

CHARMING LEADERS AND ENCHANTED PEOPLE IN NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI'S
WORKEugenia Mattei¹

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to approach the relationship between Niccolò Machiavelli and populism on two simultaneous levels: first, by mapping the research of Sandro Landi and José Pedro Zúquete on the relationship between Machiavelli and enchantment; second, using these works as a theoretical framework, we propose an interpretation of the figure of the enchanters and their connection with emotions from a relational and situated perspective to consider the relationship between Machiavellian leadership and the people. The organization of the article is divided into four parts: in the first part, a systematization of readings on Machiavelli regarding leadership and republicanism is carried out, with a primary focus on works conducted in the Latin American region; in the second part, the latest readings proposed by Landi and Zúquete are addressed with the aim of developing our hypothesis; in the third part, the relational perspective of enchantment and the situated perspective of emotions are systematized through selected Machiavellian leaderships; finally, the conclusions derived from the work conducted are presented.

Keywords: Enchantment. Populism. Emotions. Leaderships.

LÍDERES ENCANTADORES Y GENTE ENCANTADA EN LA OBRA DE NICCOLÒ
MAQUIAVELO

Resumen: El objetivo principal de este artículo es abordar el vínculo entre Nicolás Maquiavelo y el populismo en dos planos simultáneos: por un lado, se cartografía las investigaciones de Sandro Landi y José Pedro Zúquete sobre la relación entre Maquiavelo y el encantamiento; segundo, a partir de estos trabajos que sirven como insumo, se propone una interpretación sobre la figura de los encantadores y su vínculo con las emociones desde una perspectiva relacional y situada para pensar la relación entre liderazgos maquiavelianos y pueblo. La organización del artículo está dividida en cuatro partes: en la primera, se realiza una sistematización de las lecturas sobre Maquiavelo en torno a los liderazgos y el republicanismo, dando principal lugar a los trabajos realizados en la región de América Latina; en la segunda, se abordan las últimas lecturas propuestas por Landi y Zúquete con el objetivo de llegar a nuestra propuesta de hipótesis; en la tercera, se sistematiza la perspectiva relacional del encantamiento y situada de las emociones a través de algunos liderazgos maquiavelianos seleccionados; por último, se presentan las conclusiones que se derivan del trabajo realizado.

Palabras-clave: Encantamiento. Populismo. Emociones. Liderazgos.

¹ Universidad de Buenos Aires- Instituto de Investigaciones Gino Germani-Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas. PhD in Social Sciences (Facultad de Ciencias Sociales-Universidad de Buenos Aires). Associate Researcher at the National Scientific and Technical Research Council (CONICET) and Professor at the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Buenos Aires. Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5158-7161>. E – mail: emattei@conicet.gov.ar.

1 Machiavelli and his many faces

On the epitaph of Machiavelli's tomb built in 1787 by Innocenzo Spinazzi, one can read "Tanto nomini nullum par elogium". There should be no other author or figure in political thought with as many faces, whose name has become an adjective: "Machiavellian." Since the 16th century, Machiavelli has been identified as the master of evil, the blasphemer, the impious, the ideologue of the St. Bartholomew's Day massacre. For the Argentine "founding fathers," the Generation of 1837, Machiavelli was the symbol of political arbitrariness, representing an outdated world. For Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, as he made clear in *Facundo*, Machiavelli was associated with political despotism and had a clear disciple in Juan Manuel de Rosas. For Juan Bautista Alberdi, Machiavelli encouraged the despotisms of the people (LOSADA, 2020)

