**ABSTRACT**

From May to June 1948, and with the approval of MoMA's trustees, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and James Thrall Soby did a “grand tour” of Italy, visiting artists, collectors, critics, dealers, museum, and galleries in Milan, Bergamo, Brescia, Rome, Venice, and Florence. Along the way they saw the Fifth Quadriennale in Rome and the Twenty-Fourth Venice Biennale; these, the most important art events of the time, would prove major sources for Barr and Soby as the curators of the 1949 exhibition *Twentieth-Century Italian Art*. The mission of the journey was double: selecting artworks for the show, and acquiring artworks for MoMA's collection, which was sparse in its Italian modern art holdings.

This essay analyzes how and why Barr and Soby worked to shape a history of Italian modern art within the international context of modernism according to the stylistic genealogy of art that Barr had, since 1936, proposed at MoMA. The details of whom they met; which works they saw and selected, borrowed or purchased; and which works weren't available makes it possible to better understand the framework of the exhibition. In effect, Barr and Soby's approach was ambivalent: their desire for autonomy and their strategy of not involving public institutions allowed them to build direct relationships with artists and private collectors. *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* was an operation of cultural diplomacy that needed to go through official channels, even as the curators insisted on selecting works based primarily on their artistic value and high quality, without prioritizing the political affiliation of the artists. Barr and Soby considered the new democratic and political order in Italy after the end of Fascism an indispensable prerequisite for an artistic “renaissance,” which merited the organization of an exhibition at MoMA; they often agreed on selected artworks, and their personal tastes and interests emerged during the process.
As detailed in the foreword to this issue of *Italian Modern Art*, the 1949 exhibition *Twentieth-Century Italian Art*, at the Museum of Modern Art in New York (figures 1a–1b), reflected the Cold War rhetoric of its moment. The climate for art was propitious in Italy, after the end of presumed Fascist isolationism, and – the message went – a “new renaissance” was blossoming after the defeat of Italy’s powerful Communist Party in the political elections of April 18–19, 1948, which signalled a return to democracy. In effect, the new political order was the prerequisite for the United States’ participation in the re-establishment of cultural exchange with Italy, and the 1949 show was a crucial step.

**Along the Peninsula**

Thus, with the approval of MoMA’s trustees, in the spring and summer of 1948 Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and James Thrall Soby did a “grand tour” of Italy. On April 24, 1948, Barr wrote from Paris to Charles Rufus Morey, the Cultural Attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Rome: “After two years of discussion and uncertainty which has lasted right through the current week, we have finally decided that we can go ahead with our exhibition of Italian painting and sculpture.” *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* was largely the product of Barr and Soby’s research activities and interactions with Italian critics, dealers, and collectors (figure 2) – in particular Romeo Toninelli, who functioned as the “executive secretary” of the exhibition. During their journey, Barr and Soby were accompanied by

Soby’s wife, Eleanor “Nellie” Howland Soby, and Barr’s Italian-born wife, Margaret Scolari Barr, who had much experience in organizing exhibitions as well as fluency in the Italian language; indeed, Scolari Barr’s long-under recognized role in the exhibition’s planning is now well documented in the Margaret Scolari Barr Papers, available to researchers through the MoMA Archives since 2015.

In Italy, Barr and Soby spoke with everybody: artists, collectors, dealers, important critics (such as Roberto Longhi and Lionello Venturi), and museum superintendents and directors. However, while discussions with the leading figures of the Italian art world were prioritized to a degree, for the two curators it was most important to maintain their “independence” in deciding the selection of artworks; this required that they avoid official entanglements:

We realize of course that the present political situation in Italy is delicate and complicated. Although we hope that the exhibition will promote sympathy and understanding between Italy and the United States on a cultural level, we feel that it is essential to act independently of official channels insofar as possible. We should like your sympathy and understanding in this problem, for if it were to appear that the exhibition – whatever its quality – were officially sanctioned or supported it would suffer in the eyes of the artists and critics because of the political implications. We believe that we must choose the exhibition on artistic values alone irrespective of the political affiliation of the artists. This may seem unrealistic during this period, but after a great deal of thought we are convinced that no matter what happens in the next year or so, in the long run even the political consequences of the exhibition will be better if it is selected for quality alone.6

In time, Barr and Soby’s autonomy caused friction. A number of the Italian collectors and critics who met with them – Emilio Jesi, Carlo Frua de Angeli, Fernanda Wittengs, Lamberto Vitali, and Raffaele Carrieri – complained about the role given to Toninelli, and lamented the curators’ final selection. Some likely felt their institutional charge, expertise, and scholarship had not been sufficiently appreciated. Barr and Soby treasured each meeting, but, in the end, they made their choices according to their own point of view.

It’s also clear that the scenario arranged by Barr and Soby corresponded to the Italian strategy of “indirect cultural diplomacy” evident in the activities of the Italian Prime Minister Alcide De Gasperi during his travel in U.S. in 1947.7 Despite their desire for autonomy, theirs was an operation of cultural diplomacy that needed to go through official channels. Between the summer of 1946 and the spring of 1947, Monroe Wheeler, Director of Exhibitions and Publications at MoMA, involved Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, Director of the Division of Antiquities and Fine Arts of the Ministry of Public Instruction, in the exhibition planning of Twentieth-Century Italian Art, and both the Circolo delle Arti in Milan and the American Academy in Rome contributed to the ministry’s administrative, logistic, and economic support. As officially approved by Bandinelli, the ministry placed its staff at the disposal of Barr
and Soby for their curatorial research; covered the cost of the works’ transportation to the port of embarkation; and lent pictures from the State collection.  

The MoMA team’s research trip was hugely fruitful, thanks to meetings, discussions, and visits with artists, collectors, museums, galleries, dealers, critics, and scholars. One of Barr and Soby’s missions in Italy was to fill in gaps in MoMA’s collection of Italian modern art. As Director of Collection, Barr oversaw the museum’s expanding holdings, and with Soby he planned an important acquisition campaign in advance of the Italian show and after. They worked together with intensity: proposing tentative lists of works, comparing their opinions (they often agreed), and finding a commendable balance in the number of items by various artists and loan requests to collectors. Aware that the show would probably not be a comprehensive historic survey, Barr and Soby nonetheless aimed to trace a history of Italian modern art that would establish its role in the international context of modernism. Beyond Futurism and the Metaphysical School, the two curators were interested in younger artists emerging after World War II, as well as in the leaders of the older and middle generations born before the 1890s or soon after, respectively. Further, although the planned exhibition focused on the twentieth century, the curators’ attention stretched back into nineteenth-century traditions of Italian painting in order to better understand to sources of Italian modern art. Thanks to his first-hand exposure, Soby could review, in 1949, the *Exhibition of Italian Nineteenth-Century Paintings* sponsored by the city of Florence and displayed in New York at the Wildenstein Gallery and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and he especially appreciated the Tuscan group of Macchiaioli painters’ innovative approach: “[T]he accomplishment of the Macchiaioli seems just that much more impressive [...] not until the arrival of the futurists did Italian painting begin once more to move forward” (figure 3).

Barr and Soby’s selection process worked on two levels: they studied the careers and research directions of individual artists, selecting those useful to their curatorial vision of Italian modernism; and they closely evaluated each and every painting, sculpture, and print under consideration, choosing the only the best quality possible, according to the canon of MoMA’s idea of modernism. Altogether, the complex activity of designing an exhibition such as *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* involved both analysis of modernism rooted in
knowledge of its historic, political and artistic context, and the practical motives of organizing activity.

