Stuart Elden

The Yoke of Law and the Lustre of Glory: **Foucault and Dumézil on Sovereignty**

Martina Tazzioli and William Walters (eds.), *Handbook on Governmentality*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, forthcoming 2022.

Introduction

This contribution explores the relation between Michel Foucault and one of his intellectual mentors, Georges Dumézil (1898-1986), on the question of sovereignty. While sovereignty is often seen as a model of power which Foucault's work allows us to get beyond, he was still interested in the question, especially in his mid 1970s lecture courses at the Collège de France. Equally there has been a renewed critical interest in the question of sovereignty, either historically or in the contemporary moment, some of which is in dialogue with Foucault. In this piece I suggest that Foucault's use of Dumézil's work helps us to shed light on his understanding. Dumézil was a comparative mythologist and philologist, and he and Foucault first met as a result of Dumézil being asked by the University of Uppsala for a recommendation for a new lecturer in French. Dumézil had held this post himself in the 1930s, and after consulting friends in France, was given Foucault's name. Dumézil made the introduction to Uppsala and Foucault took up the post there in 1955 (Eribon 2011; Macey 2019; Elden 2021).

Foucault and Dumézil kept in close contact, with Dumézil supporting Foucault throughout his career. They exchanged books and ideas over a thirty-year period, and while Dumézil imagined Foucault would write his obituary, he found himself writing a tribute to the younger man in 1984 (Dumézil 1984b). Foucault pays tribute to Dumézil in key places, including in the original preface to the *History of Madness*, where he says without him "the work would never have been undertaken" (1961, x; 2005, xxxv).[1] Dumézil is also invoked as one of three important mentors in Foucault's inaugural lecture to the Collège de France in 1970, alongside Georges Canguilhem and Jean Hyppolite.[2] Dumézil is praised for his influence on Foucault's research process – "it was he who encouraged me to work at an age when I still believed that writing was a pleasure" – but also for his writings and ideas:

> I hope he will forgive me if I have stretched [*éloigné*] the meaning of his texts, which dominate us today, or departed [*détourné*] from their rigor. It was he who taught me to analyse the internal economy of a discourse in a manner entirely different from the methods of traditional exegesis or linguistic formalism; he is the one who taught me to identify [*repérer*], through the play of comparisons, systems of functional correlations from one discourse to the next; it was he who taught me how to describe the transformations of a discourse and its relationships to an institution. If I sought to apply this method to discourses other than legends or mythological narratives, it was probably because I was looking at the work of historians of science, especially that of Monsieur Canguilhem (1971, 72-74; 2019, 169-70).

Dumézil is a frequent reference in lectures and interviews, and Foucault sees him as sitting alongside Claude Lévi-Strauss and Jacques Lacan in his contemporary importance (i.e. 1994 Vol I, 516; 2020, 31). He particularly suggests that Dumézil's philological work has opened up new ways of thinking about the social sciences (1994 Vol I, 667, 822). Foucault's partner Daniel Defert suggests that Dumézil was important in Foucault's reading about debates in historiography which led to *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1994, 30), and while Dumézil is absent from the published book, he is present in an earlier draft.[3] Archival documents such as this add some detail to an account of their relation.[4]

Dumézil is also important for the content of his work, rather than just his approach. He is particularly used by Foucault in his work on Greek and Roman antiquity, alongside more familiar figures including Paul Veyne and Pierre Hadot (see Davidson 1994, 116). Dumézil's book *Servius et la fortune* is briefly quoted in the *Lectures on the Will to Know* course from 1970-71 on the relation between true speech and speech of justice, and the same passage serves as an epigraph to the 1981 Louvain lectures *Wrong-Doing, Truth-Telling* (Foucault 2011, 82; 2013, 84; 2012a, 17-18; 2014, 27-28; Dumézil 1943, 243-44). Foucault engages with Dumézil's work in much more detail in some of his final lectures on the figure of Apollo and on the death of Socrates in Plato's *Phaedo* (Foucault 2008, 113-6; 2010, 122-5; on Dumézil 1982; and Foucault 2009, 87-101; 2012b, 95-109 on Dumézil 1984, 129-70; 1999, 93-124).[5]

The links between Foucault and Dumézil are under-explored. There is no entry for Dumézil in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, for example, and he is unmentioned in the Blackwell *Companion* or the Palgrave *Research Companion* (Lawlor and Nale (eds.), 2015; Falzon, O'Leary and Sawicki (eds.), 2013; Raffnsøe, Thaning and Gudmand-Hoyet, 2016). Arnold Davidson underscores the importance of Dumézil to Foucault, saying that the lack of a contribution by Dumézil in his collection *Foucault and his Interlocutors* is, "of all the possible lacunae in this book, the one I most regret… Both personally and intellectually, Dumézil accompanied Foucault from the beginning until the end of his career" (1997, 16). The significant exception to the lack of work on Foucault and Dumézil is Didier Eribon. In his *Michel Foucault et ses contemporains*, Eribon declares that "Dumézil's *oeuvre* is one of the fundamental theoretical sources of inspiration for Foucault" (1994, 247). As well as being Foucault's first and arguably most important biographer, Eribon conducted a series of conversations with Dumézil which were published shortly after his death, and wrote a book on Dumézil a few years later (Dumézil 1987; Eribon 1992). Eribon's work is invaluable for tracking the biographical links between Foucault and Dumézil, with some useful discussion of their intellectual relation (1994, Part II, Chapter 1). More recently, the relation between Dumézil and Foucault's archaeological method has been explored by Troels Krarup (2021).

In this chapter the focus is more specific than these wider questions, which I hope to explore further elsewhere. The focus concerns the question of sovereignty, which is one of the modes of power Foucault wishes to go beyond with the notion of governmentality, but also a question of interest to him in its own right.

