

THE “NECESSARY MODERNISATION” OF SACRED ART.  
A “DOUBLE VISION” ON MODERNISM AND MODERNITY

Monica JANSEN

University of Utrecht, University of Antwerp

Luca SOMIGLI

University of Toronto \*

**The turn from the ‘religion of speed’ towards religious modernism**

This essay tries to reconstruct the history of a dialogue, at first sight unlikely and unsustainable, between the Futurist movement and the Catholic Church regarding the possibility and terms of a modern sacred art. Given the well-known and widely-publicized mutual hostility between the two parties, it comes as no surprise that such a dialogue would present difficulties: after all, as early as 1913 *La Civiltà Cattolica* had described the Futurists as nothing more than “insolent brats.”<sup>1</sup> For his part, the Futurist leader and theorist Filippo Tommaso Marinetti had seen fit to open his 1931 manifesto on Futurist sacred art – the text that constitutes one of the central documents for this contribution – by proudly reiterating the anti-clerical stance of the movement and offering as a premise to his argument the notion that “it [is] not essential to practice the Catholic religion in order to create masterpieces of sacred art.”<sup>2</sup> However, it is possible that the reasons for this missed encounter might have to do not only with the obvious ideological differences between the two parties, but also with a radically different notion of what constitutes modernity and an almost incompatible view of the temporality of the work of art – clearly crucial questions in this debate.

When modernity is imagined as a fundamental element of Futurist discourse throughout the movement’s history, it is imagined in the terms of Nietzsche’s critique of historical thinking in his second ‘Untimely Meditation,’ *On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life* (1874): a rejection not so much of a historical tradition, but of history and tradition as such.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, Marinetti’s conception of modernity could be summarized in the terms of Paul De Man’s much-quoted commentary on Nietzsche’s text:

Modernity exists in the form of a desire to wipe out whatever came earlier, in the hope of reaching at last a point that could be called a true present, a point of origin that marks a new departure. This combined interplay of deliberate forgetting with an action that is also a new origin reaches the full power of the idea of modernity.<sup>4</sup>

In Marinetti's theory and practice, Futurism is a project to learn how to dwell on the threshold, to perform the difficult balancing act involved in evading history while at the same time carrying out the production of cultural artifacts that inevitably exist upon the historical plane.<sup>5</sup>

Let us now consider the position of the second interlocutor in this dialogue, namely the Catholic Church. In his study of Catholic cultural modernism in France, Stephen Schloesser describes the *renaissance catholique* of the 1920s as a response to the Great War and as an attempt "to move Catholicism from the margins of culture to its very centre"<sup>6</sup> after its almost century-old tradition of opposition to the cultural and intellectual ideologies of modernity, from political liberalism to scientific positivism to literary realism. This 'jazz age Catholicism,' to use Schloesser's term, aimed to refute the prejudice that Catholicism and modernity could not be reconciled, a position abandoned in the period of "trauma and memorialization"<sup>7</sup> following the Great War. In this perspective, 'modernity' and 'modernism' become complex and multidirectional notions, and therefore another reading of the idea of modernity could be formulated in the terms proposed by Schloesser in *Jazz Age Catholicism*:

'To master modernity by thinking *with* history, to master modernity by thinking *without* history' [Carl E. Schorske] are not mutually exclusive antitheses but rather aspects of modernity as a critical project in response to modernization.<sup>8</sup>

Not by chance, Schloesser speaks of 'dialectical realism' in describing post-war Catholic modernism: the two poles within which Catholic modernism moves are on the one hand the eternal and unchanging truths of faith, on the other their expression in terms appropriate to the times.<sup>9</sup> We can now see the radically different notions of the temporality of the work of art that underlie the project of Futurism and that of Catholic cultural modernism. For the former, the work of art acts on the present to make it the starting point of a utopian future, while for the latter, the work of art is the present guise of eternal truths that connect it to the past and to tradition.

