

International Yearbook of Futurism Studies

Open Issue

Edited by
Günter Berghaus

With the assistance of Mariana Aguirre, Selena Daly,
Sze Wah Lee, Renée M. Silverman

Volume 4
2014

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-033400-5
e-ISBN 978-3-11-033410-4
epub-ISBN 978-3-11-036790-4
ISSN 2192-0281

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at
<http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2014 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Typesetting: Johanna Boy, Brennbreg
Printing and Binding: CPI buch bücher.de GmbH, Birkach
∞ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com



Hanno Ehrlicher

Bartolomé Galíndez's Magazine, *Los raros*: A 'Symbolist' Fusion of Futurism and Ultraism

Abstract: The magazine *Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista*, published in a single issue by the Argentine poet Bartolomé Galíndez in Buenos Aires in January 1920, is not only a rare publication, but also an unusual document, offering a mixture of the turn-of-the-century aesthetic paradigm of Latin American *modernismo* and the new avant-garde ideas arriving from Europe, especially Italian Futurism, which Galíndez roughly equates with the Iberian *Ultra* movement. This kind of reception of Futurism in Argentina was quite symptomatic of the situation of *posmodernismo* and was marked by a mixing and merging of very different poetic currents, by epistemological uncertainty and by an institutional lack of stability typical of an emerging 'field' of literature. Galíndez's project failed because he did not succeed in creating an intellectual network that could spread his personal idea of a part-Symbolist, part-Futurist avant-garde, where the new beauty of the racing car would meet the old one of the swan. Despite its failure, this 'rarefied' Futurism remains interesting as it offers proof of a high degree of transatlantic exchange of ideas and materials in the Spanish-speaking world of the early 1920s.

Keywords: *Modernismo*, *posmodernismo*, Ultraism, Symbolism, Argentine avant-garde, Bartolomé Galíndez, Rubén Darío, Jorge Luis Borges, cultural field, cultural transfer.

Introduction

Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista was published by Bartolomé Galíndez in Buenos Aires in January 1920.¹ Its life was extremely short, since only one single issue was actually printed; moreover, it is nowadays an antiquarian rarity due to the fact that hardly any copies survived in libraries or archives. Thus, the magazine, in a sense, does justice to its title, but in a manner that is different from what the editor had originally intended. The magazine's heading, *Los raros*, made

¹ The essay here is a revised and updated version of my introduction and commentaries to the magazine's reedition of 2012, *La revista 'Los raros' de Bartolomé Galíndez (1920)*. I would like to thank Sandro Engelmann for his valuable help with the preparation of the definite English version and to Mariana Aguirre for a first translation.



Fig. 1. Front Page of *Los raros* (1920).

a clear allusion to Rubén Darío's book of the same name, which had presented a series of writers considered 'raros' (unusual) due to the exceptional nature of their writings and/or lives, and due to the fact that they offered something different from what was then the dominant literary paradigm.² If the magazine's main title recalled Darío's literary portraits from 1896, which had foundational impor-

² *Los raros* was printed by the Tipografía La Vasconia de Buenos Aires in 1896 and presented mainly French Symbolist authors, such as Leconte de Lisle, Paul Verlaine, Villiers de l'Isle Adam, Léon Bloy, Jean Richepin, Jean Moréas, Rachilde, Lautréamont, and Laurent Tailhade. A *segunda edición, corregida y aumentada* was printed in Barcelona in 1905 and added Camille Maclair and Paul Adam to the list. When defending the artists included in his anthology with respect to Paul Groussac's criticism in the periodical *La biblioteca* (Buenos Aires) in November

tance for the construction of *modernismo* by erecting an alternative pantheon of heroic ancestors in literature,³ its subtitle referenced the movement that had inaugurated the avant-garde tradition in Europe, Italian Futurism, led by Filippo Tommaso Marinetti since its foundation in 1909. While the Milan Futurist opted for a violent rhetorical rupture vis-à-vis the Symbolist aesthetic that had nurtured him during his youth, Bartolomé Galíndez sought to establish a continuous line of development between the old fin-de-siècle modernity and the newest avant-garde trend arriving from Europe, between the curiosity, perversity and eccentricity of *modernismo* and the distinctive ‘anomaly’ of Futurism’s latest innovations.

Literary scholarship has all but ignored Galíndez’s enterprise because it failed to establish any lasting literary links or leave behind any permanent footprints. The most substantial text written about the magazine continues to be Adolfo Prieto’s article of 1961,⁴ which has the undeniable merit of offering a first systematic account of Galíndez’s ‘curious’ magazine, but which, at the same time, due to its negative value judgments, discouraged future researchers from probing the publication any further.⁵ Later critical responses continued to affirm that the magazine was “curious” as well as “forgettable”,⁶ without adding many further analytical contributions.⁷ Thus, *Los raros* remains a document that is difficult to access and is disdained by the very few scholars who have examined it.

Although Galíndez’s magazine has become a negligible entity in the Latin American literary universe, it is nevertheless worth reassessing, because it was symptomatic of a certain historical situation that gave birth to it. The literary trend of *posmodernismo*, which immediately followed *modernismo* (roughly dating from 1888–1910), does not have a secured place within the ‘grand narra-

1896, Darío highlighted the fact that “lo raro es contrario de lo normal”. See Darío: “Los colores del estandarte”, p. 55.

3 See Solares-Larrave: “Hacia un panteón alterno.”

4 Prieto: “Una curiosa ‘Revista de orientación futurista’.”

5 “El lector habrá advertido sobradamente que las fallas de información y una no resuelta aspiración a la coherencia, restan al artículo de Galíndez las condiciones necesarias para considerarlo un documento literario importante.” Prieto: “Una curiosa ‘Revista de orientación futurista’”, p. 59.

6 Although Hugo J. Verani applies such adjectives only to the manifesto included in *Los raros*, these are typical of the critical reception of the text. See his introduction to the anthology, *Las vanguardias literarias en Hispanoamérica*, p. 28.

7 In addition to Prieto’s article, one can add Marta Scrimaglio’s assessment in *Literatura argentina de vanguardia (1920–1930)*, pp. 16–24, Matteo D’Ambrosio’s article: “Bartolomé Galíndez, la revista ‘Los raros’ e il primo manifesto futurista sudamericano”, and the brief commentary by May Lorenzo Alcalá in her monograph, *La esquiva huella del futurismo en el Río de la Plata*, pp. 22–24.

tives' of literary histories that smoothly move from one epoch to another as if there existed a continuous linear progression in literary history. Latin American *posmodernismo*, however, falls between the two stools of *modernismo* and the avant-garde and is characterized by a lack of clearly configured aesthetic tenets. Bartolomé Galíndez's attempt to combine Symbolism's *fin-de-siècle* heritage with Futurist novelty was typical of this 'in-between' phase, as can be seen in the magazine's manifesto (see Appendix 1) that recalls the idea of a racing car – which Marinetti held as the emblem of a new beauty related to speed – and links it to a car in the shape of a swan: “The automobile is useful due to its speed; however, it could also be beautiful if it were shaped like a swan, dragon, peacock, shark or dinosaur. Let's hand over this idea to the mechanical engineers.”⁸

In my view, *Los raros* is a magazine that can offer us some interesting insights into the *posmodernismo* of Spanish-speaking America, a postmodernism, incidentally, which must not be confused with the Postmodernism of the 1970s, despite its terminological equivalence. *Los raros* must be understood as a representative of a modernity that, precisely because of its 'peripheral' or rather 'semi-peripheral' nature, is not insignificant. It can demonstrate that culture does not 'progress' in a step-by-step manner, but is marked by a simultaneity of different, sometimes clashing, modernities along the lines of what Ernst Bloch and Reinhart Koselleck have termed “die Ungleichzeitigkeit des Gleichzeitigen” (the simultaneity of the non-simultaneous).⁹

The persistence of *modernismo* in Latin America: Darío's negative review of Futurism and its consequences

Los raros was published more than a decade after the launch of the first Futurist manifesto on 20 February 1909 in *Le Figaro*. Despite this, the magazine constitutes a relatively early attempt at adopting Italian Futurism within the context of Spanish-speaking cultures. That is to say, relatively early, because the first reception of Futurism in Spain and Latin America in form of press-articles and short reviews did not really contribute to a positive acceptance of Futurist aesthetics and programmatics, but rather blocked a comprehensive reception and instead established a tradition of critical rejection.

⁸ “El automóvil por su velocidad es útil; pero sería bello si tuviese figura de cisne, dragón, pavo real, tiburón o dinosaurio. Damos esta idea a sus mecánicos.” Galíndez: “Manifiesto”, p. 47.

⁹ For the history of this concept see Dietschy: “Ungleichzeitigkeit, Gleichzeitigkeit, Übergleichzeitigkeit.”

