“‘La casa va con la città’: The ‘Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti’ Exhibition of 1949.”

Cristelle Baskins and Silvia Bottinelli

There has been a marked increase in the exhibition of Renaissance domestic painting in recent years. Yet “Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti” [“Lorenzo the Magnificent and the Arts”], an exhibition held in the Palazzo Strozzi in Florence from 21 May to 31 October 1949, is still the most impressive to date for the sheer number of cassoni, deschi, and spalliere displayed. A stunning fifty examples constituted roughly one quarter of the objects installed in twelve galleries on the main floor of the palace. The show opened with early-fifteenth-century anonymous Florentine cassoni and ended with early-sixteenth-century spalliere by Piero di Cosimo and his contemporaries. In between, the galleries alternated with named masters and canonical examples of Florentine portraiture, sculpture, and religious painting.

In the words of Lorenzo de’ Medici, “La casa va con la città”—the fate of the house (or family) depends on the fate of the city. Lorenzo’s insight about the relationship of the public and private spheres guides our analysis of the exhibition of Renaissance domestic painting in post-World War II Florence. The following essay examines the political, institutional, and scholarly frameworks of the “Lorenzo il Magnifico e Le Arti” show and considers the ways in which postwar reconstruction, as well as the changing role of women in the late 1940s, brought new critical attention to domestic painting.

The Cultural Capital of Renaissance Florence

A close look at the Palazzo Strozzi exhibition of 1949 reveals the intersection of politics, scholarship, the art market, tourism, and education. We might expect such a nexus of concerns for any exhibition, but the specific emphasis on domestic furniture painting in the aftermath of World War II makes the 1949 show worthy of further investigation. The Palazzo Strozzi exhibit was part of a state funded program of ‘onoranze’ celebrating the quincentenary of the birth of Lorenzo de’ Medici in 1449. Likewise, the quincentenary of Lorenzo’s death in 1992 witnessed

---

1 See the following exhibition catalogs: Marta Ajmar and Flora Denis, eds., At Home in Renaissance Italy (London: Victoria & Albert Museum, 2006); Patrizia Lurati, ed., Doni nuziali del Rinascimento nelle collezioni svizzere (Locarno: Armando Dadó, 2007); Susan E. Wegner, ed., Beauty and Duty: The Art and Business of Renaissance

2 See the Appendix for the complete list and their distribution.


5 See Licia Collobi Ragghianti, ed., Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti (Florence: Palazzo Strozzi, 1949), 5–9. A biographical show based on archival documents was installed on the upper floor of the palace. For the exhibit of books at the Biblioteca Laurenziana, see Mario Salmi, ed., Mostra della biblioteca di Lorenzo nella Biblioteca
a profusion of special events, publications, and exhibitions. Such anniversary celebrations open up a space for public debate about the identity of Lorenzo il Magnifico. From hero to despot, Lorenzo’s reputation was avidly debated by his peers as well as by subsequent generations down to the Risorgimento and the Fascist period. Ugo Ojetti, for example, in his Preface to the catalogue for the “Mostra Medicea” held at the Palazzo Medici Riccardi in 1939, praised Lorenzo as an exemplum for the modern (ie. Fascist) Italian. And Lorenzo de’ Medici continues to inspire polarized readings right down to the present. Is he, as PBS would have it, one of the “Godfathers of the Renaissance,” or its most sublime statesman, poet, and arbiter of taste?

The “Lorenzo il Magnifico e Le Arti” show was conceived during a short-lived but crucial period in Italian politics and culture. The passage from Fascism to democracy was unsettled and spirited; opposing political factions—the Italian Communist Party (PCI), the Christian Democrat Party (DC), and other factions stemming from the Action Party—were thrown into dialogue and compromise. For example, among those listed in the Executive Committee responsible for planning the show, we find a lawyer and two senators, a contemporary artist, two architects, an antiquarian, officials connected to the Uffizi and other city museums, professors at local universities, a scholar from the Accademia della Crusca, and officials from the National Tourism Board (ENT) as well as the Autonomous Tourism Agency (AAT). Altogether, the Executive Committee forms a roll call of important politicians, administrators, scholars, teachers, and cultural producers. Their combined expertise in art history covered the spectrum from attribution, conservation, cultural context, function, and market value, to urban history. While the contributors shared a focus on the city, its history, and its culture, they could not be called a homogeneous group. Although the committee members were all concerned with the restoration of Florence, they represented different points of view in the contentious debates of the day regarding postwar reconstruction. Furthermore, the committee was made up of aristocrats and communists, partisans and those whose actions during the war years were ambiguous. Looking back, we have the impression of a group brought together of necessity, drawing together a profusion of special events, publications, and exhibitions.

8 See Ugo Ojetti, ed., Mostra Medicea (Florence: Marzocco, 1939). Ojetti writes, “one can say of Lorenzo, he who was never called a prince, that being strictly Florentine, he was an Italian, and since he was Florentine and Italian, he was universal […] So today Mussolini’s Fascism, looking to Rome and to these most Roman Florentines who wrote Latin in competition with Cicero and Virgil, is preparing its arrival, and not only in our own nation” (“Preface,” in ibid., 8–9). See also Lando Ferretti, Il Magnifico Lorenzo de’ Medici. Discorso pronunciato l’8 aprile 1942 in Palazzo Vecchio a Firenze per il 450 anniversario della morte (Florence: Istituto della Cultura Fascista, Istituto Nazionale di Studi sul Rinascimento, 1942).
multiplicity of ideas, personalities, ideologies, and competing interests. The Executive Committee for the “Lorenzo” show was itself a postwar coalition, a microcosm of the political struggle in the late 1940’s to form a liberal democracy in Italy.

In light of the devastation caused by World War II—the lack of adequate housing, food shortages, labor strikes, and poor transportation—, the decision to invest in an international loan show at Palazzo Strozzi seems odd, if not downright irresponsible.\(^10\) And yet, both the national funding and civic resources devoted to the show attest to the logic of cultural capital. Mayor Mario Fabiani personally coordinated plans for reconstruction and renewal of the city.\(^11\) He sponsored a number of initiatives, all of which drew on the city’s Renaissance heritage to tempt visitors and foreign tourists. He formed a committee of architects, urban planners, and art historians to decide how to rebuild the historic city center. Fabiani also tirelessly petitioned the authorities in Rome to obtain funding for the *Maggio Musicale* opera festival. He revived the *Calcio Storico*, a civic spectacle that had lapsed during the war.\(^12\) And as President of the Executive Committee responsible for the “Lorenzo” show, Fabiani reminded visitors of the high standard of living in Renaissance Florence while simultaneously encouraging development of local furniture and antiques markets. While the show was on view at the Palazzo Strozzi, the Florence Craft Fair, revived only in 1947, ran concurrently at the Piazza della Libertà.\(^13\) The lengthy acknowledgments in the 1949 exhibition catalogue mention the Presidents of the Commercial and Industrial Unions, making clear the ties to local economy. In addition to boosting Florentine products, Fabiani also worked on recruiting the film industry, hoping to attract directors and film festivals to Florence. Whereas Roberto Rossellini’s *Paisan* (1946) showed the shocking devastation of postwar Florence, *September Affair*, filmed on location in Florence in 1949, has the female lead, Manina (played by Joan Fontaine), exclaiming, “Nothing has changed since the days of the Medicis.”\(^14\)

Mayor Fabiani’s Preface to the “Lorenzo” exhibition catalogue clearly states the goal of the Palazzo Strozzi show: “above all to evoke an essential aspect of the complex figure of Lorenzo the Magnificent: his activities and connections with the art of his time […] not limited to his patronage.”\(^15\) Furthermore, this framework allowed the Committee “to choose from among the vast artistic production of Lorenzo’s time, less well-known and less appreciated works, but no

\(^{10}\) Miller, *Politics in a Museum*, 40–41: “The De Gasperi administration carefully distinguished between repair projects for the city’s cultural monuments, which it lavishly financed, and the exhibits and performances promoted by the commune, which it frequently underfinanced.”