The Two Faces of Sovereignty

In his 1975-76 lecture course *'Society Must Be Defended'* Foucault suggests that "we can understand the discourse of the historian as a sort of ceremony, oral or written, that must in reality produce both a justification of power and a reinforcement of that power" (Foucault 1997, 58; 2003, 66).[6] Traditional history therefore had the aim both recounting a past that provides both a legal foundation for power in the present, and of provoking a fascination for "the almost unbearable intensity of the glory of power". Foucault suggests then that historical discourse uses both "the yoke of law and the lustre [*l'éclat*] of glory". In this way it might be situated alongside other modes of commemoration or celebration. "Like rituals, coronations, funerals, ceremonies, and legendary stories, history is an operator of power, an intensifier of power" (Foucault 1997, 58; 2003, 66). This historical work might stress the "antiquity of kingdoms", the lineage of rulers, and the heroes who founded polities. The two interlinked aspects of power are described by Foucault as "binding and dazzling, subjugating by imposing obligations and intensifying the lustre of force [*l'éclat de la force*]" (Foucault 1997, 59; 2003, 67).

Foucault's point is that these "two functions correspond very closely to two aspects of power, as represented in religions, rituals, and Roman, and more generally in Indo-European, legends" (Foucault 1997, 59; 2003, 68). The key passage where he explores this theme reads:

> In the Indo-European system of representing power, power always has two aspects or two faces, and they are perpetually conjugated [*conjugés*]. On the one hand, the juridical aspect: power uses obligations, oaths, commitments, and the law to bind; on the other, power has a magical function, role, and efficacy: power dazzles, and power petrifies. Jupiter, that eminently divine representative of power, the preeminent god of the first function and the first order in the Indo-European tripartite system, is both the god who binds and the god who hurls thunderbolts. Well, I believe that history, as it is still functioned in the Middle Ages, with its antiquarian research, its day-to-day chronicles, and its circulating collections of examples, was still this same representation of power. It is not simply an image of power, but also a way of reinvigorating it. History is the discourse of power, the discourse of the obligations power uses to subjugate; it is also the dazzling discourse that power uses to fascinate, terrorize, and immobilize. In a word, power both binds and immobilizes and is both the founder and guarantor of order; and history is precisely the discourse that intensifies and makes more efficacious the twin functions that guarantee order. In general terms, we can therefore say that until a very late stage in society, history was the history of sovereignty, or a history that was deployed in the dimension and function of sovereignty. It is a 'Jupiterian' history... [History] had a certain political function, which was precisely to be a ritual that reinforced sovereignty (Foucault 1997, 60; 2003, 68-9).

Although Foucault thinks this is just "a crude sketch" he suggests that it provides a foundation for the past which a more modern historical approach begins to replace. This is history as a conflict between races, which he describes as "the first non-Roman or anti-Roman history that the West had ever known" (Foucault 1997, 60; 2003, 69).

The question of race and the conflict between races is a well-known theme of this course, and has been widely explored (see Dillon and Neal eds. 2008; Elden 2016, Chapter 2). So too has the way this course leads to his explicit theorisation of governmentality in the subsequent course *Security, Territory, Population* (2004; 2007). But what might be said about the sense of sovereignty which Foucault sketches here? There are some key terms which he leaves largely unexplored. What is the basis for the two kinds of power he outlines as operating within sovereignty? Where does this distinction between a juridical and magical sense originate? What does it mean to talk of the "first function and first order", and what is the "Indo-European tripartite system"? Why the reference to Jupiter, and how is Jupiter both the god that binds – a contract – and hurls thunderbolts – a weapon more akin to Mars or the Norse god Thor? How might this be significant enough to warrant the description of a "'Jupiterian' history"?

Foucault does not develop the point in detail in the course, provides no reference and cites no authority. In mid-1970s Paris, many of his auditors would have made a connection and his editors fill in this reference, saying that "Foucault is obviously referring to the work of Georges Dumézil" (in Foucault 1997, 73 n. 2; 2003, 85 n. 3). A twenty-first century Anglophone audience is unlikely to immediately make the same connection, and Dumézil is not so well-known even in France today. The editors add the two works they suggest Foucault is thinking of "in particular": *Mitra-Varuna: An Essay on Two Indo-European Representations of Sovereignty*, and *Mythe et épopée* [Myth and Epic].

Relatively little of Dumézil's extensive work is available in English translation, though *Mitra-Varuna* was translated in 1988, having been first published in French in 1940 and extensively revised in 1948.[7] *Mythe et épopée* appeared in three volumes in 1968, 1971 and 1973 and has gone through multiple reeditions in French, now being available as a single large volume (1995). It has only been partly translated into English. The second French volume is translated as three separate English books – *The Stakes of the Warrior*, *The Plight of a Sorcerer* and *The Destiny of a King* – and parts of the third volume appear in *Camillus* (1983, 1986, 1973b, 1980). The first volume was at one point due to be translated into English as *Earth Unburdened: Mythic Infrastructure in the Mabharata*, edited by Jaan Puhvel, but it was never published (see Coutau-Bégarie, 1998, 56). Most of these books are long out-of-print in English, and *Mitra-Varuna* is also hard to find in French.

