



Revista Internacional

Nº 12 Año 2015

ESPAÑÓLES, INDIOS, AFRICANOS Y GITANOS.
EL ALCANCE GLOBAL DEL FANDANGO EN MÚSICA, CANTO Y DANZA

SPANIARDS, INDIANS, AFRICANS AND GYPSIES:
THE GLOBAL REACH OF THE FANDANGO IN MUSIC, SONG, AND
DANCE

CONSEJERÍA DE CULTURA

Centro de Documentación Musical de Andalucía

Actas del congreso internacional organizado por The Foundation for Iberian Music, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York el 17 y 18 de abril del 2015

Proceedings from the international conference organized and held at The Foundation for Iberian Music, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, on April 17 and 18, 2015

Depósito Legal: GR-487/95 **I.S.S.N.:** 1138-8579

Edita © JUNTA DE ANDALUCÍA. Consejería de Cultura.

Centro de Documentación Musical de Andalucía

Carrera del Darro, 29 18010 Granada

informacion.cdma.ccul@juntadeandalucia.es

www.centrodedocumentacionmusicaldeandalucia.es

Facebook: <http://www.facebook.com/DocumentacionMusicalAndalucia>

Twitter: <http://twitter.com/CDMAndalucia>

Música Oral del Sur es una revista internacional dedicada a la música de transmisión oral, desde el ámbito de la antropología cultural aplicada a la música y tendiendo puentes desde la música de tradición oral a otras manifestaciones artísticas y contemporáneas. Dirigida a musicólogos, investigadores sociales y culturales y en general al público con interés en estos temas.

Presidente

ROSA AGUILAR RIVERO

Director

REYNALDO FERNÁNDEZ MANZANO

Coordinación

K. MEIRA GOLDBERG

ANTONI PIZÀ

Presidente del Consejo Asesor

JOSÉ ANTONIO GONZÁLEZ ALCANTUD

Consejo Asesor

MARINA ALONSO (Fonoteca del Museo Nacional de Antropología. INAH – Mexico DF)

ANTONIO ÁLVAREZ CAÑIBANO (Dir. del C. de Documentación de la Música y la Danza, INAEM)

SERGIO BONANZINGA (Universidad de Palermo - Italia)

EMILIO CASARES RODICIO (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

TERESA CATALÁN (Conservatorio Superior de Música de Madrid)

MANUELA CORTÉS GARCÍA (Universidad de Granada)

Ma ENCINA CORTIZA RODRÍGUEZ (Universidad de Oviedo)

FRANCISCO J. GIMÉNEZ RODRÍGUEZ (Universidad de Granada)

ALBERTO GONZÁLEZ TROYANO (Universidad de Sevilla)

ELSA GUGGINO (Universidad de Palermo – Italia)

SAMIRA KADIRI (Directora de la Casa de la Cultura de Tetuán – Marruecos)

CARMELO LISÓN TOLOSANA (Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Políticas – Madrid)

BEGOÑA LOLO (Dir^a. del Centro Superior de Investigación y Promoción de la Música, U. A. de Madrid)

JOSÉ LÓPEZ CALO (Universidad de Santiago de Compostela)

JOAQUÍN LÓPEZ GONZÁLEZ (Director Cátedra Manuel de Falla, Universidad de Granada)

MARISA MANCHADO TORRES (Conservatorio Teresa Berganza, Madrid)

TOMÁS MARCO (Academia de Bellas Artes de San Fernando – Madrid)

JAVIER MARÍN LOPEZ (Universidad de Jaén)

JOSEP MARTÍ (Consell Superior d'Investigacions Científiques – Barcelona)

MANUEL MARTÍN MARTÍN (Cátedra de flamencología de Cádiz)

ANTONIO MARTÍN MORENO (Universidad de Granada)
ÁNGEL MEDINA (Universidad de Oviedo)
MOHAMED METALSI (Instituto del Mundo Árabe – París)
CORAL MORALES VILLAR (Universidad de Jaén)
MOCHOS MORFAKIDIS FILACTOS (Pdte. Centros Estudios Bizantinos Neogriegos y Chipriotas)
DIANA PÉREZ CUSTODIO (Conservatorio Superior de Música de Málaga)
ANTONI PIZA (Foundation for Iberian Music, CUNY Graduate Center, New York)
MANUEL RÍOS RUÍZ (Cátedra de flamencología de Jerez de la Frontera)
ROSA MARÍA RODRÍGUEZ HERNÁNDEZ (Codirectora revista Itamar, Valencia)
SUSANA SARDO (University of Aveiro)
JOSÉ MARÍA SÁNCHEZ VERDÚ (Robert-Schumann-Musikhochschule, Dusseldorf)
FRÉDÉRIC SAUMADE (Universidad de Provence Aix-Marseille – Francia)
RAMÓN SOBRINO (Universidad de Oviedo)
Ma JOSÉ DE LA TORRE-MOLINA (Universidad de Málaga)