\(^{12}\) Lasansky, *Renaissance Perfected*, 63–73.

\(^{13}\) The Artigianato, established in 1931 but suspended from 1941 to 1946, was held at the Parterre Exhibition Palace. See Tina De Rocchi Storai, “La mostra internazionale dell’artigianato di Firenze,” *Arti e mercature* (September 1972): 3–17. On the role of the craft fair under Fascism, see Lasansky, *Renaissance Perfected*, 80–83.


\(^{15}\) Mario Fabiani, “Preface,” in *Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti*, ed. Licia Collobi Ragghianti (Florence: Studio italiano di storia dell’arte, 1949), 11. Fabiani referred to the “Mostra Medicea” of 1939 in his Preface to the 1949 catalogue, but he omitted Ogetti’s name, presumably to avoid associating Lorenzo with Fascism.
less elevated and important [i.e., *cassoni, deschi, spalliere*].”\(^{16}\) Fabiani says that these “works of art were not just decoration for [Florentines] in the past, but, rather, their display in secular settings gave them wider freedom, so they could take vivid inspiration from the climate […] of humanism.”\(^{17}\) Nevertheless, Fabiani admits that the exhibition is arranged according to “monographic nuclei”, that is around the “greatest artists of the epoch like Filippo Lippi, Pollaiuolo, Verrocchio, Lorenzo di Credi, Botticelli, and Piero di Cosimo.”\(^{18}\) As Fabiani’s contradiction reveals, the Palazzo Strozzi exhibition pursued two divergent strategies; on the one hand, it sought to highlight unfamiliar works including furniture painting by anonymous artists, but it could not abandon the canonical, great masters of the Florentine Quattrocento. The result was a compromise.\(^{19}\)

The official requests for loans for the “Lorenzo” exhibition came from the office of the mayor, with additional support from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. In the loan requests, Fabiani touches on themes that will reappear in the Preface of the exhibition catalogue: “The town of Florence is celebrating this year the quincentenary of the birth of Lorenzo de’ Medici, il Magnifico. The honors accorded by the State to this great historical figure are intended to evoke both Lorenzo as a promoter of the arts and humanities and his age, which was one of the most significant periods of civilization for the heights reached in creative art and historical development.”\(^{20}\) The elevated tone and rhetorical flourish of the opening statement contrast with a poignant, gritty reminder of the present situation in 1949 as Fabiani concludes: “Your contribution will constitute an act of unforgettable solidarity with a town which has suffered greatly from the war and which sees in this celebration a good omen for the fervent resumption of its cultural and artistic life.” If Florentines had felt their world ending in 1944, what better antidote to an apocalypse than a rebirth, a Renaissance? Although the 1949 catalogue did not explicitly refer to Lorenzo the Magnificent’s French motto, “*le temps revient*” [time returns, comes again, or will be restored], the show echoed the theme of restoration.\(^{21}\)

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 12.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 12.


\(^{19}\) Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti writes, “[The public] expected the particular character of historical re-enactment that this Exhibition could not avoid having.” (“Le mostre d’arte antica e moderna della città di Firenze,” *Firenze. Rassegna Mensile del Comune 1944–1951* [May 1951]: 76, translated by Silvia Bottinelli). See also D. J. Gordon, who says, “The exhibition probably fell between two stools. It was neither simply an exhibition of the masterpieces of Florentine art in the second half of the fifteenth century, nor was it based on a serious historical attempt to reconstruct Lorenzo’s relations with the artists of his time” (“Letter from Italy,” *Renaissance News* 3/1 [1950]: 7).

\(^{20}\) Steven Borys shared with the authors a copy of the loan request, dated 28 January 1949, as well as other correspondence related to the show in the curatorial files at the John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota, FL.

\(^{21}\) Paola Ventrone, ed., *Le Tems Revient. ’I Tempo si rimuova. Feste e spettacoli nella Firenze di Lorenzo il Magnifico* (Milan: Silvana, 1992). This idea was also shared by the contemporary artists, including Oscar Gallo, Quinto Martini, Onofrio Martinelli, Ugo Capocchini, Emanuele Cavalli, and Giovanni Colacicchi, who founded the group “Nuovo Umanesimo” in Florence in 1947. Colacicchi was a member of the “Lorenzo” Executive Committee and a friend of Enrico Barfucci.
“Lorenzo il Magnifico e Le Arti” opened one year after “La Casa Italiana nei Secoli” [“The Italian House through the Centuries"], another state-sponsored exhibition mounted in Palazzo Strozzi.22 Most of the members of the Executive Committee in 1949 had also been involved in 1948. Contemporary reviews in Italy, Belgium, and the UK recognize Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti as the curator of both exhibitions, crediting him with the concepts and the installations.23 Each exhibition attracted the national spotlight and enjoyed abundant notice in the press.24 Luigi Einaudi, President of the newly formed Italian Republic, inaugurated the openings of each show. Nearly identical newsreel footage of 1948 and 1949 records crowds cheering the presidential motorcade, Einaudi’s arrival at the Palazzo Strozzi, and the reception of the president by Ragghianti and other members of the Executive Committees.25 A photograph taken during the inauguration of the 1948 show (Fig. 1) features Ragghianti standing at the microphone.

22 Licia Collobi Ragghianti, ed., La casa italiana nei secoli, Mostra delle arti decorative in Italia dal trecento all'ottocento, catalogo itinerario (Florence: Studio italiano di storia dell’arte, 1948).
24 There were brief notices in many Italian newspapers, including La Nova Stampa, Il Giornale d’Italia, La Stampa, La Gazzetta del Popolo, Il Corriere della Sera, and Les Arts Plastiques: Les Carnets du Séminaire des Arts. From correspondence with Ragghianti in August and September of 1949, we learn that Raymond Cogniat intended to see the show and write a review for the Paris journal Beaux-Arts; circumstances prevented him from making the trip (AFR Corrispondenza, 5, 6, 7).
25 The two newsreels are preserved in the Luce Archive: Firenze: mostra della casa italiana nei secoli. Einaudi inaugura la mostra della Casa, (Rome: La Settimana Incom, 2 June 1948), and Visita del Presidente Einaudi a Firenze (Rome: La Settimana Incom, 25 May 1949).
beside the seated dignitaries, including President Einaudi in the center and Mayor Fabiani to his left. Note the banner emblazoned with the Florentine lily as well as the pages in Renaissance dress standing in the background.


In essence, the 1949 show was an outgrowth of “La Casa Italiana” that had featured a fifteenth-century “Florentine Room” shown as Gallery 5 on the Palazzo Strozzi ground plan illustrated in the exhibition catalogue (Fig. 2). Each gallery in the 1948 show displayed objects and artworks representing domestic interiors from various cities and regions of Italy. It was a striking choice to represent Florence with furniture, painted cassoni and spalliere, by unknown or minor artists. Viewers of the “Florentine Room” might have expected to see private devotional Madonnas by Lorenzo Ghiberti or patrician portraits by Paolo Uccello. Instead, the installation of the Florentine Room included three benches (two from the Bargello and one from Stefano Bardini), two chairs (Museo Horne), the Triumphs now attributed to Giovanni di Ser Giovanni Guidi, Lo Scheggia (at that time at Museo Horne), another set of Triumphs by Jacopo del Sellaio (Museo Bandini, Fiesole), and the so-called Adimari-Ricasoli “cassone” [spalliera] now given to Lo Scheggia (Accademia, Florence), along with Giuliano da Sangallo’s wooden model of the Palazzo Strozzi.\footnote{Another cassone depicting scenes from the life of Saint Andrew of Scotland was displayed in the Mystic’s Cell (Gallery 3) of “The Italian House through the Centuries.”} The cassoni and spalliere from Gallery 5, with their scenes of
civic pageantry and triumphal processions, were all to appear again in the installation of 1949, although dispersed among different rooms.


