Günter Berghaus

Editorial

The International Yearbook of Futurism Studies has reached the end of its first decade of existence. Time to look back at what has been achieved, what this volume brings to its readers and what we intend to do in the near future.

In 2009, De Gruyter gave us a test period of three years, then extended to five, to see if there was a need for a periodical that would serve as a channel of communication between Futurism scholars based in countries other than Italy or Russia – generally considered to be the ‘natural home’ of Futurism scholarship. Having worked in Italy for more than twenty years, I was fully aware that hardly any of the Futurism experts there could read Russian; and as I subsequently learned, very few Russian colleagues followed Italian research into Futurism. Added to which, neither communities of scholars had much knowledge of the lively research into Futurism that was being carried out in Northern Europe, Asia or the Americas. Way back in the 1960s and 70s this may have been understandable, as the literature on Futurism was then predominantly concerned with Italy and Russia and written in Italian and Russian. But by the time I had become a serious Futurism scholar, this was not the case any longer.

After the epochal 1986 Palazzo Grassi exhibition *Futurismo e futurismi* had presented the international ramifications of Marinetti’s movement, a long series of international exhibitions raised Futurism to a status on a par with Expressionism, Dada and Surrealism. Consequently, Futurism entered the syllabus of academic institutions and became a standard topic not only in courses on Italian or Russian art and literature, but also Hispanic Studies, Slavonic Studies, Cultural Studies, Theatre History, Music History, etc. In 2000, I published a short bibliographic guide to the literature that investigated Futurism on an international scale. It listed 2,350 publications written in more than a dozen languages. In the run-up to the 2009 Centenary of Futurism, I agreed with De Gruyter to issue an updated and expanded version of this bibliography and to include several thousand new items which had come to my notice in the intervening years. 2009 turned out to be a bumper year for Futurism. It not only brought hundreds of exhibitions and 68 symposia at which nearly one thousand papers were presented, but also 600 book publications on Futurist art and artists.

Work on the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* extended my range of international contacts, many of whom became contributors to the still expanding bibliographic handbook, with the result that by 2013 my database had reached the previously unexpected size of 25,000 entries, with less than half of

them written in Italian or Russian. Thus, there was no doubt in my mind that Futurism Studies had become an international discipline. However, most of the research was still pursued in institutions dedicated to national cultures. Language barriers, in the first instance, prevented people from investigating the similarities and differences between the manifold Futurisms that existed around the globe.

Looking back at ten years of editing the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*, I can say that I met many colleagues who shared my frustration with the lack of communication between scholars working in closely related fields. Between 2009 and 2012, I attended some twenty-five conferences in order to present the Yearbook and my research into the global reach of Futurism; and on each occasion people approached me with suggestions for an essay that they felt should get translated for an international readership. Thus, my network grew and now encompasses more than 700 scholars around the world. They regularly inform me about books or PhD theses which they think could be of interest to the wider community of Futurism scholars. Especially younger scholars outside the Western strongholds of learning are keen to send me English language summaries of their research. Consequently, every year I receive more essays than I can possibly accommodate in our volumes.

The ten issues published between 2010 and 2020 demonstrate that International Futurism Studies is a thriving academic discipline, to which we have contributed some 5,600 pages of studies concerned with Futurist activities in over 30 countries and on 3 continents. It is encouraging to see how the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* has enriched and broadened our knowledge of the world-wide circulation of Futurist ideas in the years 1909–1945.

Volume 10 again examines how the innovative impulses that came from Italy were creatively merged with indigenous traditions and how many national variants of Futurism emerged from this fusion. The Futurists in many countries demonstrated how historical precursors, ancient and modern, could serve as a source of inspiration, just as much as the ideas emanating from Italy and Russia. Mzia Chikhradze, for example, acquaints us in this issue with the case of Ilya Zdanevich, who undertook research into the ancient culture of Georgia because he felt that the Caucasian Futurism he wanted to create had to combine selected features of Marinetti's aesthetics with the 'deep past', i.e. the national roots which, since the fourth century, had given his country such a vibrant creative tradition. In our previous volume, dedicated to Russian Futurism, we presented parallel cases that showed how the traditions and ancient monuments of the Scythians – a civilization that flourished from c. 900 BC to c. 200 BC in central Eurasia (ancient Hylea) – had inspired artists of the twentieth

century to the point that some of them chose to call themselves Hylaeans (*Gileia*) rather than Futurists.¹