Secretaría del Consejo de Redacción

MARTA CURESES DE LA VEGA (Universidad de Oviedo)

Secretaría Técnica

MARÍA JOSÉ FERNÁNDEZ GONZÁLEZ (Centro de Documentación Musical de Andalucía)
IGNACIO JOSÉ LIZARÁN RUS (Centro de Documentación Musical de Andalucía)

Maquetación

ALEJANDRO PALMA GARCÍA
JOSÉ MANUEL PÁEZ RODRÍGUEZ

Acceso a los textos completos

Web Centro de Documentación Musical de Andalucía

<http://www.centrodedocumentacionmusicaldeandalucia.es/opencms/documentacion/revistas>

Repositorio de la Biblioteca Virtual de Andalucía

<http://www.bibliotecavirtualdeandalucia.es/catalogo>

CANTE LIBRE IS NOT FREE – CONTRASTING APPROACHES TO FANDANGOS PERSONALES¹⁾

John Moore
UC San Diego

Resumen:

Los palos flamencos suelen dividirse en dos categorías: los palos a compás y los palos libres. La mayoría de los palos libres pertenece a la familia de los fandangos, que derivan de palos folklóricos rítmicos. Los palos libres surgieron a finales del siglo XIX y principios del XX, cuando cantaores profesionales ampliaron el repertorio flamenco transformando los palos rítmicos en obras libres. Entre estas últimas se encuentran los fandangos personales, asociados con el movimiento de la “ópera flamenca”. Este ensayo estudia dos posibles formas de compás en los fandangos personales: la de Pepe Marchena y la de Manolo Caracol. Propongo aquí que existe una amplia gama de expresiones rítmicas que incluye estructuras rítmicas claramente definidas, así como estructuras de canto libre. Sin embargo, siempre quedan vestigios de compás incluso en los ejemplos más libres del canto libre.

Palabras Clave:

Fandangos, fandangos personales, canto libre, flamenco, rhythm, ópera flamenca, Pepe Marchena, Manolo Caracol

Abstract:

Flamenco song forms are often divided into two categories: *cante a compás* and *cante libre*; respectively those with a steady rhythmic structure and those said to lack any regular rhythmic structure. Most of the *cante libre* forms belong to the generalized fandangos family and derive ultimately from rhythmic folkloric song forms. *Cante libre* emerged in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as professional singers expanded the flamenco repertoire by transforming these rhythmic forms into libre vocal showpieces. Among these are the *fandangos personales*, which are often associated with the twentieth century *ópera flamenca* movement. This paper will examine two contrasting approaches to rhythm in *fandangos personales*: those associated with Pepe Marchena and Manolo Caracol. I discuss the interplay between rhythm and adornment in the execution of this form and an evolution where compás diminishes over time. Interestingly, however, one finds vestiges of compás, even in the freest expression of *cante libre*.

KEYWORDS

Fandangos, fandangos personales, canto libre, flamenco, rhythm, ópera flamenca, Pepe Marchena, Manolo Caracol

¹⁾ Thanks to Brook Zern for generously sharing the discographic information. He is not responsible for any erroneous interpretations presented here.

Author Bio:

John Moore received his Ph.D. in Linguistics in 1991 from UC Santa Cruz and has been on the UC San Diego linguistics faculty since 1992. His research has been in the areas of theoretical syntax, lexical semantics, and Spanish linguistics. His current research includes work on the syntax of Moro (central Sudan), and Spanish, as spoken in the San Diego-Tijuana border region. Moore began as provost of UC San Diego's John Muir College in September 2013.

Outside academia, Moore has played flamenco guitar semi-professionally for over 40 years. In 2008 he released a solo guitar CD *Cinfución* and has recently begun to publish on flamenco topics, including a 2012 annotated translation of Ortiz Nuevo's classic *Mil y una historias de Pericón* de Cádiz (*A thousand and one stories of Pericón de Cádiz*).