Dumézil and the Three Functions

This is not the place for a long sketch of Dumézil's voluminous work (see i.e. Rivière 1979; Littleton 1982; Eribon 1992; García Quintela 2001; Poitevin 2001; Dubuisson 2006, Part I). Briefly, in a series of works from his two doctoral theses in 1924, Dumézil devoted most of

his attention to studies of comparative Indo-European mythology. This was the theme of his principal thesis on magic drinks which gave the gift of immortality, a study of centaurs in 1929, as well as a 1934 book on the relation between the Indian god Varuna and the Greek Uranus. All these books had the subtitle 'Étude de mythologie comparée indo-européenne' (Dumézil 1924, 1929, 1934). A parallel research project begun while at the University of Istanbul in the 1920s explored the languages of the northern Caucasus, both in terms of their linguistic structure and the myths and legends of the people that spoke them.[8] For his principal project, Dumézil explored sources from India, Iran, Rome, Scandinavia and the Celts, and showed how a comparative approach could reveal similarities and differences between quite diverse sources. While initial sketches of his key ideas can be found in *Ouranos-Varuna* in 1934 and *Flamen-Brahman* in 1935, Dumézil saw 1938 as the year he made his major breakthrough, identifying a fundamental division in otherwise distinct traditions (Dumézil 1934, 1935, 1938).

This was his influential tripartite hypothesis, with a divide between priests, warriors and farmers or traders. Two books mark this breakthrough in particular, *Mythe et dieux des Germains* in 1939, and *Mitra-Varuna* in 1940. *Mythe et dieux des Germains* has three parts on myths of sovereignty, warriors and vitality. There is a political controversy about this book which is significant but largely beyond the reach of this chapter.[9] It is worth noting though, that even his most prominent defender, Eribon, suggests that between 1933 and 1935 Dumézil "was pro-Fascist and anti-Nazi" (1992, 140). Twenty years later Dumézil reworked themes of the book in *Les dieux des Germains* with parts on "magic, war, law [*la droit*]", "the drama of the world" and "from storm [*l'orage*] to pleasure" (1959, 1973c). The other book which outlines the first formulations of this model, *Mitra-Varuna*, concentrates on the first function, and draws on examples in comparative mythology from India to Iran, Rome, Greece and Scandinavia.

Dumézil suggests that the traditional etymology of the Vedic name for a king, *rāj-* (*rājan-*), relates to both the Latin *rēg-* and the Celtic *rīg-* (1938, 189). Similarly, the Vedic name for a priest, *brahmon,* can be related to the Latin *flamen*.[10] In a key article of 1938 he suggests that the fundamental breakthrough he made in the mid-1930s was that these were not two distinct claims, but one and the same (1938, 189). "In both India and Rome, the two names designated two connecting bodies [*organes solidaires*], more precisely the two inseparable halves of a single body [*organe unique*], the body of *Sovereignty*" (1938, 189). As he goes on to discuss, in India, the relation between the *rāj-brahman* was fundamental, "not isolated, detached from the rest of the world", but "by contrast the head of the social hierarchy" (1938, 190-91). The *brahmin* sat above the warrior class, *kshatriya* or sometimes *rajanya*, and the *éleveurs-agriculteurs* – the breeders and farmers of the *vaishya* group*.* This distinction between the *brahmin*, *kshatriya* and *vaishya* varna or castes is fundamental, but can also be found in legends of Rome, with the *flamen*, military and farmers. As Dumézil notes, the patrician-plebian distinction of historic Rome is a distinction of another kind, not a functional one (1992, 87).[11]

One of the best summaries of this position comes in a late work:

> three fundamental functions: the mastery of the sacred and knowledge with the form of temporal power it founds; physical strength and warrior value; fecundity and abundance with their conditions and their consequences (1985a, 94).

Across his work Dumézil provides multiple examples of how this tripartite model might structure society or mythology.[12] He finds indications in Julius Caesar's writings of how this worked in Celtic and Gallic society, with druids and *equites*, cavalry, forming the first two groups, as well as in Irish pagan texts (1938, 191-92). Ancient Germanic societies, though, had no priesthood to compare with the *brahmin, flamen* or druids.[13] In the Christian world it includes the medieval *oratores, bellatores, laboratores* – i.e. those who pray, fight and labour, which becomes the clergy, nobility, and third estate of the French *ancien régime*. This is work which has been extended by the historian Georges Duby, especially in his book *The Three Orders* (1978; 1980). Most important in Dumézil's work, however, is the way that this can correspond to gods in different religious systems, such as Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus in Ancient Rome; or Odin-Thor-Freya in Norse mythology (1948, 143; 1988, 121; see 1952, chapter 1, 1939, 1959, 1973c). Jupiter is therefore, as Foucault notes, the god of the first function in Rome. Dumézil's four volume study *Jupiter-Mars-Quirinus*, especially the first volume, is therefore also significant to Foucault's account (1941).

Dumézil was an inveterate reviser of his ideas, and he developed these claims in other works including *Les dieux des Indo-Européens* (1952); *Mythe et épopée*, especially volume II (1971) and – postdating Foucault's remarks – in *Les dieux souverains des indo-européens* (1977). This last work is a major summary of his work. In part it is almost a third edition of *Mitra-Varuna*, summarising some of its claims and developing the comparative reading in Iran, Rome, and Scandinavia.[14] But this 1977 book also summarises key claims of *Les dieux des Indo-Européens* and *Le troisième souverain: Essai sur le dieu indo-iranien Aryaman* (1952; 1949b). It appeared towards the end of Dumézil's life, and was part of his attempt at an overall assessment of his work. He described this project in 1968 as:

> This unitary publication of revised studies constitutes part of the general updating in which I have been engaged for the past five years, in an effort to prepare for the inevitable autopsy as proper a cadaver as possible, that is, to deliver to the critic of the near future, in an organized and improved form, the results of the endeavours, of varying success, carried out over the past thirty years… neither program nor *Vorarbeiten*, but a balancing of accounts [*bilan*] (Dumézil 1969, 5; 1970, xiv).

In the second volume of *Mythe et épopée* Dumézil outlines 'three types', of which the king and the sorcerer represent the two forms of the first function; and the warrior the second (1971; 1983, 1986, 1973b). There is no equivalent study for the third function of the producer, though his English editor Udo Strutynski suggested in 1980 that such a volume was forthcoming: "a yet-to-be-assembled collection of previously written articles, properly revised and commented on, for the third prong, which is diffused throughout the spectrum

of concepts relating to welfare" (Strutynski 1980, 260). Unfortunately, this collection never appeared, and given the number of studies of the first and second functions, its absence seems to indicate Dumézil's preference for sovereignty and war as a focus for his work.