The first news regarding the movement's foundation were received in different news outlets, both in the Iberian peninsula and in Latin America. Three of them – Rubén Darío's account for *La nación*, Juan Más y Pí's for *El diario español*, both published in Buenos Aires, and Enrique Gómez Carrillo's for *El liberal* (which appeared in Madrid and other places) – were gathered by Marinetti himself in his magazine *Poesia* as part of a documentation of the world-wide reaction to his manifesto of 20 February.¹⁰ As several investigations published in the *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* have recalled the mixed responses Futurism initially received in the Iberian world,¹¹ it will not be necessary here to survey again the reception history of the *Foundation and Manifesto of Futurism*. However, it might be useful to analyse the reasons for the delay between the first impact of Futurism in the Spanish press (1909/10) and Galíndez's decision to publish a "Futurist" magazine a good ten years later and to proclaim an autochthonous form of 'Ultra-Futurism' geared towards the specific cultural context of the Rio de la Plata region.

Resistance to Futurism was partly caused by the profound and long-lasting influence of Hispanic *modernismo* and partly by the public stance towards Futurism taken by Rubén Darío, the most important representative of *modernismo*, in an article published in *La nación* on 5 April 1909.¹² Darío's text was decisive for the destiny of Italian Futurism in Latin America until the emergence of indigenous avant-gardes more than a decade later. Compared to Gómez Carrillo and Juan Más y Pí's rather positive assessments, Rubén Darío's position constituted an active barrier against Futurism's potential advance in Latin America. It was also more efficient than the others, because the Nicaraguan writer possessed a much higher degree of symbolic capital in the Spanish-speaking literary world, due to his wide network of contacts on both sides of the Atlantic, and due to his global influence as a Latin American writer of his time. When reviewing Marinetti's first Futurist manifesto, Darío took advantage of his profound knowledge of Spain's literary field to highlight a detail that in and of itself might seem insig-

¹⁰ *Poesia* 5:3–6 (April–July 1909), pp. 5–34 contained a section "Adhésions et objections" with letters by various writers, and "Le Futurisme et la presse internationale", a press review in which also Darío's article was reproduced.

¹¹ See, in particular, Herrero-Senés: "Polemics, Jokes, Compliments and Insults" and Sbriziolo: "Futurist Texts in the Madrilenian Review 'Prometeo'."

¹² Darío's "Marinetti y el futurismo" has become an obligatory point of departure for Hispano-american contemporary historiography and has been included in nearly every critical anthology on this subject, for example Osorio Tejeda: *Manifestos, proclamas y polémicas*, pp. 3–7, and Schwartz, ed.: *Las vanguardias latinoamericanas*, pp. 403–408.

nificant, but which came to be decisive for his decision to erect a barrier against Futurist's equally global ambitions.

Darío's article begins with a critical assessment of Marinetti's achievements as a poet, dramatist and editor of a literary journal, and then focusses on the 'new literary school' founded by him. He immediately asserts that 'Futurism' is anything but new and has in fact been in existence for a number of years:

Marinetti's poems are violent, sonorous and unbridled. This is the effect of an Italian fugue on a French organ. It is curious to observe that the one he is most similar to is the Flemish Verhaeren. But the purpose of speaking to you about Marinetti is a survey he makes today about a new literary school he has founded, or whose principles he has proclaimed with all the trumpets of his strong words. This school is called 'El Futurismo.' Except that Futurism had already been founded by the great Mallorcan Gabriel Alomar. I have spoken about this already in *Dilucidaciones*, which precede my *Canto errante*.¹³

Darío's reference here is to the regenerative Catalanian *futurisme* proclaimed by Gabriel Alomar i Villalonga during a lecture at Barcelona's Ateneo in 1904.¹⁴ At the beginning of Marinetti's campaign, Alomar recalled his own initiative of some five years earlier and published several protest notes against the other Futurism in the contemporary press.¹⁵ The convergence of two different Futurisms, which the Catalanian regional press reacted to with humorous comments,¹⁶ gained even greater relevance when Rubén Darío referred to it in a newspaper that circulated widely within the Hispano-American world. For Darío to remind readers of Alomar's 'first' Futurism was not a disinterested piece of information but rather sign of an efficient strategy to discredit the novelty value of Marinetti's Futurism. Darío

13 "Los poemas de Marinetti son violentos, sonoros y desbridados. He ahí el efecto de la fuga italiana en un órgano francés. Y es curioso observar que aquel que más se le parece es el flamenco Verhaeren. Pero el hablaros ahora de Marinetti es con motivo de una encuesta que hoy hace, a propósito de una nueva escuela literaria que ha fundado, o cuyos principios ha proclamado con todos los clarines de su fuerte verbo. Esta escuela se llama El Futurismo. Solamente que el Futurismo estaba ya fundado por el gran mallorquí Gabriel Alomar. Ya he hablado de esto en las *Dilucidaciones*, que encabezan mi *Canto errante*". Darío: "Marinetti y el futurismo", in Osorio: *Manifiestos*, p. 3.

14 The text of the speech circulated in print both in the Catalan and the Castilian idiom. See Bird: "Futurist Social Critique".

15 In an article in *El poble català* on 9 March 1909, Alomar complains by stating: "Quan el nom de futurisme, qua va a ésser la paraula meva i única, cració del qui això escriu, és entrada ja en el nostre lèxic corrent, hi ha encara corresponsals espanyols que la donen com una novetat, sols perquè un poeta parisenc, 'cinc anys després' que jo, usa el mateix mot." See Mas: *Dossier Marinetti*, p. 13.

16 See, for example, the gloss that appeared in *Papitu*, reprinted in Mas: *Dossier Marinetti*, p. 14.

elevated Gabriel Alomar, little known outside the small Catalan intellectual circle until then, to the level of a 'great' personality in order to more efficiently highlight Marinetti's delay. On top of that, it was a double delay, since not only had Alomar's theses anticipated Marinetti, but also Darío himself had commented on them two years ago. Darío relativized Marinetti's Futurism's rhetorical radicalism with this terminological argument and demonstrated that he himself was actually much more up to date.

Using the newspaper *La nación* as his platform, Darío explicitly praised the literary value of the Italian author in order to integrate him into the ranks of an already established modern literary élite. He also qualified Marinetti's achievement by relegating him to a position behind other 'unbridled' authors from his own generation, such as Émile Verhaeren. By highlighting Marinetti's association with *fin-de-siècle* Symbolism, he negated the manifesto's innovative qualities, which were meant to go precisely beyond the production of individual works in order to inaugurate a collective and performative artistic practice, and arrived at the conclusion: "The only thing I find useless is the manifesto."¹⁷

Faithful to an élitist concept of art, Darío continued to support 'strange' works by exceptional individuals. That is why the manifesto seemed unnecessary to him, since it would incite imitation and the creation of a school that would only weaken the artistic rarity of single works. Yet, Darío's ignorance of the rôle of publicity for the construction of literary modernity is, in reality, only apparent. This is so because he himself, as a distinguished representative of *modernismo*, was able to deftly use the power of publicity, and due to this, occupy a central rôle within the communicative web of *modernista* magazines. In order to respond efficiently to the call for war launched by Marinetti from the pages of *Le Figaro*, it was necessary to publish his response in a mass medium such as *La nación*, the most influential newspaper in Latin America at the time. Darío's ironic commentary in a Spanish-language, mass-circulation medium had considerably more impact in the Hispanic world than Marinetti's shrill French words, which had to go through the mediation of translators and commentators in order to reach its potential readership.

On the one hand, Darío's terminological argument, and alongside it, the 'contamination' of Italian Futurism with Alomar's movement rapidly became a topic of criticism in the Hispanic press. Other representatives of *modernismo*, e.g. Amado Nervo in a review for *Boletín de instrucción pública* (Mexico, August

17 "Lo único que yo encuentro inútil es el manifiesto." Darío: "Marinetti y el futurismo", p. 6.

1909), reacted in a manner similar to Darío.¹⁸ On the other hand, the impact of Darío's article can also be observed in the positive reviews Futurism found in Latin America. Juan Más y Pí, for example, continued to spread more information on the movement following his first review in *El diario español* (21 March 1909). In August 1909, he published in the magazine *Renacimiento*, also based in Buenos Aires, notes about Italian Futurism as "a tendency in art and life".¹⁹ Like Darío, he made reference to Gabriel Alomar as a precursor of F.T. Marinetti, but rather than using this as a means to deprecate the Italian's originality, he emphasized the substantial differences between Catalan and Italian Futurism. He was of the view that "Alomar is a classic, whose Futurism is a renaissance, that is, a continuation; he does not renew the conditions of life, as we hope to do."²⁰ But this Futurist 'we', which Más y Pí wanted to establish also in Latin America, could not yet find practical expression. "We" – *Nosotros* – was precisely the name of a cultural magazine in Argentina at the time, perhaps the most important mouthpiece in the country for advancing the aesthetic tendencies of *posmodernismo* in the decade after 1910.²¹ But Juan Más y Pí did not find enough support for his reformist programme and his own vision of a new Argentine cultural identity which, due to his own biographical situation as an émigré, he saw as a continuity and expansion of European, Spanish culture.²²

The Latin American critics of Futurism – for example the Venezuelan Henrique Soublette and the Uruguayan Álvaro Amado Vasseur – insisted, in general, on their own cultural autonomy and specificity.²³ During the transitional phase

18 Nervo criticized the "gruesome prose" of the "Italian portaliras" in his essay, "Nueva escuela literaria", pp. 10 and 12.