Moore, John. "Cante libre is not free – contrasting approaches to fandangos personales". *Música Oral del Sur*, n. 12, pp. 185-198, 2015, ISSN 1138-8579

INTRODUCTION

This paper will discuss aspects of the *fandango personal* – a flamenco *cante* that became popular during the early twentieth century and remains a popular major flamenco song form today. I will begin by discussing the folkloric roots of these fandangos and how the folkloric rhythmic structure was altered to create a vocal showpiece. *Fandangos personales* are usually characterized as *cante libre* – that is, a form with no fixed rhythm. Nevertheless, I will show that this is not always the case and that vestiges of the folkloric rhythm remain, even in interpretations that seem to be *libre*. In addition, I will suggest that interpretations range from fully to less rhythmic, with the trend to dispense with some of the rhythmic remnants as the form evolved in the twentieth century. After discussing the emergence and structure of these *fandangos*, I will concentrate on their interpretation by two prominent exponents of the *fandango personal*: Pepe Marchena and Manolo Caracol. These artists had very different approaches, but both were hugely influential during the mid-twentieth century and both were widely imitated, leading to a division in interpretation, which, to some degree, remains with flamenco today.

EASTERN AND WESTERN VARIETIES

The *fandango personal* has its roots in the folkloric *fandangos* of Southwestern Andalucía – often loosely referred to as *fandangos de Huelva*, due to their prominence in the province of Huelva, although there are several regional varieties of *fandangos* found in that area. Nevertheless, it is useful to distinguish Western *fandangos* (de Huelva) from the related Eastern *fandangos* found in the provinces of Málaga, Granada, and elsewhere, as these latter are characterized by a distinct rhythm (“*abandolao*”), despite a nearly identical chord structure.

The *abandolao* forms include a number of regional varieties, all with a basic 6-count rhythm and a similar chord structure. The *abandolao* cover term has gained increased currency over the past decades for forms that once were, perhaps too loosely, referred to as *verdiales*. Indeed, *verdiales* represent a particular form in this family, as do *rondeñas*, *jaberas*, *fandangos de Granada*, *fandangos de Lucena*, among others.²⁾ The Golden period of flamenco – roughly the late nineteenth century – saw several singers develop personalized versions of some of these forms. By dispensing with the strict rhythmic structure, they created a repertoire of free form (or *cante libre*) forms such as *malagueñas* and *granadinas*. Major figures from this period include artists such as Juan Breva, Antonio Chacón, Fosforito, El Canario, and Enrique el Mellizo (Molina and Mairena 1979:298-305, Alvarez Caballero 1981:121-127). A somewhat different, but similar, process, also in the late nineteenth century, led to the development of the *Levante* forms from *fandangos* associated with the Eastern provinces of Almería and Murcia; these include *tarantas*, *mineras*, *cartegeneras*, among others (Castro Buendía 2011).

Discographic evidence shows that both *abandolao*-based and *Levante* forms were popular around the turn of the twentieth century. In 2003 the Centro Andaluz de Flamenco released a double CD with 45 tracks taken from early wax cylinder recordings. While these are not dated, they probably were recorded before 1905. They include six *malagueñas*, three *cartegeneras*, and one *murciana*. Similarly, a 1996 Sonifolk collection of 24 recordings by Antonio Chacón (recorded between 1913 and 1927) includes five *malagueñas*, two *granadinas*, two *media granadinas*, two *mineras*, and three *cartegeneras*. Interestingly, neither of these collections includes forms labeled '*fandangos*'. A survey of recordings from the Soler collection (consisting of about 6000 recordings from cylinders and 78s), restricting the search to recordings from 1890 through 1909, reveals seven cuts labeled simply '*fandangos*' – three by el Niño de Cabra, one by el Diana, and three by el Mochuelo. While I have not been able to locate all of these, those I have reviewed (by el Niño de Cabra and el Mochuelo) were actually *fandangos de Lucena*, again from the *abandolao* category. Also included among these early recordings were a total of twelve cuts labeled '*malagueña y fandango*', '*cartagena-fandangos*', '*tarantas y fandango*', '*fandangos de Granada*', '*fandangos de Málaga*', and '*fandangos de Lucena*'. I assume these also represent *fandangos* based on *abandolao* or other Eastern forms. Thus, it is likely that the term '*fandangos*' had not been widely applied to Western varieties at this point and that the regional varieties from the Huelva region had not yet been exploited by professional singers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

²⁾ It may be the case that aficionados did not always control the melodic distinctions between these forms and simply referred to them all as *verdiales*. Nowadays, more enlightened aficionados still do not always control the distinctions, but refer to them all as *abandolao*.

Whereas the late nineteenth century saw the rise of personalized versions of *abandolao* forms, the rise of Western-based *fandangos* seems to have begun slowly in the teens to become a robust trend in the 1920s. Looking again at the Soler collection, of the 26 recordings from teens identified as some type of *fandango*, we still find fifteen that are unlikely to be Western (listed as *malagueña y fandango*, *fandango de Lucena*, etc.), but eight labeled simply ‘*fandangos*’ and three ‘*fandangos de Huelva*’. Of course, we don’t know how many of those listed as ‘*fandangos*’ might be something like *fandangos de Lucena*, but the first appearance of ‘*fandangos de Huelva*’ shows that Western varieties are entering the professional repertoire.