Yet, such borrowing of ideas from ancient sources did not prevent the Futurists from producing works of absolute ‘originality’, which, of course, was one of the key concepts of Modernism and of the historical avant-garde. However, if we look at previous decades, or even centuries, we notice that neither ‘originality’ nor ‘imitation’ were ever clear-cut concepts. In previous volumes of the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* we discussed the relations between Primitivism and Futurism in Peru, Brazil, the Caribbean, Yugoslavia, Ukraine, Poland, Estonia and other countries. The artists and writers examined did not participate in the age-old *Querelle des Anciens et des Modernes* but rather sided with Immanuel Kant, who distinguished between *Nachfolge* (aemulatio) und *Nachahmung* (imitatio) and recommended in his *Critique of the Power of Judgment*

not to undertake misguided attempts [...] to turn their successors into mere imitators, but rather put others by means of their method on the right path to seek out the principles in themselves and thus to follow their own, often better, course. [...] Emulation, which refers to a process, not imitation, is the right expression for all influence that products of an exemplary author can have on others.²

As many contributions in volumes 1–10 of the yearbook show, ‘originality’ also demanded an emancipation from the precepts proclaimed by Marinetti et al. Futurists all over the world not only fought against academic institutions, but also the modern (*scilicet* Futurist) tradition based in Italy or Russia. This is why ‘influence’ is such a questionable term in our context, no less, in fact, than ‘imitation’ was to the Classicists.

Johann Joachim Winckelmann wrote in 1755: “The only way for us to become great and, indeed, if this is possible, to become inimitable, is to imitate

¹ See also in previous volumes of the yearbook the essays by Michael Kunichika on “Primitivism and Scythianism in Russian Futurism” and by Irene Chytraeus-Auerbach and Lisa Hanstein on “The Russian Avant-garde and Its Eastern Roots”.

² “Es ist gar kein Gebrauch unserer Kräfte, [welcher] nicht in fehlerhafte Versuche gerathen würde, wenn nicht Andere mit den ihrigen ihm vorgegangen wären, nicht um die Nachfolgenden zu blossen Nachahmern zu machen, sondern durch ihr Verfahren andere auf die Spur zu bringen, um die Principien in sich selbst zu suchen und so ihren eigenen, oft besseren, Gang zu nehmen. [...] *Nachfolge*, die sich auf einen Vorgang bezieht, nicht *Nachahmung*, ist der rechte Ausdruck für allen Einfluß, den Producte eines exemplarischen Urhebers auf Andere haben können.” Kant: *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, § 32. “Erste Eigentümlichkeit des Geschmacksurteils”, in *Sämmtliche Werke* IV, pp. 145–146.

the ancients.”³ When we examine this well-known adage more closely, we notice that the paradox of “becoming inimitable by way of imitating” suggests that even in Classicist aesthetics ‘imitation’ did not mean a sterile and mechanical ‘copying’. Artists, we learn, should be inspired by an ideal to create an art that is equal in quality to that of the ancients. Kant’s *aemulatio* means: competing with a model and surpassing the example set by tradition. In this sense, tradition acts like a pool of resources that needs to be carefully sifted, and that which has been gathered and found useful should then be combined wisely and transformed into a new creation.⁴

A similar process can be observed amongst the artists we are concerned with here in our yearbook. The creative appropriation of ideas emanating from Italy or Russia and their combination with indigenous traditions and/or aesthetic concepts originating in coeval art movements turned International Futurism into a highly complex and multifaceted phenomenon. Artists inspired by Futurism created something original that moved beyond the inspiration received from abroad or from older traditions. Their works simultaneously integrated and rejected the models emulated, thus opening up a fluid field of transformation and assimilation.