Installation photos of the “Lorenzo” show a range of the display strategies being employed in postwar Italian museums. Historicizing installations were being challenged in the 1940s by austerely geometricized modern interiors. The galleries of the 1948 “La Casa Italiana” at Palazzo Strozzi had alternated spare, simplified installations with judicious historical recreations and some daring novelties. For example, Gallery 10, with its planar, rectilinear supports, featured a framed cassone frontal attributed to Francesco di Giorgio on a low shelf at floor level leaning against the wall to suggest the original position and low viewpoint for painted furniture. The installation of Gallery 8, featuring a reconstruction of Andrea del Castagno’s uomini famosi series from Legnaia (Fig. 3), was carried over for the 1949 show but renumbered as Gallery 5;

---

27 As singled out by Renzo Chiarelli, “Le mostre laurenziane di Firenze,” Emporium 111 (1950): 15. Some members of the 1949 Executive Committee, like Giovanni Poggi, Carlo Gamba, and Count Alessandro Contini Bonacossi were proponents of “period rooms,” but others were concerned to avoid fakes, reconstructions, and adaptations. As Davies noted of the 1948 show, “Dr. Ragghianti […] remarks that it was his intention to avoid a collection with the feel of bric-à-brac” (“La casa italiana,” 200). See also Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti, “Preface,” in La casa italiana, ed. Collobi Ragghianti, 19–25; Antonella Huber, Il museo italiano. La trasformazione di spazi storici in spazi espositivi: attualità dell’esperienza museografica degli anni ’50 (Milan: Lybra immagine, 1997); and Adriana Turpin, “Objectifying the Domestic Interior: Domestic Furnishings and the Interpretation of the Italian Renaissance Interior,” in The Early Modern Italian Domestic Interior, 1400–1700: Objects, Spaces, Domesticities, ed. Erin J. Campbell, Stephanie R. Miller, and Elizabeth Carroll Consavari (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2013), 207–25.

note the simple cubic pedestals supporting portrait busts of members of the Medici family and other contemporaries.

A photo of Gallery 4, from the 1949 “Lorenzo,” shows that the cassone panels and deschi were stacked on stepped platforms with built-in light boxes concealing neon bulbs (Fig. 4).

![Fig. 4. Gallery 4, “Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti,” Palazzo Strozzi, Florence, 1949. Photo: Alinari/Art Resource, NY.](image)

According to Sienese art historian and conservator Cesare Brandi, these neon lights created a deadening effect.\(^{29}\) Brandi also commented that in contrast to 1948, the Palazzo Strozzi galleries of 1949 featured less furniture and more velvet draping.\(^{30}\) Indeed, an installation photo (Fig. 5) shows Gallery 9 with entirely draped walls, creating an elegant, luxurious effect while at the same time filling up the cavernous space of the gallery. Publicity for “Lorenzo” took a variety of forms beyond the presidential inauguration and the local press. The public was invited to revive Laurentian Florence by taking part in festive spectacles. A Renaissance cavalcade opened the city’s quincentenary programming on April 24 and a costume ball, or “Ballo Mediceo,” was held at Palazzo Strozzi on 25 June 1949 (Fig. 6).

---

\(^{29}\) Cesare Brandi, “Le mostre di Lorenzo il Magnifico,” \textit{L’Immagine} 12 (March–April 1949), 185–86: “neon lights, as they have now come into use, are a bit deadening.” In contrast, Renzo Chiarelli, finds the show “very diligently thought-out in terms of lighting” (“L’arte e la cultura medicee nelle mostre di Firenze,” \textit{Vernice} 1 [July–December 1949]: 5–6, translated by Silvia Bottinelli). The lighting system was designed by Guido Morozzi: see Serramondi, \textit{La mostra "Lorenzo il Magnifico e Le Arti,"} 61.

\(^{30}\) Brandi, “Le mostre,” 185.
According to the invitation, those who arrived in fancy dress had a chance to win four grand prizes: 1) for the best portrayal of a historic person, 2) for the best fifteenth-century costume, 3) for the best hairstyle and clothing, and 4) for the best group in historic attire. The ten smaller prizes to be awarded included evening wear for men and women, perfume, jewelry, nylon stockings, and a big panettone. Similarly, the programming for the 1948 “La Casa Italiana” had
included a fashion show at Palazzo Strozzi on 12 June, 1948 titled, “La donna italiana attraverso i secoli” [“The Italian Woman through the Centuries”]. Beautifully dressed high-fashion models wore garments representing different historical eras; they posed in front of the antique furniture on display in the exhibition space (Fig. 7). Those who attended the fashion show were invited to see the Renaissance past come back to life in the present day.

Fig. 7. “La Donna italiana attraverso i secoli,” Palazzo Strozzi, Florence, 1948. Photo: © Copyright Archivio Foto Locchi Databank, Florence.

In addition to publicity events advertising the 1949 show, Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti made a documentary film about the Lorenzo exhibition. The film, *Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti*, was commissioned by the AAT and produced by the Italian Center for Art History (SISA); it won first prize in the cultural films section at the Venice International Film Festival of 1949.³¹ Ragghianti explained, “it is an attempt to reconstruct some of the events in Lorenzo’s life…[and] as an individual, using only composition, editing, and movement of plastic images carefully chosen for their meaning and for their synthetic and evocative power. His life and the history of his day are summarized by means of rapid dramatic summaries composed through images taken from works of art by his contemporaries.”³² Ragghianti’s documentary could be screened well

---


³² According to the Fondazione Ragghianti in Lucca, there is no extant copy of this film. See Antonio Costa, ed., *Carlo L. Ragghianti. I Critofilm d’Arte* (Udine: Campanotto, 1995), 157–58; Marco Scotini, *Carlo Ludovico*
beyond the duration of the temporary show in Palazzo Strozzi; like the exhibition catalogue, it preserved the didactic message but in a modern, time-based medium, accessible to a wide general public.

Enrico Barfucci, Secretary General of “Lorenzo,” compared attendance figures for the two Palazzo Strozzi exhibitions of 1948 and 1949. In the first two months of the “Lorenzo” show, there had already been over 25,000 visitors, a slight increase over figures reported for the previous year. More significantly for the local economy and public relations, the number of foreign visitors increased from one third to one half of the overall ticket sales. The total attendance figure for “Lorenzo,” covering the period from May to October, exceeded 100,000, including a large number of foreigners; 14,000 exhibition catalogues were sold. Whereas Ragghianti reported that the budget for the “La Casa Italiana” was 10 million Lit, he described the Lorenzo show as having only “meager means”—in 1948, there were 400 objects on display; in 1949, only 196. Specifics about the costs involved in the 1949 “Lorenzo” show can be gleaned from documents regarding the shipping of five cassone panels from three different museums. The Triumph of Scipio, Battle of Romans and Gauls, and Alfonso I in Naples from the John and Mable Ringling Museum in Sarasota, Florida, were valued at $7,500 each. The insurance premium to be paid for their transatlantic journey to Italy was a mere $105.74. The Judgment of Paris from the Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, MA and the Cupid and Psyche from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, were valued at higher rates. If we assume an average of $10,000 per domestic painting in the 1949 show, the total for that portion of the exhibition would be roughly $500,000. But this must have amounted to a fraction of the total value of the works by named artists and for masterpieces, such as Sandro Botticelli’s Pallas and the Centaur (Gallery 8). Featuring so many cassoni in the 1949 “Lorenzo” show made it economical as well as celebratory.