Turning next to recordings from the 1920s, we find an explosion of *fandangos*, and it is likely that the majority of these are based on the Western style. Of the 595 Soler recordings from this decade bearing some kind of ‘*fandangos*’ label, only fourteen have labels like ‘*fandangos de Lucena*’, etc., while 26 are ‘*fandangos de Huelva*’; the remaining 555 are simply labeled ‘*fandangos*’. Of course, the increase in numbers is certainly due to the general increase in recording, but the small percentage of non-Western labels, as compared to earlier periods is significant. Furthermore, we begin to see recordings by artists famous for the Western-based *fandangos personales*: e.g., Pepe Marchena, Angelillo, José Cepero, el Carbonerillo, Manuel Centeno, el Niño Gloria, Pepe Pinto, and Manuel Vallejo (Alvarez Caballero 1981:191-199; 207-208). Molina and Mairena (1979: 294) note that the popularity of *fandangos personales*, often based on *fandangos de Huelva*, began around 1925.

I suspect that while the use of the term ‘*fandangos*’ once tended to refer to *abandolao* forms, particularly *fandangos de Lucena*, by the end of the 1920s, this same term generally referred to Western-derived *fandangos personales* or, in some cases, *fandangos de Huelva*. Certainly, this latter usage seems to be the norm today.³⁾

FANDANGOS DE HUELVA AND FANDANGOS PERSONALES

Fandangos personales are the personalized version of primarily Western *fandangos* and vary in melody and delivery from singer to singer. Often, but not always, these are *libre* – that is, the guitarist’s rhythm associated with *fandangos de Huelva* is relaxed or abandoned. The adjective ‘*personales*’ suggests that each singer modifies the melody and delivery in a way to create a personal style of *fandango*. Such *fandangos*, particularly

³⁾ A related term ‘*fandanguillos*’ seems to be used in at least two ways. Manfredi Cano (1963:147-153) uses it as a synonym for *fandangos de Huelva*, noting that Pepe Pérez de Guzmán (1895-1930) was an important creator in this genre. Pohren (1984:120) gives the same definition. Nevertheless, Blas Vega and Ríos Ruiz 1988:288 note that ‘*fandanguillo*’ can also refer to any *fandango* associated with the *ópera flamenco* period (roughly 1920-1950), including the *fandangos personales* discussed here.

when *libre*, are sometimes called *fandangos naturales* or *fandangos grandes*.⁴⁾

To understand the structure of these *fandangos*, I first discuss the structure of *fandangos de Huelva* according to three dimensions: rhythmic structure, chord structure, poetic structure.

Rhythmic structure

The rhythm associated with *fandangos de Huelva* is usually described as either a three or six beat cycle. The flamencopolis website represents it with two measures of three beats, as in (1):



(1) (<http://www.flamencopolis.com/archives/472>)

Because the two measures have slightly different accents, most guitarists think of the form as having a six-beat pattern.

CHORD STRUCTURE

The chord structure of *fandangos de Huelva* involves two separate sections: the *copla* and the *entrecopla*. The *copla* is the verse; the singer is accompanied in a major key – often using a C major position.⁵⁾ The verse is divided into six melodic units, each with two measures of six beats. While there are several variations, the pattern in (2) is common:

- (2) *Copla*: a. G7 – C
 b. C – F
 c. G7 – C
 d. C – G7
 e. G7 – C
 f. C – F – E

Notice that while the *copla* uses chords associated with the C major key, the last line resolves from the sub-dominant F down a half-step to E, creating an E phrygian chord progression. This leads to the chord structure for the *entrecopla* ('between *coplas*'), where the guitar, without singing, cycles through the Andalusian cadence – a pattern associated with the phrygian mode:

- (3) *Entrecopla*: E – Am – G7 – F – E

⁴⁾ Pohren (1984:118-119) uses the term 'fandangos grandes', as do many non-Spanish aficionados. It is not clear that this term has much currency in Spain, where the nomenclature 'fandangos naturales' or 'fandangos personales' is common.

⁵⁾ While the guitarist often plays in the C major position, the actual key will vary, depending on the singer's range, which is accommodated through the use of a capping.

The *entrecopla* is played over two six-beat measures per cycle – there are usually two or more *entrecoplas* between each *copla*. In addition, the guitarist may play melodic variations (*falsestas*) between *coplas* – these are usually structured around the *entrecopla* chord pattern.