Many of the processes mentioned above can be found elucidated in this issue of the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* in **Section 1: Futurism Studies**, which opens with an essay by Giacomo Coronelli, **The Futurist Manifestos of 1909: Dates and Editions Reconsidered**. It re-examines the genesis of the foundational manifesto of Futurism in the light of new material that has recently emerged on the antiquarian book market, including Marinetti’s first Futurist press release, of which no copy was previously known. Coronelli has concerned himself for many years with the editorial history of Futurist manifestos. The new material brought to light in 2019 overturned a number of assumptions in his previous narratives. The essay published here invalidates many previous studies on the subject and demonstrates that even issues of fundamental importance – such as the foundation of the Futurist movement – have not been finally settled and require a great deal of further research. **Guicciardo Sassoli de’ Bianchi Strozzi** (Scuola di Specializzazione in Beni Storico Artistici, Università di Bologna) discusses

3 “Der einzige Weg für uns, groß, ja, wenn es möglich ist, unnachahmlich zu werden, ist die Nachahmung der Alten.” Johann Joachim Winckelmann: “Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst”, p. 2.

4 The Classicists, in fact, follow in this Seneca’s bee metaphor which said that we ought to imitate the bees in the way they gather from flowers various kinds of nectar and transform this harvest into a unique blend that is fundamentally different from its original components. See Seneca: *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium*. Liber XI, Epist. LXXXIV. § 3–5.

Margherita Sarfatti, Novecento and Futurism. Much has been written about the two competing artistic tendencies in 1920s Italy: Novecento and Futurism. Yet, despite their unquestionable competition for public attention, for State sponsorship and recognition as the most representative reflection of the period's *zeitgeist*, several key members in both groups were on friendly terms with each other and collaborated in joint projects. Sassoli, who recently co-curated two exhibitions on Margherita Sarfatti held at the Casa d'Arte Futurista Depero in Rovereto and the Museo di Arte Moderna e Contemporanea di Trento e Rovereto, paints a less familiar picture of this journalist, art critic and patron of the avant-garde. During the 1910s, she entertained an amicable relationship with the Futurist leader F. T. Marinetti. Her Milanese salon in Corso Venezia was frequented by Futurists of all colours; and even later, when she had become a key representative of the 'return to order' in the Italian art world, she did not cut herself off from her former friends. But the very fact that ex-Futurists such as Mario Sironi and Achille Funi now operated under her umbrella and promoted a 'new classicism' made conflicts unavoidable.

Using documents from the Fondo Sarfatti at MART, Rovereto, Sassoli explores Sarfatti's activity within the Futurist ambit of the 1910s. He characterizes her campaign for the Novecento group in the 1920s and analyses the conflicts between Futurism and Novecento when both tried to establish themselves as the hegemonic artistic movement in the Fascist State. In this essay we are not only given a complex picture of the fate of Futurism under the conditions of a Fascist State, but also learn how Marinetti's perceived enemy, supposedly courted by the régime, ended up in exile in Latin America. Clearly, things were not quite as clearcut in Fascist Italy as many critics would like to make us believe.

Gábor Dobó and Merse Pál Szeredi (Kassák Múzeum, Budapest) paint an equally complex picture of **Futurism in the Network of Avant-garde Journals**. Their essay explores the functions of advertisements for each other in avant-garde periodicals after the First World War. These 'network diagrams' constructed a virtual avant-garde community, and Dobó and Szeredi examine the rôle that Futurism played in this, especially after Marinetti issued his manifesto *Le Futurisme mondial* and attempted to re-conquer Futurism's position within the international avant-garde. Dobó and Szeredi analyse how the artists and groups mentioned in Marinetti's manifesto defined their own position in the avant-garde and how Futurism fared in the network advertisement, usually printed on the last page(s) of the magazines. Dobó and Szeredi's analysis demonstrates in no uncertain terms how the Italian movement lost its avant-garde image due to its compromises with the Fascist régime and how, in the second half of the 1920s, it was gradually replaced by International Constructivism.

Arturo Larcati (Stefan Zweig Zentrum, Salzburg) returns to a topic we have repeatedly broached in the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*: **The Reception of Futurism in Vienna during the 1920s and 30s**. As a German-speaking country, Austria participated in many debates conducted in Berlin and Munich but, due to its position in the Habsburg Empire, it also benefited from discursive and artistic influences coming from Hungary and Bohemia. Futurism arrived in Austria in December 1912, when the touring exhibition that had previously been shown in Paris, London, Berlin and other European cities, reached Vienna on its way from Munich (October–November 1912) to Budapest (January–February 1913). It gave rise to the Kineticism movement (also known as Kinetism), a method of art education developed by Franz Čížek and formally quite close to Futurism, Cubism and Expressionism. In terms of publicity, Austrian Futurism benefited greatly from the activities of Theodor Däubler, Ludwig Ficker and his magazine *Der Brenner*, Robert Müller and the periodical *Der Ruf* and Lajos Kassák's six-year residency in Vienna.