How did visitors respond to the “Lorenzo” exhibition? Sounding a critical note, Brandi argued that “although the effort of the organizers to obtain works from abroad was rewarded by noteworthy contributions, there were still only two or three works that were truly worth making an effort to see.” In contrast, a reviewer in Emporium proclaimed, “For the first time, art lovers will be able to see first-hand works that were once in Florence but that have been separated for centuries by historical events.” Another Emporium review argued that “the galleries dedicated to wedding chests of the fifteenth century […] suggest with their refined fables and various allegories, the golden atmosphere of chivalry and humanism of the Medicean age.” Reviewers frequently linked the Renaissance past and the postwar present through the contrast of liberty and despotism. In a congratulatory telegram to Ragghianti, President Einaudi commented that

---

**Ragghianti and the Cinematic Nature of Vision** (Lucca: Charta, 2000); and Valentina La Savia, *I Critoﬁlm di Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti. Tutte le sceneggiature* (Lucca: Fondazione Ragghianti, 2006). Ragghianti wrote on 15 November 1948 to the United States Information Service in Florence to alert them of the forthcoming Lorenzo film (AFR Corrispondenza, 58). He must have been hoping for screenings or distribution in the US market.

### Notes
33 Barfucci to the Camera di Commercio, Florence, 26 July 1949 (AFR Pro Memoria, Relazioni con enti vari fiorentini): “Last year the ‘Exhibition of The Italian House Through the Centuries’ had more than 70,000 visitors in six months, more than two thirds of which were foreigners.” Translated by Silvia Bottinelli.
35 Ibid., 76–77. In the exchange rate of 1949, 625 Lit equaled $1.
36 Document dated 19 April 1949 from the curatorial files at the John and Mable Ringling Museum, Sarasota, FL.
37 Brandi “Le mostre,” 185, does not single out the domestic paintings for praise; he is much more impressed by Domenico Ghirlandaio’s portrait of Giovanna Tornabuoni in Gallery 9.
39 Chiarelli, “Le mostre,” 22. On the other hand, Chiarelli finds Jacopo del Sellaio’s allegories “tedious, at times.”
through the Lorenzo show, Florence “did more than just evoke the past, the city exalted the fullness of life that is expressed in all times through its great and generous soul and that still today longs for and tenaciously works for reconstruction of the patria.” Oxford historian Cecilia Ady confirmed Einaudi’s image of Laurentian Florence as a mirror of the present, arguing that Florentine citizens fought despotism, internal or external, and kept alive the spirit of liberty. Lorenzo de’ Medici “maintained contact with the rulers of Italy and Europe and used his influence to dissuade them from aggression [...] the honour accorded to him by his fellow citizens of 1949, is a tribute to a true servitor patriae.” In a more ambivalent vein, Brandi observes “the fact that [Lorenzo] was a tyrant, even if the most enlightened of tyrants [...] creates embarrassment in these current celebrations [i.e. the national quincentenary programming including the ‘Lorenzo the Magnificent and the Arts’ show].” Brandi went on to say that the “civilization of the Renaissance seems a bitter corollary to the present condition of Florence, the most desolate [...] of the cities wounded by the war. Finding oneself by chance on those bridges, those ruins covered with weeds, those scarred banks of the Arno, creates a melancholy without equal. All the more reason to line up for the museums and the shows.”

Such polarized responses to “Lorenzo” suggest that even though the Executive Committee downplayed Lorenzo’s princely habits, such as art collecting or patronage, they were not entirely successful in deflecting Lorenzo’s reputation as a tyrant. The discomfort Brandi noted probably accounts for the fact that no independent portrait of Lorenzo de’ Medici was included in the quincentenary show even though the exhibition catalogue had promised an “unusual wealth” of portraits of the Magnifico. Lorenzo de’ Medici appears only in disguise as a bystander in Botticelli’s Adoration (Gallery 9), among other presumed likenesses of Medici family members. If the Magnifico was absent, independent portraits of other Medici or extended kin were displayed, including paintings and sculptures of Contessina de’ Bardi, Piero de’ Medici, Giovanni de’ Medici, Giuliano de’ Medici, and Giovanna Tornabuoni. Such portraits emphasized the familial, communal, and corporate nature of Renaissance Florence. One reviewer suggested that, even without his likeness, the show portrayed Lorenzo since the “portraits that surround the

---

40 Original telegram dated 25 May 1949 (AFR, Inaugurazione mostra).
41 Ady, “Review,” 66. She developed these themes at length in Cecilia Ady, Lorenzo de’ Medici and Renaissance Italy (London: English Universities Press, 1955). Compare Barfucci, Lorenzo il Magnifico, 17: “For us, Lorenzo is not the destroyer of liberty but rather the most refined inheritor of Cosimo”; or, similarly, Umerto Dorini, Lorenzo il Magnifico (Florence: Vallecchi, 1949), 9–10: “Fortunate are the cities in which the tyrant—rather than being [...] arrogant, overbearing, egocentric, cruel and, sometimes, even inept and cowardly—is instead a Lorenzo de’ Medici [...] unity was a matter of life and death, like today for Europe, which worryingly reflects the painful conditions in which Italy struggled at that time.”
42 Brandi, “Le mostre,” 185. In a more apologetic vein, Rodolico writes “if there is good reason to reduce the value of Lorenzo’s political role, it does not overshadow his reputation for animating an intellectual movement [i.e. Humanism]” (“Nel quinto centenario,” 110).
43 Brandi, Le mostre,” 185. See also Miller, Politics in a Museum, 41.
44 For a revisionist interpretation of Lorenzo’s patronage, see E. H. Gombrich, “The Early Medici as Patrons of Art: A Survey of Primary Sources,” Italian Renaissance Studies, ed. E. F. Jacob (London: Faber and Faber, 1960), 279–311. Returning to the question of Lorenzo’s impact, Kent, Lorenzo de’ Medici, 4, recalls “the superman described in the Renaissance rhetoric, against which Gombrich and others understandably reacted forty years ago.”
45 According to Fabiani, the show “will include an unusually large number of portraits of the Magnifico” (“Preface,” 11, translation by Silvia Bottinelli). For the persistent problem of portraying Lorenzo, see Katherine Gaja, “Illustrating Lorenzo the Magnificent: From William Roscoe’s The Life of Lorenzo de’ Medici called the Magnificent (1795) to George Frederic Watts’ Fresco at Careggi (1845),” in Victorian and Edwardian Responses to the Italian Renaissance, ed. John E. Law and Lene Østermark-Johansen (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005), 121–44.
figure of Lorenzo il Magnifico constitute a living frame of his contemporaries.”46 British literary historian D. J. Gordon, on the other hand, complained, “The most general criticism […] is that it was difficult to see where in fact Lorenzo himself came in. This is signally apparent in the catalogue.”47