However, by the late 20th century and early 21st century, Machiavelli began to be considered as the representative of republican freedom, that is, freedom as non-domination by neo-republicans Quentin Skinner (1993), Phillip Pettit (1999), J. G. A Pocock (1975), and Maurizio Viroli (1998; 1999). In recent years, several theorists from Latin America and the Caribbean have begun to explore and define the concept of plebeian, popular, or democratic republicanism (RINESI, 2021; RINESI AND MURUCA, 2010; TORRES, 2013; RODRIGUEZ RIAL, 2013; CADAHIA AND CORONEL, 2018; QUINTANA, 2020; FERNANDEZ PEYCHAUX, 2018; VELASCO GOMEZ, 2021), allowing them to move away from the interpretation proposed mainly by Phillip Pettit (1999, 2005). In general terms, authors seek to dispute the meaning and appropriation of the so-called neo-republicanism of the Skinner (1993), Pettit (1999), Pocock (1975), and Viroli (1998, 1999) team concerning notions of republic, freedom, and institutions, as well as their relationship with leadership. Despite the different approaches and perspectives, ranging from political philosophy and theory to history, these works all have in common the presence of Niccolò Machiavelli. In fact, the corpus of the Italian author is like the sun around which all these discussions revolve: some texts, like the planet Mercury, are closer to the Sun; others, like Neptune, are farther away. Therefore, we would like to highlight some works that take the signifier Machiavelli to ponder the notion of republic and republicanism in order to seek, in the words of Macarena Marey (2021), to theorize from one's own practices.

According to Sebastián Torres, Machiavelli's notion of republic accounts for a "Machiavellian democracy" that "designates the possibility for the community to expose itself to its fracture in the singularity of every political event, which possesses a specific historical-temporal

framework (hence its singularity)" (2013, p. 193). Gabriela Rodríguez Rial contends that, under the leadership of Castruccio Castracani, a variant of Machiavellian republicanism linked with popular governance emerges, diverging from the contemporary model of representative government. Her analysis indicates that this type of republicanism is distinctively demonstrated in Castracani's exercise of authority and is not easily compatible with the prevailing structures of representative governance (2013, p. 216).

Furthermore, building on the research trajectory initiated by Eduardo Rinesi several years ago, the relationship between republicanism and leadership is explored. In his notable collaborative work with Matías Muraca, emphasis is placed on Machiavelli's reading of the Roman Republic, which suggests that freedom arises from the antagonism between the plebeians and the senate, rather than from moderation. Machiavelli allows for the recovery of the idea that conflicts and struggles should not be suppressed but can be the genesis of the best laws. According to this line of argumentation, Machiavellian thought can serve as a source of inspiration for analyzing Latin American populisms, as "there is no politics if there is no division within the social body and the consequent attempt to define opposing identities and positions" (RINESI AND MURACA, 2010, p. 70). In his latest work, titled *What a Thing, the Public Thing! Shakespearean Notes for a Popular Republic*, Rinesi analyzes Shakespearean works such as "Julius Caesar," "Coriolanus," and the poem "The Rape of Lucrece" through the Machiavellian lens. Through this analysis, he aims to broaden the perspective and diversify the various types of republicanism that exist:

(...) the famous anti-personalism that we are led to believe is a fundamental principle of all republicanism (...), is not actually characteristic of all republicanism (...), but rather of a very specific type of republicanism, one of the two types of republicanism that we can identify throughout the history of ideas on the matter: aristocratic, minority-driven, and anti-popular republicanism, which indeed despises the leaders of the people as much as (...) it detests the people themselves, but not the other democratic, majority-driven, popular republicanism that, on the contrary, has managed throughout history to be more than once personalist without ceasing to be republican (RINESI, 2021, pp. 223-224).

Luciana Cadahia and Valeria Coronel (2018, 2021) express a cautionary note on this matter. Firstly, they acknowledge the value of Machiavelli's figure as a means to reflect on republicanism in the region because it diverges from the liberal interpretation of the republic. However, they identify a problem in confining the discussion to the Atlantic tradition of republicanism and its relationship with the continental republicanism of Antonio Negri and Karl Marx. On one hand, these continental and Atlantic republicanism could lead to overlooking the relevance of Latin America in shaping the republican imaginary, thus reinforcing the mistaken notion that republican theories

and history are exclusive to Europe and the United States. On the other hand, this perspective could foster an abstract relationship with the region's past, overlooking the complexity and richness of republican experiences in Latin America. In the authors' words:

The intention is not to dismiss the fact that these theorizations result from a dialogue with the continental and Atlantic histories of the Global North, but rather to emphasize that they should be enriched by engaging with the history of the Atlantic revolutions in the region. This is to make more explicit in the current field of political thought the role that Latin America and the Caribbean have played in shaping the socio-symbolic registers of republicanism. In other words, it is about becoming more aware of both the theoretical and practical contributions of Latin America to the contemporary understanding of republican theory (CADAHIA AND CORONEL, 2021, p. 93).