Futurism's public profile in Austria reached a peak in 1924, when the *International Exhibition of New Theatre Technology* was held at the Konzerthaus, with a large Futurism section curated by Enrico Prampolini. The audience could see numerous stage designs and figurines by Carmelich, Caviglioni, Depero, Dottori, Marasco, Marchi, Paladini, Pannaggi, Prampolini, Tato and Valente. The catalogue reproduced manifestos by F.T. Marinetti, Luigi Russolo and Enrico Prampolini. Marinetti visited Vienna, engaged in several controversial debates and explained his concept of 'global Futurism' to large audiences of Austrians and international guests.

Larcati also directs our attention to a third wave of Futurism in Austria, when a touring exhibition of aeropaintings moved from Hamburg and Berlin to Vienna (February – March 1935). In contrast to Nazi Germany, where all Modernist schools were officially condemned as 'degenerate art', the Viennese public was much more open to the innovations in Futurist art, comparing them even to the achievements of the Bauhaus. The last Futurist exhibition Larcati discusses in his essay was held in 1937. The Roman Futurist Arturo Ciacelli, who had played a major rôle in bringing Futurism to Scandinavia (he ran a gallery in Stockholm from 1915 until 1921), came to Vienna and stayed there until after the Second World War. Ciacelli's paintings fused tradition and modernity into a harmonious whole and found, as Larcati analyses, a favourable reception in Vienna when he held his first exhibition there in 1937. However, Austria's annexation by Nazi Germany in March 1938 meant that National Socialist concepts of art also became the official cultural doctrine in Vienna and Futurism was banned as it was in Germany.

Fernando Dias (Faculdade de Belas Artes da Universidade de Lisboa) offers a useful complement to the Portuguese section in the 2013 yearbook on Iberian Futurisms by introducing us to **Carlos Porfirio and Futurism in the Algarve**. Before the short but fruitful ‘season of Futurism’ in Lisbon, there was already a precursor to be found in Faro. The painter and poet Carlos Porfirio was crucial for the Futurist circle that had emerged in this southern city in early 1917. Dias discusses in his essay Porfirio’s relations with the Futurist group in Lisbon, especially Santa Rita Pintor and José de Almada Negreiros, and their joint initiatives in Faro. He introduces us to the painter Carlos Lyster Franco who helped Porfirio to set up the “Futurismo” section in the newspaper *O heraldo* (The Herald), discusses the Futurist aspects of an art exhibition Porfirio organized in Faro in 1917, and then examines his rôle in the editorial history of *Portugal futurista* (1917). Drawing on a wealth of material brought together for the exhibition *Carlos Porfirio: Diálogos do modernismo*, which he curated for the Museu Municipal in Faro in 2019, Dias introduces us to the key features of Futurism in the Algarve and its double peripheral position with regard to the artistic debates in Lisbon and Paris. He outlines how, in the course of 1917, the movement’s activities shifted to Lisbon, eventually to be replaced by a Portuguese/Hispanic notion of Modernism. In an appendix, he communicates some previously unknown letters concerning Futurism in the Algarve.

Luca Bochicchio (MuDA Museo Diffuso Albisola) brings us back to Italy in his discussion of **Tullio d’Albisola between Futurism and Fascism**. The artist, poet and ceramicist Spartaco Mazzotti has become recognized as one of the most important members of the second generation of Futurism. Taking the political origins of his artistic pseudonym as a starting point, Bochicchio addresses the artist’s complicated relationship with the Fascist régime. Based on unpublished documents in Marinetti’s and Tullio’s personal archives, preserved in the Beinecke Rare Books and Manuscripts Library and in the Casa Mazzotti in Albissola Marina, Bochicchio gives us new insight into the collaboration between the founder of Futurism and the leader of the Futurist branch in Albisola. He also opens our eyes to the complex situation many Futurists found themselves in during the 1920s.