Thus, the chordal structure alternates between phrygian Andalusian cadence *entrecoplas* before and between verses, with related major key *coplas* interspersed.⁶⁾

POETIC STRUCTURE

Fandangos verses typically consist of five lines of approximately eight syllables each;⁷⁾ the example in (4), recorded by el Cojo de Huelva in 1943, is typical:

- (4) 1. tengo una pena conmigo (9 syllables)
 2. que me sirve de compañía. (8 syllables)
 3. Ya la alegría para mí (8 syllables, *para* → *pa*)
 4. me parece cosa extraña, (9 syllables)
 5. desde que te conocí. (7 syllables)
 ‘I have a sorrow
 that keeps me company.
 For me happiness
 is something unknown,
 ever since I met you.’

In order to fit five lines into six melody units, one of the poetic lines (usually the second) is sung twice – as the first and third melodic line (lines a and c in 2). Each line contains twelve beats (two measures of six) and approximately eight syllables. However, there is often more than one syllable per beat and the final syllable may fall as early as the fifth or sixth beat of the first measure, or as late as the third beat of the second measure. In order to fill out the second measure, some syllables can be elongated; most commonly the last syllable is extended several beats, while other accented syllables may also be extended. It is common for the singing to end before the end of the second measure, where the singer rests during the remaining beats. Putting this all together, the example in (4) is sung approximately as in (5):

⁶⁾ Because traditional flamenco guitarists were unschooled in music theory, they referred to the E position as ‘por arriba’, reflecting the altitude of the left hand on the fingerboard. Fandangos de Huelva could also be played in the A position, which was called ‘por medio’ (left hand in the middle of the fingerboard); this would involve an A phrygian *entrecopla* (A Dm, C7, Bb, A), and the related F major *copla*. Additionally, there are several regional varieties (e.g. Calaña, among others), where the *entrecopla* remains in E phrygian, while the *copla* may be in A major, A minor, or A major alternating with A minor.

⁷⁾ See Navarro (1968:61-76) for a discussion of Spanish intonation groups and how they are typically seven or eight syllables long.

(5) *Fandangos de Huelva* (el Cojo de Huelva)

Line a. Rhythm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

Chords: G7 C

Verse: que me sir- ve de com- paña aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

Line a. Rhythm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

Chords: C F

Verse: tengo una pena con- mi- gooooooooooooooooooooo

Line a. Rhythm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

Chords: G7 C

Verse: que me sir- ve de com- paña- aaaaaaaa

Line a. Rhythm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

Chords: C G7

Verse: ya la ale- gría pa iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii

Line a. Rhythm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

Chords: G7 C

Verse: me par- ece cosa (e)xtra ñaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

Line a. Rhythm: 1 2 3 4 5 6 1 2 3 4 5 6

Chords: C F E

Verse: des- de que te cono- cii

Taking the structure of *fandangos de Huelva* as a canonical pattern upon which *fandangos personales* are based, we find that singers employ a variety of mechanisms to personalize their interpretations. These include:

(6) Non-canonical aspects of *fandangos personales*:

Medium to long extensions: varying degrees of longer extensions than normally found in *fandangos de Huelva*

Linking: combining lines – that is, moving from one line to the next without resting for the final beats

Pauses: breaking up a line with pauses, repetitions, and vocalizations (‘ay’, ‘jipíos’)

The last line (line f) often involves extensions, repetitions, vocalizations, etc.; however, these features are also possible on the other lines. The following examples illustrate some of these effects:

(7)*Fandangos*, Pepe Marchena (Gramophóno, 1934; re-released 1996, *Cátedra del Cante*)

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | a implorer vienes tú perdón | |
| b. | tú le faltaste a mi madre un día | extensions throughout |
| c. | y vienes a implorarme perdón | extension, mid-line |
| d. | sabiendo que tú no podías | extension, end of line |
| e. | perdonar tu mal acción | extensions, beginning & end of line |
| f. | aunque tanto yo a ti te quería | pauses |

‘One day you disrespected my mother
and now you come asking forgiveness
knowing that you cannot
forgive such a bad deed
even though I loved you so much.’

(8)*Fandangos*, Manolo Caracol (Columbia, 1954; re-released 2007, *Discos de Pizarra*)

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| a. | de mi mente | extension, end of line |
| b. | le pido a ese gran poder | pause, extensions, mid- & end of line |
| c. | que te quitara de mi mente | extensions throughout |
| d. | yo paso un día sin verte | |
| e. | delante de una cruz | |
| f. | a Dios le pido la muerte | |
- vocalizations (ay ...), pauses, long resolve⁸⁾

‘I ask that great power
to get you out of my mind.
If I go a day without seeing you
in front of a cross
I ask God for death.’