We can follow Barr and Soby’s grand tour along the peninsula in five notebooks and pocket diaries: two notebooks usually attributed to Soby, but written in by Margaret Scolari Barr as well; a pocket diary by Soby; a travel diary by Soby; and a last pocket diary by Margaret Scolari Barr. Barr and Soby traveled together for portions of the trip. They were all in Milan until May 4, and then in Rome, until May 15. At that point, Soby returned to Milan, then proceeded to Venice for the Twenty-Fourth Biennale; the Barrs stayed in Rome until at least the end of month, then moved on to Venice. Thus, we can follow the Barrs and Sobys to Milan, Bergamo, Brescia, Rome, Venice, and Florence. The Fifth Quadriennale in Rome and the Twenty-Fourth Venice Biennale were the most important art events in Italy at the time and major sources for the American curators. They were the first edition of the Quadriennale and the Biennale, respectively, after WWII, and exposed Barr and Soby to a breadth of Italian artists’ postwar work, which they could compare to international advanced art production. Moreover, as Soby pointed out in one of his reports to MoMA, the Quadriennale included special galleries devoted to Futurism, while the Biennale had a large section on the Metaphysical School – the two movements that would open Twentieth-

Century Italian Art. Barr and Soby intended to propose Futurism and the Metaphysical School as Italian versions of Cubism and Surrealism, the two main tendencies Barr’s modern art genealogy according to his landmark exhibitions *Cubism and Abstract Art* and *Fantastic Art, Dada and Surrealism* in 1936–37.

Soby's penned a review of the Biennale for the *Saturday Review of Literature* that provides an overview of both movements – despite a major interest in metaphysical painting transpired –, highlighting their contrasting elements and the specificities of their influence on younger artists:

The aims of the Scuola [metafisica] were the opposite of those of the futurists (1909–16), who had so avidly embraced their era’s industrial characteristics of speed, precision and clangor. The painters of the Scuola achieved an enigmatic and poetic art, based on philosophical meditation, in which still-life objects and mannequin figures were assembled in strange settings, amid an uncanny calm, with emphasis on that evocative incongruity of juxtaposition which led to surrealism in later hands. Since the Futurists’ accomplishment was also reviewed this spring in a special gallery at the huge Quadriennale Exposition in Rome, it was possible to reconsider in one season the two principal movements of earlier twentieth-century Italian art – Futurism and the Scuola metafisica. Both movements are revered by many younger Italian artists – they are, indeed, the cubism and surrealism of Italy – and both are perhaps more influential now than any time during the past twenty years. But the contrast between them is fairly absolute, and passing from one to the other is like turning from Vachel Lindsay’s ‘Boomlay, boomlay, boomlay, BOOM’ to Lewis Carroll’s unforgettable, disquieting lines ‘Of shoes-and-ships-and-sealing wax-of cabbages and kings.’

Soby's and the Barrs’ travels in Italy were noticed by the Italian press, including *L'Osservatore Romano*, on May 19, 1949:
Two representatives from the Museum of Modern Art, James Thrall Soby, Director of Painting and Sculpture Department, and Alfred H. Barr, Jr., Director of Collections, came to Italy in order to study the last developments of contemporary art and to select works for the Italian modern art exhibition that the museum has planned for next year. The show will include about 150 paintings and sculptures and 50 drawings and etchings.¹⁸

The news of an upcoming exhibition dedicated to Italian modern art by MoMA was confirmed by the artist Corrado Cagli in the newspaper Gioventù, on July 22, 1948. Cagli enthused about how Barr and Soby had been impressed by the art they had recently seen in Italy – more so than they had expected to be. Similar commentary was related by Soby and Barr in their reporting to MoMA.¹⁹ However, Cagli also complained that the major effort by MoMA, achieved through and Barr and Soby’s abilities, would not be enough to support the lasting success of Italian modern art in the international art system, if Italian dealers did not work systematically to support Italian art in the US.²⁰ As examined by Raffaele Bedarida in his book dedicated to Cagli’s years exile in the U.S.,²¹ the artist was a primary point of connection in the American and Italian artistic panorama. Starting with the list of Italian artists and galleries in his article “Italian Renaissance,” published in Harper’s Bazaar in March 1948, he provided ample suggestions for Barr and Soby’s research trip.²² In fact, Cagli was aware of MoMA’s Twentieth-Century Italian Art project as far back as early 1946, when, in a letter to Pietro Maria Bardi, he professed his aim to be a promoter and consultant for the exhibition.²³

The Italian Collectors of Italian Modern Art: “White Flies”

Following their strategy of not involving public institutions or critics, Barr and Soby based their research on building direct relationships with artists and collectors, whose contributions compensated for museums’ indifference to supporting Italian art during the 1930s through the purchase paintings and sculpture.²⁴
In effect, around 1950, artistic historiography started to celebrate the “heroic” role played by private collectors in the 1930s – those who had first bought works from contemporary artists. Between February 16 and March 23, 1952, the dealer Gino Ghiringhelli arranged an exhibition dedicated to the tailor and art collector Adriano Pallini at the Famiglia Abruzzese-Molisana association in Milan; the preface to the catalogue lauded the cultured and polished Italian collector. The following year, Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti presented the Gianni Mattioli Collection at Florence’s Palazzo Strozzi, which he called “the first modern art museum of Italian contemporary art.” Recognizing the foresight of private collectors went together with decrying the paucity of public museums, the involution of art criticism, and the backwardness of bourgeois tastes. The recognition of private collectors was also advocated in the organization of the Twenty-Sixth Venice Biennale, in 1952. Rodolfo Pallucchini, General Secretary of the Biennale institution, proposed to Roberto Longhi, member of the Executive Commission, an exhibition of Pallini and Mattioli’s art collections; however, Longhi declined.

The praise worthiness of private collecting was already being acknowledged in the 1930s. *Mostra Protesta del Collezionismo* opened at the Galleria del Milione in Milan on December 23, 1933, a presentation of works from the Pietro Feroldi Collection, and Raffaello Giolli published an article dedicated to the Della Ragione Collection in the journal *Colosseo Colonna* in December 1934. In 1938, Giuseppe Gorgerino wrote in *L’Ambrosiano* of these few collectors’ bravery: “They attempted a mystical act, a leap in the dark; they trusted in their art expert – if they have one – or in the their own taste – the best way - or in foreign rules and trends. If men of good will should be blessed, they really are: white flies.” In 1949, the *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* exhibition at MoMA, of paintings and sculptures lent by Italian private collectors, seemed to confirm the notion that advanced art in Italy was collected much more by private citizens than by public institutions.