Tullio’s anti-Fascist attitude caused him to be jailed from November 1921 until March 1923. Bochicchio draws on a variety of sources to show how Tullio d’Albisola acted as the leader of an anti-Fascist group in Albisola, which met in secret to discuss arts and politics as well as prepare actions against the Fascists in the province of Savona. Given his political record, Mazzotti was monitored by the Fascist authorities and forbidden to participate in public exhibitions. Adopting the pseudonym Tullio d’Albisola offered him an opportunity to circumvent this prohibition. Mazzotti’s career was also impeded by the fact that,

between 1928 and 1935, he was excluded from professional confederations and labour unions. In order to survive as an artist and to earn a living, he was forced into making certain compromises with the Fascist authorities. This meant that while prominent anti-Fascists were regular guests at the Mazzotti ceramics factory during the 1930s, Tullio also participated in the rituals and phraseology of Mussolini's régime. His enthusiastic support of Marinetti's cultural initiatives within the corporate institutions of Fascist Italy was, however, not politically motivated. As numerous letters testify, Mazzotti had great personal admiration for the Futurist leader. Marinetti, on the other hand, took great pride in promoting Mazzotti and procuring him commissions and exhibition opportunities. But still, in 1935 Mazzotti was forbidden to publish articles in periodicals and to contribute to radio broadcasts. Notwithstanding the fact that politically they were poles apart, Mazzotti and Marinetti had great esteem for each other and did their best not to let politics interfere in their personal relationship. Thus, one of the greatest œuvres in Futurist ceramics could be produced and found buyers in the years of greatest political repression.

Mzia Chikhradze (National Centre for Georgian Art History, Tbilisi) takes us into Transcaucasia in her essay on **The Georgian Avant-garde: Futurism and More**. In the first issue of the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*, Bela Tsipuria offered a fairly general introduction to Futurist and avant-garde culture in Georgia. Chikhradze focusses our attention on what Georgian Futurism is probably best known for nowadays: its truly outstanding book art, especially by the brothers Zdanevich. The years between 1910 and 1920, when Georgia's short-lived independence safeguarded it against Russian intrusion, was one of the most dynamic periods in the country's cultural history. Georgian artists were very receptive to new artistic trends coming from Western Europe and Russia. The turmoil of the Russian Revolution and subsequent Civil War made leading Futurists move out of Moscow and Saint Petersburg and settle in Tbilisi for a number of years. As a consequence, European Modernist culture was fused with local artistic traditions and given powerful expression in a profusion of highly original works of art and literature

Ilya Zdanevich acted as a link between local artists and the immigrants from Russia and other countries. He was a multicultural cosmopolite who developed an alternative position to European visions of the avant-garde. Although he admired Marinetti's poetry, he rejected the Futurist leader's ideology of destruction and antipasséism. He complemented technophilia and machine aesthetics with ancient local traditions, thus creating a form of Futurist art that had strong national roots and a pronounced Georgian imprint. Chikhradze follows Ilya and Kirill Zdanevich's career, discusses their Cubo-Futurist paintings, flamboyant décor of artists' cafés, nightclubs and dining halls as well as theatre designs that

verge on Dadaist absurdity. The second part of her essay then focusses on the Zdanevich brothers' contribution to Futurist book art, inspired not only by Italian models (Marinetti's *parole in libertà*), but also by Russian avant-garde literature (*zaum'*) and Dada. The 41° group in Tbilisi sought to overcome the monotonous visual impression of conventional page design, to establish a new balance between words and images, and to operate with a large variety of fonts, different-sized letters and handwritten texts. Furthermore, their books were printed on unusual surfaces rather than sheets of industrial paper, thus giving them a pronounced 'primitive' appearance. As Chikhradze shows, the Futurist artists' books from Tbilisi were more versatile than their Italian and Russian counterparts. Because of this, Futurist publications from Tbilisi were an important step ahead in artistic book design. Texts became an artistic medium, where each letter, word or sentence had specific graphic characteristics. Images were an integral part of the books, and the cooperation of poets and artists created an inseparable system of representation in the volumes.