19 "Alomar es un clásico cuyo futurismo es un renacimiento, es decir, una continuación; él no va hasta renovar las condiciones de la vida, como anhelamos nosotros." Más y Pí: "Una tendencia de arte y vida", quoted in Artundo: "El futurismo de Juan Más y Pí", p. 54.

20 Quoted in Artundo: "El futurismo de Juan Más y Pí", p. 54.

21 The magazine's rôle in the Argentine cultural field during the years of *posmodernismo* and the discrepancies among the collaborators' positions have both been analysed by Shumway: "Nosotros y el 'nosotros' de *Nosotros*". See also Ardissonne and Salvador: *Bibliografía de la revista "Nosotros", 1907–1943*.

22 Juan Más y Pí, who had Catalan origins, was a founding member of the Ateneo Hispano-Americano in Buenos Aires, which sought to foster cultural relations with the old metropolis.

23 Soublette: "El futurismo italiano y nuestro modernismo naturalista" ends with the contrast between an alleged cultural revolt 'over there' and the need for modernization 'here': "Allá, entreténganse los futuristas del Mediterráneo en quemar museos y aporrear mujeres, nosotros aquí tenemos algo más serio y más grande que hacer: Desmontar una selva de millón y medio de kilómetros cuadrados." Tejada: *Manifiestos, proclamas y polémicas de la vanguardia literaria hispanoamericana*, p. 28. Álvaro Amado Vasseur, in his poetry collection *Cantos del otro yo* from

of *posmodernismo*, most young Latin American writers preferred not to follow a new modernist trend from Europe but to continue to support their ‘own’ aesthetic paradigm of *modernismo*, which had been the first movement in art and literature not to have arrived from the former metropolis but to be exported to it. The desire to establish cultural independence was particularly evident in Vicente Huidobro’s chronicle, *El futurismo* (1914). Here, he repeated Rubén Darío’s rejection of Marinetti’s claim to originality by referring to Alomar’s early version of *futurisme*. At the same time, he reiterated Amado Vasseur’s claim that the ‘new world’ of America possessed a great deal more novelty than the old European continent:

And one fine day, Mr. Marinetti decided to proclaim a new school: ‘El Futurismo.’ New? No. A Mallorcan, Gabriel Alomar, an admirable poet and keen thinker, had proclaimed it before. And before Alomar, an American proclaimed it, Armando Vasseur, whose *auguralismo* is nothing if not Futurist theory. Thus, Futurism is American.²⁴

Huidobro’s postulation of a genuine American Futurism that preceded Marinetti’s school served him in his endeavour to establish an independent cultural genealogy of the avant-garde. Nevertheless, his own variant of an American avant-garde, *creacionismo*, had to be mediated by the European avant-gardes before it could attain international resonance.²⁵ Thus, Huidobro’s example demonstrates two things at once: a) Rubén Darío’s cultural embargo against Marinetti’s form of Futurism produced long-term effects in Latin America, and b) Latin American authors had great difficulty in founding and developing their own avant-garde as long as the previous generation of *modernista* authors – with the towering figure

1909, concluded with a diatribe: “Un poeta de la joven América, un contemporáneo del hombre de las ciudades que ha creado el Futurismo en hechos, en cantos, en libros, antes que tú soñaras en histrionizar la palabras [...] te sonrío oh, poeta milanés, calvo, espadachín, y ‘fundador de la escuela’ a los treinta años!” Quoted in Osorio: “Sobre la recepción del futurismo en América Latina”, p. 158.

24 “Y he aquí que un buen día se le ocurrió al señor de Marinetti proclamar una escuela nueva: El Futurismo. ¿Nueva? No. Antes que él lo había reclamado un mallorquín, Gabriel Alomar, el admirable poeta y sagaz pensador. Y antes que Alomar lo proclamó un americano, Armando Vasseur, cuyo auguralismo no es otra cosa que la teoría futurista. Por lo tanto el futurismo es americano.” Huidobro: “El futurismo”, p. 163.

25 With this I refer to the magazine *Creación* (later *Création*), of which Huidobro edited three issues (Madrid, April 1921, Paris, November 1921 and Paris, February 1924). It sought to be an “international art magazine”, as stated in the subtitle, but ended up being a personal polemic with Guillermo de Torre about the originality of *creacionismo*. This polemic, developed in a Spanish-language supplement to the last issue, occupied more room than all contributions of previous issues taken together. See Lastra: “Sobre la revista ‘Creación’.”

Rubén Darío ranking first – continued to occupy a dominant position in the cultural system. This tension was still noticeable even after Darío's death in 1916 and the end of the First World War. As we shall see below, it also left distinct traces in Galíndez's periodical, *Los raros*.

Posmodernismo and Ultraísmo: The fusionist programme of Bartholomé Galíndez

The very title of the magazine, *Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista* makes it clear that its editor was guided by the will to undo the tension between *modernismo* and the avant-garde by fusing the two. This intention characterizes especially the long essay about “new trends” (*Nuevas tendencias*), which covers about two thirds of the issue (pp. 1–43) and which is followed by a manifesto written by Galíndez (pp. 44–48), an anthology of poems (pp. 49–61) and the presentation of some ideas for future cultural projects (pp. 62–64). Galíndez sought to legitimize his critical survey of the newest trends in literature – that is, Marinetti's Futurism alongside Spanish *Ultra* – by taking recourse to the authority of Rubén Darío, whose words are cited at the beginning (p. 3) and end of the essay (p. 43). But whereas Darío had attempted to defuse the discourse of modernization propagated by the Futurists, Galíndez never considered this rivalry to be a problem. He rather emphasized the continuities within the multi-faceted and multi-layered process of aesthetic innovation. Galíndez simply integrated Italian Futurism into a schema of ‘eternal’ advancement of literary modernity which, in his view, went through various stages, yet always had a ‘symbolist’ character, whose diverse strands differed only in form:

Everything is symbolism, my friends, Rimbaud and Mallarmé are symbolists, as is Huidobro, as are Reverdy and Apollinaire, Cocteau and Rivoire, Cannell and Holley, Blaise Cendrars and Cansino Assens, Priets and Ruche, Decarisse and Solomon ... Yes, my friends; Solomon – 1020–962 – before Christ, Solomon, the libertine King of the thousand and one wives, was a symbolist two thousand nine hundred and fifty years ago; he is imitated to this day.²⁶

26 “Todo es simbolismo, amigos míos, Rimbaud y Mallarmé son simbolistas, como simbolista es Huidobro, como lo son Reverdy y Apollinaire, Cocteau y Rivoire, Cannell y Holley, Blaise Cendrars y Cansinos Assens, Priets y Ruche, Decarisse y Salomón ... Sí, amigos míos; Salomón, – 1020–962 – antes de Jesucristo, Salomón el rey libertino de mil y tantas esposas, fué simbolista hace dos mil novecientos cincuenta años; y aún hoy se le imita.” Galíndez: “Nuevas tendencias”, p. 15.

Such a wide-ranging concept of literary ‘modernity’, so abstract and all-embracing that it levelled out any historical differentiation, makes, at the very least, any serious scholar of literature frown. However, it should not be refuted straight away. Galíndez’s viewpoint was not exceptionally strange, because at the time, when he wrote his essay (1919), nobody in Buenos Aires was in a position to distinguish easily between the different positions vying with each other in the dynamic and confusing panorama of *posmodernismo*. And yet, Galíndez’s position towards the aesthetics of the avant-garde was highly ambivalent, because he seemed to have recognized and at the same time ignored the innovations brought about by Marinetti’s Futurism.

This becomes particularly evident in the manifesto which Galíndez wrote for his magazine (see the translation in Appendix 1). It is by far the best known section of *Los raros* and has found its way into several anthologies of programmatic texts from the Latin-American avant-garde.²⁷ Galíndez’s formal model was undoubtedly the *Foundation and Manifesto of Futurism*, which had served as the prototype not only for a string of other Futurists manifestos, but also for those proclaimed by all posterior avant-gardes. As we have seen above, it was precisely this innovation that Rubén Darío wanted to ignore, because he saw in it nothing but a useless and superficial advertising gimmick.

Galíndez differed in this point from the *modernista* model and adopted the practice of the manifesto as it had developed from the late nineteenth century onwards. His goal was neither to affirm, nor to criticize or to mock the Futurist *arte di fare manifesti*, as the Dadaists had done. Rather, Galíndez adopted Marinetti’s formal language while at the same introducing several corrections on a content level. For example, he espoused Marinetti’s misogynist attitude (“We will fight the Feminism of the poets, evil heritage of France’s vinegar”²⁸) while, at the same time, rejecting Marinetti’s glorification of war and violence, which in the manifestos acted as a complement to his misogyny: “We won’t glorify war as the only cleanser of the world [...] – like the Futurists of Alomar’s school have done.”²⁹

It is astonishing to see Galíndez with all seriousness attempting to fuse in his manifesto incompatible positions, for example to graft Symbolist aesthetics onto

27 The manifesto in *Los raros* is reproduced in Collazos: *Los vanguardismos en la América Latina*, pp. 57–60 and in Mendonça Teles and Müller-Bergh: *Vanguardia latinoamericana*. Vol. 5, pp. 166–167.

28 “Combatiremos el feminismo de los poetas, mala herencia del vinagre de la Francia”. Galíndez: “Manifiesto” p. 44.