Function is perhaps a somewhat restrictive way to describe the term, though it is not incorrect since the French is *fonction*. But Dumézil does not want to restrict a function to simply activity [*activité*]. It has a social function, but also an ideological one, in which morality, science and knowledge are also important (Dumézil 1992, 95-96; see Allen 1993, 121-22). As Nick Allen glosses, "a function is a domain within an ideology, a unit within a structure of ideas" (Allen 1993, 122). Between the first and second function there is a distinction between "science and intelligence… mediation and manipulation of sacred objects" and "physical force, brutal, and the uses of force" (Dumézil 1992, 96). The third function encompasses a wider range of aspects: "fecundity, certainly, human, animal and vegetal, but at the same time nutrition and wealth [*nouritture et richesse*], health and peace… and often lust [*volupté*], beauty, and also the important idea of the 'great number', applied not only to goods (abundance), but also to the men who compose the social body (the mass)" (Dumézil 1992, 96).

Dumézil's point is that studies need to explore relations between elements – gods, people, groups, characteristics – rather than just look at each in isolation, in order to uncover structural similarities. Indeed, often when Foucault invokes Dumézil's work early in his career, it is this sense of structure which he highlights. Foucault does so, for example, in his first interview with *Le Monde* in 1961, following the publication of the *History of Madness*. Foucault is asked about his influences, he notes some literary figures, but in contrast to the interviewer's insistence of psychoanalysts, says that Dumézil is the most important. The interviewer expresses surprise: "Dumézil? How could a historian of religions have inspired a work on the history of madness?" Foucault response is interesting: "Through his idea of structure. Just as Dumézil did for myths, I attempted to discover the structured forms of experience whose pattern can be discovered, again and again, with modifications, at different levels". He clarifies that it is "social segregation, that of exclusion". It is this approach which reveals, he suggests, the "structural coherence" between a play by Racine and a seventeenth century Police lieutenant (1994, Vol I, 168-69).

Foucault would of course strongly deny he was a structuralist, and Dumézil similarly rejected that label (Foucault 1970, ix-xiv, xiv; Dumézil 1973a, 14; 1979, 78). But this does not mean that they did not make analyses of structures in investigating their topics. Indeed, we might suggest that when Foucault uses language of structure in his early work – especially prevalent in texts he would later revise – he has Dumézil much more in mind than, for example, Claude Lévi-Strauss. This relation is one which requires much fuller investigation, which I hope to do elsewhere. But one point is important to insist upon. When in two 1970 lectures Foucault used Dumézil's book *Horace et les Curiaces* to illustrate what he thought were the benefits of the structural method, he stresses that the point is not to look at resemblances between different myths, but rather to analyse the "system of differences".[15]

Dumézil's Two Forms of Sovereignty

The first of the three functions is therefore the one which Dumézil describes as sovereignty. Foucault had already indicated the importance of this understanding in the third of his "Truth and Juridical Forms" lectures in Brazil in 1973. Talking of an ancient relation between power and knowledge in the Eastern Mediterranean, in which a political ruler holding power also held a knowledge that could not be more widely communicated:

> This is the form of power-knowledge that Dumézil, in his studies concerning the three functions, has isolated, showing that the first function was that of a magical and religious political power. Knowledge of the gods, knowledge of the action that can be brought to bear on us by the gods – that whole magico-religious knowledge is present in the political function (Foucault 1994, Vol II, 569; 1997-2000, Vol III, 31).[16]

This point is essential. Rather than conceiving of the first function as a unitary god, or source of power, Dumézil sees it as split into two parts, distinct though often conjoined. Dumézil crucially distinguishes between a worldly, juridical form and a magical, supernatural form of this power of sovereignty. This has already been indicated by his suggestion that the king-priest formed two parts of an inseparable whole. He indicates this in the preface to the original edition of *Mitra-Varuna*:

> This essay investigates a certain bipartite conception of sovereignty that appears to have been present among the Indo-Europeans, and that dominated the mythologies of certain of the peoples who spoken Indo-European languages at the time of the earliest documents. In my earlier work, mostly devoted to the mechanisms and representations of sovereignty, I had already encountered some of the elements that interest me here; but I had previously understood their relations only very imperfectly. In this work, it is the broad system of those relations that I try to elucidate (1948, 17; 1988, 17).

Mitra and Varuna are gods who exemplify the two different parts of sovereignty. Mitra is associated with the open, the juridical, right, light; Varuna with the hidden, magical, left, dark (see Miller 2000, 29).

> Mitra is the sovereign under his reasoning aspect, luminous, ordered, calm, benevolent, priestly; Varuna is the sovereign under his attacking aspect, dark, inspired, violent, terrible, warlike (1948, 85; 1988, 72; see 1952, 42).

While the book is titled *Mitra-Varuna*, Dumézil also discusses a range of other pairings. In Rome, Jupiter is the key god who accords to the first function, but when this function is analysed as the two forms – magical and judicial – Dius Fidius, as the god of oaths, sits alongside Jupiter (Dumézil 1992, 158-59).

In Norse mythology Odin and Tyr represent the two forms of sovereignty. The book also discusses examples outside of India, Rome and Norse mythology. There are discussions particularly of the Celts and Iran. There is also some discussion of the Greek myths. In his

1934 book Dumézil had seen the Greek Uranus as having a similar function to the Indian Varuna. He also proposed an etymological link between their names, though he tends not to develop this claim in subsequent works, and later scholarship has seen the linguistic link at least as untenable.[17] Indeed, *Mitra-Varuna* suggests that while he could discern the twofold understanding of sovereignty in India and, especially, Rome, it could not be found in Greek myth. He suggests that this is because "Uranus does not form a couple with any other god", which is part of the reason for his noting the "peculiarity of the Greek myths, and the impossibility of reducing them to the Indo-European systems" (1948, 140; 1988, 119).