In both of the examples in (7-8), the guitarist does not keep a steady rhythm; rather, there is a background rhythm that is broken to match the singer’s structure – this is typical of *cante libre*, and particularly of *libre fandangos*. The rhythm is not totally absent, but it is inconsistent. Hence, in these *libre fandangos personales*, there are still vestiges of the six beat pattern associated with *fandangos de Huelva*. Nevertheless, it is possible to employ non-canonical features and still keep rhythm; in the following example, the guitarist keeps a steady beat, while the singing tends to float over the rhythmic structure; in addition, each line is longer than the two six-beat measures found in *fandangos de Huelva*:

⁸⁾ The series of ‘ay’ vocalizations in this example is similar to the malagueña de Enrique Mellizo. In addition, the melody of the fandango resembles that of the malagueña del Mezillo; this was a signature feature of Caracol’s fandango personal. Thus, while the guitar accompaniment is clearly based on Western fandangos, the melody is based on the (ultimately Eastern) malagueña. This is possible because the chord structures are very similar.

(9)Fandangos, Pepe Marchena (unknown year, re-released 1996, *Cátedra del Cante*)

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---|
| a. | yo vendo flor de romero | vocalization ('ay'), extensions, mid- & end of line |
| b. | en un campo entre tomillo | extensions, mid- & end of line, lines b & c linked |
| c. | yo vendo flor de romero | |
| d. | allí vive en un Castillo | lines d & e linked |
| e. | la mujer que tanto quiero | extension mid-line, vocalizations |
| f. | a reina del fandanguillo | long resolve |

'In a field of thyme
I sell rosemary flowers
there, in castle, lives
the woman I love so much
the queen of the *fandanguillo*.'

To summarize, there are a number of non-canonical features associated with *fandangos personales* – aside from melody, these are mechanisms for personalizing the *cante*. We have seen these features employed both with a rhythmic accompaniment and as *cante libre*, although, even in the latter case, the guitarist tends to keep vestiges of a six beat rhythm. This raises several questions about *fandangos personales* and *cante libre*: Is there a tendency for them to be *libre*? Put another way, is there a correlation between non-canonical features and a *libre* accompaniment? Has *libre* accompaniment become more prevalent over time? Finally, what is the range of individual variation? I will explore these questions in the next section based on a comparison of two famous *fandangueros*: Pepe Marchena and Manolo Caracol.

MARCHENA AND CARACOL: CONTRASTING APPROACHES TO FANDANGOS PERSONALES

Two of the most influential flamenco singers from the mid-twentieth century were Pepe Marchena and Manolo Caracol. Both enjoyed immense popularity, both have been criticized for their commercialization of flamenco, and both have left scores of followers. However, the two are far apart in the way they approach *cante*.

José Tejada Martín (1903-1976) was born in Marchena (Sevilla) to working- and service-class parents. His home town gave him the artistic name 'Niño de Marchena' and later 'Pepe Marchena'. Marchena worked at menial jobs, beginning around age eight and began singing in local taverns, despite opposition from his father (who was an amateur singer himself). In 1917 Marchena debuted in the *Café de Novedades* in Sevilla, which launched his professional career. He began recording in 1925 and ended up with one of the most illustrious careers in flamenco and is largely credited with popularizing the *fandangos personales*. Marchena was the leading figure of the *ópera flamenca* period, which lasted from the 1920s until the 1950s and was characterized by *fandangos*, Latin American inspired songs (e.g. *milongas*), *cante libre*, and use of falsetto. The antithesis to Gypsy

flamenco, *ópera flamenca* generated considerable controversy; many saw it as a watered-down parody of pure flamenco, while for others, it was the preferred form of popular flamenco. Thus, Marchena was a polarizing figure; while many credit him for his *fandangos* creations (e.g. el de Triana 1952:24), there is a range of opinion over his merit and influence (e.g., González Climent 1975, Pohren 1988, Cobo Guzmán 1990, and Mitchell 1994). The *ópera flamenca* period was populated with Marchena imitators; many aficionados grudgingly admire Marchena, while heaping scorn on these *marchenistas* (e.g. Camacho Galindo 1977:154-155).