Before the 1920s, modernity and tradition seem to have been incompatible forces within the secular project of Futurist modernism. As scholars of Futurism have already noted, in spite of its avowed and loudly proclaimed anticlericalism, the movement did not disregard the question of the spiritual in modernity.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, its anti-clericalism was in the first instance

a denunciation of the perceived interference of the Catholic Church as an institution in Italian political and social life that resulted in “inertia” and hindered the “tempestuous speed of Italian Genius.”<sup>11</sup> At the same time, as Jeffrey Schnapp has shown in his analysis of the 1916 manifesto ‘The New Religion-Morality of Speed,’ the Futurists and Marinetti in particular elaborated a notion of spirituality rooted precisely in the experience of modernity. Futurism intended to contribute to “the anthropology of speed” in an unprecedented way, by offering a new kind of divinity (speed) and a new kind of faith (this-worldly animism), as Christian morality had been emptied out by history itself. Therefore, according to Schnapp, it is not accurate to reduce Futurist religion-morality to conventional religiosity or to “flirtations with Christianity,” as has been suggested by critics of the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art.’<sup>12</sup> Rather, Futurism is “born out of a desire to pit modernity against antiquity,” and its strategy is one of “perpetual tension.”<sup>13</sup> In other words, dialectical modernism prevails over dialectical realism.

This, then, is the theoretical framework within which we intend to discuss the very different visions of sacred art that opposed once again Futurism and the Catholic Church between the late 1920s and the 1930s. The ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art’ should be understood as a ‘double vision’ on modernity, to freely quote the title of an essay by Northrop Frye:<sup>14</sup> one vision grounded in the historical-political context of religious modernity, and the other in the aesthetics or anthropology of a new kind of modernist spirituality.

### **Futurist Sacred Art in the Shadow of the Concordat**

In the late 1920s and in the 1930s the debate on ‘sacred art’ and the growing interest of the Futurists in the subject – in part because of the lucrative contracts that such artistic production might entail – forced the movement to confront a religious version of modernity and to redefine its own. In a recent essay on Marinetti’s politics, Ernest Ialongo has observed that the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art’ was timed to release in May 1931, “immediately after Mussolini had shuttered *Azione Cattolica*,”<sup>15</sup> the Catholic association that competed with Fascist organizations in coordinating social activities, especially those involving the youth. Ialongo interprets this manifesto as part of a wider strategy to “work towards Mussolini,” and confirms that Marinetti was a “fervent fascist”<sup>16</sup> – thus agreeing with the socio-political interpretation of the manifesto put forward by scholars such as Christopher Adams, who suggests it should be read as “an expression of Fascist solidarity and faith.”<sup>17</sup>

This interpretation, however, does not take into account the gradual emergence of the spiritual within Futurist discourse. In this sense, Futurist sacred art is coherent with the more general gradual shift towards the rediscovery of the spiritual values of tradition that characterizes the post-war period as a whole. As Rajesh Heynickx has argued,

Rather than opposing an old world, interwar modernism incarnated the characteristic tendency to disturb old-new classifications and to weave them together in varying forms. Modernism therefore encompassed multiple layers, amongst which traditional religious reference frames such as Catholicism.<sup>18</sup>

While holding fast to its trademark anti-clericalism, as we have seen, Futurism does not see the spiritual as incompatible with modernity, but rather attempts to rethink the relationship between the two on its own terms. Indeed, the 'Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art' can be seen as the product of an articulate and complex process that dates back at the very least to the Great War, with the aforementioned 1916 manifesto 'The New Morality-Religion of Speed.' Here, flight figures as a transcendental experience that liberates the subject from the weight of the body and allows it to meld momentarily with speed itself, in a Futurist re-interpretation of the traditional Christian dichotomy of body and spirit.<sup>19</sup>