Caterina Toschi (Università per Stranieri di Siena) also directs our attention to graphic design in her essay on **Futurism and the Birth of a Modern European Typography**. She analyses the expressive means of avant-garde typography and examines the rôle played by Marinetti and some other Futurists in its historical development. Discussing the influence of Futurist typography in Eastern and Central Europe, she introduces us to El Lissitzky's theories about the visual effect of words and compares them with László Moholy-Nagy's research into the physicality of writing. The essay concludes with Jan Tschichold's technical studies on the historic rôle of blank and unprinted spaces in poetic and other texts and demonstrates that all of these designers operated with the Futurist heritage, but also incorporated elements taken from Dada and Constructivism. Toschi also shows how, after 1925, many of the techniques that Marinetti had handled so masterfully in *Zang tumb tuuum* (1914) and *Les Mots en liberté futuristes* (Futurist Words-in-Freedom, 1919) were replaced by the latest innovations in the printing industry which fused typography and photomontage. Thus, Marinetti as the initiator of the typographical revolution of the 1910s had to give way to a new generation stimulated by photography and its artistic use in the 'Typo-Photo' and 'Photo-Text'.

Ilaria Schiaffini (Università di Roma "La Sapienza") also deals with the medium photography in her essay on **Tato and Exhibitions of Futurist Photography in the 1930s**. Whereas most studies of Futurist photography highlight the experiments undertaken by A.G. Bragaglia and his brothers in the field of photodynamism (actually rejected by the Futurist painters), Schiaffini examines the contribution made by Tato (Guglielmo Sansoni), co-signatory with Marinetti of the *Manifesto della fotografia futurista* (Manifesto

of Futurist Photography) in 1930. Although Tato is best known for his *aeropittura*, he was also a professional photographer with a studio in Rome and contributed to the re-integration of Futurism into the photographic avant-garde. Schiaffini investigates the Futurist sections of two photographic exhibitions in Rome, the *Primo concorso nazionale* (First National Competition, 1930), where the *Manifesto of Futurist Photography* circulated for the first time, and *Prima Biennale internazionale d'arte fotografica* (First International Biennial of Photographic Art, 1932). She also presents two exhibitions organized by the Futurists themselves: the *Mostra sperimentale di fotografia futurista* (Experimental Exhibition of Futurist Photography), held in Turin in 1931, and the *Mostra nazionale futurista (ceramiche)* (National Futurist Exhibition: Ceramics), held in Trieste in 1932. Finally, she discusses the international dimension of Futurist photography by comparing the Futurist section at the *Prima Biennale internazionale d'arte fotografica* (First International Biennial of Photographic Art, 1932) to the *Mostra fotografica internazionale* (International Photographic Exhibition), organized as part of the Fifth Triennial in Milan in 1933.

Schiaffini demonstrates in her essay that Futurism tried to play a significant rôle in international photographic trends of the 1930s. What emerges is that Tato was well acquainted with aerial photography, which had emerged during the First World War, took it out of its original military contexts and transformed the new technical achievements into Futurist art. Furthermore, Tato's photography incorporated elements which had been ignored by Bragaglia and Marinetti (photomontage, macro photography, sandwich printing) but had found international dissemination through the seminal *Film und Foto* exhibition (1929). The novel photographic procedures allowed Tato to create images that demonstrate great mastery and exquisite craftsmanship.

Yet, in a Fascist State, none of these achievements discussed by Schiaffini, however innovative they may have been, lacked a political dimension. Schiaffini shows us how Futurist experiments, on the one hand, fitted in and supported Mussolini's cultural guidelines and military objectives, but on the other they were also hindered by the cultural bureaucracy. Schiaffini thus confirms what also Sassoli in his essay demonstrates: Marinetti's desire to occupy a position of official art in the Fascist State was never successful; Futurism never conquered a rank similar to that occupied by the Novecento group. Yet in the end (i.e. after the racial laws of 1938), also Novecento and, in particular, its Jewish leader Margherita Sarfatti, became victims of the corporatist State marching in unison with its Nazi ally.

Caro Verbeek (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam) is a scholar and curator whose work I have been following for many years. Joined by a common interest in synaesthesia, we have had many fruitful exchanges regarding tactilism,