The Barrs and Soby started their Italian journey in Milan, where the Circolo delle Arti – of which Toninelli was President, coordinating a membership of many Milan-based collectors and critics – was an excellent base for pursuing information and publications on Italian art. It also facilitated the curators’ exposure to paintings and sculptures from several different collections that were installed in the waiting room, two galleries, and bar of the Circolo delle Arti. On display were works by Carlo Carrà, Arturo Martini, Giacomo Manzù,

Carrà and Alberto Savinio were the first artists that Barr and Soby visited in Milan, between May 1–3. The details of their meeting with Savinio, including a discussion of the Metaphysical School and de Chirico, were recorded by Soby in the notebook “Milan II–X”34 no works by Savinio, however, would be included in the MoMA show. Their visit to Carrà’s studio, as noted by Soby and Margaret Scolari Barr, focused on his Futurist, Metaphysical, and later works, such as L’estate (Summer, 1930) and Natura morta con anguria (Still Life with Watermelon, 1941). In particular, Margaret Scolari Barr listed some Futurist sketches, several of which be lent to the show by the artist. On May 3, the Barrs and Soby started examining the holdings of the Milan-based collectors Antonio Boschi, Jesi, and Riccardo Jucker. The day after, in Brescia, they looked at the Pietro Feroldi Collection;35 Gianni Mattioli would acquire the latter collection and lend a number of the works to Twentieth-Century Italian Art.36

The pages of the travelers’ notebooks list masterpieces of Italian art held in private collections, bearing witness to the high quality of collecting in Milan in the first half of twentieth century. Soby and the Barrs were shocked by the collections, and such impressions and thoughts are recorded along with lists of titles and the occasional small sketches they drafted as they worked towards a mutually agreed upon selection for MoMA.

At Boschi’s home, Barr and Soby took note of many important works by Sironi, de Chirico (figure 4), Casorati, Gianni Dova, and Italo Valenti. They recorded their admiration for works from Jesi’s collection by Gino Severini, Ottone Rosai, Umberto Bocchioni (Studio per la Città che sale [Study for The City Rises], 1910; and Rissa in galleria [Riot in the Galleria], 1910), Campigli, Morandi, Mario Mafai, Scipione, Filippo De Pisis, Casorati (Nudo nello studio [Naked Woman Seated Frontally], 1921), Carrà (Ritmi di oggetti [Rhythms of Objects], 1911; La casa dell’amore [The House of Love], 1922; and Il Cinquale, 1926), and Marino Marini (Ritratto di Jesi [Portrait of Mr. Jesi], 1947). But unfortunately nothing would be lent both by Boschi and Jesi. In the Jucker Collection, they found remarkable Bocchioni’s Bevitore (Drinker, 1914), Carrà’s Figlio del costruttore (Builder’s Son, 1917–21) and Natura morta con la squadra
(Still Life with Triangle, 1917), Morandi’s *Natura morta con manichino* (Still Life with a Mannequin, 1918) and *Natura morta con scatola e birillo* (Still Life with Box and Ninepin, 1918), and de Chirico’s *Giorno e notte* (Day and Night, 1926); the two Morandi works would be lent to MoMA.

After Soby arrived back in Milan from Rome, on May 16, he continued to visit private collections – belonging to Toninelli, Carrieri, Frua de Angeli, Giuseppe Vismara, Franco Marmont, and Cesare Tosi – as well as art galleries – Galleria Bergamini, Galleria Barbaroux, Galleria Borromini, Galleria della Spiga, Galleria II Camino, and Galleria II Milione. Also in Milan, he went to the warehouse of Galleria d’Arte Moderna, which officially reopened in the following year (having closed during the war); there he saw Futurist paintings, drawings, and collages; MoMA would borrow Boccioni’s *Scomposizione di figura di donna al tavolo* (Woman at a Table: Interpenetration of Lights and Planes, 1914) and *Dinamismo di un corpo umano* (Dynamism of a Human Figure, 1913).

Of course, Toninelli was well-disposed to lend his own works to *Twentieth-Century Italian Art*, and to discuss selling some paintings to MoMA. Soby selected many works from Toninelli’s collection, some of which he would display in New York: Boccioni’s *Materia* (Matter, 1912) and *I selciatori* (Street
Pavers, 1914), and de Chirico’s *Ettore e Andromaca* (Hector and Andromacha, 1926). Among the works in Frua’s collection, he admired two Campiglis, which would be lent to the show (*Isola felice* [Happy Isle], 1928; and *Uomo a cavallo* [Horseman], 1928), Sironis, Morandis, and, in particular, de Chirico’s *Pesci sacri* (Sacred Fish, 1918–19), which MoMA would eventually purchase at the exhibition’s end. From the Vismara and Marmont Collections Soby chose De Pisis’s *Pollaiio* (Poultry Yard, 1928) and *Natura morta con imbuto e borsa della spesa* (Still Life with Funnel and Shopping Bag, 1925). Cesare Tosi lent two recent works by Sironi, De Pisis’s *Il cavallo di Napoleone* (Napoleon’s Horse, 1924), a Futurist collage and *Natura morta* (*Still Life*, 1914) by Soffici, and Casorati’s drawing *Commessa* (Midinette, 1935).

Soby and the Barrs went to Rome on May 5 or 6;39 where they benefitted from the support of Laurence P. Roberts, Director of American Academy in Rome (1947–60), where works for the exhibition were collected for shipping. Since the great and wide private collecting in Milan had no parallel in Rome, here they visited galleries, museums, and above all artists, like Renato Guttuso, Emilio Greco, Fausto Pirandello, Antonio Donghi, Carlo Levi, Pompeo Borra, and many others. In Guttuso’s studio they saw him working on the important painting *La Mafia* (The Maffia, 1948), which MoMA bought for the exhibition, though later Barr exchanged it for *I mangiatori di cocomero* (Two Figures and the Watermelon, 1948), which they also saw in studio. At Greco’s studio they selected *Testa maschile* (Head of a Man, 1947) and *Il cantante* (The Singer, 1948). Of their visit to Donghi’s studio, Soby noted his appreciation for the artist’s intense realism and emotional simplicity, comparable to that of “primitives” like Henri Rousseau. In fact, Soby dedicated a section of his text in the exhibition catalogue to Donghi as well as Rosai, as two different versions of social realism, but pointed out that Donghi’s had nothing to do with political-social commentary.

Among the art galleries Soby and the Barrs visited Galleria La Margherita, L’Obelisco, Studio d’Arte Palma, and Galleria del Secolo. The owners of Galleria L’Obelisco, Irene Brin and Gasparo Del Corso, played a crucial role in facilitating the organization of the *Twentieth-Century Italian Art*.40 The curators visited the Del Corsos’ gallery and home repeatedly, where they saw pieces by Afro Basaldella, Toti Scialoja, Luigi Bartolini, Marcello Muccini, and Renzo Vespignani. At the Galleria del Secolo, Soby and Barr saw works by Pio Semeghini, Giovanni Omiaccioli, Guttuso, Roberto Melli, Pirandello, Giovanni
Stradone, and much admired works by Mafai such as *Foglie e garofani secchi* (Dry Leaves and Carnation, 1934), which would be lent to the show by the gallery owner’s, Giulio Laudisa. On May 13, while speaking with Lionello Venturi about Futurism, Impressionism, and Novecento, as well as Casorati, Birolli, Antonio Corpora, Guttuso, and Vespignani, Soby learned of Mafai’s extremely important role in Rome during 1930s: as Fascism celebrated Rome as the eternal capital of the new Caesar, Mafai painted scenes of demolition, of old buildings slithering to the ground to make way for triumphal boulevards.\(^1\) Soby and Barr would see an important group of paintings and sculptures by Mafai, Scipione, and Antonietta Raphael at the Venice Biennale, where the Roman School was well represented and supported by Italian critics.\(^2\) In particular, Scipione’s solo show at the Biennale allowed them to evaluate his historical place in the development of Italian art, and also his influence on younger artists.