29 “No glorificaremos la guerra, higiene del mundo [...] como los futuristas del colegio de Alomar”. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

Futurist topics. The already cited idea of a 'swan-like speedcar' is nothing but a grotesque, and unintentionally comical, attempt to combine the uncombinable. Galíndez neglected the action-based and performative character of the Futurist manifesto and discussed individual points as if Marinetti's text were a rational programme with realistic, practicable goals. At the same time, he ignored the mythological character of the foundation narrative. The large number of modifying adverbial constructions in the *Los raros* manifesto are nothing but a formal expression of a desire to give serious consideration to programmatic details, whereas the Italian Futurist had a global perspective and attempted nothing but a total revolt:

We adore the aeroplane; but we recognize that human life is more precious than the machine's screws or the combustion engine. Nevertheless, we declare that contempt for danger is Icarus's legacy and must be commended. And we shall not forget the glory of the propeller nor the victory of the railway.³⁰

Galíndez's *posmodernista* programme was oddly out of step with time. The compromise that was already visible in his literary criticism became even more evident in his manifesto. Galíndez's in-between position was too late for an already outdated *modernismo*, yet too early for the avant-garde, which to Galíndez remained an alien phenomenon.

Thus, on the one hand, the strange manifesto in *Los raros* anticipated the fashionable boom in Latin America of writing avant-garde manifestos – see, for example, the *Ultra* manifestos in Argentina, the proclamations of Mexican *estridentismo*, the declarations of *euforismo* in Puerto Rico or of *runrunismo* in Chile. On the other hand, however, Galíndez remained rooted in the paradigms of an art of beauty and contemplation and never really warmed up to the radical demands of the avant-garde. This is why we can find Bartholomé Galíndez named in an early Latin-American avant-garde document, the "directory of the avant-garde" published by Manuel Maples Arce in December 1921,³¹ but after that time he disappeared from the chronicles of Argentine literature.

30 "El aeroplano nos encanta: pero reconocemos que la vida de los hombres es más preciosa que los tornillos de las máquinas y los motores de nafta. Sin embargo, declaramos que el desprecio al peligro es hijo de Ícaro y debe ser cantado. Y no olvidaremos la gloria de la hélice, ni la victoria del riel." *Ibid.*, p. 47.

31 At the end of the first number of *Actual* (1921). See the reprint of the text in Mendonça Teles and Müller-Bergh, eds.: *Vanguardia latinoamericana*. Vol. 1, pp. 103–111 (the name of Bartolomé Galíndez appears on p. 110), and Rubén Gallo's discussion of this directory in "Wireless Modernity: Mexican Estridentistas, Italian and Russian Futurism", pp. 154–156. Maples Arce was

Galíndez's fusion of the 'new tendencies' of Futurism and Ultraism

The fact that Galíndez's position converged towards Italian Futurism cannot be explained by aesthetic deliberations, but rather should be seen as a strategic ruse. His long critical essay, *Nuevas tendencias*, contained a substantial section in which Galíndez posed as a connoisseur of Futurism by compiling a large number of facts regarding the history of the Futurist movement and its publications.³² This raises a number of questions regarding the value of the fusion of Symbolism and Futurism as envisaged by Galíndez. The essay on "New Trends" served as a kind of introduction to *Los raros*, but suffers from being tedious due to the encyclopaedic accumulation of information. The author sought to present himself as an erudite scholar and to advertise his personal ties to Marinetti, who, it seems, had provided him with the propaganda material he regularly sent out to potential promoters of Futurism. Galíndez tried to make an impression with this 'special relationship', and went as far as inverting the rôles of authorial standing and mutual influence:

According to my critics, the attentive ears of this great poet have undoubtedly heard of my 'revolutionary,' 'strange,' 'extravagant,' 'daring' activity, and he has suddenly sent me, embellished with kind dedications, Futurist postcards, Futurist pamphlets, his portrait and some newspapers from Florence and Milan which, of course, speak highly of him and his works.³³

not the only one to include Galíndez in the ranks of the avant-garde. Towards the end of 1920, also Guillermo de Torre had considered Galíndez an ally of (Spanish) Ultraism in Latin America. When, in November of that year, he published a long account of Ultraism, *El movimiento ultraísta español*, and an anthology of poems in the Madrid magazine, *Cosmópolis*, he mentioned Galíndez as being part of the "supporters of Ultra aesthetics" in South America – alongside Hugo Mayo and José-Juan Tablada. See Torre: "El movimiento ultraísta español", p. 493

32 Such facts were quite unknown to the average Argentine intellectual, since the Spanish-language material about Futurism accessible in the capital's literary market was relatively scarce and expensive at the time. In terms of Marinetti's writings, these were limited to essentially one anthology, *El futurismo*. Valencia: E. Sempere y cia. [1911/12?] and Buenos Aires: Viuda de S. Ponzinibbio, [1919?]. It is a direct translation of various texts in *Le Futurisme*, which appeared first in French in 1911. Other than this anthology, one must mention Rómulo Romero's study: *El futurismo literario*. Buenos Aires: Peuser, 1913. "Casi con certeza, es el primer libro local sobre este movimiento", according to Lorenzo Alcalá: *La esquivia huella del futurismo*, p. 18.

33 "Los oídos atentos de este gran poeta, han escuchado seguramente mi labor 'revolucionaria', 'extraña' 'extravagante' 'atrevida', según mis críticos, y he aquí que, de pronto, con varias de sus obras amablemente dedicadas, me envía tarjetas postales futuristas, papeles futuristas,

Galíndez's had only just turned twenty-three when he edited *Los raros*.³⁴ Previously, he had only published two short poetry collections, *Poemas modernos y exóticos* (1918) and *Venecia dorada* (1919), both at the publishing house of Hermanos Serantes, as part of a series called "Library of Young Authors". The fact that he was the editor of this 'library', which also included an *Antología de poetas jóvenes* (Anthology of Young Poets, 1917) and poetry collections by Alfredo R. Bufano, *El viajero indeciso* (The Undecided Traveller, 1917) and Fausto Burgos, *Cuesta arriba* (Uphill, 1917, with a prologue of Bartolomé Galíndez), indicates that Galíndez, at that time, was part of a literary coterie. However, it should also be clear that this network of young poets which continued the aesthetics of *modernismo* (see the aforementioned titles of Galíndez's books of poems, which evoke dreams of a "golden Venice" and search for the exotic, as was typical of *modernismo*) had only a limited social resonance. And one does not have to be hyper-critical to suspect that Galíndez's own 'fame' was still slight and more of a wish than a reality. In order to make his aspirations to be a 'revolutionary writer' come true, he had to find allies beyond his own little circle in Buenos Aires. Marinetti's Futurism was not the only driving force in his ambitious project; he also entertained contacts with Spanish Ultraists and used this, above all, to exchange mutual credentials and to insert himself within the Iberian avant-garde. This strategy becomes apparent in a long footnote, in which the young poet's ambition slipped into boasting:

I believe, when looking deep within, that the poetry of my *Poemas* and *Venecia* is the quintessence of subtlety, exoticism, autocracy, strength and emotion, and not, except for some works where the intensification and condensation of Symbolism prevails, a totally Ultraist work. Isaac del Vando Villar, director of the Sevillian magazine *Grecia*, and, together

su retrato y algunos diarios de Florencia y Milán que hablan, claro está, enormemente de él." Galíndez: "Nuevas tendencias", p. 5.

34 There is very little known about Galíndez's life. Born in Buenos Aires on 10 December 1896, he also died in this city on 12 August 1959. In an obituary we can find the following information: "En su juventud hizo abandono de los estudios que seguía en la Facultad de Medicina para consagrarse de lleno a las letras, figurando entre sus obras primigenias *Poemas modernos y exóticos*. Radicado en el barrio de Flores de la ciudad porteña, trabajó activamente en el fomento de la cultura de esa zona de la capital argentina, ejerciendo las funciones de presidente de la Junta de Estudios Históricos de San José de Flores. Su fervor por el barrio preferido le llevó a escribir la *Historia de San José de Flores*, obra que ha quedado sin terminar. Entre sus trabajos históricos figuran: *Apuntes de tres revoluciones: 1930 – 1943 – 1955*; e *Historia política argentina, la revolución del 80*. En la Comisión Nacional del Monumento al Teniente General Julio A. Roca, actuó como secretario y director de las publicaciones históricas que editó la misma. Perteneció a distintas academias e instituciones culturales, en las que Bartolomé Galíndez prestó sus entusiasmos y conocimientos". Garcés: "Bartolomé Galíndez", p. 604.

with Cansinos-Asséns, prince of the Ultra movement in Spain, has qualified me as being the greatest poet in America today. These words partly prove the breadth of critical views amongst the writers belonging to this new tendency, something that is not really shared by the literary school of Milan. As for me, I believe that both the Futurists from Milan and the Ultraists from Seville, and all others like me, profess an aesthetic of beauty and aristocracy, have a duty to be aware of our defects without, however, fighting against each other over such issues. We are all faced with one enemy: Academism.³⁵