Nonetheless Rome is the key example in this work, not just in terms of its mythologies, but its political history. Parallels might be found in legends of a tyrannical king, often with magical powers and a better, more just king. As the legendary founder of Rome, Romulus created the city, but the next king, Numa Pompilius, founded many of Rome's legal, political and religious institutions (1948, 55; 1988, 47).

> What I do think is that, from its very beginnings, from the time when it acquired those specific characteristics that led to its success, Rome conceived its myths on the terrestrial plane, as a dynamic balance between terrestrial actors and forces" (1948, 179; 1988, 152).[18]

Conclusion

Dumézil recognises that this analysis of the Mitra-Varuna, Numa-Romulus pairings indicates that the trifunctional analysis was not, in itself sufficient:

> The implications of this then led me to look more closely at the Indo-European hierarchy of social functions, and I observed that this 'bipartition' was not a specific characteristic of the first function, by that, by a sort of dialectical deduction, the entire social and cosmic hierarchy was made up of similar opposing pairs, successively harmonized into wider and wider concepts (1948, 189-90; 1988, 161; see 1948, 210; 1988, 179-80).

Such an analysis exceeds Foucault's use of his work, and the point being made here, but it does suggest that Dumézil's work requires a more nuanced appreciation than the trifunctional hypothesis alone. It is important to underscore then, that it is the distinction between forms of sovereignty, of the twofold division of the first function, more than the tripartite one between three functions, to which Foucault alludes in the *'Society Must be Defended'* lecture course. It was also an approach adopted by Georges Bataille in his *Theory of Religion* (1976, 358; 1992, 122-23).

The two-part aspect of sovereignty can be compared to other models of political power. The constitutional and the charismatic might bring to mind Max Weber, while the relation of the religious and political rule is essentially that of the medieval doctrine of the two swords of the Church – spiritual power to use direct; temporal power to command in kings and other rulers.[19] Notoriously, in 1939 Dumézil himself suggested that the Third Reich had based itself on earlier mythology, and that in this context "Adolf Hitler could conceive, forge, and

practice a sovereignty that no German overlord has known since the fabulous reign of Odin" (1939, 156). Denis Hollier and Bruce Lincoln have also suggested that the relation of magic and law as that of church and state owes something to Benito Mussolini's reconciliation of his power with that of the Vatican in the Lateran treaty (Hollier, 1988, 33; Lincoln 1999, 267 n. 83). But the treaty and related conventions date from 1929, a decade before Dumézil elaborated this view. The treaty did, however, deal with one crucial question, the temporal power of the Papacy, which was now restricted to the Vatican City, with acceptance of the Italian state's sovereignty over the former Papal States.[20]

Foucault's work on governmentality, which he contrasts both to this view of sovereignty and his earlier work on discipline, is not the focus here. That relation is explored in other chapters of this volume. But it is worth recalling Foucault's suggestion that we should not conceive of these different modalities of power on a linear scale, with a movement from sovereignty to discipline to governmentality. Rather we should think about power relations within a sovereignty – discipline - government triangle, with different societies across history and geography closer to one corner or another (Foucault 2004, 111; 2007, 107-8). Some work using Foucault's ideas has usefully recognised this need to think about sovereignty and biopower together, rather than as distinct (i.e. Thompson 2007; Dean 2013). Additionally, there has been something of a resurgence of interest in sovereignty in recent years, some of which is due to the work of Giorgio Agamben, especially *The Kingdom and the Glory* (2009; 2011), and the wider work on the question of political theology (i.e. Hammill and Lupton eds. 2011; Santner 2011). While the term political theology in its modern use follows the classic, if not notorious works of Schmitt in 1922 (1985; 2009) and Ernst Kantorowicz in 1957, the term has been used critically to think about both historical and modern forms of power (see, for example, Dean 2012; Diamantides and Schütz 2017; Cavanaugh and Scott 2018). Regrettably, the name of Dumézil is almost entirely absent from these accounts, despite the importance of his analysis of sovereignty and its two forms.[21] As this chapter has discussed, Dumézil's analysis of the dual nature of sovereignty was utilised by Foucault, who is a crucial reference in contemporary debates about the multiple senses of political power. Dumézil's analysis and Foucault's use remains of interest and importance today.

References

Allen, N. J. 1993 "Debating Dumézil: Recent Studies in Comparative Mythology", *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* 24, 119-31.

Agamben, Giorgio 2008 *Il sacramento del linguaggio: Archeologia del giuramento*, Roma-Bari: Laterza.

Agamben, Giorgio 2009 *Il regno e la gloria. Per una genealogia teologica dell'economia e del governo*, Turin: Bollati Boringhieri.

Agamben, Giorgio 2010 *The Sacrament of Language: An Archaeology of the Oath*, translated by Adam Kotsko, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Agamben, Giorgio 2011 *The Kingdom and the Glory: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government*, translated by Lorenzo Chiesa with Matteo Mandarini, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Arvidsson, Stefan 1999 "Aryan Mythology as Science and Ideology", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 67 (2)*,* 327-54.

Arvidsson, Stefan 2006 *Aryan Idols: Indo-European Mythology as Ideology and Science*, translated by Sonia Wichmann, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bataille, Georges 1976 *Théorie de la religion* in *Oeuvres complètes VII*, Paris: Gallimard.

Bataille, Georges 1992 T*heory of Religion*, translated by Robert Hurley, New York: Zone Books.

Cavanaugh, William T. and Scott, Peter Manley 2018 *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, second edition.