Another gallery the MoMA representatives visited in Rome was Studio d’Arte Palma, which Pietro Maria Bardi founded in May 1944 (before he went to Brazil in 1946). It was an unusual experiment in the Italian art system to combine within the same commercial art gallery, spaces for ancient and modern art, a restoration workshop, and radiography and photograph labs (for art diagnostic, conservation, and documentation), inspired by French and American galleries and museums models such as Wildenstein and Knoedler galleries in New York.\(^3\) Barr and Soby visited Studio d’Arte Palma on May 13, when the gallery was holding the exhibition *Quattro accademie straniere: USA, UK, Ungheria, Belgio*. Rather than the current show, however, they went to see Cagli’s work, held in the gallery’s storage. In November 1947, Cagli organized his first major postwar show at Studio d’Arte Palma, in which the artist exhibited a combination of expressionist paintings and of non figurative works on n-dimension inspired by de Chirico’s *Metaphysica*.\(^4\) Soby and Barr appreciated the latter kind, of which they borrowed for the exhibition at MoMA *Teatro tragico* (Tragic Theatre, 1947), one of the most accomplished paintings in the show, (figures 5 and 6) and *Studio per Spie al palo* (Study for Spies at the Stake, 1947).\(^5\)

A pivotal event of their sojourn in Rome took place at the Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Moderna (GNAM), then directed by Palma Bucarelli, who was rethinking the setting up of the museum collection after the war, with an...
emphasis on promoting international and Italian abstract art. Here the Americans wrote down a long list of names: Martini, Tosi, Mino Maccari, Marini, Casorati, Manzù, Gianfilippo Usellini, Franco Gentilini, Pirandello, Pericle Fazzini, Omiccioli, Boccioni, and Mafai. GNAM would indeed lend a remarkable group of paintings and sculptures to MoMA: Fazzini’s *Ritratto di Ungaretti* (Portrait of Ungaretti, 1936), Manzu’s *Cardinale* (Cardinal, 1938), Mafai’s *Due donne che si spogliano* (Two Women Disrobing, 1935), Guttuso’s *Battaglia con cavalli feriti* (Battle with Wounded Horses, 1942), and Armando Pizzinato’s *I difensori della fabbrica* (Defenders of the Factory, 1948).

Also in Rome, Soby and the Barrs visited great private collectors of Italian art: Pietro Rollino, Riccardo Gualino, and Giorgio Castelfranco. In Rollino’s collection, Soby especially admired a group of works by Morandi, de Chirico, De Pisis, and Sironi; he also sketched Morandi’s beautiful *Natura morta (metafisica)* (Metaphysical Still Life, 1918; figures 7 and 8). At Gualino’s home...
there were important paintings by Casorati; among them Ragazza a Pavarolo (Children at Pavarolo, 1943) would be included in Twentieth-Century Italian Art. Moreover they appreciated de Chirico’s paintings, and above all, many Manzù’s sculptures: Deposizione (Skeleton Hanging from the Cross, 1940), Deposizione con prelato (Cardinal and Deposition, 1941), and Crocifissione con soldato (Christ and the German Soldier, 1942). The topic of conversation at Giorgio Castelfranco’s was again de Chirico, specifically his earlier paintings and Metaphysical production.47

At the end of Soby’s stay in Rome, the trio visited Margherita Sarfatti,48 an episode that filled several pages of a notebook with titles of artists and works collected everywhere in her home, kitchen included: Sironi, Carrà, De Pisis, Casorati, Soffici, Alberto Salietti, Pirandello, Michele Cascella, Raffaele De Grada, Boccioni, Severini, Achille Funi, and Martini.49 However, just two paintings, Casorati’s Stanza d’albergo (Room in an Inn, 1929) and Luigi Russolo’s La nebbia (The Fog, 1912), would be lent to the 1949 show.

On May 16, Soby left for Milan again, and the Barrs stayed on in Rome until the end of the month, visiting more collectors, artists, and critics. Alfred Barr was also sick at this time. Notable was Barr’s long visit to Benedetta Marinetti’s house, where he looked through scrapbooks, heard Zang Tumb Tuum record, and discussed the sale of Boccioni and Balla works in collection. At the time Barr purchased Boccioni’s two bronze sculptures *Sviluppo di una bottiglia nello spazio* (Development of a Bottle in Space, 1912) and *Forme uniche della continuità nello spazio* (Unique Forms of Continuity in Space, 1913; figure 9), and after the MoMA exhibition the second version of his triptych *Stati d’animo* (States of Mind, 1911) and the charcoal *Dinamismo muscolare* (Muscular Dynamism, 1913), lent by Benedetta Marinetti together with *Elasticità* (Elasticity, 1912). As Barr wrote to Soby, his encounter with Yvonne Müller Casella – second wife of the composer Alfredo Casella, who had just passed away in 1947 – was highly interesting too. Nevertheless, this didn’t persuaded Barr to include in MoMA show a section dedicated to music, theater or any kind of futurist work different from painting, sculpture or...
drawing. Barr suggested to his colleague that they add some paintings by Casorati, Carr, de Chirico, Donghi, and Morandi; of these, they would later decide upon Carra's *Pino sul mare* (The Pine, 1921 – “one of his best” – Casorati’s *Conversazione platonica* (Platonic Conversation, 1925, and de Chirico’s *Paesaggio romano* (Roman Landscape, 1922).  


**Break or Continuity? The Fifth Quadriennale in Rome**

At Rome’s Galleria Nazionale d’Arte Moderna (GNAM), Soby and Barr visited the Fifth Quadriennale, organized by the new General Secretary of the event, the sculptor Francesco Coccia, who had replaced Cipriano Efisio Oppo, the Secretary who oversaw the Fascist editions of the exhibition. The 1948 edition, on view from March 31 to the end of May, included 816 artists and 1292 works in 36 rooms – all the possibilities in Italian art were there. Coccia was supported by an organizing committee and a selection jury, both composed above all by artists: in addition to the critic Giuseppe Marchiori, the lawyer Alberto Carocci, and Giuseppe Natale and Carlo Speranza from the board of directors, among the committee’s members were the artists Nino Bertoletti, Aldo Carpi, Casorati, Vincenzo Ciardo, Giovanni Colacicchi, Guttuso, Levi, Marini, Melli, Morandi, Natale, and Carlo Speranza; and the jury included Casorati, Fazzini, Alberto Gerardi, Guttuso, Mafai, and Paolo Ricci.

On November 22, 1944, the Italian Prime Minister Ivanoe Bonomi had appointed Coccia temporary director of the institution. In this role, Coccia began consulting with artists who were members of the various political factions within the Committee of National Liberation in order “to implement the changes in the institution in the superior interest of Italian art and with the consent of all the artists interested in this development.” The Palazzo delle Esposizioni – the past location for the Quadriennale – had been used as a warehouse for food supplies during the war, then as a club for the allies, and had since been converted into a polling station. The Fifth Quadriennale was planned, early on, for December 1947 at the Mercati Traianei, and only later was the GNAM decided up as the hosting venue. The 1948 edition changed its name to the National Exhibition of Visual Art in order to mark the gap with the previous editions.
previous, Fascist editions, though the institution’s statute continued to exist on the same terms as before the war. Indeed, some critics and artists – such as Carlo Levi, from the Partito d’Azione, and the Communist Guttuso – found the exhibition’s continuation troublesome.

