blow of the current aesthetic is the same man who breaks new ground for the boldest trends, who explores untrodden territories while delving more deeply into the ancestral mystery of the core essence of man since prehistorical times.”

Neither does Picasso venerate, nor does his work seek to represent, any ideal beauty. Can he perhaps be distinguished from the other leaders of the new modern movements on account of his stylistic boldness? With blessed incoherence, in response to the modern artistic spirit, he dares take on any form to cannibalize it.

And he does so by pursuing a destabilizing creative strategy whose overall success, as can be seen, amounts to rejecting the aesthetic cliché so typical of the interpretations and standardizations of conventional art historians which allow only one creative stance that is clear insofar as it shuns possible stylistic conflicts that would make it theoretically contradictory.

More Baroque than classical as a Spaniard, more Latin than Celtic as a Frenchman, the Málaga-born artist seems to enjoy a unique status, a sort of double nationality, a safe-conduct whereby being a Spaniard and becoming a Frenchman situates his work in a broad and vague conceptual territory that is sensitive both to respect for tradition and to loyalty towards being modern.
The universality required of, and attributed to, Pablo Picasso’s work soon made him a reference point and guide for twentieth-century international art history. He thus is a unique example of how an artist’s formal approach is capable of changing not only the language but the very understanding of art in an international community. However, it is the singularity and creative independence the Málaga-born painter always jealously guarded that set his legacy apart from that of other artists. We propose that it was his loyalty to the syncretic history of his place of origin—the cultural and cultual Mediterranean of Spain, Andalusia, and Málaga—that saved it from the typical divorce of modern European culture. How? By thinking along the lines of Aristotelian universality, by not being averse to evoking emotions or to telling his own life story. To paraphrase the French philosopher François Jullien, Picasso’s southern resistance kept at bay the ailment of history, a classic symptom of northern culture. As this exhibition shows, Spain’s artistic heritage played an important referential role in the mythological account of what the south is in Picasso’s complex conceptual map.

Since the Romantic period, the metaphor of the path, of the creative foray in search of an otherness located in a supposedly eternal time, helped construct the contemporary artistic imaginary. Unlike the eighteenth-century orientalist writers and painters captivated by the promises of colonial ambitions, or the nineteenth-century traveling impressionists dazzled by the brilliant sun’s rays of faraway lands, Pablo Picasso was born in the south of Europe, where colony and light are the birthright of its inhabitants, whose harshness handed down by history does not need to be desired.

The artist set out of his own accord and at his own risk on a particular northward path: as a teenager in La Coruña, a student and editor in Madrid, a non-conformist bohemian in Barcelona, and a professional artist in Paris, where he coincided with other southerners such as the Romanian Constantin Brancusi (“create like a god, command like a king, work like a slave”), the Italian Amedeo Modigliani (“Rome is not outside me, but inside me”), and the Uruguayan Joaquín Torres García (“our north is the south!”). He arrived in the city of light and art from a place that was alien to the notion of the Mediterranean as an ideal concept or spectacular setting.

Picasso’s “Mediterranean” is interpreted in the south as not being part of a planned program or artistic project. It consists of episodes chosen from the life of a painter who appears to wander, albeit with a steady course, between the policies of theme and form, along the paths and tracks of the essential—of the mystical even—translating magic into images when he narratively explores the expressive rhetoric of mythology: “It has taken me a lifetime to learn to draw like a child.”

This manner of looking at his work has little to do with the German archaeologist and historian Johann Joachim Winckelmann’s conception of classicism according to which a painting is the representation of an idealized space. The founder of art history as a modern discipline attached particular importance to education, beauty, and virtue, stating that “there is but one way for the moderns to become great, and perhaps unequalled by imitating the ancients.” There is no Arcadia here and much less calls to any sort of order from someone who expressed his sympathies for anarchism during his rebellious youth in Barcelona and uttered the programmatic proclamation “let’s disorder history!”

As John Berger has aptly pointed out, “Picasso the métèque, a foreigner to the refined French environment, with the force of a primitive from a very early agrarian civilization, is capable of subverting order. The stylized Andalusian derives everything from his much-discussed archaism, from his deep Mediterranean roots. The savage and brutal destroyer of classical beauty, the barbarian who shatters academic art and deals the harshest