The 'Manifesto of Aeropainting' (1929), a crucial linchpin between earlier theories of Futurist art, mechanical sacred art and sacred art,<sup>20</sup> interprets in similar terms the physical elevation produced by flight. The last of the nine points in the programmatic section of the manifesto reads: "we will soon achieve a new plastic extra-terrestrial spirituality."<sup>21</sup> In the 'Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art,' Marinetti would underline, in points 2 and 3, the importance of aeropainting as the constitutive element of Futurist sacred art, differentiating it from the "obsessive, inescapable terrestrial realism" of traditional religious art and identifying it as the means to achieve a true mystical experience. Thus, it is the Futurist 'aeropainters' who are best able to capture the transparency of infinite beatitude, the velocity of angels or the apparition of the Saints.<sup>22</sup> Gerardo Dottori, who with his 'Velocity Triptych' paved the way for aeropainting,<sup>23</sup> is described in the 'Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art' as "the first Futurist to infuse sacred art with original intensity."<sup>24</sup>

This increasing interest in new forms of transcendental experiences put the Futurist movement again in conflict with the Catholic Church, this time precisely on the grounds of the relationship between spirituality, modernity and tradition. Furthermore, the ratification of the Lateran Accords on 11 February 1929, which granted Catholicism the status of State religion in Italy and introduced Catholic education as a subject in the public school system, generated great enthusiasm among Catholic intellectuals.<sup>25</sup> The

question of the public role and appeal of sacred art thus became more urgent, and in order to understand if Marinetti’s intervention was in tune with Mussolini’s goal to reduce “the autonomy of the Vatican intermediary,”<sup>26</sup> it is crucial to get the timing of the events right – manifestoes, declarations and exhibitions.

The first version of the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art’ appeared simultaneously in the Turin newspaper *Gazzetta del Popolo* and *La provincia di Padova* on 23 June 1931, signed only by Marinetti, and was republished two weeks later in *Oggi e Domani*, now signed by Marinetti and Fillia.<sup>27</sup> It thus followed the opening, in May 1931, of the International Exhibition of Modern Sacred Art in Padua, where Fillia had been allowed to organize an entire Futurist room that, like the later manifesto, triggered fierce reactions in the press, in the first place on the part of some former Futurists. On the pages of *L’Ambrosiano*, Carlo Carrà censured the Futurist works exhibited, noting the absence of what he considered to be the only real artist of Futurist sacred art, Gino Severini, and predicted that Marinetti would soon follow with a manifesto – which of course he did.<sup>28</sup> Severini had in fact been asked to exhibit in the Futurist room but had declined the invitation, much to his relief, as he wrote to Jacques Maritain in a letter dated 15 August 1931, where he also expressed to his friend and spiritual father his opposition to the Futurists’ belief that faith was not essential for the creation of religious art.<sup>29</sup> It is also worth pointing out that Fillia, who, in 1929, had met Severini in Paris and had been introduced to Maritain’s ideas on art and religion, did consult with Catholic critics in selecting artists for the Futurist room. In a letter to Tullio d’Albisola (Turin, 19 March 1931), he wrote that he had been assisted by the Catholic art critic Emilio Zanzi, who found him the right clergyman for the permit to exhibit the selected artworks and who had also suggested to invite Dottori and Severini to participate to the show.<sup>30</sup>

This brief reconstruction of the historical context of the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art’ also shows the active role played by the Catholic Church and its cultural representatives in the struggle for hegemony in the cultural field of sacred art. The first issue of *Arte sacra. Rivista Trimestrale dell’Arte Sacra di Oggi e di Domani* – one of the most polemical voices against the modernist deviations of sacred art<sup>31</sup> – was published on 30 September 1931 with the backing of both Fascist and Catholic institutions: the Fascist Federation of Artisans, the Sacred Congregations of Rome, and the Italian Council of Bishops.<sup>32</sup> According to a note published in 1933 in the *Annali dell’Italia Cattolica*, *Arte Sacra* followed a policy of free expression and open discussion, without espousing any particular artistic school or direction, although within “limits that must not be crossed in order not to slip into

artistic modernism.”<sup>33</sup> Its supreme authority was the Pope himself, who, in the words of an unsigned editorial on Pope Pius XI’s speech for the inauguration of the Pinacoteca Vaticana (28 October 1932), “la[id] down the law” in the debate on Sacred Art.<sup>34</sup>