Though it has been overlooked in art historical scholarship for a long time, the first postwar Quadriennale (figure 10) presented a strong portrayal of the Italian artistic panorama after the war, including its breadth of generations: it combined past and present, older masters and younger artists, figurative painting and Neocubism as well as abstract art, as we can see in this video from the Archivio Istituto Luce.

Among this broad abundance of proposals and names – though most of them were not particularly known to Barr and Soby – and especially due its lack of a systematic and progressive organization, the Quadriennale seemed more mixed up than the concurrent Venice Biennale (even if the latter displayed 3065 works by 1108 Italian artists). The Quadriennale required multiple visits by Barr as he stayed on in Rome until the end of May. In effect he wrote that the third and fourth visits revealed little new – three good pictures by Pirandello, a big Guttuso, a big Cagli (but inferior to oils already listed), and Pietro Annigoni. During a second visit to the GNAM collection, Barr appreciated some Casorati’s works, as well as Mafai’s Donne che si spogliano (Women Undressing, 1934–35) and Guttuso’s excellent Battaglia con cavalli feriti (Battle with Wounded Horses, 1942); these last two paintings were both lent for the New York show.
Connecting to the past, the Fifth Quadriennale included masters of Italian modern art – Carrà, Casorati, Levi, Mafai, Martini, Marini, Modigliani, Morandi, Pirandello, and Savinio – and dedicated Room 10 to Futurist artists of the Pre-World War I years, showing approximately thirty works by Boccioni, Balla, Carrà, Russolo, Severini, Sironi, Soffici, Funi, Fortunato Depero, and Enrico Prampolini. Many of the exponents of the so-called Second Futurism had not been invited; others, including Fillia, Benedetta Marinetti, Marasco, and Tato, were exhibited with artists affiliated to different movement or stylistic tendencies. This choice – vociferously disapproved of by Benedetta Cappa Marinetti – was the result of a tendency emerged after WWII to separate out the Futurist artists who were active primarily after the First World War, and more connected with Fascism; this chronological division promoted the founding members of Futurism as the precursors to the latest trends in advanced art, and, chiefly, abstraction.

Of course, this display of Futurism was a significant reference point for Barr, who went on to dedicate the first and largest section of *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* to the movement. In effect – as Raffaele Bedarida had pointed out – Barr finessed a resolution to the main problem facing the postwar reception of Futurism: its involvement with Fascism. He demarcated the movement into two generations, considering the activities of the second group marginal and their works minor in quality in comparison to those of the original Futurists; in doing so, he proposed a Boccioni-centric interpretation of the movement (even if he recognized Balla's significant role, which was more appreciated by Soby, who especially commended Balla's kinetic innovations and talent as a colorist). Barr's presentation of Futurism was limited to the aesthetic qualities of painting and sculpture rather than ideological grounds – and the same held true for the representation of the Novecento group in *Twentieth-Century Italian Art*.

Since one of Barr and Soby's missions was to fill in the gaps in MoMA's collection of Italian modern art, the museum bought, with the mediation of Laurance P. Roberts, two of Balla's paintings shown in the Quadriennale: *Rondoni: line andamentali + succession dinamiche* (Swifts: Paths of Movement + Dynamic Sequences, 1913), and *Automobile in accelerazione* (Speeding Automobile, 1912).
Near to the Futurism section at the Quadriennale, Rooms 11 and 12 featured abstract compositions (paintings by Magnelli, Mario Radice, and Mauro Reggiani, made in the 1930s, to works by the young Forma 1 group, for example by Ugo Attardi, Pietro Consagra, Piero Dorazio, Giovanni Guerrini, Achille Perilli, Antonio Sanfilippo, and Giulio Turcato) as well as Neocubist (by Prampolini, Afro, Corpora, Nino Franchina, Guttuso, Mattia Moreni, and Pizzinato). These rooms were praised by Italian critics as the most innovative and dynamic sections of the Quadriennale, but Barr and Soby noted only minor appreciation of them initiating a long-term oblivion on this area of artistic production in the United States. On the one hand, the curators positively evaluated several works by members of the Fronte Nuovo delle Arti as possible items for display at MoMA – works that demonstrated the influence of Pablo Picasso's paintings of the past fifteen years; neocubism was a way to a semi-abstraction for painters like Cassinari, Giuseppe Santomaso, and Pizzinato, who also revived the Futurists' interest in kinetics. On the other, the two American curators didn't select any Forma 1 works – since they needed to be very careful with younger artists – nor abstractionists operating in non-objective direction during the 1930s. Soby and Barr professed to preferring the non-representational paintings of Afro and Cagli – both on view at the Fifth Quadriennale – who “added to abstraction an element of enigmatic mystery by reviving in a personal manner the strong linear perspective and dramatic shadows of de Chirico's 'metaphysical' period.”

After all, “abstract art” was missing in Twentieth-Century Italian Art exhibition. The only non-figurative works included by Barr and Soby came from neocubism or metaphysical models, instead the 1930s Italian abstract production wasn't considered good enough, save Magnelli. Two curators identified Magnelli as a fine abstractionist, but his absence was unfortunately due to his works unavailability for the exhibition in New York. Moreover Soby mentioned in the catalogue Lucio Fontana as an “abstract Constructivist” who had abandoned the non-objective forms and machined materials of his early career for the expressionist figures in ceramic that he was producing in 1947 (included in the MoMA exhibition). Also the name of Osvaldo Licini was missing; unlike Italian critics, Soby didn't like his work: “so many people feel is the greatest living abstract artists. To me he seems rather dull school of Klee.”
Among the retrospective section of the Quadriennale dedicated to early twentieth-century masters of Italian art, a major one focused on Amedeo Modigliani. As a Jewish artist who was part of international milieu, Modigliani had been target of Fascist censorship during the 1930s. After WWII a series of publications and exhibitions attempted to pick up the thread where it had been interrupted. Between April and May 1946, Jewish critic Vitali (who had just returned to Italy from the exile) organized at Casa della Cultura in Milan the first major solo show dedicated to Modigliani since the large exhibition curated by Lionello Venturi at the 1930 Venice Biennale. Vitali’s show included sixteen paintings and forty-five drawings and was widely reviewed. One of these reviews, published by Umbro Apollonio in the art journal *Emporium*, was included by Barr and Soby in the selected bibliography about Modigliani in *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* catalogue (figure 11). In the Quadriennale (room 7), the two curators saw six drawings and four paintings by Modigliani. Unlike the Italian shows, however, which limited themselves to paintings and drawings because of the lack of Modigliani’s sculpture in Italian collections, Barr and Soby were keen to include in the MoMA exhibit two sculptures as well. One of them was already in the Museum’s collection – *Testa* (Head, 1911–12; figure 12) –, and the second one – *Cariatide* (Caryatid, 1919 ca.) – was lent by the Buchholz Gallery. Comparing paintings, drawings and sculptures, Soby pointed out that like so many painters whose drawing is incisive, Modigliani “was attracted to sculpture, and in that medium his love of stylization is conveyed with exceptional clarity and force.”