olfactory theatre, colour audition etc. She has now written up her research in an essay entitled **In Search of Lost Scents: The Olfactory Dimension of Italian Futurism**. Very few scholars indeed have ever directed their focus on the Futurists' use of smell in their creative experiments. Although Futurist art and literature repeatedly highlighted olfaction as an important human sense and linked it to other elements in the human sensorium, it never received the same attention as, for example, tactilism did. As Verbeek emphasizes, the inherent volatile nature of scent and a lack of a proper vocabulary have impeded research and have left olfaction as the last sensory bastion to be conquered in Futurism Studies. Yet, scent was a medium of communication for several Futurists, including F.T. Marinetti, Fedele Azari, Carlo Carrà, Bruno Munari and Bruno Sanzin. Olfaction played an important rôle in Futurist writings (manifestos, poems, plays). Verbeek's research reveals that the Futurists were fully up-to-date with contemporary artistic and scientific developments in the realm of olfaction. Therefore, scents were not just reflected on and evoked in their writings, but also actively employed during performances, artistic banquets and in cinemas. Verbeek suggests that also Futurist toys and sculptures may have possessed a fragrant dimension. Therefore, the Futurists can be regarded as predecessors of a phalanx of contemporary artists working in the realm of olfaction. No doubt, Verbeek's essay will ring in a new phase in Futurism Studies and more essays will soon explore this "valuable and volatile heritage" left by the Futurists.

Serge Lorenzo Milan (Université Côte d'Azur) analysed in volume 6 of the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* one of André Warnod's clever satires of Futurism. He returns to this subject in his essay **Satirizing Futurism in France: Roland Dorgelès, André Warnod and their Circle** and offers us an insight into one of the most effective lampoons of Futurism, the so-called 'Boronali Affair'. In 1910, the journalist Roland Dorgelès published in Paris a *Manifesto of Excessivism*, a satire of avant-garde painting, in general, and Futurist manifestos, in particular. It was distributed at the 1910 Salon des Indépendants, where the artist 'Joachim-Raphaël Boronali' exhibited a painting executed in a vaguely Post-Impressionist style. This work, in actual fact, had been produced by a donkey manipulated by Roland Dorgelès and André Warnod, in the presence of an official witness from the Civil Court of the Seine. Initially, this painting was largely ignored by the public, as was Dorgelès' manifesto, because the audience had plenty of innovative and extravagant paintings to admire at the 1910 salon. But then, on April Fool's Day, the satirical magazine *Fantasio* printed a detailed account of how the art-loving public had been duped by Lolo the Donkey and 'Boronali', the head of the School of Excessivism. The story went 'viral' and was

reported on even in the USA and in Russia (where it gave rise to the artists' group 'Donkey's Tail').

Serge Milan in his essay offers us not only a detailed account of the events in Paris in 1910 but also sheds light on the artistic atmosphere in the years when Futurism first appeared on the French scene and on the ties between bohemian circles and the budding avant-garde scene. He describes the personalities of Dorgelès, an inveterate critic of Modernism, and Warnod, a supporter of Futurism in France. Specifically, Milan focusses on the two accounts of the Boronali affair written by Dorgelès and offers us valuable insights into French opposition to Futurism between 1909, when *The Foundation and Manifesto of Futurism* appeared in *Le Figaro*, and 1912, when the first exhibition of Futurist paintings took place at the Bernheim-Jeune gallery.

Serge Milan's essay leads over to **Section 2: Caricatures and Satires of Futurism in the Contemporary Press**, which in this issue contains examples from Hungary, Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Russia and Portugal. **Section 3: Archive Report** then presents an exciting new institution, the **Archiv der Avantgarden (AdA)**, affiliated to the Staatliche Kunstsammlungen Dresden. With approximately 1,5 million objects, the collection is unique in scope and structure and covers the entire spectrum of the twentieth century. It reflects the international cross-connections and intermedia affiliations within the historical and postmodern avant-garde in the fields of fine art, literature, music, theatre, film, dance and politics. There is no doubt that in the years to come the Dresden archive will be of major importance to scholars researching the multifaceted paths of the twentieth-century avant-gardes.

Measured in terms of the total holdings, the Futurist records make up only a small portion of the Dresden archive. The material is multifaceted and disparate, encompassing both primary and secondary sources related to the first, second and third phases of Futurism, on Neo-Futurism and the activities of ex-Futurists in the period after the Second World War. A large collection of exhibition catalogues and secondary literature documents the history of Futurism both in Europe and other parts of the world. Journals and periodicals make up a great part of the Futurism holdings, but there are also hundreds of first editions of Futurist books, photographic reproductions of works of art, letters and other autographs, architectural drawings, design sketches and many original works of art.