Interpreting these words just as a sign of an author's 'megalomania'³⁶ would, in effect, turn an often employed strategy into some personal psychological flaw. Galíndez's quote was not the result of an exaggerated self-image but formed part of a strategy that aimed at establishing a connection between his own aesthetics of *posmodernismo* and the contemporary avant-garde, which he understood to be a 'broad church', like Spanish *ultraísmo*, and not a polemical programme, in the way Futurism was conceived. After all, Spanish *ultraísmo* in its early stage after the First World War showed an open attitude towards competing '-isms' that had developed in Europe at that time. Evidence of this we find in the first manifesto of the Spanish *Ultra* group, published in January of 1919 in the review *Cervantes*:

Our literature must be renewed and achieve its highest potential, just as today our scientific and political thinking strive to achieve it. Our motto will be "ultra", and our credo will incorporate all tendencies without distinction, as long as they express a longing for the new. Later, these tendencies will attain their pinnacle of development and will define themselves.³⁷

35 "Creo, penetrando en mí, que la poesía de *Poemas* y la de mi *Venecia*, es una quintaesencia de sutilidad, exotismo, autocracia, fuerza y emoción, y no, salvo algunos trabajos donde prima la intensificación o condensación del simbolismo, una obra puramente ultraica. Isaac del Vando Villar, director de la revista "Grecia", de Sevilla y príncipe con Cansinos-Asséns, del Ultra en España, me ha calificado de ser, yo, el más grande poeta de la América actual. Estas palabras, prueban en parte, la amplitud de miras críticas de los escritores de la nueva tendencia, cosa que casi no ocurre con los del Colegio de Milán. Yo por mí, creo que tanto los futuristas de Milán como los ultraicos de Sevilla y los que como yo mantienen una estética de belleza y aristocracia, estamos en el deber, si bien de vernos los defectos, no por ello combatirnos. Un solo enemigo se nos presenta. El academicismo." Galíndez: *Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista*, p. 36.

36 Lorenzo Alcalá: *La esquivada huella del futurismo en el Río de la Plata*, p. 23. This negative evaluation turns out to be rushed if one considers that Vando-Villar, the director of *Grecia*, had indeed praised the poet's quality. See the note about the appearance of *Los raros* in issue 40 (20 February 1920), p. 7, in which Vando-Villar speaks of the "inmenso poeta argentino" and his "moderna revista". In that same issue, he dedicates his poem *Lluvia* to Bartolomé Galíndez, "abanderado del Ultra en la República Argentina", p. 16.

37 "Nuestra literatura debe renovarse, debe lograr su ultra, como hoy pretenden lograrlo nuestro pensamiento científico y político. Nuestro lema será ultra, y en nuestro credo cabrán todas

Building a bridge between Spanish and Latin American Ultraism

It appears that Galíndez's link to the Spanish Ultra movement was the rather insignificant Pedro Luis Gálvez, a character with "great notoriety among Madrid's literary riffraff",³⁸ but marginal to the development of the group and only involved with it in its initial phase. If Gálvez was really Galíndez' main source of information, as May Lorenzo Alcalá assumes due to the frequency with which he is cited in his essay about "Nuevas tendencias", then it is easy to understand that, after losing this main source, the Argentine poet could not successfully continue his project to create a 'Symbolist' avant-garde in which Ultraism and Futurism were fused. The idea itself was not only out of place, but also doomed to failure when Galíndez lost touch with the latest developments in the Spanish literary scene where, around the year 1920, Ultraism was rapidly moving into new directions and undergoing a change of personnel.

Galíndez had adopted the same amalgamating tactics that had been typical of Spanish Ultraism in its formative phase. However, when Rafael Cansinos-Asséns abandoned the rôle of 'teacher' assigned to him by his young followers and ended up severing his links to the movement,³⁹ the *posmodernista* compromise of Ultra had come to an end, and the movement undertook concerted efforts to overcome the old aesthetic paradigms and to go beyond Romanticism (which was roughly equated with *modernismo*). Moreover, the move from Seville, its first setting, to Madrid in the early months of 1921 entailed not only a rhetorical radicalization of Ultraism, but also increasing infighting in the group and a scramble to occupy the privileged seat formerly occupied by Cansinos-Asséns. Guillermo de Torre distinguished himself the most during this period of reorganization and soon played a starring rôle.⁴⁰ In the supplement to *Grecia* 50 (1 November 1920), he issued the manifesto *Manifiesto ultraísta vertical* (Vertical Ultra Manifesto), in which he broke with the *novacentista* aesthetics of the older generation of *modernistas* (Eugenio d'Ors et al.). In contrast to Cansinos-Asséns, who had always

las tendencias, sin distinción, con tal que expresen un anhelo nuevo. Más tarde estas tendencias lograrán su núcleo y se definirán." Bóveda et al.: "Ultra: Un manifiesto de la juventud literaria", p. 2. Since the classical study of Gloria Videla on Ultraism, this first manifesto has often been wrongly dated autumn 1918. See Videla: *El ultraísmo*, pp. 32–33.

38 Bonet: *Diccionario de las vanguardias en España 1907–1936*, p. 267

39 Cansinos-Asséns documented this break with Ultraism in a *roman à clef* published 1921 by *Nuevo Mundo* in Madrid. For a reprint, see Cansinos-Asséns: *El movimiento V.P.*

40 On the history of Spanish Ultraism, see Ehrlicher: *Die Kunst der Zerstörung*, pp. 313–368 and Pérez Alonso: "Futurism and Ultraism", which includes more bibliographical sources.

highlighted the *inclusive* character of Ultraism and had sought to incorporate “every school” in a common “will to renew”⁴¹ – a programmatic vagueness not unlike Galíndez’s “perennial modernity” – Torre radically broke with the last remnants of Symbolism and argued for a ‘modernization’ of vocabulary via scientific neologisms and technicisms.⁴²



Fig. 2. Front page of Guillermo de Torre's *Manifiesto ultraísta vertical* (1920).

The *Manifiesto ultraísta vertical* was illustrated by Rafael Barradas and Norah Borges, whose brother Jorge Luis Borges praised it enthusiastically in the magazine *Reflector* as an imperative and ‘virile’ act “before the blurry democracy of the environment”.⁴³ Adapting Torre’s erudite style full of foreign words, Borges speaks of an “excessive phallophoria”.⁴⁴

⁴¹ See, above all, his foreword to the first anthology of Ultra poets published in the magazine *Cervantes*, June 1919, pp. 84–86, here p. 86.

⁴² The manifiesto appeared as a supplement to *Grecia* 50 (1 November 1920).

⁴³ Borges: “Vertical”, p. 18. See the illustrations to the right of the title and those included in the text itself. To the left there is a portrait of Guillermo de Torre with a Bolshevik hat, painted by the Uruguayan artist Rafael Barradas.

⁴⁴ “Desde hoy su Manifiesto – cálido, primordial, convencido – posee ante la democracia borrosa del medio ambiente todo el prestigio audaz de una desorbitada faloforia en un pueblo jesuítico.” Borges: “Vertical”, p.18. Unlike José Manuel López de Abiada, p. 92, who corrects the text at

With this gesture of vertical male empowerment, Spanish Ultraism entered its second phase. When Jorge Luis Borges, who had been very actively involved with Ultraism during his sojourn in Spain, returned to his homeland in 1921,⁴⁵ a new image of *Ultra* crossed the Atlantic and took root in Latin America. This new form of Ultraism sidelined and then supplanted the moderate position Galíndez had assumed in *Los raros* at the beginning of 1920.

The early writings of Borges in Argentina do not contain any mention of Galíndez, nor of the circle of writers Galíndez had promoted in his anthology and magazine. To be more precise, one should actually be talking about two anthologies, because one collection of poems can be found at the end of his essay, "Nuevas tendencias" (pp. 36–41), where he compiled examples of various Ultraist (in the sense he understood the term) authors coming from Spain (with the only exception of Paul Morand). The second anthology, forming an independent section (pp. 49–61) of *Los raros*, contains predominantly authors from the Buenos Aires area. This could be interpreted as sign of Galíndez's attempt at building bridges between Spain and Latin America and imitating the Spanish avant-garde by gathering a similar group of local authors, who could represent the most advanced position in the field of literary modernism. However, a more detailed analysis reveals a considerable tension between both anthologies and shows that Galíndez's attitude towards European *ultraísmo* was rather ambiguous.

In his commentary on the poems selected, Galíndez differentiates clearly between positive models (Pedro Rida, Rogelio Buendía, Isaac del Vando-Villar, Rafael Cansinos-Asséns and Claudio de la Torre) and trends which in his view were still insufficiently developed. Pedro Garfias in particular attracted Galíndez's disapproval, because his poetry seemed to him still "dieciochesco",⁴⁶ i.e. rooted in the eighteenth century, despite the affinity to the world of technology that can be found in "Nocturno". It seems that this kind of 'technophilia' was a feature that Galíndez criticized in the work of other *ultraistas*, such as Guillermo de Torre who, next to Jorge Luis Borges, influenced decisively the 'migration' of *Ultra* aesthetics to Argentina and was one of the instigators of the group's radicalization. In his first anthology, integrated into his critical essay, Galíndez separated two trends: one with a positive tendency, being *ultra-modernista* only in

this point into "faloria" (an Argentinism which means a kind of fictitious, exaggerated history), 'faloforia' makes perfectly sense as it refers to the practice of phallophoria in the Dionysian cult.

