellenistic astrology. In showing the symbiosis between the aesthetic, political and theological in Warburg's aesthetic theory, Vatter is able to reveal the latter's famous *Pathosformel* as a species of political theological cosmology.

If Vatter's essay concludes by affirming a certain aesthetic cosmopolitics of "wandering" where astral theology is seen to traverse the entire globe, art theorist Charlie Gere's critical creative excursion "Footnotes" traces what we might call a precarious politics of the footstep --- which is to say also of the real or possible misstep, stumble, or fall --- in Martin Heidegger. To follow in Heidegger's own footsteps, Gere shows us, we discover that the former's entire philosophy could be said to be a thinking of the foot --- whether it takes the form of his insistence upon the organic rootedness of his thought in the "soil" of the German language; his consistent recourse to the metaphor of the *Holzwege*, pathway or beaten track; or, notoriously, of his condemnation of any allegedly rootless or nomadic people in the *Black Notebooks*. For Gere, Heidegger's virtuously closed and circular philosophical itinerary --- which always returns us to the position from which we began --- becomes a vicious circle which excludes the other: the animal, the woman, and the Jew. In this sense, Heidegger's footstep is equally a misstep which results in his own dramatic philosophical "fall" after 1933.

In "Time Against the Sovereign Power: The Interregnum in Stuart Brisley's Live Art", comparative literature scholar Sanja Perovic's contribution asks what, if anything, remains of images of sovereignty in a democratic age. To answer this question, Perovic turns to the work of the modern English performance and multi-media artist Stuart Brisley: Brisley's durational "live art" work --- in which he often subjected himself to extremes of hunger, discomfort, and physical exhaustion in performances that lasted days, weeks or even years --- are here shown to constitute a peculiarly modern embodiment of the ancient concept of the temporal interregnum that exists between the passing of an old sovereign (or form of sovereignty) and the coming-to-power of a new one. For Perovic, Brisley's live art (which frequently invokes classic images of sovereignty from David's *Death of Marat* and Velazquez's *Las Meninas*) correspondingly seek "to make visible the mortal body as a site of individual freedom or even a kind of sovereignty" over and against the imaginary remnants of historical forms of sovereign power. In Perovic's verdict, however, Brisley's work cannot finally escape the interregnum between royal and popular sovereignty that it so powerfully stages.

Finally, literary and critical theorist Niall Gildea's essay, "The Family Photo at the Overlook Hotel: Fisher, King, Freud, Klein and the Image of Psychoanalysis," navigates the labyrinthine relationship between psychoanalysis, politics, and the image via a reading of Stanley Kubrick's classic horror film *The Shining* (1979). It takes as its focus the uncanny concluding scene of the film --- a photograph of a photograph --- which reveals that its present-day protagonist, Jack Torrance, had already been the caretaker of the Overlook Hotel more than 50 years earlier in 1921. To challenge orthodox and normalizing Freudian interpretations of the film's denouement, Gildea returns to the early Jean-François Lyotard's own radically libidinal "take"

(in the full cinematic sense of that word) upon Freud, which refuses any simple linear or aetiological recuperation or explanation of pathology. In contrast to Mark Fisher's curiously Freudian reading of the final scene of *The Shining* as symptomatic of the closed psychoanalytic circuit of childhood abuse – where trauma is compelled to reproduce itself infinitely --- Gildea's essay concludes by proposing a Lyotardian re-reading of the same moment as an inhuman, indeed automatic, open circuit which finds its paradigm in the artificial eye of Kubrick's revolutionary Steadicam camera.

3

In the contributions that follow, we thus present a series of very different political *imaginaria* from the early modern period to the present. To explore the relation between the political and the imaginary, Didi-Huberman revisits political philosophy of the imagination from Kant to Benjamin; Rust returns to that classic early modern political thought experiment called More's *Utopia*; Gere offers a kind of political theological metaphorology of Heidegger; whereas Vatter, Hills, Perovic and Gildea interrogate the political universes or cosmologies encapsulated in specific works of art, literature, and film by Cosmè Tura, Poussin, Brisley and Kubrick. What provisional lessons, to recall Plato's allegory of the cave, might we spectators draw from these new political *imaginaria*?

To repeat our hypothesis in this special issue one more time: what we call the *imaginarium politicum* is reducible neither to a purely aesthetic locus of "the beautiful" --- such as the Kantian object which allegedly possesses purposiveness without purpose --- nor to a political site of the crudely "ideological" --- such as the Marxian superstructure erected upon some political economic base --- but rather short-circuits such classic conceptions of the relation between the aesthetic and the political. In each of the following essays, what ultimately emerges out of the encounter between politics and aesthetics is something that is, strictly speaking, neither simply aesthetic nor political, so much as an irreducibly *aesthetic-political* matrix or object: the Palazzo Schifanoia frescoes (Vatter); More's *Utopia* (Rust); Poussin's drawings; the "red-power" imagined by the revolutionary tradition (Didi-Huberman); Stuart Brisley's live-art (Perovic) and Kubrick's cinema (Gildea).

If we obviously continue to speak of specific "images" of power in this special issue --- whether they be frescoes, drawings, paintings, photographs, films or literary fictions ---- we are thus strictly referring to neither sensuous instantiations of some pre-existing theory of the political, for example, nor to the decorative adornments upon some raw or brute form of political praxis. To the contrary, our own persistent claim is that the political does not exist outside of, and cannot subtract itself from, its imaginary expressions as such --- which means that the latter are consequently as "real" as any really-existing political institution, organization, or establishment. In his discussion of the political utopian tradition from Robespierre to Bloch, for example, Didi-Huberman is insistent that the utopian space is not a (variously pathetic or fantastic) refuge from the "real world" of politics, but rather the very genesis or becoming of the political itself.