Coutau-Bégarie, Hervé 1998 *L'Œuvre de Georges Dumézil: Catalogue raisonné*, Paris: Economica.

Davidson, Arnold I. 1994 "Ethics as Ascetics: Foucault, the History of Ethics, and Ancient Thought", in Gary Gutting (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Michel Foucault*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115-40.

Davidson, Arnold I. 1997 "Structures and Strategies of Discourse: Remarks Towards a History of Foucault's Philosophy of Language", in Arnold I. Davidson (ed.), *Foucault and his Interlocutors,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1-17.

Dean, Mitchell 2012 "Governmentality Meets Theology: 'The King Reigns, but He Does Not Govern'", *Theory, Culture and Society* 29 (3), 145-58.

Dean, Mitchell 2013 *The Signature of Power: Sovereignty, Governmentality and Biopolitics*, London: Sage.

Defert, Daniel 1994 "Chronologie", in Michel Foucault, *Dits et écrits 1954–1988*, edited by Daniel Defert and François Ewald, Paris: Gallimard, Four Volumes, Vol I, 13-64.

Diamantides, Marinos and Anton Schütz 2017 *Political Theology: Demystifying the Universal*, Edinburgh University Press.

Dillon Michael and Andrew Neal (eds.) 2008 *Foucault: Politics, Society, and War*, London: Palgrave.

Dubuisson, Daniel 2006 *Twentieth Century Mythologies: Dumézil, Lévi-Strauss, Eliade*, translated by Martha Cunningham, London: Equinox, second edition.

Duby, Georges 1978 *Les trois ordres ou l'Imaginaire du féodalisme*, Paris: Gallimard.

Duby, Georges 1980 *The Three Orders: Feudal Society Imagined*, translated by A Goldhammer, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dumézil, Georges 1924 *Festin d'immortalité: Étude de mythologie comparée indo-européenne,* Paris: Paul Geuthner

Dumézil, Georges 1929 *Le Problème des Centaures: Étude de mythologie comparée indo-européenne*, Paris: Paul Geuthner.

Dumézil, Georges 1934 *Ouranos-Varuna: Essai de mythologie comparée indo-européenne*, Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Dumézil, Georges 1935 *Flamen-Brahman*, Paris: Librarie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner

Dumézil, Georges 1938 "La préhistoire des flamines majeurs", *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 118, 188-200.

Dumézil, Georges 1939 *Mythes et dieux des Germains*, Paris: Librarie Ernest Leroux, 1939.

Dumézil, Georges 1941 *Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus: Essai sur la conception indo-européenne de la société et sur les origines de Rome,* Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1942 *Horace et les curiaces*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1943 *Servius et la Fortune*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1948 [1940] *Mitra-Varuna – Essai sur deux représentations indo-européennes de la Souveraineté*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, revised edition, Paris: Gallimard

Dumézil, Georges 1949a *L'Héritage indo-européen à Rome*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1949b *Le troisième souverain: Essai sur le dieu indo-iranien Aryaman*, Paris: G.P. Maisonneuve.

Dumézil, Georges 1952 *Les dieux des indo-européens*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Dumézil, Georges 1958 *L'Idéologie tripartie des Indo-Européens*, Brussels: Latomus.

Dumézil, Georges 1959 *Les Dieux des Germains*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Dumézil, Georges 1968 *Mythe et épopée I: L'Idéologie des trois fonctions dans les épopées des peuples indo-européens*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1969 *Heur et Malheur du guerrier: Aspects de la fonction guerrière chez les Indo-Européens*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Dumézil, Georges 1970 *The Destiny of a Warrior*, translated by Alf Hiltebeitel, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Dumézil, Georges 1971 *Mythe et épopée II: Types épiques indo-européens – un héros, un sorcier, un roi*, , Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1973a *Mythe et épopée III: Histoires romaines*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1973b *The Destiny of a King*, translated by Alf Hiltebeitel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Dumézil, Georges 1973c *Gods of the Ancient Northmen*, edited by Einar Haugen, Berkley: University of California Press.

Dumézil, Georges 1975 *Le Verbe oubykh, études descriptives et comparatives*, Paris: Klincksieck.

Dumézil, Georges 1977 *Les dieux souverains des Indo-Européens*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1978 *Romans de Scythie et d'alentour*, Paris: Payot.

Dumézil, Georges 1979 "Entretien sur les mariages, la sexualité et les trois fonctions, chez les indo-européens", *Ornicar?* 19, 69-95.

Dumézil, Georges 1980 *Camillus: A Study of Indo-European Religion as Roman History*, edited by Udo Strutynski, translated by Annette Aronowicz and Josette Bryson, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dumézil, Georges 1982 *Apollon sonore et autres essais: Vingt-cinq esquisses de mythologie*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1983 *The Stakes of the Warrior*, edited by Jaan Puhvel and David Weeks, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Dumézil, Georges 1984a «*Le moyne noir en gris dedans Varennes»: Sotie nostradamique suivie d'un Divertissement sur les dernières paroles de Socrate*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1984b "Un homme heureux", *Le Nouvel Observateur*, 29 June, ix.

Dumézil, Georges 1985a *L'oubli de l'homme et l'honneur des dieux et autres essais: Vingt-cinq esquisses de mythologie (51-75)*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1985b "Science et politique: Réponse à Carlo Ginzburg", *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 40 (5), 985-989.

Dumézil, Georges 1986 *The Plight of the Sorcerer*, translated by David Weeks, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.

Dumézil, Georges 1987 *Entretiens avec Didier Eribon*, Paris: Gallimard.

Dumézil, Georges 1988 *Mitra-Varuna: Essay on Two Indo-European Representations of Sovereignty*, translated by Derek Coltman, New York: Zone Books.