Manuel Ortega Juárez (1909-1973) bore the family nickname ‘Caracol’ after his father, Manuel Caracol “el del Bulto”, a singer and sword bearer for his bullfighter cousins Rafael el Gallo and Joselito el Gallo. Born in Sevilla, and growing up in the famous Alameda de Hércules neighborhood, Caracol belonged to the Gypsy family Ortega, famous for flamenco artists and bullfighters, tracing their ancestry back to El Planeta and Curro Dulce – two of the earliest singers for which there are historical records. Manolo Caracol debuted at the 1922 *cante* contest in Granada, organized by Federico Gacía Lorca, Manuel de Falla and others. This contest was an intellectual reaction to the commercialization of flamenco; therefore, only non-professionals were allowed to compete (Mitchell 1994). The teenaged Caracol won the youth prize. He made his first recordings in 1930, and launched a very successful theatrical career, exploiting the popularity of the *ópera flamenca* movement. While his approach to *cante* was very Gypsy, he created many commercialized *cantes*, including *zambras* (to orchestral accompaniments), often performed with singer/dancer Lola Flores. His *fandangos personales* are famous and widely imitated, particularly by Gypsy singers. Caracol opened the Madrid *tablao Los Canasteros* in 1963. Aficionados tend to be more forgiving towards Caracol – partly because he can sing very intense and personal Gypsy flamenco. However, he had no qualms about commercializing his art when expedient, and this has caused some controversy (Camacho Galindo 1977:162-165).

EVIDENCE FROM A SAMPLE

In this section I report on a sample of 60 *fandangos personales* recorded between 1928 and 1963 by Marchena and Caracol (30 *fandangos* each). Each *fandango* was coded according to the degree to which it strays from the canon of a typical *fandangos de Huelva*. These codings are based on the sum of a score – between 0 and 3 – assigned to each of the first five lines of the *fandango*. Because the final line is usually ornate, it was not coded. The line score was based on the number and degree of non-canonical features: pauses, linked lines, and extensions all add to the non-canonical score (up to a ceiling of 3). The five line scores are added, yielding a range of scores from zero to ten. The purpose of this coding is to answer the following questions:

(10)

- a. Is there a significant difference between Marchena and Caracol's approach to *fandangos*?
- b. Is there a correlation between date of recording and whether the guitar accompaniment is *libre*?
- c. Is there a correlation between non-canonical features and whether the guitar accompaniment is *libre*?

It is clear from listening to the examples in (7-8) that Marchena and Caracol sound very different. Caracol's delivery is typically Gypsy, while Marchena has the sweet, high-pitched voice (with some falsetto) popular in the 1920s and 1930s. However, non-canonical features are, in principle, orthogonal to voice quality. Nevertheless, we find that Marchena's *fandangos* are, indeed, less canonical than those of Caracol. The average of Marchena's 30 scores is 4.8 (SD=2.27), while Caracol's average is 3.16 (SD=2.26). A one-tailed T-Test shows that this difference is highly significant ($p=0.00465$). While it may be possible to find examples where Marchena's *fandango* seems more ornate than Caracol's and vice versa, the statistical analysis shows that Marchena's *fandangos* are significantly more non-canonical than Caracol's.

As the *fandangos personales* evolved from Western varieties of *fandangos*, the rhythmic structure became less pronounced. If this is an actual trend from rhythmic *fandangos* towards *cante libre*, we would expect to find more *fandangos personales* with rhythmic accompaniment earlier and fewer later. The data from this sample bear this out. With two exceptions (two verses from a 1928 recording), all of the recordings between 1928 and 1933 had rhythmic accompaniments. There were two more rhythmic recordings in 1934, but the remaining eight recordings from 1934, and all subsequent recordings (1944-1963) had *libre* accompaniment. In total, there were 20 rhythmic recordings and 37 *libre* ones.⁹⁾ Thus, with the exceptions of two *libre fandangos* in 1928, the practice of *cante libre* for *fandangos personales* takes hold definitively in 1934. The correlation between date and type of accompaniment is further confirmed by a regression analysis.

In order to determine whether the degree of non-canonicity correlates with a *libre* accompaniment, and to see if this correlates with other factors, a logistic regression analysis was conducted to see which is the best-fit model to predict *libre* accompaniment. The independent variables were singer (Marchena, Caracol), guitarist (orchestra, Ramón Montoya, Niño Ricardo, Paquito Simón, Manolo de Badajoz, Paco Aguilera, Manuel Morao, Melchor de Marchena), year (1928-1963), and non-canonical score (0-10). Running a step-up regression, the only factors that were significant in the best model were year and non-canonical score:¹⁰⁾

⁹⁾ One of Marchena's recordings, with three verses, was undated and excluded from these data.

¹⁰⁾ The regression was run using the R-based Rbrul software package (<http://danielezrajohnson.com/rbrul.html>).