⁴⁵ Despite of the author's later attempts at distancing himself from his Ultraist past and at repressing his early works, Borges' biography is now well documented, for example in Meneses: *El primer Borges* (on Borge's Ultraist phase in Spain) and Olea-Franco: *El otro Borges, el primer Borges* (with a focus on Borges' Argentine 'criollo' Ultraism).

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 41.

the sense of being a continuation of Symbolist modernism; another looked upon with suspicion by Galíndez, but which soon would win the upperhand within Spanish *Ultra* and change the movement into a true avant-garde movement that aggressively challenged the past and was *ultra-modernista* in the sense of being opposed to *modernismo*. At the end of 1919, when Galíndez joined the Spanish group, the latter trend was still an undercurrent and would not have won a dominant position, if the group of authors supported by Galíndez had continued to occupy the key positions. One could therefore conclude that Galíndez had simply put his bets on the wrong personnel in a competitive yet still undecided battle.

Galíndez's conception of *ultraísmo* in the Argentine context found expression in the second collection of poems, which continued the early phase of Spanish *ultraísmo*, i.e. it focussed on the moderate tendency still rooted in the remnants of a Symbolist-Modernist model of literature. The persistence on the aesthetic paradigm of *modernismo* can already be detected in the titles of some poems, as for example "El cisne" (The Swan) by Martín de Berutti, or "Los palacios encantados" (The Enchanted Palaces) by Atilio García y Mellid.⁴⁷ These works were still replete with the "ornamental bric-a-brac", which Guillermo de Torres, Jorge Luis Borges and their collaborators on the poster-size review *Prisma* criticized so heavily, as it stood in the way of their attempt to radicalize *Ultra* for the Argentine context:

In its most evident and automatic form, the game of interconnecting words stands out in that patched-up nothingness current literature is made up of. The poets only busy themselves with moving ornamental bric-a-brac around, which the 'rubenianos' inherited from Góngora – roses, swans, fauns, Greek gods, garden-like good-tempered landscapes – and richly weaving slack adjectives: 'inefable,' 'divino,' 'azul,' 'misterioso.' What sarcasm and falsehood lies in this manhandling of inefficient and faded words, what arrogant fear of truly delving into things, what impotence in the vainglory of foreign symbols! Meanwhile, the other lyricists, those who do not flaunt the blue 'rubeniano' tattoo, practice a loutish storytelling and foster pitiful rhymes, which, varnished with facile visual elements, they will later sell with a gesture of tamed simplicity and expected spontaneity.⁴⁸

47 Galíndez: *Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista*, pp. 50–53.

48 "En su forma más evidente y automática, el juego de entrelazar palabras campea en esa entablillada nadería que es la literatura actual. Los poetas sólo se ocupan de cambiar de sitio los cachivaches ornamentales que los rubenianos heredaron de Góngora – las rosas, los cisnes, los faunos, los dioses griegos, los paisajes acuánimes i enjardinados – i engarzar millonariamente los flojos adjetivos inefable, divino, azul, misterioso. Cuánta socarronería y cuánta mentira en ese manosear de ineficaces i desdibujadas palabras, cuánto miedo altanero de adentrarse verdaderamente en las cosas, cuánta impotencia en esa vanagloria de símbolos ajenos! Mientas tanto los demás líricos, aquellos que no ostentan el tatuaje azul rubeniano, ejercen un anecdotismo gárrulo, i fomentan penas rimables que barnizadas de visualidades oportunas venderán después con un gesto de amaestrada sencillez i de espontaneidad prevista." Borges et al.: "Proclama", p. 122.

The aesthetics embraced by Galíndez and most of the authors anthologized in *Los raros* had thus become outdated and surpassed by the most recent developments in the Argentine world of letters. In fact, things had moved ahead to fast and in so many directions that Galíndez, like many of the other Argentine authors who shared his ideals, for example Martín de Berutti, Atilio García y Mellid or Athol de Páros (surely a pseudonym⁴⁹), have nowadays fallen into oblivion. Those authors, who formed part of Galíndez's anthology and are still given consideration in literary textbooks, such as Amado Villar, Emilio Lascano "Vizconde" de Tegui or Ezequiel Martínez Estrada, were not actively involved in the later development of *Ultra*. Galíndez's *Revista de orientación futurista* did not really have a future any longer, nor did his other cultural projects: an annual book fair, a bureau organizing the intercultural exchange with other nations of 'Hispanic-Latin-Saxon' America, or the founding of a 'mental convalescent home for poor authors'.⁵⁰ Nonetheless, the author's attempt to reconcile *modernismo* with the avant-garde under the umbrella of Symbolism was historically significant despite the fact that in the end it turned out to be failure. Galíndez's project was an expression of the Argentine *zeitgeist* in a phase of transition, when the literary and cultural field of *posmodernismo* was rather fragmented and unstructured, and had not yet been given a new direction by the avant-garde.

Bibliography

- Ardissonne, Elena, and Nérida Salvador: *Bibliografía de la revista "Nosotros", 1907–1943*. Buenos Aires: Fondo Nacional de las Artes, 1971.
- Artundo, Patricia M.: "El futurismo de Juan Más y Pí: Una tendencia de vida." *Hispanérica* 35:104 (2006): 49–57.
- Bird, David W.: "Futurist Social Critique in Gabriel Alomar i Villalonga (1873–1941)." Günter Berghaus, ed.: *Iberian Futurisms*. Special issue of *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*. Vol. 3. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. 47–63.
- Bonet, Juan Manuel: *Diccionario de las vanguardias en España 1907–1936*. Madrid: Alianza, 2007.
- Borges, Jorge Luis: *Textos recobrados, 1919–1929*. Barcelona: Emecé, 2002.
- : "Vertical." *Reflector: Arte – Literatura – Crítica* 1 (December 1920): 18. Reprinted in Jorge Luis Borges: *Textos recobrados, 1919–1929*. Barcelona: Emecé, 2002. 96–97.
- Borges, Jorge Luis et al.: "Proclama." *Prisma* (Buenos Aires, December 1921). Reprinted in Jorge Luis Borges: *Textos recobrados, 1919–1929*. Barcelona: Emecé, 2002. 122–124.

⁴⁹ At least, the author is unknown to me and is also absent from *Nosotros*, which served as a kind of 'who's who' of Argentine literature of the epoch.

⁵⁰ Galíndez: *Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista*, p. 62

- Boveda, Xavier et. al.: "Ultra: Un manifiesto de la juventud literaria". *Cervantes* (January 1919): 2–3. Reprinted under the title "Un manifiesto literario." *Grecia* 2:11 (15 March 1919): 11.
- Cansinos-Asséns, Rafael: *El movimiento V.P.* Prólogo de Juan Manuel Bonet. Madrid: Viamonte, 1998.
- Collazos, Oscar, ed.: *Los vanguardismos en la América Latina*. Barcelona: Ediciones 62, 1977.
- Daño, Rubén: "Los colores del estandarte." Ricardo Gullón, ed.: *El modernismo visto por los modernistas*. Barcelona: Guadarrama, 1980. 49–57.
- : "Marinetti y el futurismo." *La nación* (Buenos Aires), 5 April 1909. Reprinted in *Poesía* 5:3–6 (April–July 1909): 28–30.
- D'Ambrosio, Matteo: "Bartolomé Galíndez, la revista 'Los raros' e il primo manifesto futurista sudamericano." *Avanguardia: Rivista di letteratura contemporanea* 13:37 (2008): 34–36.
- Dietschy, Beat: "Ungleichzeitigkeit, Gleichzeitigkeit, Übergleichzeitigkeit". Beat Dietschy, Doris Zeilinger, and Rainer Zimmermann, eds.: *Bloch-Wörterbuch: Leitbegriffe der Philosophie Ernst Blochs*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012. 589–633.
- Ehrlicher, Hanno: *Die Kunst der Zerstörung: Gewaltphantasien und Manifestationspraktiken europäischer Avantgarden*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001.
- Ehrlicher, Hanno, ed.: *La revista 'Los raros' de Bartolomé Galíndez (1920)*. La Plata: Universidad Nacional de La Plata. Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación, 2012. [http://bibliotecaorbistertius.fahce.unlp.edu.ar/05-ehrllicher]
- Galíndez, Bartolomé: "Manifiesto." *Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista* 1:1 (January 1920): 44–48.
- : "Nuevas tendencias." *Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista* 1:1 (January 1920): 1–43.
- Gallo, Rubén: "Wireless Modernity": "Mexican Estridentistas, Italian and Russian Futurism." *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies* 2 (2012): 141–170.
- Garcés, Julián: "Bartolomé Galíndez." *Revista de historia de América* 48 (1959): 604.
- Gómez-Carrillo, Enrique: "Una nueva escuela literaria: El futurismo." *El liberal* (Madrid), 28 February 1909. Reprinted in *Poesía* 5:3–6 (April–July 1909): 26–28.
- Herrero-Senés, Juan: "'Polemics, jokes, compliments and insults': The Reception of Futurism in the Spanish Press (1909–1918)." Günter Berghaus, ed.: *Iberian Futurisms*. Special issue of *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*. Vol. 3. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. 120–150.
- Huidobro, Vicente: "El futurismo." Vicente Huidobro: *Pasando y pasando: Crónicas y comentarios*. Santiago de Chile: Imprenta Chile, 1914. 160–171.
- Lastra, Pedro: "Sobre la revista *Creación*." *Revista iberoamericana* 106–107 (1979): 175–181.
- Lopez de Abiada, Jose Manuel: "Guillermo de Torre: Versificador y teorico ultraista, cronista y definidor de la vanguardia." Harald Wentzlaff-Eggebert, ed.: *Europäische Avantgarde im lateinamerikanischen Kontext*. Akten des internationalen Berliner Kolloquiums 1989. Frankfurt: Vervuert 1991: 79–103.
- Lorenzo Alcalá, May: *La esquivada huella del futurismo en el Río de la Plata*. Buenos Aires: Rizzo, 2009.
- Los raros: Revista de orientación futurista*. Buenos Aires: s.n., 1920.
- Marinetti, Filippo Tommaso: *El futurismo*. Valencia: Sempere, [1912].
- : *El futurismo*. Buenos Aires: Viuda de S. Ponzinibbio, [1919].
- : *Le Futurisme*. Paris: Sansot, 1911.
- Más y Pi, Juan: "Una tendencia de arte y vida: Notas sobre el futurismo". *Renacimiento* (Buenos Aires) 1:3 (August 1909): 381–400.