The curators’ emphasis on sculpture was no limited to Modigliani. The “Recent Sculpture” section of the MoMA catalogue – unique in the volume for its focus on a specific medium, even if the sculptures were exhibited in different rooms within the exhibition – reveals the curators’ increasing interest in Italian sculpture: “perhaps the most agreeable surprise of the trip was the amount of good sculpture by modern Italian artists.” Barr and Soby recognized a line in sculpture that run from Medardo Rosso, Boccioni, and Modigliani to the so-called “Three M’s” (Martini, Marini, and Manzù), and younger sculptors. Such sculptural production was well represented at the 1948 Rome Quadriennale and Venice Biennale, which included an homage to Martini, who had just died in 1947.
At the Quadriennale, different approaches to sculpture, ranging from various types of figuration to non-representational ones, were displayed together: works by Martini, Marini, Manzù, Gerardi, Greco, Edgardo Mannucci, Luciano Minguzzi, Venanzo Crocetti, Amerigo Tot, Leoncillo, Fontana, Carmelo Cappello, and Giuseppe Mazzullo along with plenty by Consagra, Alberto Viani, Franchina, Renato Barisani, Antonio Venditti, Francesco Somaini, and Pietro Cascella. A second short newsreel on the Quadriennale produced from the Istituto Luce documents how an icon of futurism such as Boccioni's *Unique Forms of Continuity in Space* was exhibited next to a traditionally representational, academic piece such as Mario Vita's *Vanità nascente* (Rising Vanity, 1948) – without any curatorial or critical framework. Among this huge and undifferentiated set of sculpture samples, Soby and Barr selected Viani's *Nude* – a work that was clearly influenced by the biomorphic forms of Jean Arp – their section “The Younger Abstractionists; the Fronte Nuovo delle Arti.”

Despite this opening to the new abstract and neo-cubism proposals, the accrochage of the 1948 Quadriennale, as well as the ways to communicate it, reveals how much the framework of the first Quadriennale after the WWII was still related to the Fascist Ventennio. Thus, even if Barr and Soby selected some works from the Quadriennale, they displayed them at the MoMA show in a different way, much more inspired to the Venice Biennale approach.
“A Step in the Right Direction”: The Twenty-Fourth Venice Biennale

If the Quadriennale was suspended between past and present, the Twenty-Fourth Venice Biennale looked forward, by presenting a new perspective and breaking with the Fascist past.

In his review of the Biennale for the Saturday Review of Literature – which would be the basis for his essay in the Twentieth-Century Italian Art catalogue – Soby asserted that the “biennial now current is more advanced in approach and more comprehensive than ever before. This is a suitable fact to report, for the first thing to be said as the modern art’s prospects in postwar Italy is that the atmosphere is propitious, in fact is amazingly energetic and hopeful.”

The rhetoric of a “new renaissance” after the end of Fascism – at the basis of Twentieth-Century Italian Art exhibition at MoMA – inspired the Venice Biennale editions after World War II directed by Rodolfo Pallucchini as General Secretary of the institution. Through grand retrospective exhibitions, the Pallucchini Biennales (1948–56) proposed a historical reconstruction of
the pivotal artistic developments and events of international modernism, in
order to create a bridge between European avant-garde masters and new,
进一步 advanced international endeavors. Unlike the Quadriennale’s
approach, the Venice Biennale went back until Impressionism to find the
sources of current not-academic and of modernism, and to propose the right
models to younger generation involved in the most innovative artistic
researches: going back to go forward.

In the foreword to the Biennale catalogue of 1948, Pallucchini claimed to
come back to the original agenda of the Biennale to offer “to all smart men
the way to know and compare different aesthetic directions and styles, as
well as to enrich the intellectual heritage of young artists.” This, according to
Pallucchini, had proved impossible in the still recent past because of the
“purist creed of Nazism that was unfortunately embraced by some
supporters in Italy too. The freedom of the new climate, a remarkable
achievement of the European spirit, has been welcomed by the members of
the Executive Commission for the Twenty-Fourth Venice Biennale.” In the
catalogue’s preface, Giovanni Ponti, President of the Biennale, encouraged
everyone to go beyond national borders and ideological walls in favor of a
humanism: “I don’t think I am wrong in saying that, for the first time since the
war’s end, we have a large and complete vision of what has been done by the
most significant artists of modern times. All movements are included: from
the first reactions against the academy by Impressionism, to Post-
impressionism, Expressionism, abstract art, and Surrealism.”

In his review Soby pointed out that “this year’s Biennial is a step in the right
direction. It includes the first important exhibition in Italy of the French
impressionists – fantastic as this may seem. It includes as well selections of
[Henry] Moore, Picasso, [Georges] Rouault, and other leaders of the modern
movements.” He added that it was important to give to young artists the
tools and information to learn more about what has happened elsewhere in
the art.

Following the suggestions of the Committee for Arts and the organizers of
the national pavilions, the first postwar edition of the Biennale was an
arrangement of numerous focuses: an exhibition of Impressionism was
curated by a special committee at the German Pavilion and featured works
by Claude Monet, Alfred Sisley, Camille Pissarro, Édouard Manet, Berthe Morisot, Paul Cézanne, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Edgar Degas, Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, Paul Gauguin, Vincent van Gogh, and Georges Seurat (figure 13); 92 solo shows were presented of Picasso (whose work was returning for the first time since its removal during the Biennale of 1905), Klee, and Oskar Kokoschka; and a collective exhibition was dedicated to German artists including, among others, Willi Baumeister, Otto Dix, Max Pechstein, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, and Emil Schumacher. The national pavilions’ significant exhibitions included: at the French Pavilion, Braque’s paintings from 1940s and works by Chagall and Rouault; at the Austrian Pavilion, Fritz Wotruba and Egon Schiele; at the British Pavilion, William Turner and Moore, who was awarded with the international prize for sculpture; at the Belgian Pavilion, Paul Delvaux, James Ensor, René Magritte, and Constant Permeke. The Greek Pavilion was empty because of the civil war in that country, and hosted the Peggy Guggenheim Collection.

Among the exhibitions dedicated to Italian artists, the most significant ones concerned the three major Italian sculptors Martini, Manzù and Marini, Campigli and De Pisis, members of “School of Paris,” thus aware of the international researches, Gino Rossi – Venetian painter who had just dead in 1947, and was able to merge Italian models with international influences by Gauguin, Cézanne and Cubists –, Cagnaccio di San Pietro (dead in 1946), Scipione and Mafai from “Roman School,” and Maccari, awarded with the international prize for etching; particularly remarkable were the cohesive group presentations Tre pittori italiani dal 1910 al 1920. Carlo Carrà, Giorgio de Chirico, Giorgio Morandi (Three Italian Painters from 1910 to 1920: Carlo Carrà, Giorgio de Chirico, Giorgio Morandi) and Il Fronte Nuovo delle Arti (The New Front).