Dumézil, Georges 1992 *Mythes et dieux des indo-européens*, edited by Hervé Coutau-Bégarie, Paris: Flammarion.

Dumézil, Georges 1995 *Mythe et épopée I II III*, Paris: Gallimard Quarto.

Dumézil, Georges 1999 *The Riddle of Nostradamus: A Critical Dialogue*, translated by Betsy Wing, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Dumézil, Georges forthcoming *Mitra-Varuna: Essay on Two Indo-European Representations of Sovereignty*, translated by Derek Coltman, edited by Stuart Elden, Chicago: HAU books.

Elden, Stuart 2013 *The Birth of Territory*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Elden, Stuart 2016 *Foucault's Last Decade*, Cambridge: Polity.

Elden, Stuart 2017a *Foucault: The Birth of Power*, Cambridge: Polity.

Elden, Stuart 2017b "Foucault and Shakespeare: Ceremony, Theatre, Politics", *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 55, Spindel Supplement S1, 153-172.

Elden, Stuart 2021a *The Early Foucault*, Cambridge: Polity.

Elden, Stuart 2021b "Ceremony, Genealogy, Political Theology", in Shirin M. Rai, Milija Gluhovic, Silvija Jestrovic and Michael Saward (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Politics and Performance*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 377-90.

Elden, Stuart forthcoming "Canguilhem, Dumézil, Hyppolite".

Eribon, Didier 1992 *Faut-il brûler Dumézil? Mythologie, science et politique*, Paris: Flammarion.

Eribon, Didier 1994 *Michel Foucault et ses contemporains*, Paris: Fayard.

Eribon, Didier 2011 [1989] *Michel Foucault*, Paris: Flammarion, third edition.

Falzon, Christopher, Timothy O'Leary and Jana Sawicki (eds.) 2013 *A Companion to Foucault*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Foucault, Michel 1961 *Folie et déraison: Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique*, Paris: Plon.

Foucault, Michel 1970 "Foreword to the English edition" to *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*, New York: Pantheon, ix-xiv.

Foucault, Michel 1971 *L'ordre du discours*, Paris: Gallimard.

Foucault, Michel 1994 *Dits et écrits 1954–1988*, edited by Daniel Defert and François Ewald, Paris: Gallimard, Four Volumes.

Foucault, Michel 1997 *«Il faut défendre la société»: Cours au Collège de France (1975-1976)*, edited by Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, Paris: Seuil/Gallimard.

Foucault, Michel 1997-2000 *Essential Works*, edited by Paul Rabinow and James Faubion, translated by Robert Hurley and others, London: Allen Lane, Three Volumes.

Foucault, Michel 2003 *"Society Must Be Defended": Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*, translated by David Macey, London: Allen Lane.

Foucault, Michel 2004 *Sécurité, Territoire, Population: Cours au Collège de France, 1977-1978*, edited by Michel Sennelart, Paris: Seuil/Gallimard.

Foucault, Michel 2005 *History of Madness*, translated by Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa, London: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel 2007 *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977-1978*, translated by Graham Burchell, London: Palgrave.

Foucault, Michel 2008 *Le gouvernement de soi et des autres: Cours au Collège de France 1982-1983*, edited by Frédéric Gros, Paris: Gallimard/Seuil.

Foucault, Michel 2009 *Le courage de la vérité: Le gouvernement des soi et des autres II: Cours au Collège de France 1983-1984*, edited by Frédéric Gros, Paris: Gallimard/Seuil.

Foucault, Michel 2010 *The Government of the Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France 1982-83*, translated by Graham Burchell, London: Palgrave.

Foucault, Michel 2011 *Leçons sur la volonté de savoir: Cours au Collège de France, 1970-1971*, suivi de *Le savoir d'Œdipe*, edited by Daniel Defert, Paris: Gallimard/Seuil.

Foucault, Michel 2012a *Mal Faire, Dire Vrai: Fonction de l'aveu en justice*, edited by Fabienne Brion and Bernard E. Harcourt, Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.

Foucault, Michel 2012b *The Courage of Truth (The Government of the Self and Others II): Lectures at the Collège de France 1983-84*, translated by Graham Burchell, London: Palgrave.

Foucault, Michel 2013 *Lectures on the Will to Know: Lectures at the Collège de France 1970-71*, translated by Graham Burchell, London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, Michel 2014 *Wrong-Doing Truth-Telling: The Function of Avowal in Justice*, translated by Steven W. Sawyer, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, Michel 2019 "The Order of Discourse", translated by Thomas Scott-Railton in Nancy Luxon (ed.) *Archives of Infamy: Foucault on State Power in the Lives of Ordinary Citizens*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 141-73.

Foucault, Michel 2020 "Interview with Madeleine Chapsal", translated by Mark G.E. Kelly, *The Journal of Continental Philosophy* 1 (1), 29-35.

García Quintela, Marco V. 2001 *Dumézil: une introduction*, Crozon: Armeline.

Ginzburg, Carlo 1989 "Germanic Mythology and Nazism: Thoughts on an Old Book by Georges Dumézil", in *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method*, translated by John and Anne Tedeschi, Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 126-45.

Hammill, Graham and Julia Reinhard Lupton (eds.) 2012 *Political Theology and Early Modernity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hollier, Denis 1998 "January 21st", translated by Mark W. Andrews, *Stanford French Review* XII (1), 31-47.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. 1957 *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Krarup, Troels 2021 "Archaeological Methodology: Foucault and the History of Systems of Thought", *Theory, Culture and Society*, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0263276420984528

Lawlor, Leonard and John Nale (eds.) 2015 *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lincoln, Bruce 1999 *Theorizing Myth: Narrative, Ideology, and Scholarship*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Littleton, C. Scott 1982 [1968] *The New Comparative Mythology: An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil*, third edition, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Macey, David 2019 [1993] *The Lives of Michel Foucault*, afterword by Stuart Elden, London: Verso.