Given the Pope’s indictment of artistic modernism, the Futurist attempt to be at the avant-garde of sacred art was countered with all available means and arguments. Sacred art and its alleged ‘crisis’ was such a fiercely debated topic that *Arte sacra* also dedicated a *Referendum* [Survey] to it in 1932–1933,<sup>35</sup> the results of which were followed closely also by the *Annali dell’Italia Cattolica*. Before discussing the survey, however, we want to take another close look at the aesthetic implications of the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art,’ and confront them with the verdict of the Pope, condensed in 1933 by *Arte Sacra* in the following epigraph: “We are in favour of modern art: ‘we heartily welcome and open all doors to any good and advanced development of our good and venerable traditions [...] the new is not true progress unless it is as beautiful and good as the ancient’ (Pius XI).” With this formula, the Pope’s words are selected so as to be coherent with the journal’s open policy towards modern sacred art, initiated with the editorial ‘On future sacred art’ by Giovan Battista Montini (the future Paul VI) in its first issue.<sup>36</sup> In this way, the Pope’s verdict on “so-called new sacred art,” expressed unambiguously in his speech – “Our will can only be that Canon Law be obeyed [...], that is, that such art not be allowed inside Our Churches” – is countered with his welcome, uttered on the same occasion, to every renewal inspired by tradition. It is this ambiguity that allows for a ‘double vision’ on modern sacred art.

### Catholic modernism

Besides reasserting their anticlericalism in the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art,’ where they described Futurism as “firmly anti-Masonic and anticlerical,” Marinetti and Fillia also sensed the need to emphasize again the novelty of Futurism and to summarize its results: “Futurism [...] prophe-sized twenty years ago the advent of Fascism, [and] has created and led artistic avant-gardes throughout the world.”<sup>37</sup> Futurism’s anticlericalism and antitraditionalism are reaffirmed here to address other factions within the broad modernist movement, such as the Novecento group, which also aspired to the unofficial role of Fascist art, as much as they were meant to catch the attention of the Church and of the Regime.<sup>38</sup> At a time when the movement’s modernity was under attack, it felt the need to underscore its

premises once again. Futurism was convinced that it possessed not only the practical but also the spiritual values necessary for future renewal, even in the case of sacred art. There was, however, one precondition that hindered a synthetic union between Christian and Futurist artists in their purpose to reach a “perfect and religious harmony” as formulated in the ‘Manifesto of Aeropainting,’<sup>39</sup> expressed clearly in Maritain’s *Art et Scholastique* (1920): there is “no technique, style, or system of rules that belong strictly to Christian art. In order to make Christian art one should only ‘be Christian, and simply try to make a beautiful work.’”<sup>40</sup>

On what terms is Futurist religious modernism debated by a Catholic culture in the making? As was pointed out on the pages of the *Annali dell’Italia cattolica*: “when it comes to modern sacred art, we are at the very beginning.”<sup>41</sup> If in the Catholic discussion on sacred art there was total agreement on the Pope’s authority on the matter, there was no consensus on how a new, modern sacred art should be conceived, and this led to an increasingly defensive attitude towards modern artistic currents.<sup>42</sup> Let us therefore consider more closely the *Referendum* started by *Arte Sacra* in the first issue of 1932 and sanctioned by the holy word of the Pope from issue 3-4 1932 onwards.<sup>43</sup>

On 15 May 1932, the journal *Futurismo*, which had not been officially invited to provide an answer to the *Arte Sacra* survey, did so on its own pages, with a text subsequently reprinted on *Arte Sacra*. The answer to the second question of the referendum – “What in your opinion, is the current state of Italian Sacred Art? Is there a crisis? If so, what are its causes? What are the solutions?” – was a classic example of Futurist self-assertion: “In the present, there is no sacred art other than that of the Futurists, who even in this field are forerunners, and through whom is blooming again a sacred art for our time and worthy of God.”<sup>44</sup> The third question – “Are you willing to contribute to the rebirth of sacred art, and how? What works would you prefer to do for this goal?” – is intentionally ‘misread’ in order to open a polemic with the former futurist painter Ardengo Soffici, who was invited instead by *Arte sacra* to answer to the survey:

We are not willing to contribute to the rebirth of sacred art, but we have already been doing so for the past four years not only with our works, but also by making statements that are in complete opposition to what Ardengo Soffici has said in his answer to *Arte Sacra*. If there is one painter in Italy who has no talent for any sort of sacred art – an art that must provide a link between human beings and God – that painter is Ardengo Soffici, the most down-to-earth painter in Italy.<sup>45</sup>

These querulous words were preceded by *Arte sacra*’s editorial comment in ‘Avvio alle risposte,’ in which the journal clearly distanced itself from what it

considered Futurist blasphemy and even invited the clergy to take measures against it, if necessary:

We don't deny the contribution that they made and will make to art. What we do not like is their tone, as well as, very often, their absolute mediocrity. [...] This is the case with Soffici; when Soffici was a Futurist, he was not seen so negatively. [...] Aside from their boasts (to each their own), these dear *enfants terribles* should do more and shout less, and should remember that, if they don't mind, we are in church, and it is not polite to be arrogant, even if you are a futurist. That's enough for us.<sup>46</sup>

Indeed, *Annali dell'Italia cattolica* provided a counter-point to this critique of the futurists by emphasizing the answers to the *Referendum* of their former fellow-travelers Soffici and Papini, whose responses even informed the journal's own official position. Giuseppe De Mori's 1933 article quoted approvingly both authors' statements, in the *Referendum*, on the non-existence of contemporary sacred art. De Mori further added that art in general may be in crisis, but that this crisis is felt more urgently in religious art, because "the autonomy of art and spirit is felt more clearly and strikingly in religious art, and its results are more harmful."<sup>47</sup> Later, in a 1935 overview of the arts, De Mori listed Soffici among the many artists in Italy and abroad (among them, Claudel, Huysmans, Carrà) who once believed in the contradictory nature of modern consciousness and have now returned, through art, to the spiritual unity of faith.<sup>48</sup>

In the Catholic debate, tradition is placed against modernism but not against modernity. This important distinction is made by Giovan Battista Montini in his 'On Future Sacred Art,' which opens with the following statement:

A journal like the present one, which, according to its program, aims at providing an artistic education, should speak not so much of modern art as of future art. Has the demon of futurism then entered the pious and peaceful bower of sacred art? [...] No, that is not the case. In fact, [...] it is immediately obvious that [*Arte sacra*] can clearly make the distinction, in its field of competence, between modernity and modernism, to reject the latter and promote the former.<sup>49</sup>

Modernity in religious art should be the result of the expression of the realism of religion, of the recomposition of that spiritual unity disrupted by modernism, but firmly founded on "absolutely modern roots." And the beauty of truth can only be reached with the help of an art created by Christian artists.<sup>50</sup>

Soffici argues that

Religiosity or spirituality in art do not consist in its outer forms, but in its plastic *essence*, in its being powerful and honest art – in other words, in the quality



and the human effectiveness of its style. [...] Catholicism is such (that is, universal) precisely because in its doctrine and its practice there is room for naïve simplicity and rich virility, for austere reason and playful imagination; for poverty and magnificence, for the soul and the body.<sup>51</sup>

From all these definitions and comments one can start to deduce what is wrong with Futurism’s proposal for sacred art. First of all, the manifesto obviously starts in the wrong way. De Mori quotes at length from an article by Marziano Bernardi that appeared on *La Stampa* on 26 November 1932. Bernardi asks himself if expressions of modern art, such as Futurism, that take form and genius as their essence, are to be considered fatal errors, and he gives the following answer:

An aesthetic movement is never an error, if nothing else because no one can impose it. It is a spiritual necessity that matures in a historical context. [...] Precisely, the solution can only come from ideas [...]. The problem is a spiritual one. [...] Sacred architecture will be born anew when the contemporary spirit will have reacquired its power by rising up to God. This is precisely the opposite of the manifesto on sacred art of the Academic Marinetti that began with the following historical and artistic heresy: it was not essential to practice the Catholic religion in order to create masterpieces of sacred art.<sup>52</sup>