By identifying Impressionism as the progenitor of modernism, through which European artistic tastes developed, and in also considering the relevance to modern art and Surrealism of the Metaphysical paintings of de Chirico, Carrà, and Morandi,93 the Biennale aimed to reaffirm the central position of modernism in contemporary European culture, highlighting the roles played by France and Italy.
Thus, for Barr and Soby the opportunity to attend the Venice Biennale was an important and educational experience. Indeed, on June 25, 1948, having evaluated Soby’s long list of works displayed at the Biennale, Barr wrote to Soby: “I visited the Biennale five or six times for many hours carefully checking your notes with my own made independently. I find that we agree to a remarkable extent and that my most radical differences developed usually after I had seen the pictures many times.” Comparing both lists, a role-playing seemed to emerge. Soby – considered the expert on Italian art by Barr – started the discussion on artworks displayed at the Venice Biennale and suitable for the 1949 MoMA show, and suggested artists and works or dismissed them thanks to a more refined look; moreover he summarized the features of some works referring to well-known International and Italian artists. Barr, by a more concise approach, removed excess. Anyway, the main differences concerned above all minor artists (according to his personal taste) and didn’t change the shared whole framework of Twentieth-Century Italian Art exhibition. Instead it’s more interesting note they agreed to consider not...
enough good works of artist well appreciated by Italian critics, such as Mino Maccari, Gino Rossi, and Osvaldo Licini.

After Futurism, Metaphysical painting was the second original contribution to modernism that Barr and Soby proposed in *Twentieth-Century Italian Art*, represented in a selection of names and works based on the Biennale’s afore mentioned show *Tre pittori italiani dal 1910 al 1920*. In including Carrà and Morandi as members of the Scuola Metafisica along with de Chirico, the Biennale’s curators interpreted Metaphysical painting as an innovative expression of Italian identity (despite de Chirico’s claim that it was, for him, a personal philosophy and experience). Thus, the Metaphysical style clearly visible in great masterpieces on display in Venice, and also lent by the Italian private collectors mentioned above, was identified as an Italian model as prominent as Futurism. In the MoMA catalogue, Soby would credit Mario Broglio’s *Valori plastici* journal, published from 1918–21, as having brought the Scuola Metafisica international fame and lasting influence.

In his 1948 review of the Biennale (figure 14) (and in the *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* catalogue too), Soby considered the careers of de Chirico, Carrà, and Morandi separately, and in so doing spotlighted Morandi’s role in Italian modernism. In recalling Morandi as a great discovery during their travels in Italy, he confessed to having previously assumed that Italians’ esteem for Morandi was exaggerated and simply the result of the isolation imposed on Italian art by the Fascist regime. But “as one sees whole rooms hung with Morandis in the leading Italian collections, one becomes aware that his art reflects the most subtle modifications of form and tone, that he has in fact devoted himself to a research whose formal purity and lyric impetus are comparable, in more representational terms, of the late Piet Mondrian.” Moreover, Soby grasped just how much Morandi had influenced younger painters of different tendencies throughout Italy – abstractionists, expressionists, romantics, and realists.

Reviewing Soby’s list of works at the Biennale, Barr of course agreed with him on Morandi, selecting several works; he bought the beautiful *Natura morta* (Still Life, 1916) from Morandi for MoMA’s collection, and *Natura morta con bottiglie e piatto di frutta* (Still Life with Bottles and Fruit Dish, 1916) and *Oggetti* (Objects, 1919) would be lent from the Feroldi and Longhi collections. For MoMA’s print collection Barr purchased five etchings also from Morandi.
Three landscapes, from 1913, 1928, and 1933; and two still lifes, from 1933 and 1934), as well as additional items from Bartolini (La storia del martin pescatore [The Story of the Kingfisher], 1935; Il sogno di Anna [Anna’s Dream], 1941; Tacchi alti [High Heels], 1946; and Lungotevere [Tevere Waterfront], 1947), Giuseppe Viviani (La gambo [The Leg], 1939; Bicicletta dal mare [Bicycle by the Sea], 1941; and five miniature etchings, 1947), Casorati (Ragazza che dorme [Girl Sleeping], 1946; Due donne [Two Women], 1946, and lithographs from an album portfolio), and Manzù (etchings for Le Georgiche di Virgilio [Virgil’s Georgics], 1948); these works were included in Twentieth-Century Italian Art. After WWII the print collection of MoMA became more and more important, leading to the opening of the Abby Aldrich Rockefeller Print Room in May 1949, which was inaugurated with the show Master Prints from the Museum Collection. Despite prints having always had a place in the museum’s collection, only at the end of 1940s MoMA established a department of prints, naming William Slattery Lieberman as its first curator. This development followed the model of other pioneering institutions in

championing printmaking, such as the Brooklyn Museum, the Cincinnati Art Museum, and the Art Institute of Chicago. In a special bulletin dedicated to the print exhibition, Barr highlighted the extraordinary flowering of printmaking, which as an art had reached unprecedented levels of accomplishment. He presented printmaking as an essentially democratic medium and the most efficient means for disseminating abstract art far and wide.

Similarly to the Quadriennale, the Venice Biennale gave a special visibility to the sculpture, but in a different way: by focusing on the main figures such as Martini, Marini, and Manzù thanks to dedicated rooms, and also by displaying the pieces in the rooms according to the painting on the walls, in order to suggest a mutual visual dialogue between both medium and languages. Thus at the Venice Biennale, Barr and Soby also appreciated the sculptors Minguzzi, Marcello Mascherini, and Fontana, with his ceramic piece Cristo (Christ, 1948). But they focused above all on the three most-esteemed Italian sculptors: Martini, Marini, and Manzù. The latter had a special position of preeminence at the 1948 Biennale having been awarded the top prize for Italian sculpture. Soby asserted that the “Three M’s” contributed enormously to the call for modern Italian art to be better known internationally.

Among Martini’s sculptures on display in the rotunda (figure 15) and other rooms of the Italian Pavilion, Barr borrowed from Brigida Pessano, Martini’s wife, Dedalo e Icaro (Dedalus and Icarus, 1935–36). Moreover the terra-cottas Le collegiali (Women Chatting, 1927–31) and La moglie del pescatore (The Fisherman’s Wife, 1931) were lent by the art dealer and collector Count Contini Bonacossi, whom Margaret Scolari Barr visited in Florence, while Alfred Barr “wasted a dreary two hours going through the modern Collection on the top of Pitti, closed to public.” Dedalo e Icaro (Daedalus and Icarus, 1934), which would be purchased by MoMA during the run of Twentieth-Century Italian Art, is exemplary of Martini’s language, featuring a rude, powerful expressionism and sense of archaic grandeur that draws equally on primitive and mannerist sources.

As is well known, since 1948 Marini enjoyed strong success in America thanks to the dealer Curt Valentin and Soby, as his sculptures were exhibited in galleries and museums throughout the country. Soby's interpretation of
Marini’s work was partially based on the analysis of Lamberto Vitali, specifically a long article published in the American magazine Horizon in September 1948: Marini was an heir of Italian tradition – primitive and anti-academic – but he was also extremely modern and connected to European developments. Soby was enthusiastic about Marini’s sculpture, and he highlighted his plastic values of Marini’s sculpture as well as his strong textural interest, and his sensitivity to the particularities of character: “Marini is today one of the few major figures of his generation in European sculpture. [...] His presence in Italy today is an extraordinary asset in the resurgence of creative impetus among the younger men.”