Malan, André 1976 "Colloque de Saclay", in A. Lichnerowicz, F. Perroux and G. Gadoffre (eds.), *Structure et dynamique des systèmes*, Paris: Maloine, 165-90.

Miller, Dean A. 2000 "Georges Dumézil: Theories, Critiques and Theoretical Extensions", *Religion* 30 (1), 27-40.

Momigliano, A.D. 1994 "Introduction to a Discussion of Georges Dumézil", in G.W. Bowerstock and T.J. Cornell (eds.) *Studies on Modern Scholarship*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 286-301.

Polomé, Edgar C. 1997 "Binder-god", in J.P Mallory and D.Q. Adams (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Indo-European Culture,* London–Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 65.

Poitevin, Michel 2001 *Georges Dumézil, un naturel comparatiste*, Paris: L'Harmattan.

Raffnsøe, Sverre Morten S. Thaning and Marius Gudmand-Hoyet 2016 *Michel Foucault: A Research Companion*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Rivière, Jean-Claude 1979 *Georges Dumézil à la découverte des Indo-Européens*, Paris: Copernic.

Santner, Eric l. 2011 *The Royal Remains: The People's Two Bodies and the Endgames of Sovereignty*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schmitt, Carl 1985 *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty*, translated by George Schwab, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schmitt, Carl 2009 *Politische Theologie: Vier Kapitel zur Lehre von der Souveränität*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.

Strutynski, Udo 1980 "Bibliographical Note" in Georges Dumézil, *Camillus: A Study of Indo-European Religion as Roman History*, edited by Udo Strutynski, translated by Annette Aronowicz and Josette Bryson, Berkeley: University of California Press, 257-262.

Thompson, Grahame F. 2007 "The Fate of Territorial Engineering: Mechanisms of Territorial Power and Post-Liberal Forms of International Governance", *International Politics* 44: 487-512.

Notes

1   This is from the book's 1961 preface, absent in whole or part from later French editions.
2   On the lecture, see Elden 2017a, Introduction; on the links between the three older men, Elden, forthcoming.
3   This manuscript is archived at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, Fonds Michel Foucault, NAF28284, box 1.
4   Another is a 1957 radio lecture on anthropology, "IV: Die französische Anthropologie", Fonds Jean Bollack, Archives littéraires suisses, D-6-a-FOU, in which Foucault praises Dumézil's work. See Elden 2021, Chapter 6.
5   There are some other interesting discussions of Dumézil in this course, on the Indo-European root *mel* (Foucault 2009, 109-10; 2012b, 117-18) and around the relation of the two parts of Dumézil's *Le moyne noir* (Dumézil 1984a; see Foucault 2009, 111-13; 2012b, 119-21).
6   Foucault had discussed this question in what appear to be Dumézilian terms in his first course at the Collège de France, *Lectures on the Will to Know*. See particularly 2011, 106-7; 2013, 111-12. On ceremony in Foucault generally see Elden 2017b; and for a development, 2021b.
7   A critical edition of this text, comparing the 1940 and 1948 versions, is forthcoming from HAU books.
8   Foucault does not seem to show a particular interest in this aspect of Dumézil's career, though it is a largely unstated theme in *The Order of Things*. For late summaries of this work, see Dumézil 1975 and 1978.
9   It was sparked by a 1983 piece by A.D. Momigliano (1994); and followed by one in 1984 by Carlo Ginzburg (1989). Dumézil replied in 1985a, 299-318; and 1985b. In the last essay (1985b, 985) Dumézil anticipated a more detailed response, but died before this was completed. For discussions, see Eribon 1992; Lincoln 1999, Ch. 6; and Miller 2000, 34-37; and for a deeper historical background, see Arvidsson 1999, 2006. I return to this politics briefly in the conclusion.
10   On this relation, Dumézil 1935 is the key source, especially 6-9. Late in life Dumézil continued to believe this "relation… as probable, though it does not matter [*rapprochement… comme probable, mais cela n'a aucune importance*]" (1985a, 324 n. 4). This is a reprint from 1949a, 243, to which Dumézil adds notes to retrospectively examine this text of which he says "few things have to change in substance" (1985a, 319).
11   This text contains a partial reprint of Dumézil 1958. References are to this more easily available edition.

[12] There is a table of the gods in Indo-Iranian, Rome, Zoroastrian, and Germanic mythologies in Dumézil 1992, 114-15 and a more reduced one of Rome, India and Scandinavia in 1952, 34.

[13] See for example his noting of "the absence of a large priestly body, analogous to the brahmans, the magi, the Druids or the pontifical college (flamines and pontiffs)" (1948, 142; 1988, 121; see 1939, 4-5).

[14] The first chapter of the second part of *Les dieux souverains*, entitled 'Mitra-Varuna' (1977, 55-85), is effectively a summary of the earlier book.

[15] See Foucault 1994, Vol II, 273-76; 1997-2000, Vol II, 423-26; and his contribution to a seminar, summarised in Malan 1976, 177-78. The text analysed is Dumézil 1942. See also Foucault 1994, Vol I, 614-15 on the relation between structure and the question of the subject.

[16] The editorial reference here is Dumézil 1941 and 1968.

[17] See, in particular, Dumézil 1934, 37-46; 1938, 194; Polomé, 1997, 65; Littleton 1982, 182-83.

[18] On the successor kings to Numa and Romulus, which link through to many of Dumézil's subsequent studies, see 1948, 191-92; 1988, 163.

[19] For a discussion and references, see Elden 2013, especially Chapters 5 and 6.

[20] See http://www.uniset.ca/nold/lateran.htm

[21] Agamben's most sustained discussion of Dumézil comes instead in *The Sacrament of Language*, on the question of the oath (2008; 2010).