Expanding on this perspective, Laura Quintana (2020) observes that within the Machiavellian-inspired republicanism, as interpreted by Rinesi and Claudia Hilb, there is an acceptance of division "as part of the common given." This denotes a recognition of conflict as inherent, which can be addressed through either the existing state institutions or the establishment of new ones (2020, pp. 353-354). Quintana particularly underscores, in Rinesi's interpretation, the pivotal role attributed to the State as an entity facilitating the development of freedom and equality. However, this emphasis leads to the assertion that plebeian republicanism is inherently state-centric and, consequently, fails to adequately address the tension between "state institutions—regardless of their purported egalitarian nature—and emancipatory practices" (p. 133).

It is worth highlighting the works of Ambrosio Velasco Gómez and Diego Fernández Peychaux for their efforts to link Machiavelli with America. According to Velasco Gómez (2021), Machiavelli is a republican who, at the same time, contributed to formulating an imperial theory "that underlies the justificatory positions of the conquest of America, such as that of Ginés de Sepúlveda" (2011, p.10). Velasco Gómez distinguishes two moments in Machiavelli's work: the monarchical and foundational, characterized by the concentration of power in a context of external threat and internal conflict, and the republican moment, which guarantees peace and tranquility. In Fernández Peychaux's research (2018), an original theoretical-political approach is articulated: Machiavelli and Simón Bolívar would use the same theoretical strategy in the ways they account for the link between conflict and freedom in the republic. From Rome to Simón Bolívar, passing through Machiavelli to return to America once again. In other words, an alchemy in the art of translating Machiavellian echoes onto American soil.

Thus, it becomes evident how Machiavelli's figure can be approached from multiple perspectives and approaches to contemplate institutions and leadership. In this regard, it is essential

to highlight the recent compilation of a book that addresses, from various angles, the relationship between Machiavelli and populism (MATTEI AND LOSADA, 2024). This ongoing discussion, in which Machiavelli's figure has symptomatically emerged, revolves around the phenomenon of populism.

Within the context of this concise overview of a broad and captivating debate, while also considering the cautions and concerns raised, this article is positioned. In this work, we will analyze the relationship between Machiavelli and populism on two simultaneous levels: firstly, by mapping the research of Sandro Landi and José Pedro Zúquete on the connection between Machiavelli and enchantment; secondly, drawing from these works as inputs to propose an interpretation of the concept of enchantment and emotions from a relational and situated perspective.

2 The enchanters and the sacralization of politics

In recent years, the historian and theorist Sandro Landi (2023) has embarked on a very interesting and powerful line of research: analyzing populism as a phenomenon of the enchantment of politics through the transformations undergone by the notions of "enchantment" and "enchanter" in the 16th century, primarily in the texts of Niccolò Machiavelli, Pietro Pomponazzi, and Étienne La Boétie. In this section, I will draw upon Landi's work to examine his contribution regarding the figure of the enchanter and the construction of a politically charged bond permeated by enchantment in Machiavelli's texts.

It all begins with the word "ciurmatore," which is the red thread that Landi pulls to formulate one of his initial hypotheses: "there is a potentially political dimension in the character of the enchanter whose meaning is fully manifested, in different but related contexts, during the 16th century" (LANDI, 2023, p. 41). The term "ciurmatore" can be translated as "charlatan"; a condition that referred to popular figures who practiced ancestral medicine and wandered between the rural and urban worlds. In fact, Machiavelli wrote a composition titled "Canto de' ciurmadori" (MACHIARELLI, 1964, pp. 336-338; BAUSI, 2014). Already at the beginning, it reads: "Enchanters are we who enchant by nature". The *canto* then continues, in a joking manner, with the narrative of seducing women through remedies. But Landi emphasizes that behind this parody of those healers lies something more subtle: it is the talent that certain individuals possess to influence "and enslave not only wild animals, but also credulous spectators" (LANDI, 2023, p.41).