Apart from its extensive Italian holdings, the Archive of the Avant-gardes possesses important first editions of books and journals related to Russian Futurism, as well as drawings by some of its greatest masters. The collection of documentary material encompasses the correspondence between David Burliuk and the American collector and art dealer Eric Estorick, related to the Grosvenor

Gallery in London and the Marussia Gallery in New York. This entirely unexplored material shows how Western art galleries began to develop an interest in Russian art of the Revolutionary period and how the market responded to it. Polish documents stored at the Archive of the Avant-gardes contain a sizeable number of avant-garde books and manuscripts and amount to what can be described as the largest collection of its kind in the world. The Archive holds first editions of all poetry volumes published by five poets, who formed the short-lived Polish Futurist literary group. The Dresden collection possesses full runs of all Polish avant-garde magazines, together with the books published by them. As the Polish Futurists participated in the wider international trends and collaborated with various avant-garde movements across Europe, the Polish section of the archive is also of interest to scholars investigating Futurism in other countries, and in Modernist movements cooperating with Polish Futurism.

A team of ten archivists and librarians is currently cataloguing the holdings in the Archiv der Avantgarden, so that in the near future in-depth analyses and contextualization can begin. As the report in this volume of the yearbook shows, the Dresden collection is a mine of information, where Futurism scholars will find material that documents its manifold connections with different avant-garde movements, throw new light on under-researched aspects of International Futurism, and investigate the links between Futurism and its precursors and successors. The Dresden State Art Collections will become an essential research tool for Futurism scholars in the years to come, and this work will be aided by scholarships, especially to young scholars and PhD students, and a book series, *Studies from the AdA Dresden*.

Section 4: Reviews contains six critical responses to new books that make a useful contribution to Futurism Studies. They include two volume of conference proceedings, *Valentine de Saint-Point: Des feux de l'avant-garde à l'appel de l'Orient* (Nantes, May 2017, reviewed by Simona Cigliana) and *El futurismo en Europa y Latinoamérica* (Madrid, September 2017, reviewed by Juan Herrero-Senés). Two publications are concerned with Italian Futurism: Stefano Bragato's study of Marinetti's diaries (reviewed by Dalila Colucci), and Katia Pizzi's analysis of the Italian Futurists' attitudes towards the Machine (reviewed by Marja Härmänmaa). Furthermore, Marina Dmitrieva assesses Vera Faber's extensive new study of Futurism and Constructivism in the Ukrainian avant-garde, Günter Berghaus comments on a new study of Růžena Zátková's life and works, and Luca Somigli discusses the merits of a new edition of Julius Evola's critical writings of the years 1916–1921, issued under the title *Teoria e pratica dell'arte d'avanguardia*.

As in every year, I have compiled **Section 4: Bibliography: Publications on Futurism, 2017–2020**. This time it offers details of 26 exhibition catalogues, 2

special issues of journals and periodicals, 8 edited volumes of conference proceedings, 17 collective volumes, 36 monographic studies, 28 editions and 3 volumes that turn Futurism into fiction. These 120 book publications are supplemented by 1 film recording.

Finally, a few words regarding future issues of this Yearbook. Volume 11 (2021) will be dedicated to Futurism and the Sacred, edited by Luca Somigli and Monica Jansen. The final selection of the essays is still in progress, but those selected so far contradict the old prejudice that Futurism was a movement characterized by technomania and machine worship. The next themed volume will appear in 2023 and be dedicated to Neo-Futurism, to be edited by Tim Florian Klähn and Dalila Colucci.

Bibliography

Berghaus, Günter: "Futurism: A Bibliographic Reference Shelf." G. Berghaus, ed.: *Futurism in Arts and Literature*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2000. 487–597.

Chytraeus-Auerbach, Irene, and Lisa Hanstein: "The Russian Avant-garde and Its Eastern Roots." *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* 5 (2015): 523–530.

Kant, Immanuel: *Sämtliche Werke*. Herausgegeben von Karl Rosenkranz und Friedrich Wilhelm Schubert. Vierter Theil. Leipzig: Voss, 1838.

Kunichika, Michael Mitsuo: "Primitivism and Scythianism in Russian Futurism." *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* 6 (2016): 302–327.

Winckelmann, Johann Joachim: "Gedanken über die Nachahmung der griechischen Werke in der Malerei und Bildhauerkunst." J.J. Winckelmann: *Werke in einem Band*. Berlin und Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1969. 1–38.