In addition to offering new critical reflections on the relationship between the political and the imaginary, this special issue can perhaps also be read as a new experiment in political imagining itself. To recall Plato's abyssal allegory of the cave one more time, we are all "prisoners" of the *imaginarium politicum* --- even or especially when we seek to expose the

imaginary to, and denounce it by, the daylight of reason --- and the same law applies in our own case as well. If the following essays all seek to describe a certain inescapable aesthetico-political matrix in political theory, philosophy, art history and literature, they equally could be said to *perform* that very matrix formally, stylistically and generically: Didi-Huberman's essay, for example, belongs to the very tradition of imagining "the common" that it tracks; Hills's fugitive pieces re-trace Poussin's own gesture of (with-)drawing; Gere's essay is both literally and figuratively a series of footnotes to Heidegger's own philosophy of the foot; and Gildea's recursive theoretical machine uncannily re-describes the open and closed circuits he discovers in Freud, Lyotard and Kubrick. In this sense, the essays on the *imaginarium politicum* collected here might themselves be described as new political *imaginaria*.

---

[1] Plato, *The Republic*, Book VII, trans. by Paul Shorey, in Plato, *The Collected Dialogues*, ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairns (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 514c. All further references will be given in the text by title, section number and letter.

[2] See Samuel Weber, *Theatricality as Medium* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004) for a recent example of such readings of Plato's allegory of the cave.

[3] Chiara Bottici, *Imaginal Politics: Images Beyond Imagination and the Imaginary* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014), 16.

[4] Jacques Rancière, "From Archipolitics to Metapolitics," in *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 74.

[5] To be sure, a very large secondary literature now exists on the intimate proximity or relationship between politics and aesthetics whether by political theorists, philosophers, historians, anthropologists, or literary critics. See Zvi Ben-Dor Benite, Stefanos Geroulanos and Nicole Jerr eds. *The Scaffolding of Sovereignty: Global and Aesthetic Perspectives on the History of a Concept* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017) for an excellent contemporary survey of the field.

[6] Blaise Pascal, *Pensées* ed. Philippe Selliers and Gérard Ferreyrolles (Paris: Librairie Générale Française, 2000), 3: 78, 66. Selliers numbering. All further references will be given in the text.

[7] See Michael Moriarty, "Imaginary," *Paragraph* 17: 3 (1994), 236-243.

[8] It is worth recalling that the Latin etymology of the word "imagination" reflects, in part, tradition: in ancient imperial Rome, the *Imaginifer* was one of the *signiferi*, that is, the ranks of the Roman legion entrusted with insignia-bearing – who carried the *imago* (the image) of the Emperor. See Vegetius, *Epitema rei militaris*, II, 6: "Note that in a legion there ought to be ten cohorts. But the First cohort exceeds the remainder in the number of soldiers and in rank, for it seeks out the most select men as regards birth and instruction in letters. It protects the eagle, which was always the especial and distinctive sign in the Roman army of a whole legion. It undertakes the worship of the images of the Emperors, that is the divine and propitious *signa*."

[9] See Marc Bloch, *Les rois thaumaturges. Étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre* [1924] (Paris: Gallimard, 1983); Erik Petersen, *Heis theos: epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur antiken "Ein-Gott"-Akklamation* (Berlin: Echter Verlag, 2012) and Andreas Alföldi, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970).

[10] Percy Ernst Schramm, "Die Geschichte des mittelalterlichen Herrschertums im Lichte der Herrschaftszeichen," *Historische Zeitschrift* 178 (1954), 3–24, 11.

[11] See Percy Ernst Schramm, *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom dritten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert*, 3 vols (Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag: 1954–1956); Ernst Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1957) and Norbert Elias, *Die höfische Gesellschaft* (Darmstadt and Neuwied: Hermann Luchterhand Verlag, 1969).

[12] Louis Marin, *Portrait of the King*, trans. by Martha M. Houle, foreword by Tom Conley (London: Macmillan, 1988), 8.

[13] See, for example, Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992); Christine Buci-Glucksman, *Baroque Reason: The Aesthetics of Modernity* trans. by Patrick Camiller (London: Sage, 1994); Marie-José Mondzain, *Image, Icon, Economy: The Byzantine Origins of the Contemporary Imaginary* trans. by Rico Franses (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); Georges Didi-Huberman, *Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art* trans. by John Goodman (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009) and Carlo Ginzburg, *Fear, Reverence, Terror* (London: Seagull, 2017).

[14] See, for example, Claude Lefort, "The Permanence of the Theologico-Political?" in *Democracy and Political Theory* trans. by David Macey (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988); Jean-Luc Marion, *God Without Being: Hors-Texte* trans. by Thomas Carlson (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991); Jacques Rancière, *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*, ed. and trans. by Gabriel Rockhill (London: Continuum, 2004); Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Ground of the Image* trans. by Jeff Fort (Fordham: Fordham University Press, 2005); Giorgio Agamben*, The Kingdom and the Glory: A Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government* trans. by Lorenzo Chiesa and Matteo Mandarini (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011),

[15] Philippe Lacoue-Labarthe, *Typography: Mimesis, Philosophy, Politics* ed. by Christopher Fynsk, trans. by Barbara Harlow et al and intr. by Jacques Derrida (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

[16] Stephen Greenblatt, *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Eric Santner, *The Royal Remains: The People's Two Bodies and the Endgames of Sovereignty* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2011); Victoria Kahn, *The Future of Illusion: Political Theology and Early Modern Texts* (Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press, 2014).