Following this thread of the presence of enchanters in Machiavelli's narrative, Landi highlights four figures from Machiavelli's discourse: Numa Pompilius, Moses, Savonarola and

Cesare Borgia, and Moses. Numa Pompilius was the first successor of Romulus and is known for having introduced religion in Rome. In Machiavelli's words:

As he [Numa] found a very ferocious people [*ferocissimo*] and wished to reduce it to civil obedience with the arts of peace, he turned to religion as a thing altogether necessary if he wished to maintain a civilization; and he constituted It so that for many centuries there was never so much fear of God [*timore di Dio*] as in that republic, which made easier whatever enterprise the Senate or the great men of Rome might plan to make (MACHIAVELLI, [D, I, 11] 1998 p.34).

The religion created by Numa is not the foundation of a truth but rather the instrument to make a "most ferocious" people obedient. That being said, with the presence of religion, Numa introduces a transformation in the spirit of the people: transitioning from ferocious to docile through the instillation of fear of God. The second reference to Numa is as follows:

One sees that for Romulus to order the Senate and to make other civil and military orders, the authority of God was not necessary [*non gli fu necessario della'autorità di Dio*]; but It was quite necessary to Numa, who pretended to be intimate with a nymph who counseled him [*il quale simulò di avere domestichezza con una Ninfa*] on what he had to counsel the people [*ch'egli avesse a consigliare al popolo*]. It all arose because he wished to put new and unaccustomed orders the city and doubted that his authority would suffice (MACHIAVELLI, [D, I, 12], 1998, p.35)

Numa, in some sense, resembles the Mosaic figure. Machiavelli's Moses was depicted as the privileged representative of God, mediating with his aura of mystery between God and the people. Numa plays a sort of mediating role through religion, but unlike the Hebrew leader, he employs religion to address any doubts the people may have about his authority. The leader's use of religion instills a necessary fear for the sustenance and continuity of his authority. Machiavelli suggests that Numa needed religion to uphold his authority, implying that he lacked sufficient reasons for obedience, and notes that Numa deceived the people by claiming he "simulated" speaking with the nymph Egeria. The fiercely Roman people not only became docile but also deceived. From this analysis of Numa's figure, we observe that Landi finds evidence for the construction of an enchantment bond between the leader (Numa) and the people. There is something magical in the act of simulating communication with a nymph that enabled a special bond with his people.

Next, we encounter the magnetic figure of Friar Savonarola. The friar was renowned; so many people flocked to hear him at his church that there was not enough space to sit. Machiavelli states:

Although coarse men may be more easily persuaded to a new order or opinion, this does make it impossible also to persuade to it civilized men who presume they are not coarse. To the people of Florence It does not appear that they are either ignorant or coarse; nonetheless, they were persuaded by Friar Girolamo Savonarola that he spoke with God. I do not wish to judge whether It is true or not, because one should speak with reverence of such a man; but I do say that an infinite number believe him without having seen anything extraordinary to make them believe him (MACHIAVELLI, [D, I, 11], 1998, p. 36).

Once again, the theme of persuasion and interaction between these two figures comes to the fore: while Numa persuaded that he communicated with a nymph, Savonarola claimed direct communication with God. Later on, Landi revisits Machiavelli's letter to Ricciardo Becchi from March 1498, wherein the friar's oratorical prowess is underscored. Furthermore, in the *Decennial Prose* (1506), an intriguing reference is noted:

But what displeased many more, / And divided you, was that school / Under whose sign your city lay:/ I mean that great Savonarola, / Who, inspired (*afflato*) by divine virtue, / Kept you entangled (*involti*) with his word." (MACHIAVELLI, 1964, p. 240).

Landi emphasizes from this paragraph the "persuasive effect" that Savonarola's words produce. Such oratorical prowess has an impact on the people ("*involti*"). This latter aspect seems to suggest to Landi the enchanting nature of words. In this sense, it appears that the sense of hearing is the most closely linked to a process of enchantment.

Finally, we have the case of Cesare Borgia presented in Chapter VII of *The Prince*. The well-known narrative concerns the public execution of Ramiro d'Orco, Borgia's right-hand man. In the chapter, Machiavelli recounts how Borgia realized that the excessive cruelty exercised by Ramiro d'Orco towards the people could harm his own political legitimacy. Indeed, Machiavelli points out that Borgia ended up executing him and hanging him in the public square of Cesena. By spectacularly displaying him dead there, Borgia managed to relieve the people's mood and, as the author writes, completely win them over. This spectacle is configured as a kind of public revenge against the man who nullified the measurement between him and the people. Borgia thus restored his reputation and left the people *soddisfatto e stupido*. From this episode, Landi observes that it is a type of thaumaturgical spectacle because it seeks to generate astonishment and a medical type because it seeks to heal the people.