For Twentieth-Century Italian Art, Barr and Soby selected a few Marini drawings and some outstanding sculptures: Pugile (Prizefighter, 1935) from the Valentiner Collection; Nudo (Nude, 1943), shown at Buchholz Gallery in New York in 1948; the great Cavallo e cavaliere (Horse and Rider, 1947–48), purchased by Mrs. John D. Rockefeller III and by MoMA just before the show; the Ritratto di Lamberto Vitali (Portrait of Lamberto Vitali, 1945), lent by the critic and then acquired by MoMA after the exhibition; and Ritratto di Carlo Carrà (Portrait of Carlo Carrà, 1947), lent by the artist.
Italian critics saw the sculptor Manzù as continuing in the tradition of Medardo Rosso. Though Soby on the whole preferred the work of Marini, since it was more original and stronger, both he and Barr deeply admired Manzù’s sculpture *Ritratto di signora* (Portrait of Lady, 1946), on display at the Venice Biennale and later at MoMA. They described it as “a moving and gracious work of art, achieving an atmospheric magnetism through its delicacy of line and surface.” Soby added that Manzù was a sculptor “warm, tender [and] romantic, belonging essentially to older sculptural tradition.”

Barr agreed with Soby also on Semeghini, Borra, Casorati, Pirandello, Campigli and Mafai; on many of Scipione’s paintings; Stradone’s *Coleotteri* (Beetles, 1944) (even if *The Colosseum* seen in the Laudisa Collection in Rome was the best); Cassinari’s *La madre* (The Mother, 1948), purchased by Barr from Vitali; and above all on Carrà, whose paintings enriched the Metaphysical School section of the MoMA exhibition, as well as the focus on Italian painting during 1920s and 1930s. As Soby wrote, Carrà was a problem because of the difficulty of selecting among many great works. The selection of De Pisis’s works wasn’t easy either: Barr got generally bored by his paintings seen at Biennale and he only liked few items, mostly suggested by Soby since excellent in quality: Jesi’s brilliant portrait of *Soldato nello studio* (Recruit, 1937), Novacco’s *I peltri* (Pewters, 1941), Romanelli’s *Il Coniglio* (The Rabbit, 1933), Venturi’s *La porta del mio studio* (The Door of My Studio, 1935), which will be showed at *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* exhibition. Soby well identified the different sources of De Pisis’ painting (Manet, Impressionism, Metafisica, Baroque, eighteenth century’s venetian landscape painting) and the virtuosity of his technique. Also, he pointed out De Pisis’ “contradiction”: “Because he improvises with such rapt faith in his own virtuosity, he succeeds or fails according to the clarity and depth of the emotion that prompts a given work. His lack of meditative integrity is his vice and his virtue.” Another specific case was Gianfilippo Usellini’s one; Barr and Soby appreciated his work, but they didn’t find any very good piece available.

In Venice, Cagli’s *La Chanson d’outrée* (The song of outraged ones, 1947) was, for Barr, good but inferior to the best works seen in Rome; Alberto Ziveri (influenced by Scipione’s and Mafais’ painting) and Gianni Vagnetti were interesting; and Virgilio Guidi – thanks to his simplified language – rose in
his opinion, so much so that they chose to borrow from the artist both *Figure nello spazio III* (Figures in Space III, 1947) and *Nudo* (Nude, 1945). Instead Barr and Soby considered of insufficient quality those paintings on view beyond their very different stylistic affiliation: Rossi, Rolando Colombini, Antonio Calderara, Mario Cavaglieri (despite Longhi’s recommendation), Orfeo Tamburi, Vittorio Bolaffio, Lega, Maccari, Birolli, Turcato, Corpora, Sante Monachesi. Moreover, Barr didn’t like enough paintings by Emilio Vedova, Giuseppe Aimone, Arnoldo Ciarrocchi, and Giuseppe Capogrossi, and he disparaged works by Domenico Cantatore, Omiccioli, Domenico Purificato, Ennio Morlotti, and Leoncillo.\(^{120}\)

It’s clear that Soby and Barr were demanding and very careful in their selection of young artists at the Rome Quadriennale and Venice Biennale or supported by the commercial galleries, since they were “uneven in quality.”\(^{121}\) In effect in the *Saturday Review of Literature*, Soby wrote that “perhaps it is too early to decide whether in Italy a strong new generation of artists is emerging, but at least the young there are really young (many of the most promising are under thirty), and they work with the enthusiasm of those who believe that history is ahead of them instead dogging their tracks.”\(^{122}\) Notably, they chose only a few members from Fronte Nuovo delle Arti group to appear in *Twentieth-Century Italian Art*. The group – composed of Birolli, Corpora, Franchina, Guttuso, Leoncillo, Morlotti, Pizzinato, Santomaso, Turcato, Vedova, and Viani, who were linked much more by a common will of renewal than a shared style – was supported by the critic Giuseppe Marchiori and much discussed by Italian critics in newspapers and art journals during the Biennale; indeed, they were widely considered the most dynamic emerging practitioners of painting and sculpture. Among them, Guttuso was the most attractive to the representatives of MoMA, thanks to a visual rather than political or ideological approach: they appreciated his neo-cubist style and didn't consider his affiliation to Communist party. Both Barr and Soby appreciated also several of Pizzinato's and Santomaso’s paintings,\(^{123}\) and Viani’s sculpture (which they had already enjoyed at the Fifth Quadriennale).\(^{124}\)

Of course, the Italian Communist-artists topics was one of the main troubles which Barr and Soby faced. They always asserted that their selection was made solely on the basis of artistic quality, but they were aware of political
instability in Italy after WWII, that could be a problem as well as an opportunity:

Our choice of works for the exhibition, though not yet final, was made solely on the basis of quality. We made clear from the beginning that the political convictions of the artists would not be a factor in our judgment. As a result, we were able to work with a free hand, and perhaps it is not too optimistic to claim that our impartiality had a good if minor effect. We found on arrival in Italy that a majority of the living artists were Communists. Before the elections of April, the Communist party had made all manner of promises to prominent Italian artists. But when one of the most intelligent of the younger Italian Communist-artists was asked what he had really received from the Communist party, he reply was ‘Nothing but orders.’ These orders began to be a serious matter before we left Italy. Before the elections, the Communist party has assured the artists that they would be entirely free to paint what they liked – abstractions, expressionist pictures, anything they wanted. The assurance was frequently given that Italian Communist would not follow the Russian pattern of forcing artists to create image useful to the Communist Party, that is, to create “socialist realist” images to direct propaganda value to the Party. But soon after the elections, the Communist members of an important jury were instructed not to award prizes to any abstract paintings but rather to favour realistic and social works. This action came as a bombshell to advanced artists of Italy. It made the Museum’s non-political impartiality of choice seem the more welcome, and perhaps we are justified in saying that at least a few good artists began to consider anew the virtues of the democratic principle “Freedom of expression.”

Thus, Barr and Soby’s grand tour was utterly educational and they departed confident that an extremely interesting exhibition would result – one surely more varied and of better quality than what they had supposed possible before their trip.
Quality was the refrain of Barr and Soby, but which is “quality?” In a transnational exchange operation like *Twentieth-Century Italian Art* exhibition, the evaluation of “quality” of artworks was totally arbitrary and according to a specific point of view, influenced by the context and many factors: establishing the role of Italian art in the international context of modernism according to Barr’s stylistically derivative system proposed since 1936 and at the base of MoMA presentation of twentieth-century art; a schizophrenic and contradictory methodology, from one hand, that aimed to select artworks by a stylistic and visual approach and neglected any social and political influences, from the other, that considered the new democratic and political order in Italy after the end of Fascism indispensable prerequisite for a new “Italian renaissance” in art too; Barr and Soby’s personal taste and interest.
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