- : “Una tendencia de vida: El futurismo”. *El diario español* (Buenos Aires) 4:1279 (21 March 1909): 7. Reprinted in *Poesía* 5:3–6 (April–July 1909): 28–32.
- Mas, Ricard, ed.: *Dossier Marinetti*. Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona, 1994.
- Meneses, Carlos: *El primer Borges*. Madrid: Fundamentos, 1999.
- Mendonça Teles, Gilberto, and Klaus Müller-Bergh, eds.: *Vanguardia latinoamericana: Historia, crítica y documentos*. Vol. 1: *México y América Central*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert; Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2007.
- Mendonça Teles, Gilberto, and Klaus Müller-Bergh, eds.: *Vanguardia latinoamericana: Historia, crítica y documentos*. Vol. 5: *Chile y países del Plata: Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert; Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2009.
- Nervo, Amado: “Nueva escuela literaria.” Nelson Osorio Tejada, ed.: *Manifiestos, proclamas y polémicas de la vanguardia literaria hispanoamericana*. Caracas: Ayacucho, 1988. 8–13.
- Olea Franco, Rafael: *El otro Borges, el primer Borges*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1993.
- Osorio Tejada, Nelson: “Sobre la recepción del futurismo en América Latina.” Mátyás Horányi, ed.: *Pensamiento y literatura en América Latina: Memoria del XX Congreso del Instituto Internacional de Literatura Iberoamericana*. Budapest: Departamento de Español de la Universidad Eötvös Loránd de Budapest, 1982. 149–168.
- Osorio Tejada, Nelson, ed.: *Manifiestos, proclamas y polémicas de la vanguardia literaria hispanoamericana*. Caracas: Ayacucho, 1988.
- Pérez Alonso, Leticia: “Futurism and Ultraism: Identity and Hybridity in the Spanish Avant-garde.” Günter Berghaus, ed.: *Iberian Futurisms*. Special issue of *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*. Vol. 3. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. 151–177.
- Prieto, Adolfo: “Una curiosa ‘Revista de orientación futurista’.” *Boletín de literaturas hispánicas* 3 (1961): 53–62.
- Rampazzo, Elena: “Marinetti’s Periodical ‘Poesía’.” Günter Berghaus, ed.: *Iberian Futurisms*. Special issue of *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*. Vol. 3. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. 63–94.
- Romero, Rómulo: *El futurismo literario*. Buenos Aires: Peuser, 1913.
- Sbriziolo, Carola: “Futurist Texts in the Madrilénian Review ‘Prometeo’.” Günter Berghaus, ed.: *Iberian Futurisms*. Special issue of *International Yearbook of Futurism Studies*. Vol. 3. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2013. 96–119.
- Schwartz, Jorge, ed.: *Las vanguardias latinoamericanas: Textos programáticos y críticos*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2002.
- Scrimaglio, Marta: *Literatura argentina de vanguardia (1920–1930)*. Rosario: Biblioteca, 1974.
- Shumway, Nicolás: “‘Nosotros’ y el ‘nosotros’ de ‘Nosotros’.” Saúl Sosnowski, ed.: *La cultura de un siglo: América latina en sus revistas*. Madrid/ Buenos Aires: Alianza, 1999. 165–180.
- Solares-Larrave, Francisco: “Hacia un panteón alterno: Las estrategias críticas de Rubén Darío en ‘Los raros’.” *Crítica hispánica* 27:2 (2005): 49–62.
- Soublette, Henrique: “El futurismo italiano y nuestro modernismo naturalista.” *El tiempo* (Caracas), 1 August 1910. Reprinted in H. Soublette: *Escritos*. Caracas: Instituto de Altos Estudios de América Latina, Universidad Simón Bolívar, 1986. 163–164. Reprinted in Nelson Osorio Tejada, ed.: *Manifiestos, proclamas y polémicas de la vanguardia literaria hispanoamericana*. Caracas: Ayacucho, 1988. 27–29.
- Torre, Guillermo de: “El movimiento ultraísta español.” *Cosmópolis* 23 (1920): 473–495.
- : “Manifiesto ultraísta vertical.” Supplement to *Grecia* 50 (1920).

Videla, Gloria: *El ultraísmo: Estudios sobre movimientos poéticos de vanguardia en España*. Madrid: Gredos, 1971.

Verani, Hugo J.: "Las vanguardias literarias en Hispanoamérica." Saúl Sosnowski, ed.: *Lectura crítica de la literatura americana: Vanguardias y tomas de posesión*. Vol. 3. Caracas: Biblioteca Ayacucho, 1997. 9–41.

Appendix

Manifesto

Bartolomé Galíndez

Since the collective work of the new ones in America is still characterized by vainness, as the admirable author of *Profane prose*⁵¹ has said; since from Mexico to Argentina and from Brazil to Chile, Hispano-American young people lack intellectual loftiness; since the examination of values is not a fact, neither is studying today a quality; since artificial pessimism dictates, from early on, the pages that should be filled with faith and devotion; since poets which beg for compassion display pain like beggars display their sores; since mystical effeminacy is taking control of the young and Art feels sick from such lukewarm, unhealthy sentiments; we believe in the duty, the full moral and intellectual right, to launch this manifesto:

1. We will love antiquity from Homer to Hugo, from Shakespeare to Schiller, from Plotinus to Maeterlinck, from Amphion⁵² to Beethoven and from Phidias to Rodin. We will have a divine respect towards antiquity; but, because we understand that it is impossible to hang the portraits of all the academics on Quixote's wall,⁵³ we put them aside in a corner.
2. We will be optimistic. We will combat the poets' feminism, a bad inheritance from France's vinegar.⁵⁴ We believe that an artist's work must be healthy and pure, pure and healthy. Without advocating laughter, we will disparage crying, which for a poet, like all other confessions, is egotistical. The world is large, there are many souls, and the spirit is like a wing. We will sing to the world about things and souls. The artist must safeguard the survival of the species, sing of the greatness of man, of the man-symbol, of woman as beauty and fruit of divinity, of the sky, the sea and the earth, like an incarnation of human feelings to be transmitted to posterity. Not so much about insignificant activities and deeds in the lives of both. Man and woman as symbols prevail while centuries go by, and History talks about them. Citing Christ, Attila, Mary and Lucrezia Borgia is enough to convey the meaning of these lines. Likewise, we will be humans; although forced into it, we will lay to rest sincerity and prettiness in favour of Beauty.
3. We will be universal and cosmopolitan at all times, restless at all hours. Irrespective of whether we find ourselves in front of Pyramids or Skyscrapers, Circuses or Columns, the Bazzars of Algiers or the temples of the Acropolis: it will all be the same to us to.

51 "Porque la obra colectiva de los nuevos de América es aún vana, estando muchos de los mejores talentos en el limbo de un completo desconocimiento del mismo Arte a que se consagran." Rubén Darío in the introduction to his *Prosas profanas y otros poemas*. Buenos Aires: Coni, 1896.

52 Amphion was the son of Zeus and the nymph Antiope. Hermes taught him the art of music and provided him with a golden lyre.

53 This does not seem to refer to any specific passage in *Don Quijote*.

54 This seems to be metaphor for the negative aspects of French culture. Although Galíndez tries to show his extended learning in this manifesto, his metaphors are not always well chosen, and many of the phrases use a rather stilted style. He certainly had not mastered Marinetti's *arte di far manifest*.