These cases show how the construction of an enchanting leadership, and an enchanted people occurs. A quick reading might lead one to think that the enchanting leader exercises a one-directional will of domination.

Continuing along this state of discussion, albeit from an alternative standpoint and refraining from the examination of Machiavelli's oeuvre, but rather that of Max Weber, José Pedro Zúquete's recent work (2017) on the sacralization of politics merits attention. Despite its methodological variance from Landi's, it furnishes a complementary perspective that enriches the forthcoming section, wherein we endeavor to delineate some key aspects of the discourse.

In the second section of the referenced text, Zúquete suggests categorizing a type of populism: religious populism. The fundamental characteristic of this populism is its relationship with the sacred. In Zúquete's words:

the second manifestation of religious populisms in the modern world is tied with a functional, expansive understanding that is expressed through sacred, and the holy, which in this case involves a process of sacralization of politics, that happens when politics acquires a transcendent nature. It is no longer a mundane, limited affair, but is viewed and experienced as a tool for total change, anchored in myths, rites and symbols that galvanize group solidarity and give ultimate meaning to the life and destiny of communities. (ZÚQUETE, 2017, p. 8)

According to the author, religious populism is one that interprets politics as a transcendental cause, places the people in a consecrated position, and represents its enemies as evil on earth. In this sense, Zúquete's proposal aims to strengthen theories about populism and, to some extent, to explore the symbolic component associated with a connection to the sacred that resides in populist political forms. The sacralization of politics thus aims to re-enchant the world. Its elements include: the charismatic leader, around whom the images of the prophet (as an exemplary moral figure) gravitate; the identification of the leader with the party and the role of saving the community; the idea of constituting a moral community²; and lastly, the vision of politics as something that transcends discursive frameworks of salvation (both verbal and symbolic). This last element is centered on a conceptualization of time that seeks to address a present evil in order to highlight a redemptive future.

Landi's reference to this text is not random. It demonstrates the intimate connection between Machiavellian leadership, which he terms "enchanters," and the ancestral lineage of populist

² In this regard: "At the same time, the ingrained narrative of "chosenness" and "election" attributed to the people (who are the heroic, true patriots), in addition to making it the embodiment of Good in the struggle against Evil (those "others" who oppose the people, constitute its nemesis, and are often involved in conspiracies against it), transforms its activists into a community. Elevated into a sacred entity, this community is separated from the moral surrounding, profane corruption through the dynamics of a political theology composed of myths, rites, and symbols. Historical figures are the avatars of the essence of the respective communities" (ZÚQUETE, 2017, p.16).

leadership in the sixteenth century. It remains to return to Machiavelli's texts concerning the selected figures and to investigate the link between leadership and emotions.

3 A relational and situated perspective on enchantment and emotions

As I aimed to demonstrate in the first section, Machiavelli has assumed many faces and representations. In recent years, his work has garnered renewed interest in relation to populism, whether through the lens of "Machiavellian democracy" (MCCORMICK, 2011) or popular republic (RINESI, 2010, 2021). In this section, I will revisit Landi's hypothesis to explore how this renewed reading of the "enchanters" can be understood from a relational perspective, thereby allowing for a situated position on emotions.

Landi's work powerfully identifies in Machiavelli's texts the dimension of enchantment in the relationship between the people and their leaders. In Machiavelli's treatment of figures such as Savonarola, Cesare Borgia, Numa, and Moses, we see an enchanting leader who maintains a relationship with an enchanted people. This discovery raises several questions: How is this bond formed? What role does the people play in the process of enchantment? Is their position passive or active?

By examining these questions, we can gain deeper insight into the dynamics of political leadership and the emotional bonds that sustain it, highlighting the complex interplay between leaders and followers in Machiavellian thought.