From this premise derives that, secondly, artistic movements cannot be directed by men, but only by the spirit of the time, that is necessarily directed towards God. The guiding principle cannot be the work of art itself, or worse, ‘art for art’s sake,’ but should rather be God, or, in other words, moral truth. Commenting on Pope Pius XI’s Encyclical *Casti connubii*, Giuseppe Molteni argued that the modernists are guilty of a sin that can be defined as ‘amoralism,’ because they connect emancipation with genius and think that they have freed themselves from all prejudices and traditional Christian doctrine.

Molteni writes that, on the contrary, “For us Catholics the problem has been solved: we do not allow art to be placed above morality, or to be independent from it. For us, ‘art for art’s sake’ is the formula for an antisocial and antimoral aesthetic preciousness.”<sup>53</sup>

The conclusion of the debate on sacred art is that tradition inspires modernity, and that it is not necessarily Futurism, “the urgent and swift artistic ‘beyond’” of the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art,’ that shapes “all that lies beyond life itself.”<sup>54</sup> In the words of Montini: “sacred art is thus freed of any purely formal link with the past, which no longer rises above it, no longer demands mannered imitation, but only brings it back to the bedrock of tradition and pushes it forward; it invites it towards the new, and keeps it within the old.”<sup>55</sup> Or, in the audacious phrasing of the French

painter Maurice Denis quoted by De Mori in his 1935 survey: “Catholicism is the avant-garde of the modern movement.”<sup>56</sup>

Through the ‘double vision’ expressed in Montini’s essay, the ‘time-space’<sup>57</sup> of sacred art reaches the synthetic union between Christianity and modernity theorized and advocated by Maritain. This is no coincidence, as the future pope was an enthusiastic reader of *Art et Scholastique* and a close friend of Maritain.<sup>58</sup> This conclusion also invites us to read the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art’ in the light of the diffusion of Maritain’s thought in Italy that was actively promoted by Severini. Indeed, it is precisely while discussing the painter’s frescos for the churches of Semsales and La Roche in Switzerland, that Maritain explains how the affinities and differences between modern and sacred art should be envisioned:

We have often said that, because of the formal purification that they require, even the apparently most daring modern researches bring art surprisingly close to religious use. It is the spirit that nourishes them that removes them in the highest degree from such a use.<sup>59</sup>

These aesthetic and moral tensions within and between both parties embodied in a Futurist manifesto and a Catholic survey therefore could be considered as a first step in the investigation of what could perhaps be called a Roman ‘Jazz Age Catholicism.’

## Endnotes

\* We wish to thank the Utrecht University Aspasia programme and the University of Toronto Goggio Chair for their financial support that made our joint research on this project possible.

<sup>1</sup> Anon., “Il futurismo,” *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 26 July 1913: 329.

<sup>2</sup> Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, “Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art,” in *Piety and Pragmatism: Spiritualism in Futurist Art*, ed. Massimo Duranti et al. (Roma: Gangemi Editore, 2007), 90.

<sup>3</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Uses and Disadvantages of History for Life*, in *Untimely Meditations*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

<sup>4</sup> Paul De Man, “Literary History and Literary Modernity,” in *Blindness and Insight: Essays in the Rhetoric of Contemporary Criticism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), 148.

<sup>5</sup> See Luca Somigli, “On the Threshold: Space and Modernity in Marinetti’s Early Manifestoes and *Tavole Parolibere*,” *Rivista di studi italiani* 17:1 (1999): 249-274.

<sup>6</sup> Stephen Schloesser, *Jazz Age Catholicism. Mystic Modernism in Postwar Paris, 1919-1933* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), 5.

<sup>7</sup> Schloesser, *Jazz Age Catholicism*, 8.

<sup>8</sup> Schloesser, *Jazz Age Catholicism*, 14.

<sup>9</sup> Schloesser, *Jazz Age Catholicism*, 8.