**Cassoni Masters**

D. J. Gordon, like other visitors to “Lorenzo,” may well have been surprised to find that three of the first four galleries in the Palazzo Strozzi were dominated by cassoni and deschi while the final rooms featured many spalliere. Gordon noted that “there were many beautiful objects—this indeed, could hardly be avoided—and many little-known ones [ie. cassoni, deschi, spalliere].”48 In contrast, Renzo Chiarelli praised the “truly exceptional group of wedding chest frontals” that “occupy four entire galleries.”49 An anonymous preview of the show in *Emporium* also highlighted loans of domestic items both from the United States and within Europe: “A most important contribution will come from American museums and collections particularly rich in works of Renaissance art […] also contributing paintings and painted cassoni are the Czartoryski Museum of Cracow, the Landolthaus of Zurich, the National Gallery of Dublin, the National Gallery of Ottawa.”50 In fact, loans within Italy and from Florentine public institutions dominated, including the Accademia, Bargello, Palazzo Pitti and the Uffizi, despite claims to the contrary by the organizers and in the press.51 The loans were perhaps meant to heal wartime enmities. Of the domestic paintings in the 1949 show, many loans came from Florentine house museums, including the Casa Buonarroti, Museo Bardini, Museo Horne, the Museo Stibbert, and the Museo Bandini in Fiesole. And, with an installation of Renaissance domestic painting and sculpture for the ‘Lorenzo the Magnificent and the Arts’ show, the Palazzo Strozzi temporarily became a Florentine house museum like Alessandro Contini Bonacossi’s Villa Vittoria, or Bernard Berenson’s Villa I Tatti.52

Omissions, substitutions, and errors in the exhibition catalogue reveal that the “Lorenzo” show was both premeditated and provisional.53 The catalogue compiled by Licia Collobi Ragghianti was printed in five editions that reflect late changes made in the choice and installation of works on view at Palazzo Strozzi.54 Of the sixteen black and white plates
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46 “Firenze. Mostra d’arte antica,” 175.
47 Gordon, “Letter,” 7. Longi argues that the Palazzo Strozzi quincentenary show “did not make a contribution to the understanding of Lorenzo and his times” (“Celebrazioni,” 231).
49 Chiarelli, “Le arte e la cultura,” 5.
51 Ragghianti, “Le mostre d’arte antica,” 76: “In order to understand the exceptional character of this show, one has to observe that it was organized without recourse, other than the minimum, to the galleries of Florence.” See also Michela Passini, “Ragghianti e le mostre. Strategie per l’arte italiana nel sistema internazionale delle esposizioni,” *Predella, rivista semestrale diarti visive* 28 (2011) <http://www.predella.it/archivio/index031d> (last accessed December 12, 2017).
53 Ragghianti to A. Everett Austin, Director of the John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, 7 April 1949: “Please accept our apologies for such a late answer to your letter of March 2 […] particular circumstances in the organization prevented us from writing you at an earlier date […] send us at your earliest convenience the three panels of [sic] the Anghiari Master.”
54 Although Collobi Ragghianti was not given official credit for curating the 1949 show, in the words of Gigetta Dalli Regoli, Licia was a “valuable and hardworking contributor” with the requisite language skills (personal
following the text, seven represent details from the domestic paintings. Although the first edition of the catalogue illustrated a desco attributed to Benozzo Gozzoli, Solomon and Sheba (Museum of Fine Arts, Houston), there is no corresponding entry in the second edition of the catalogue, and it was presumably cut from the show after the first print run. The Sabine Women panels (Harewood Collection, Leeds) listed in the entries for Gallery 4 were late arrivals to the Palazzo Strozzi. The Saladìn and Torello cassone panel from the Czartoryski Museum was too fragile to travel; it was replaced by a panel with the same subject from Museo Stibbert. Another cassone panel from the Museo Stibbert, attributed to the Dido Master and depicting the story of Ulysses, was also originally intended for Gallery 4; the curatorial rationale for cutting it is not known.

In at least three places, the exhibition catalogue explicitly notes problems with loans. Lack of funding seems the most likely explanation for these changes, but institutional obstacles also played a part. In the Preface to the catalogue, Mayor Fabiani recalled “the difficulties encountered in the organization of this show,” explaining that Florentine masterpieces are integral to many public collections and often subject to strict regulations regarding loan shows. Botticelli’s so-called Derelitta (Palazzo Pallavicini Rospigliosi, Rome), associated with the Filippino Lippi Esther cycle in Gallery 11, was “unfortunately missing from this show.” Referring to Piero di Cosimo’s Vulcan series in Gallery 12, the editors “are very unhappy not to have been able to exhibit two panels (National Gallery, Ottawa and Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford).” A pair of spalliera panels illustrating the story of Perseus and Andromeda, now given to the Serumido Master, filled the gap in Gallery 12; they do not appear in the first edition of the exhibition catalogue.

Even if some loans were missing or delayed, “Lorenzo” made a contribution to scholarship by bringing many unknown or unpublished works to the Palazzo Strozzi. Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti emphasized that the show afforded a “noteworthy experience […] to be able to see a large number of capolavori emigrati side-by-side with masterpieces from Florentine galleries and palaces.” In fact, many of the US loans were unknown “immigrants” who appeared in the 1949 show due to the professional contacts between scholars, dealers, and collectors. Five cassone paintings borrowed from Massachusetts suggest the role of Berenson. For instance, the...

55 Secretary General Barfucci to the Giuntina Press, 4 July 1949, complains about errors and the poor quality of the black and white reproductions in the first printing of the catalogue. (AFR Tipografie 1 and 2).
56 See Alessandra Ugucioni, Salomone e la regina di Saba. La pittura di cassone a Ferrara. Presenze nei musei americani (Ferrara: G. Corbo, 1988), 25–54, and her catalogue entry in Andrea Beyer, ed., Art and Love, 159–61: “The Meeting of Solomon and the Queen of Sheba,” from the workshop of Francesco del Cossa, The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston, The Edith A. and Percy S. Straus Collection. The desco was sold in 1941 to Percy Straus; in 1944 it was donated to the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. Apparently the desco was rejected due to shifting critical opinions; Berenson had ascribed the painting to a Florentine painter c.1450, but in 1945–46, Richard Offner reprised the attribution to a Ferrarese artist.
57 Roberto Carità, “In margine alla mostra Lorenzo il Magnifico e le arti,” Bolletino d’Arte 33 (1949): 270–73, says that the Sabine Women panels had not yet arrived.
58 Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti, 77.
59 Ibid., 79.
60 Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti, definitive edition of 1949, 79.
Ringling pictures (Gallery 3), which Licia Collobi Ragghianti calls “delightful narrative paintings [that] were unknown to the critics up to now,” had been sold through Berenson’s close associate Joseph Duveen in 1928. The Hercules panel from the collection of Edward Fowles of New York (Gallery 4) again points to Duveen, since Fowles bought the art dealer’s firm in 1939, becoming its president in 1945. Another unpublished panel, the Siege of Troy (Gallery 4), listed as from a private collection in New York, had been sold through the Florentine shop of Luigi Bellini twice, in 1946 and again in 1948. Given that he was a member of the Executive Committee for “Lorenzo,” Bellini was the likely contact between the organizers of the show and the owner of the Siege of Troy. The panel appears only in the definitive edition of the exhibition catalogue, and so we must assume that it was a late addition to the show. Another previously unpublished work on display in Gallery 4 was a desco da parto illustrating Susannah and the Elders from the Serristori collection in Florence.

Ady declared that “the decorated cassoni […] formed a feature of the exhibition […] few cassoni have survived intact but a large number of sides have been preserved, some dating from early in the fifteenth century, and painted by anonymous “Maestri di Cassoni” of high artistic talent.” Galleries 1 and 4 were actually labeled “Maestri di Cassoni” in the exhibition catalogue in order to parallel the designations of the majority of the galleries in the Palazzo Strozzi show as containing works belonging to a singular artist. Galleries 1, 3, and 4 confronted the visitor with a bewildering array of attributions, ranging from Rossello di Jacopo Franchi, the Cassone Master, Master of the Adimari Cassone, Paris Master, and the Dido Master, to “Anonymous mid fifteenth-century painter.” By the time of the “Lorenzo” show, only one Florentine cassone painter had ever been securely identified. Wolfgang Stechow had recently linked a cassone panel in Oberlin, Ohio to a commission in the so-called bottega book of Apollonio di Giovanni (c.1415–65) and Marco del Buono (1402–89). But this significant breakthrough of 1944 had apparently not yet made its way to Stechow’s Florentine colleagues in time for the Lorenzo show.