In Borgia's case, Machiavelli exemplifies a leader who ventures into the political arena, full of a complex network of senses and meanings, demonstrating how the construction of an image operates in the relationship with the people. The power that emanates from Borgia is not found within his being but beyond and outside of himself; it is found in his appearance, in his image, and in the relationship he establishes with the people through this image. In fact, as Claude Lefort (2008) has argued, the ability to avoid generating hatred is always at stake in the construction of the prince's image and in the relationship he maintains with the people. Borgia illustrates, through his figure, the particular dynamic that is generated between a leader and the people. When he had his right-hand man executed in the square of Cesena because he foresaw that his actions could undermine his legitimacy, he demonstrated his political virtuosity and was able to display, in his relationship with the people, a particular image: that of one who can unite his condition of "man among men" with the "majesty of the State"; that is, to cloak violence in the guise of legitimacy and force under the

mask of law. This virtue implies his being-with-others. It's about a virtue that is not isolated, but is in 'communion,' a virtue with others. Its effectiveness lies in changing, every time it emerges, the horizon of meanings in which it is inscribed. The machiavellian virtue of Borgia intervenes, as Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1969) asserts, in a state of opinion and opens or closes fissures in the block of general consent. Borgia not only managed to liberate the people of Romagna but also managed to capture their adherence."

The spectacularization of Ramiro d'Orco's death in the square of Cesena staged and purged the furious hatred that the people felt for the cruelty endured. The ferocity of that spectacle left the men of the town, asserts Machiavelli, "*satisfatti e stupidi*" (MACHIARELLI, [P, VII], 2013, p. 37)

This event reinstates, on one hand, the hatred that the people may feel towards a power that exercises cruelty, and on the other hand, that a leader (Borgia) cannot act in isolation, but rather his action is linked to the need to satisfy the people. The people are "satisfied" to be rid of a cruel ruler and, at the same time, "stupefied," meaning astonished by Borgia's action. This fierce and visible "spectacle" for all produces an effect: to transmute the emotions that the people had (MATTEI, 2015). From this episode, it is highlighted not only the ability to "enchant" the people with a spectacle but also the ability of the people to feel "hatred" for those who exercise cruelty upon them. If we consider what Favret-Saada (2009) says about the relational proposal of the modes of affecting in which the emotions felt by the actors are a compound of elements that enhance each other, the charming leader is not only the generator of emotions, but also the people are part of the affective plot. Moreover, both the body and the agency capacity of the subjects are not reified independently of each other; they mutually affect each other producing hatred or astonishment. In this sense, the relational perspective on emotions allows us to go beyond the dichotomies of body/mind, cognition/emotion, reason/sensitivity.

Moses of Machiavelli is known as 'the armed prophet.' In the well-known quote from Chapter VI, it reads:

But, to come to those who have become princes by their own virtue and not by fortune, I say that the most excellent are Moses, Cyrus, Romulus, Theseus, and the like. And although one should not reason about Moses, as he was a mere executor of things that had been ordered for him by God [*uno mere essecutore delle cose che gli erano ordinate da Dio*] nonetheless he should be admired if only for that grace which made him deserving of speaking with God (MACHIARELLI, [P, VI], 1998b, p. 22)

Moreover, when Machiavelli contends that Moses is virtuous akin to Romulus, Theseus, and Cyrus, with the sole distinction lying in his possession of a "*gran precettore*" it underscores Moses's unique stature as an emblem of virtuous leadership. Through immediate communion with the divine, Moses constructs an authoritative image, positioning himself as the exclusive conduit of divine will on earth, *l'esecutore privilegiato di Dio*. This portrayal, projected onto the populace, engenders belief in his authority, bolstered by the ostentation of his direct communion with the divine.

As I have said, Numa takes on a mediating role through religion, but unlike the Hebrew leader, he uses religion to resolve any doubts the people might have about his authority. A leader's use of religion instills a necessary fear that is vital for maintaining and perpetuating his rule. Machiavelli, in arguing that Numa relied on religion to uphold his authority, suggests that he lacked sufficient grounds for obedience. However, Machiavelli also notes that Numa deceived the people by claiming he "feigned" to converse with a nymph. The fierce Roman populace transformed not only into a docile one but also into a deceived one. Nevertheless, Machiavelli pauses when he states "[...] a falsehood was discovered by the peoples." This indicates that the same people who are deceived also possess the capacity to uncover the deception. This efficacy in uncovering artifice ultimately disturbs "any good order".