<sup>10</sup> See, among others, Claudia Salaris, “Il futurismo dalla religione della velocità alla velocità della religione,” in *Beyond Futurism. Filippo Tommaso Marinetti, Writer*, ed. Gino Tellini and Paolo Valesio (Firenze: Società Editrice Fiorentina, 2011), 179-207.

<sup>11</sup> Marinetti, “Against the Papacy and the Catholic Mentality, Repositories of Every Kind of Traditionalism,” 1919, in *Critical Writings*, ed. Günter Berghaus, trans. Doug Thompson (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006), 325.

<sup>12</sup> Jeffrey Schnapp, “Why Speed is a Religion-Morality,” in *Modernitalia*, ed. Francesca Santovetti (New York: Peter Lang, 2012), 11.

<sup>13</sup> Schnapp, “Why Speed,” 7.

<sup>14</sup> Northrop Frye, *The Double Vision. Language and Meaning in Religion* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995).

<sup>15</sup> Ernest Ialongo, “Filippo Tommaso Marinetti: the Futurist as Fascist, 1929-37,” *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 18 (2013): 404.

<sup>16</sup> Ialongo, “Filippo Tommaso Marinetti,” 394.

<sup>17</sup> Christopher Adams, “A Leap of Faith: Futurism, Fascism and the ‘Manifesto of Futurist Sacred Art’,” in Duranti, *Piety and Pragmatism*, 43.

<sup>18</sup> Rajesh Heynickx, “On the road with Maritain. Europe an Modernist Art Circles and Neo-Thomism during the Interwar,” in *The Maritain Factor. Taking Religion into Interwar Modernism*, ed. Rajesh Heynickx and Jan De Maeyer (Leuven: Leuven UP, 2010), 17.

<sup>19</sup> Marinetti, “The New Morality-Religion of Speed,” in *Critical Writings*, 258.

<sup>20</sup> In 1926 Fillia issued the “Mechanical Idol. Mechanical Sacred Art. Futurist Manifesto” (also signed by Caligaris and Curtoni), on which see Massimo Duranti, “Spirituality and Futurist Sacred Art,” in Duranti, *Piety and Pragmatism*, 25. On Fillia’s development from mechanical to sacred art, see Francesco Tedeschi, “Spiritualità e arte sacra futurista,” in *Lo spirituale nell’arte. Saggi sull’arte in Italia nei primi decenni del Novecento*, ed. Luciano Caramel (Milano: Franco Angeli, 2011), 21-25. On the relevance of the “Manifesto of Aeropainting” for the definition of Futurist sacred art, see also Tedeschi, “Spiritualità,” 25-29.

<sup>21</sup> I Futuristi, “L’aeropittura, manifesto futurista,” in *Futurismo 1909-1944*, ed. Enrico Crispolti (Milano: Mazzotta, 2001), 555-556.

<sup>22</sup> Marinetti, “Manifesto,” 90.

<sup>23</sup> I Futuristi, “L’aeropittura,” 556.

<sup>24</sup> Marinetti, “Manifesto,” 90.

<sup>25</sup> Giuliano Manacorda, *Momenti della letteratura italiana degli anni Trenta* (Foggia: Bastogi, 1981), 110-111.

<sup>26</sup> Ialongo, “Filippo Tommaso,” 404.

<sup>27</sup> Tedeschi, “Spiritualità,” 32.

<sup>28</sup> Carlo Carrà, “L’arte sacra moderna all’esposizione di Padova,” *L’Ambrosiano* (11 June 1931). For an overview of the reactions to the 13 Futurist artists exhibited at Padua, see Tedeschi, “Spiritualità,” 29-32.

<sup>29</sup> Gino Severini, *Il carteggio Gino Severini Jacques Maritain (1923-1966)*, ed. Giulia Radin (Firenze, Olschki, 2011), 101-102.

<sup>30</sup> Fillia, *Lettere di Fillia a Tullio D’Albisola (1929-1935)*, ed. Danilo Presotto (Savona: Editrice Liguria, 1981), 33. The letter also states that Zanzi informed him of a big movement promoted by Maritain and sponsored by high-placed prelates to foster an aesthetic renewal of sacred art. Zanzi had supposedly promised to base this movement on the works exhibited in Padua, and therefore the Futurist room would be of “EXCEPTIONAL importance.”