In the “Lorenzo” exhibition catalogue, Collobi Ragghianti provides the expected technical information about the dimensions of pictures, their provenance, and debates about attribution. She draws on Raymond Van Marle, Adolfo Venturi, Paul Schubring, Carlo Gamba, and Bernard Berenson, among many other scholars including Ludovico Ragghianti. The reader encounters relatively little formal analysis; the single comment she makes about the style of cassone panels is refreshingly upbeat and positive. Collobi Ragghianti writes of the Cassone Master, “These panels are among the most representative […] paintings around the middle of the fifteenth century, for their color and lively decorative accents. The painter makes use of the freshest trends

63 Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti, 30.
64 Triumph of Marriage, 144–50.
67 Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti, 18, 28, 31, 36.
69 Longi notes, “however, it needed a more detailed catalogue” (“Celebrazioni,” 231).
of contemporary Florentine painting, for example Paolo Uccello, Domenico Veneziano, Pesellino (without giving up Gothic decoration and elegance), and arrives at pleasing, witty depictions enlivened by touches of gold. Similar enthusiasm for the domestic paintings came from the conservator, Carità: “In the galleries dedicated to cassoni, ancient fables and strange allegories confront the stunned beholder. It is a genre in which golden splendor, rich costumes, and compelling themes at times supersede considerations of artistic quality. But, seeing the numerous works exhibited in the show, one has the immediate impression that at Palazzo Strozzi the guests were not invited unless they were first class, starting with the ‘Maestro delle Nozze Adimari.’” Chiarelli agreed, “of the cassoni installed among many deschi da parto, the so-called ‘Nozze Adimari’ cassone took the lion’s share of attention, and not just for its size.”

Reviewers also appreciated the high standards maintained by the curators of the “Lorenzo” show. Their selectivity and care weeded out questionable examples of cassoni, deschi, and spalliere from local house museums, antiques markets, and dealers’ shops. The entire chest from the Serristori collection in Gallery 3, attributed to a Florentine Painter c.1450 and featuring the story of Griselda on its front panel, was accurately described in the exhibition catalogue as “reconstructed in the form of contemporary chests. Painting restored in the nineteenth century.” After dutifully recording Schubring’s opinion regarding the attribution of the Griselda chest, Collobi Ragghianti concludes, “in its present state it is not really possible to judge.” The Ulysses panel from Museo Stibbert listed in the first edition of the catalogue was perhaps dropped from the show due to concerns about its quality or authenticity. Another Ulysses panel from Liverpool was installed in Gallery 4; it was attributed to Jacopo del Sellaio in the first edition of the exhibition catalogue but subsequently to an anonymous Florentine painter c.1450.

Despite his overall praise for the domestic paintings exhibited in Palazzo Strozzi, Carità takes issue with the number of works attributed to the Cassone Master; he argues instead for a division of the oeuvre into two hands. Yet, time has borne out the Ragghianti’s definition of this much-discussed artistic personality. Twenty of the panels originally displayed in Gallery 3 are now usually attributed to a single artist, Giovanni di Ser Giovanni Guidi, Lo Scheggia (1406–86), brother of the celebrated Masaccio. Extensive archival research on Florentine artists, especially related to Masaccio and his family, was carried out by Ugo Procacci in the 1930’s. Procacci, a member of the Executive Committee of the 1949 show, later published an article on workshops in the Corso degli Adimari that is still fundamental to understanding the production
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70 Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti, 21.
71 Carità, “In margine,” 270–73.
72 Chiarelli, “L’arte e la cultura,” 5.
74 Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti, 32. The chest was described by Sotheby’s as being in the “Renaissance style”; see the sale of the Serristori Collection in Florence, 6 November 2007, lot 289.
75 Lorenzo il Magnifico e le Arti, first edition, 1949, 35.
of domestic painting in the fifteenth century. Procacci consulted documents relating to marriage, birth, rents, and taxes, and he was able to demonstrate the close physical proximity of artists’ shops, their frequent joint partnerships, and ties by marriage. If the installation of so many domestic pictures in “Lorenzo” cannot be credited directly to Procacci’s influence, the show nevertheless manifested this aspect of his scholarly contributions to Renaissance art history.

The Dopoguerra and Domesticity

Why did “Lorenzo il Magnifico e Le Arti” include such an extraordinary number of domestic paintings, since, as some reviewers noted, Lorenzo’s patronage did not focus on this genre? The choice can be partly explained by recalling the polarizing effect of Lorenzo de’ Medici’s princely rule in Republican Florence. In the aftermath of Mussolini’s dictatorship, a celebration of Lorenzo’s public role might have seemed distasteful to the Italian public. As we have seen, contemporary reviews of the exhibition did not shy away from the political context or from drawing parallels between the past and the present. In 1949, such underlying concerns may have inspired the curators to focus on the private life of fifteenth-century Florentine patricians. However, there are additional contributing factors that led to the exceptional concentration on cassoni, deschi da parto, and spalliere.

The curators of “Lorenzo,” having just mounted “La Casa Italiana” the previous year, were immersed in a debate on domesticity that was not only scholarly but also a lived reality. In Italy, a country physically ruined by World War II, there was an urgent need to rebuild domestic as well as public spaces; this became a crucial topic of discussion at the national level. Architects, designers, art historians, but also businessmen, politicians, workers, and housewives were concerned with the house—its reconstruction, correct maintenance, function, and social implications. The two exhibitions at the Palazzo Strozzi in the late 1940s can be seen as participating in such public discourse about domestic space. The choice of objects and strategies of display at Palazzo Strozzi correspond to the sentiments expressed in a review by Paolo D’Ancona: “Everyone can learn something about furniture, including our incomparable craftsmen who look back to our glorious tradition for inspiration, not in order to imitate it, but rather, to offer new interpretations that respond to the taste and needs of the present.” Just such a mix of modern and traditional forms underlay the installation designs of the 1948 and 1949 exhibitions in the Palazzo Strozzi.

“Beginning in the early years of the 20th century, the philosophical and aesthetic legacy of the Renaissance [was] reinterpreted, rejected, and regenerated by reformist and conservative

78 For Procacci’s numerous publications, see the bibliography in Bellosi and Haines, Lo Scheggia, 106. See also Ugo Procacci, Mostra di opere d’arte trasportate a Firenze durante la guerra (Florence: Giuntina, 1947); Millard Meiss, “Ugo Procacci: Forty Years in the Florentine Soprintendenza,” Burlington Magazine 115 (January 1973): 41–42. For an analysis of documents related to the “Lorenzo” show that are kept in the Archivio Procacci, see Serramondi, La mostra “Lorenzo il Magnifico...,” 113-119.
79 Margaret Haines, personal communication with the authors, June 2009.
81 D’Ancona, “La mostra,” 800. The 1950 exhibition, “Italy at Work: Her Renaissance in Design Today,” resulted from the collaboration of the Art Institute of Chicago and Handicraft Development Incorporated, or CADMA. Ragghianti was also involved in CADMA, whose goal was fostering import-export relations between Italy and the United States.
factions in industrial and postindustrial Italian design.”