The figure of Savonarola is often associated as a counter-figure to Moses for being the unarmed prophet compared to the Jewish leader. Beyond this comparison explored in literature, I would like to revisit the theme identified by Landi regarding the word in Machiavelli's letter to Becchi as a fixed point for understanding the figure of the friar in relation to enchantment. It is here that Machiavelli attributes to Savonarola a power with words because he was able to envelop/entangle (*involti*) the people with his oratory skills when delivering his sermons. Sermons which Machiavelli himself had attended and witnessed.

The first and only explicit mention of Savonarola in *The Prince* occurs in Chapter VI, dedicated to the presence of the great founding heroes of antiquity:

Moses, Cyrus, Theseus, and Romulus would not have been able to make their peoples observe their constitutions for long if they had been unarmed, as happened in our times to Brother Girolamo Savonarola. He was ruined in his new orders as soon as the multitude began not to believe in them, and he had no mode for holding firm those who had believed nor for making unbelievers believe. (MACHIAVELLI, [P, VI], 1998b, p. 24)

Savonarola was able to "envelop" the people with his words and thus generate a halo of enchantment. However, this halo is never permanent; it is sustained under certain considerations. At one point, the people began not to believe him and failed to maintain the pact of belief. There is

something about the shared images and horizons between the charming leader and the enchanted people that helps to construct the emotional circuit generated between them. There is a record of reversibility in the two poles of the relationship: leader-people. It is a shared capacity between both to create images. In other words, the disposition for image creation is not solely an asset of the leader; it is a capacity of both poles of the relationship, sustained by the shared atavistic horizon.

4 Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to investigate the archetypes of leadership in Machiavelli's writings (Borgia, Moses, Numa, and Savonarola) in order to analyze how the relationship between leader and people is articulated in light of the "charm/charmed" dyad. Landi's proposal to view these leadership figures as charmers is an intriguing one. Following this inaugurated line of research, it may be interesting to incorporate the theme of emotions into Machiavellian textual analysis, always observing that the circuit of emotions is not generated unilaterally. The prince or leader can generate new emotions or transmute them within an existing framework. The people, on the other hand, are also a source of creativity for new affects that the leader may experience, as demonstrated in the cases examined.

Zúquete, by virtue of his category of "religious populisms," to which we have referred, can be one of the contemporary authors who adds to the constellation of those thinking about new political forms of populism. In this sense, although the author does not reference Machiavelli as a fixed point for problematizing populisms because he takes a more Weberian approach to construct his category, through the work done, we believe it can be a resource for considering an archeology of populism anchored in the 16th century.

This way of thinking about the relationship between leaders and people traversed by a circuit of enchantment, as we sought to show with the examples discussed, implies considering both poles: leader and people. But it also involves accounting for the fact that the boundaries between the sacred and secular are unstable, and that this same instability seems to destabilize any differentiation between cognition and emotion. Furthermore, the manner in which some leaders seem to have a privileged connection with God or a nymph is not an invitation to passivity for those who believe in them. It implies a pact of belief that, like any pact, can be broken.

Bibliographic references

BAUSI, Francesco Rime sparse. In **Enciclopedia machiavelliana** https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/rime-sparse_%28Enciclopedia-machiavelliana%29/, 2014.

CADAHIA, Luciana and CORONEL, Valeria. Populismo republicano: más allá de «Estado versus pueblo». **Nueva Sociedad**, 273, pp. 72-82, 2018.

CADAHIA, Luciana and CORONEL, Valeria. Volver al archivo. De las fantasías decoloniales a la imaginación republicana. In M. MAREY (Ed.), **Teorías de la república y prácticas republicanas** (pp. 59-98). Madrid: Herder, 2021.

FERNÁNDEZ PEYCHAUX, Diego. Maquiavelo y Bolívar. La república según el pequeño género humano. In D. SCALZO Y D. FERNANDEZ PEYCHAUX (Eds.), **Pueblos, derechos y estados. Ensayos entre Europa y América Latina**, pp. 65-96, Buenos Aires: Edunpaz, 2018.

LANDI, Sandro. **La mirada de Maquiavelo. Un ensayo desde la historia intelectual**. Buenos Aires: Eudeba, 2022.