<sup>31</sup> Pia Vivarelli, “Dibattito sull’arte sacra in Italia nel primo Novecento,” in *E.42. Utopia e scenario del regime. Urbanistica, architettura, arte e decorazione, II*, ed. Tullio Gregory et al. (Venezia: Marsilio, 1987), 259.

<sup>32</sup> Do.re.mi, “Spunti d’arte sacra – L’Arte Sacra,” *Annali dell’Italia Cattolica* (1931), 271.

<sup>33</sup> Do.re.mi, “Spunti,” 271.

<sup>34</sup> “La parola del Santo Padre sull’arte sacra,” *Arte Sacra* 3-4 (1932), 298.

<sup>35</sup> On the Referendum, see also Tedeschi, “Spiritualità,” 42-43.

<sup>36</sup> Giovan Battista Montini, “Su l’arte sacra futura,” *Arte Sacra* 1 (1931): 39-45.

<sup>37</sup> Marinetti, “Manifesto,” 92.

<sup>38</sup> Duranti, "Spirituality," 26 notes that, in an article on Pius XI's inaugural speech ("La mostra Futurista a Firenze," *Futurismo* II, 18 (18 January 1933)), Marinetti suggested that the object of the Pope's criticism was not Futurism but rather the Novecento movement.

<sup>39</sup> I Futuristi, "L'Aeropittura," 556.

<sup>40</sup> Cit. in Zoë Marie Jones, "Gino Severini, a Classicist Futurist," in Heynickx, *The Maritain Factor*, 124.

<sup>41</sup> Giuseppe De Mori, "L'arte sacra nel 1932 e gli indirizzi di Pio XI," *Annali dell'Italia Cattolica* (1933): 258.

<sup>42</sup> Vivarelli, "Dibattito," 260.

<sup>43</sup> The answers to the *Referendum* by (ex)Futurists are to be found in *Arte Sacra* 1 (1932): 20-31 (Papini, 26, Soffici, 27-28); *Arte Sacra* 2 (1932): 164-197 (Bragaglia, 171, *Futurismo*, 196-97); the *Referendum* continues in *Arte Sacra*, 3-4 (1932): 312-327; *Arte Sacra* 1 (1933): 55-68.

<sup>44</sup> "Futurismo," "Una nostra risposta all'inchiesta sull'Arte Sacra," *Arte Sacra* 2 (1932): 197.

<sup>45</sup> "Futurismo," 197.

<sup>46</sup> La redazione, "Avvio alle risposte," *Arte Sacra* 2 (1932): 176-77.

<sup>47</sup> De Mori, "L'arte sacra," 257.

<sup>48</sup> Giuseppe De Mori, "L'arte religiosa in Italia e le tappe della sua ascesa nel 1934," *Annali dell'Italia Cattolica* (1935): 386.

<sup>49</sup> Montini, "Su l'arte sacra futura," 39.

<sup>50</sup> Montini, "Su l'arte sacra futura," 42, 44.

<sup>51</sup> Soffici, *Arte Sacra* 1 (1932), 27.

<sup>52</sup> De Mori, "L'arte sacra," 263.

<sup>53</sup> Giuseppe Molteni, "Lo pseudo misticismo in arte e in letteratura," *Annali dell'Italia Cattolica* (1932): 228.

<sup>54</sup> Marinetti, "Manifesto," 91.

<sup>55</sup> Montini, "Su l'arte sacra futura," 44.

<sup>56</sup> De Mori, "L'arte religiosa," 402.

<sup>57</sup> Marinetti, "Manifesto," 90.

<sup>58</sup> Jean-Dominique Durand, "Jacques Maritain et l'Italie," in *Jacques Maritain en Europe. La réception de sa pensée* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1996), 21.

<sup>59</sup> Jacques Maritain, *Gino Severini* (Paris: Gallimard, 1930), 11.