Architects like Gio’ Ponti, Carlo Scarpa, Ignazio Gardella, Aldo Rossi, Vittorio Gregotti, and the group BBPR, reinterpreted traditional forms in industrial design and architecture. Even if their goals and outcomes differed, such appropriations of historical forms rendered modern architecture and design accessible for the Italian public:

Italian designers, faithful to a cultural continuity that recognizes its roots in the distant history of the Classical world or the Renaissance, did not limit themselves to seeking the correct correspondence to a specific function in everyday objects: they expressed the ambition for the objects to speak of something else […] This feeling was not the aspiration of a dreamer isolated from the world, but the conviction shared by a whole generation of intellectuals, persuaded that beauty was something to which everyone had the right.

Post-war designers were not satisfied with selling consumer goods; their mission was to spread good taste. Such designers understood formal beauty as socially elevating. They created tasteful items and gracious spaces to improve the consumers’ quality of life, and provided more widespread access to beautiful objects, which had historically been a privilege of the upper classes. In the immediate post-WWII period, Christian Democrats and left-wing architects alike looked to the artisanal production of the past as an aesthetic model for the present. At the same time, industrial manufacturing kept production costs low and made such models more affordable.

The post-war interest in domestic environments is reflected by “La Sedia Italiana nei Secoli” (“The Italian Chair through the Centuries”), an exhibition curated by Licia Collobi Ragghianti with the contribution of Franco Albini, Ignazio Gardella, and Bruno Munari. Installed at the Triennale of Milan in 1951, the “La Sedia Italiana” focused on the aesthetic, technical, and historical significance of the chair. The show took place between the revival of the Florence Craft Fair in 1947 and the establishment of the biennial Antiques Fair held in Palazzo Strozzi beginning in 1959. The exhibition was intended to inspire small and medium sized workshops, while it critiqued the big furniture companies that had supported the war industry during the Fascist period.
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83 BBPR was founded in 1932 by Gian Luigi Banfi (1910–45), Ludovico Barbiano di Belgioioso (1909–2004), Enrico Peressutti (1908–76), and Ernesto Nathan Rogers (1909–69). Rogers articulated the theoretical ideas of the group in his writings for the periodicals Domus and Casabella.
85 In his first editorial for Domus, the newly appointed director, Ernesto Nathan Rogers, argues that the architect has a responsibility to form public taste; see Ernesto Nathan Rogers, “La casa dell’uomo,” Domus 295 (January 1946): 2–3. See also Piero Lucia, Intellettuali Italiani del secondo dopoguerra. Impegno, crisi, speranza (Naples: Guida, 2003).
86 Vittorio Fagone and François Burkhardt, eds., La sedia italiana nei secoli. Nona triennale di Milano, catalogo della Mostra: numero monografico dedicato al catalogo della mostra curata nel 1951 da Licia Ragghianti Collobi (Lucca: Fondazione Ragghianti, 2005). In a 1951 letter to Paolo Torchi, Ludovico Ragghianti explains that “Following the success of the memorable exhibition, ‘The Italian House Through the Centuries,’ organized at Palazzo Strozzi in 1948, the institution of the Triennale in Milan commissioned from SISA an exhibition of ‘The Italian Chair Through the Centuries’ (Italian Center of Art History) in Florence” (AFR Corrispondenza, 61).
During this same period, the early 1950s, Colubi Ragghianti, together with husband Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti, often wrote about the applied arts on the pages of the widely distributed magazine seleARTE. Magazines like Domus and Casabella also educated a wide public on home design and modern dwellings. In addition, popular women’s magazines presented “lifestyle models that could be appropriated through consumption.” In fact, women became a major target of furniture design, as their role was increasingly defined by the domestic interior.

Within Italy, World War II and the Resistance had created enormous public disorder, undermining normative gender roles. While men were at the war front or alla macchia (that is, hiding in remote places from which they could participate in antifascist operations), women took on jobs that had been traditionally assigned to men. Some women also took direct part in the battles of the civil war starting in 1943. Unfortunately, women’s active participation in the public sphere did not last long. Post-war society evolved as a new private order, constructed around the peace of the family and the tidiness of the home. There was continuity with aspects of the pre-war 1930s family model, because many women played the role of wife and mother. However, collaboration among women decreased as access to modern products and later appliances increased, causing further isolation of women within the boundaries of their own apartments.

In this private realm, wives and mothers were judged by the standards set forth in housekeeping manuals. In general, women focused on taking care of the family as their main economic responsibility: “the emphasis on cleaning and starching could be explained through middle-class fears of falling into the ranks of proletariat.” Cleanliness erased the signs of working class labor from everyday outfits.

Housekeeping manuals, advertisements of house cleaning and food products, as well as publicly funded propaganda films and commercials sponsored by the Christian Democrats showed urban women working full-time in the service of their families and in the maintenance of their houses. The women in these films, images, and texts represented social models for women of all classes, who consequentially aspired to the role of housewife.

The popularizing intent of designers and intellectuals (who were mostly men) did not go as far as to suggest a shift in gender relations. Some designers and intellectuals aimed at improving the residents’ quality of life through design, yet their intentions remained paternalistic and did not necessarily consider the social needs of their female public outside of the domestic walls.
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89 On the merging of high and low culture in furniture design, see Penny Sparke, An Introduction to Design and Culture (London: Routledge, 2004), 19.
91 Boneschi, Santa Pazienza, 18–19. For an introduction to this large topic, see also Victoria de Grazia, How Fascism Ruled Women (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), and Jane Slaughter, Women and the Italian Resistance, 1943–1945 (Denver: Arden Press, 1997).
fact, despite the fact that Italian women gained the right to vote in elections in 1945, much remained to be done to foster their full integration in public life. In the aftermath of World War II, the political stances of all the major parties excluded women from the public sphere. For example, Prime Minister Alcide De Gasperi and the Christian Democrats promoted the family as the basic cell of Italian society. As good Catholics, women were encouraged to sacrifice their own interests in order to take care of their loved ones and to safeguard family property. The leftists agreed with these ideas about the role of women in the home. Florentine mayor Fabiani affirmed the importance of the domestic unit: “If we Communists were in power in Italy today, we would not destroy private property. Private property has its function to fulfill in Italy for years and years to come.” Finally, Socialist politician Gaetano Pieraccini—the first post-Fascist mayor of Florence, Vice-Premier in 1948, and promoter of the Palazzo Strozzi exhibitions of 1948 and 1949—also pushed for the return of women to the private sphere. In 1953 he proposed “a State ordinance for the removal of wives from extra-domestic labor.”

At the same time that Pieraccini was calling for the strict separation of gender roles and the reformation of contemporary private life, he also contributed to the strategic planning of Florentine house museums. Wishing to create lasting examples of Italian domesticity, Pieraccini thought of turning the temporary exhibitions at the Palazzo Strozzi of 1948 and 1949 into a permanent, public installation. Pieraccini, in fact, played a crucial role in the establishment of the public museum now known as “The Museum of the Old Florentine House.” The Tuscan daily paper Il Nuovo Corriere announced, in March 1949: “Thanks to Senator Gaetano Pieraccini’s initiative, a Committee for the Florentine House through the Centuries, located in the Palazzo Strozzi, has recently been convened.” Pieraccini was named President of the Committee, and he invited scholars and local authorities, who represented both academic and commercial interests, to participate. The potential benefit to tourism was also a guiding concern for the project. Many of the people previously involved in the recent shows at the Palazzo Strozzi joined the new Committee. Their goal was to create an itinerary of historic homes, historically furnished, throughout the city of Florence. In the Committee’s first meeting, potential locations and multiple sites were discussed. Ludovico Ragghianti proposed the most accessible buildings, focusing on Palazzo Davanzati, the property of Count Contini Bonacossi, that was available via the Italian State’s right of preemption (diritto di prelazione). Following Ragghianti’s recommendations, the State acquired Palazzo Davanzati in 1951.