LANDI, Sandro. Los encantadores. Las raíces modernas del populismo (Maquiavelo, Pomponazzi, La Boétie). **Revista Argentina de Ciencia Política**, N°31, pp. 39-68, 2023.

LANDI, Sandro. Multitud, pueblo y populismo en Maquiavelo. Un enfoque histórico. **Revista Argentina de Ciencia Política** (27), 1-28, 2021.

LEFORT, Claude (2008). **Le travail de oeuvre Machiavel**. Paris : Gallimard, 2008.

LOSADA, Leandro (2020). **Maquiavelo en la Argentina: Usos y lecturas, 1830-1940**. Buenos Aires: Katz.

MACHIARELLI, Niccolò, **Opere letterarie**. Blasucci, L. (ed.), Milàn: Adelphi, 1964.

MACHIARELLI, Niccolò. **Il Principe**. Torino: Einaudi, 2013.

MACHIARELLI, Niccolò, **Discourse on Livy**. Traslated by Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov, London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.

MACHIARELLI, Niccolò. **The prince**. Translated and with an Introduction by Harvey C. Mansfield Second Edition, London and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998b.

MAQUIAVELO, Nicolás. **Discursos sobre la primera década de Tito Livio**. Madrid: Alianza, 2000.

MAREY, Macarena. **Teorías de la república y prácticas republicanas**. Barcelona: Herder, 2021.

MATTEI, Eugenia "Una pietosa crudeltà". La figura de César Borgia en Nicolás Maquiavelo. **Papeles de trabajo**, Vol 9, N°15, 2015.

MCCORMICK, John P. **Machiavellian Democracy**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

MCCORMICK, John. Machiavelli against Republicanism: On the Cambridge School's "Guicciardinian Moments". **Political Theory**, 31(5), pp. 615-643, 2003.

MCCORMICK, John. Machiavellian Democracy: Controlling Elites with Ferocious Populism. **American Political Science Review**, 95(2), pp. 297-313, 2001.

MERLEAU-PONTY, Maurice, "Nota sobre Maquiavelo". In **Signos**, Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1969.

PETTIT, Philip La libertad republicana y su trascendencia constitucional. In M. J. Bertomeu; A. Doménech y A. de Francisco (Comps.), **Republicanismo y democracia** (pp. 41-68). Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila, 2005.

PETTIT, Philip. **Republicanismo. Una teoría sobre la libertad y el gobierno**. Barcelona: Paidós, 1999.

POCOCK, J. G. A. **The machiavellian moment, Florentine political thought and the atlantic republican tradition**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

QUINTANA, Laura. **Política de los cuerpos: Emancipaciones desde y más allá de Jacques Rancière**. Barcelona: Herder, 2020.

RINESI, Eduardo y Muruca, Matías. Populismo. Algunos apuntes sobre un debate actual. In E. RINESI; G. VOMMARO Y M. MURACA (Eds), **Si éste no es el pueblo. Hegemonía, populismo y democracia en Argentina** (pp. 59-74). Buenos Aires: Universidad General Sarmiento, 2010.

RINESI, Eduardo. **¡Qué cosa, la cosa pública! Apuntes shakespereanos para una república popular**. Buenos Aires: Ubu Ediciones, 2021.

RODRÍGUEZ RIAL, Gabriela. La vida de Castruccio Castracani: un exemplum de innovación en la tradición republicana. **Foro Interno. Anuario de Teoría Política**, (13), 33-61, 2013.

SKINNER, Quentin. **Los fundamentos del pensamiento político moderno**. (Vol. II). México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1993.

TORRES, Sebastián. **Vida y tiempo de la república. Contingencia y conflicto político en Maquiavelo**. Los Polvorines: Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento / Córdoba: Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 2013.

VELASCO GÓMEZ, Ambrosio. **500 años de Filosofías sobre la Conquista y el colonialismo: Razón del poder frente al humanismo de la Universidad de México**. Ciudad de México: Universidad Autónoma de México, 2021.

VIROLI, Maurizio. **Il sorriso di Niccolò: storia di Machiavelli**. Bari: Laterza, 1998.

VIROLI, Maurizio. **Repubblicanesimo**. Bari: Laterza, 1999.

ZÚQUETE, José P. **Populism and religion**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.