(11) BEST STEP-UP MODEL OF RESPONSE *libre* IS WITH PREDICTOR(S):

year (5.83e-11) + score (0.019) [p-values building from null model]

\$year continuous logodds

+1 0.416

\$score continuous logodds

+1 0.526

The fact that neither singer nor guitarist are included in the best model shows that the likelihood of a *fandangos* having a *libre* accompaniment does not correlate significantly with each of these variables. The effect of year on the model is highly significant (with a very small p-value, 5.83e-11) and the non-canonical score also contributes significantly to the model (with a p-value less than .05, .019). The logodds show the magnitude of the effect that these variables have on the likelihood of increases in year or score resulting in a higher likelihood of a *libre* accompaniment. This regression analysis confirms that *libre* accompaniment is more likely in later years (which was clear from the distribution discussed above), but it also shows something less obvious, namely that the degree of non-canonicity contributes to the likelihood of a *libre* accompaniment. While it may seem self-evident that extending melodic lines, linking them together, and inserting pauses and vocalizations should correlate with mitigated rhythm, we have seen that these can happen with rhythmic accompaniment (e.g., the example in 9), and many of these features are found in other *cantes* that are not *libre*. Nevertheless, the current analysis shows, for a particular sample, that these non-canonical features do contribute to *cante libre* in *fandangos personales*.

CONCLUSION

In this paper we have seen the emergence of *fandangos naturales*, beginning around the 1920s. While the turn of the twentieth was dominated by *fandangos* from Eastern Andalucía (*abandolao* forms, particularly *malagueñas*), the *fandangos* from the province of Huelva became the model for a new trend that largely replaced the nineteenth reign of *malagueñas*. While Eastern-based *cante libre* is still very much alive, it is not nearly as prevalent as *fandangos personales/naturales*, which are featured in practically every serious recording and performance. It may be that the structure of these *fandangos* are simpler and more direct than the rather ornate *malagueñas* and allow for a wider range of interpretations and interpreters.

We have also contrasted the *fandangos* of Pepe Marchena and Manolo Caracol and have demonstrated both qualitatively and quantitatively that their approaches are very different. Both were widely influential, although Marchena's influence waned with the onset of *mairénismo* in the 1960s, a movement that emphasized Gypsy flamenco and disparaged *ópera flamenca* practices. Caracol, because of his ability to interpret traditional Gypsy flamenco, fared better. The result is that there have been many

younger singers interpreting *fandangos caracoleros*, and few drawn to *marchenismo*. The situation may be changing, however, as contemporary flamenco has begun to embrace some of the commercial music of the past (including both *marchenista*, e.g., Juan Valderrama, son, and *caracolera*, e.g. Antonio Reyes). Thus, both of these traditions, rooted in the *ópera flamenca*, period, remain influential today.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez Caballero, Angel. 1981. *Historia del Cante Flamenco*. Alianza Editorial. Madrid.
- Blas Vega, José and Manuel Ríos Ruiz. 1988. *Diccionario Enciclopédico Ilustrado del Flamenco*. Cinterco, Madrid.
- Camacho Galindo, Pedro. 1977. *Los Payos también Cantan Flamenco*. Ediciones Demófilo, Madrid.
- Castro Buendía, Guillermo. 2011. “Los ‘otros’ fandangos, el cante de la madrugá y la taranta. Orígenes musicales del cante de las minas.” *Revista de Investigación sobre Flamenco La Madrugá*, 4, 59-135.
- Cobo Guzmán, Eugenio. 1990. *Vida y Cante del Niño de Marchena*. Imprenta San Pablo, Córdoba.
- el de Triana, Fernando. 1952. *Arte y artistas flamencos*. Caln, Madrid. Earlier edition: 1935, Helénica, Madrid.
- González Climent, Anselmo. 1975. “*Pepe Marchena y la ópera flamenca*” y otros ensayos. Demófilo, Madrid.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1994. *Flamenco: Deep Song*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Molina, Ricardo and Antonio Mairena. 1979. *Mundo y Formas del Cante Flamenco*. (third edition). Librería Al-Andaluz. Sevilla-Granada.
- Manfredi Cano, Domingo. 1963. *Geografía del Cante Jondo*. Editorial Bullón. Madrid.
- Navarro, Tomás. 1968. *Studies in Spanish Phonology*. University of Miami Press, Coral Gables.
- Pohren, Donn E. 1984. *The Art of Flamenco*. (fourth edition). Musical New Services Limited. Guitar House. Doreset.

DISCOGRAPHY

Cátedra del Cante, vol 37: *Niño de Marchena*, Producciones AR, S.L., 1996.

Cilindros de Cera: Primeras grabaciones de Flamenco, CAF, 2003.

Don Antonio Chacón, 1913-1927: La Cumbre de un Maestro. Sonifolk, 1996.

El Cojo de Huelva: Años 1940-50, Discmeni, 2004.

El Cojo de Huelva, “Que me sirve de compañía”, Odeón, 1943.

Manolo Caracol: Discos de Pizarra, Año 1930-40-50, Fono, 2007.