95 For an overview of the history of women’s integration in post-WWII Italy, see Lucia Re, “The Mark on the Wall: Marisa Merz and a History of Women in Postwar Italy,” in Marisa Merz: The Sky is a Great Place, ed. Connie Butler (Munich: Prestel, 2017), 37–75.
100 The sites under consideration included a neglected fourteenth-century house in Via dello Sprone, a private house in Via della Pergola, selected buildings between Via Guicciardini and Via Maggio (Oltrarno), groups of houses in Piazza Santa Croce, Palazzetto Horne, the Convent of the Maddalena alle Caldine, the Pitti Palace, Villa di Legnaia and, as proposed by the architect Venè, Palazzo Davanzati (ibid.).
101 The discussion focuses on Palazzo Buonarroti and Palazzo Davanzati. Pieraccini planned to travel to Rome in order to speak with Minister Guido Gonella about the purchase of Palazzo Davanzati by the State (AFR...
The initial project formulated in 1949 was radically transformed in its final realization two years later. Instead of creating an itinerary of historic homes spread throughout the city, the Museum of the Old Florentine House took the form of a traditional museum, located at a single site. Filippo Rossi and Luciano Berti organized the collections and the installation, opening the museum to the public in 1956. As part of the system of museums under the Florentine Soprintendenza, the new institution was able to borrow works from other State collections. The holdings of Palazzo Davanzati were also augmented by private donations, such as those by Leone Ambron, Ugo Bardini, Luigi Bellini, Riccardo Bruscoli, Arturo Grassi, Francesco Romano, and Savino Salvadori. As a way to connect Palazzo Davanzati with “Lorenzo,” some of the cassoni and spalliere on view at the new museum had previously been exhibited at Palazzo Strozzi in 1949. For example, the Liberation of Andromeda and The Wedding of Perseus and Andromeda, now attributed to the Master of Serumido, were moved from the Uffizi Gallery to the Museum of the Old Florentine House. Likewise, the Petrarchan Triumphs by Lo Scheggia, after having been exhibited in both “La Casa Italiana” and “Lorenzo,” were moved from the Museo Horne/Uffizi, to become part of the permanent installation of Palazzo Davanzati.

To conclude, the extraordinary number of cassoni, spalliere, and deschi da parto included in the “Lorenzo il Magnifico e Le Arti” show corresponds to the equally extraordinary attention to domestic spaces in the aftermath of Fascism. In a country recovering from the devastation of World War II, housing and interior design emerged as priorities. Historical furniture, like that exhibited in the Palazzo Strozzi shows, was seen as an example for contemporary designers, who reinterpreted Renaissance forms in modern but familiar consumer goods. Architects likewise aimed at spreading “good taste” with the intent of democratizing access to harmonious and efficient domestic spaces. The main target of housing and furniture-related marketing was women. Women’s access to comfortable and harmonious spaces increased after the war. However, the detrimental side effect of such dynamic was that women became relegated to the private sphere by a new social order that was promoted by the Christian Democrat and Leftist parties alike. The focus on domesticity in the aftermath of Fascism and throughout the 1950s inspired Florentine politicians, scholars, and conservators to create a permanent museum based on the temporary exhibitions held at the Palazzo Strozzi in 1948 and 1949. The Museum of the Old Florentine House opened as a public institution in 1956. Thus, Lorenzo de’ Medici’s observation, “La casa va con la città,” remained relevant even in the rapidly changing city of Florence. Indeed, domestic furniture painting showed the way for the city of Florence as it made the transition between the dopoguerra and the economic boom.

Corrispondenza, 50). On 10 June 1949, Pieraccini contacted Mario Fabiani, arguing that the purchase of Palazzo Davanzati by the State should be of interest to the mayor, considering his participation in “The Italian House through the Centuries” and “Lorenzo the Magnificent and the Arts” (AFR Corrispondenza, 45).

Picardi had proposed a single location for the new museum at the first meeting of the Committee on 15 February 1949, but Pieraccini firmly rejected it (AFR, “La Casa Fiorentina nei Secoli,” Verbale della seduta del 15 febbraio 1949).

Appendix:

Installation of the Palazzo Strozzi galleries according to the definitive edition of the catalogue; changes to titles, attributions, and locations indicated in parentheses.

**Gallery 1: Cassone Masters**

Rossello di Jacopo Franchi, *Palio*, Bargello, Florence (Giovanni di Francesco Toscani)

Rossello di Jacopo Franchi, *Palio*, Cleveland Museum of Art (Giovanni di Francesco Toscani)

Florentine Painter c.1452, *Coronation of Frederick III*, front and testate, Worcester Art Museum (Giovanni di Ser Giovanni Guidi, Lo Scheggia)

Cassone Master, *Story of Alatiel* pair, Museo Correr, Venice (Shop of Apollonio di Giovanni and Marco del Buono)

Cassone Master, *Story of Griselda*, Galleria Estense, Modena (Apollonio di Giovanni)

**Gallery 3**

Master of the Adimari Cassone, *Adimari Ricasoli Wedding*, Galleria dell’Accademia, Florence (Lo Scheggia)


Cassone Master collaborator, *Antiochus and Stratonice*, Paris (Lo Scheggia with Antonfrancesco di Giovanni di Ser Giovanni, Musée de la Renaissance, Ecouen)

Cassone Master, *Triumphs*, Museo Petrarchesco Piccolomineo, Trieste (Florentine painter, 1468)

Cassone Master, *Triumphs*, Museo Petrarchesco Piccolomineo, Trieste (Domenico di Zanobi)

Cassone Master, *Triumph of Scipio*, John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota (Lo Scheggia)

Cassone Master, *Battle*, John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota (Florentine painter, *Siege of Naples*)

Cassone Master, *Battle of Romans and Gauls*, John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art, Sarasota (Lo Scheggia)

Paris Master, *Triumphs*, Pinacoteca, Siena (Lo Scheggia)

Paris Master, *Narcissus*, Casa Buonarroti, Florence


Florentine Painter c.1450, *Story of Griselda*, Serristori Collection (Sotheby’s 1977, and 2007)


**Gallery 4: Cassone Masters**

Florentine Painter c.1400–50, *Justice of Trajan*, *desco*, Serristori Collection (Florence, private collection)

Florentine Painter c.1400, *Chivalric novel*, Czartoryski Museum, Cracow (*Story of Lucretia*)


Cassone Master, *Sabine Women* pair, Harewood collection, Hampshire (Master of Marradi)

Dido Master, *Aeneid* pair, Kestner Museum, Hannover (Apollonio di Giovanni and Marco del Buono)


Florentine Painter c.1450, *Triumph of Alexander the Great and Foundation of Alexandria*, Galleria Franchetti at Ca’ d’Oro, Venice (Lo Scheggia)

Florentine Painter c.1450, *Game of Civetta*, *desco*, Museo Horne, Florence (Lo Scheggia)

Florentine Painter c.1450, *Battle of Pharsalus*, Musée des Arts Decoratifs, Paris (school of Paolo Uccello, 1466)

Florentine Painter c.1450, *Triumph of Caesar*, Musée des Arts Decoratifs, Paris (school of Paolo Uccello, 1466)
Cassone Master, *Triumph of Love, desco*, Galleria Sabauda, Turin (Apollonio di Giovanni and Marco del Buono)

Florentine Painter c.1440, *Trojan Horse*, Museo Stibbert, Florence (Lo Scheggia)

Florentine Painter c.1450, *Ulysses*, Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool (Bernardo di Stefano Rosselli)

Florentine Painter c.1450, *Triumph of David*, pair, Museo Horne, Florence

**Gallery 9**

Sandro Botticelli shop, *Judgment of Paris*, Venice private collection (Fondazione Giorgio Cini)
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