4. Like the Chinese, we will glorify thought, which is superior to feeling. The latter is fruit of sensibility, that is, of matter, the former is the human being's impalpable nature. The greatness of the world, the magnificent machines, the enormous works, are not due to the second one, but to the first. From Archimedes to Edison, thought is like the heat of the sun. Its velocity is infinite. Not even Phoebus with his horses, cited by Ovid, or Aethon, Pyrois and Eos⁵⁵ can reach him. He covers forty-million meters in one second. In the same time span, he arrives at Neptune, a distance the lightest train would cover in forty centuries; he takes a stroll to Venus and Saturn, and dismounts at the nearest star, which a Caproni⁵⁶ with 900 H.P. would reach in thirty million years.
5. We do not believe, as Oscar Wilde and the Futurists of the Ultra movement do, that Art is perfectly useless. On occasion, Art prevents a city from falling into ruins – we will cite Venice –; in others, it makes a king tremble – we will cite Napoleon III –; and, finally, it allows a nation to become immortal and a race to serve as an example – we will cite Greece. Ancient art has left to the Vatican Museums, the Louvre, Florence and London the religious character, material and spiritual beauty of humankind from the times of one thousand years before the Christian era. It has perpetuated the glories of the greatest human beings, the advent of Gods. In Greece, it was unique. In Italy, according to Saint Victor,⁵⁷ “reason in Art prevailed over the reason of the State.” It is known as the button on the cloak Cellini gave to Clement VII, when the latter had sent him to the Quirinale to be punished.⁵⁸ Neither for humanity, then, nor for man, is art a useless pursuit. Homer was declared divine; seven cities made claims for his birthplace, and there was even a religious order called Homeridae.⁵⁹ Don Miguel de Cervantes y Saavedra, if he were still alive and could charge royalties for his works, would be the richest man.

We know that Beauty is perfect poetry, that art is exquisite and that the poet, as Marinetti wrote in his manifesto, “will have to do all in his power, passionately, flamboyantly and with generosity of spirit, to increase the delirious fervour of the primordial elements.”⁶⁰ We will disdain plain and vulgar things, village literature and all the trivialities around us. The novel and the short story have been created for that which surrounds us; philosophy for our interior, and Art, poetry *par excellence*, for that which is superior.

6. We won't glorify war as the only cleanser of the world – “the black death beckons” – like the Futurists of Alomar's school have done; but we will glorify the hero of Carlyle.⁶¹ The sword

55 Phoebus is another name of Apollo, the Greek god of the sun, who was said to ride a golden chariot. Aethon, Pyrois and Eos are three of the four horses of ancient Greek mythology that pull Helios' chariot – i.e. the sun – each day across the sky.

56 An Italian aircraft.

57 Hugh of Saint Victor (c. 1096 –1141) was theologian who wrote some 46 works on a variety of subjects.

58 The magnificent gold “button” (a morser or a clasp for an ecclesiastical cope) was made by Benvenuto Cellini (1500–71) for Pope Clement VII as part of a competition, described in his autobiography (written between 1556 and 1558).

59 In the late 6th century B.C., there existed a rhapsodic guild called the *Homeridae* or ‘descendants of Homer’.

60 See § 6 of the *Foundation and Manifesto of Futurism*.

61 Thomas Carlyle (1795–1881) was a Scottish philosopher, essayist and historian. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and The Heroic in History* was published in London in 1841.

used in the battle between Carpio and Roland⁶² is beautiful; but the cannon is horrible, and today's war machines are horrendous. We will applaud the passing of Caesar dressed in Monsieur Catulle Mendès⁶³ frock coat, and the marching of a regiment that has, as a flag, a bouquet of roses. We will praise effort, sing to glory. We will not praise brisk walking in art, nor any other sport,⁶⁴ but as a measure of energy; we will recommend that it be done AFTER HAVING PRODUCED SOME ART. The new generation of artists must be strong in order to give birth to vigorous art.

7. Everybody will conceive his own God; but since we know that religions less rooted in reality also have more poetry, we will love Jehovah alongside Buddha and Jupiter alongside Odin. We will add one more to the Greek Muses: woman,⁶⁵ and give Orpheus a companion: Sancho Panza.⁶⁶
8. Our poetry will be an undiscovered quantity, a combination of principles, in the following proportions:

Form	200 grams
Fantasy	100 >>
Symbol	150 >>
Aristocracy	200 >>
Subtle essence	150 >>
Romanticism	100 >>
Filtered emotion	15 >>
Academic rhythm	003 centigrams
Rhythm	300 grams
Pity, happiness, sweetness, excipient	100 >>

The heart is the sea; its water is salty. Process through the brain's alembic.

9. We believe that he who writes verses that are like everyone else's is not a poet; he is a singer. The true poet is nowadays educated in different branches of arts and sciences:

62 In the Battle of Roncevaux Pass (778), Bernardo del Carpio, a legendary hero of the medieval Kingdom of Asturias, fought against Roland, prefect of the Breton March and commander of the rear guard of Charlemagne's army. The legend is recounted in *La Chanson de Roland* (The Song of Roland, 11th century), and in Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando furioso* (Mad Orlando, 1516).

63 Catulle Mendès (1841–1909) was a French Parnassian poet.

64 In the appendix to the *Manifesto of Futurist Cinema*, Marinetti had called for "A Futurist stroll. Study of new types of walking manners." *Critical Writings*, p. 268. In his *Futurist Manifesto Against English Art* he had demanded "that sport be considered as an essential element in art." *Critical Writings*, p. 96.

65 The Muses were the goddesses of music, song and dance, and considered a source of inspiration to poets. The *Mousai* were assigned specific artistic spheres: Kalliope, epic poetry; Kleio, history; Ourania, astronomy; Thaleia, comedy; Melpomene, tragedy; Polyhymnia, religious hymns; Erato, erotic poetry; Euterpe, lyric poetry; and Terpsichore, choral song and dance. By adding a personification of womanhood, *La mujer*, Galíndez appears to suggest that poetic inspiration can also come from a contemporary female being.

66 Sancho Panza is Don Quixote's squire in the novel written by Cervantes (1605). The illiterate, pot-bellied peasant with vulgar wit and common sense acts as a sidekick to his master.

mathematics, history, metaphysics, geography, natural sciences, mechanics, archaeology, languages, etc.

10. We will love Nature because space is infinite and Copernicus is great. We will humanize things and imbue the still life with energy.
11. We will be subtle. A genius is a creator; a talent only a maker. We may not be creators, but we will at least attempt to create, to originate ourselves. We will be concise. We will eradicate poetic anecdotalism and trivial confessions which nobody, except the person writing about them, cares about; we will send the madrigal to the gallows; we will guillotine the sonnet, stab octosyllabic verse. As for rhythmic eloquence, we will put it in a straight jacket.
12. The automobile is useful because of its speed; but it would be beautiful if it were shaped like a swan, dragon, peacock, shark or dinosaur. We will leave this idea to the mechanics. We adore the aeroplane; but we recognize that human life is more precious than the machine's screws or the combustion engine. Nevertheless, we declare that contempt for danger is Icarus's legacy and must be commended. And we shall not forget the glory of the propeller nor the victory of the railway.
13. What is solemn without being macabre will excite us. We will respectfully doff our hats to the sun. Descending from the mountain at the blue hour, we will go and contemplate the sea.
14. We will not kill the Moon:⁶⁷ firstly, because it is a cheap streetlamp; secondly, because it has the falseness of a legend; thirdly, because it amuses and affects us; fourthly, because – without being an “artificial paradise”⁶⁸ – it excites our nerves.
15. The wheat fields, corn fields, fruit orchards, greatness of the earth and of the farming man enrich nations who, in turn, enrich libraries. All poets, beginning with Triptolemus in Eleusis,⁶⁹ know wheat and fertile lands. It must be chanted about.
16. We will disdain alcohol, opium and morphine, whose influence in poetry is pronounced. In this sense, Baudelaire seems to us a poor man, and De Quincey another one. However, we praise individual eccentricity, since we support the aesthetic without reserves.
17. Subjectivity and objectivity are our quintessence. Freedom is the most lavish of kings. However, we are free. A line is a model ...
18. We will banish exaggerated voluptuousness, vices, everything that obscures Terence's proverb.⁷⁰ Exaggerated voluptuousness, pure carnality makes youngsters sick. On the other hand, artistic voluptuousness is Beauty. Beautiful is a nude of glorious plasticity. Beautiful is a Venus emerging nude from the Aegean Sea.⁷¹ Art does not have a sense of modesty.

Everybody will be the critic of his own work. The rest may move on. The door is open. A stone lion is listening to you...

67 *Let's Kill Off the Moonlight* was the second Futurist proclamation in 1909.

68 Thomas de Quincey and Charles Baudelaire spoke of drugs as an artificial paradise.

69 Triptolemus (literally ‘threefold warrior’) was a Greek mythological figure connected with Demeter and the Eleusinian Mysteries.

70 Probably a reference to “Homo sum, humani nihil a me alienum puto” (I am a human being, I consider nothing that is human alien to me) from the comedy *Heauton Timoroumenos* (The Self Tormentor, 165 BC) by Publius Terentius Afer (c.195–159 BC).

71 Venus Anadyomene (Venus Rising from the Sea) is one of the iconic representations of Aphrodite, made famous through a painting by Apelles, and in Renaissance times by Botticelli.

19. We will form part of the future. FUTURE. Our work will be immense. We will prepare tomorrow's healthy, serene and energetic generation. Artists with perfect souls and bodies will dance around us. Christ is great, but equally great is a child that, defending himself, throws stones at a leprous monster.
20. We will be men, two arms open and bathed by the sun.

Buenos Aires, 1 January 1920.