

FANDANGOS, FANDANGUILLOS AND FANDANGAZOS: FERNANDO EL DE TRIANA ON POPULAR AND FLAMENCO MUSIC

Cristina Cruces-Roldán

Catedrática de Antropología Social de la Universidad de Sevilla

K. Meira Goldberg

Translation

Abstract:

Arte y artistas flamencos (1935) is an indispensable text with reference to the “Golden Age” of flamenco and its protagonists, according to the vision of flamenco guitarist and singer Fernando el de Triana (1867–1940). The book bears witness to a moment in which flamenco experienced a genuine morphological revolution, developing positions and applying patrimonial logic, and thus complicating the dichotomies with which flamenco was commonly viewed, as it sought to define itself in light of territorial, artistic, and personal dimensions of meaning.

Fernando el de Triana intuited the differences between popular fandango, flamenco fandango, and the then-fashionable *fandanguillo*; his exposition of these forms distills the influences of early-twentieth-century *andalucismo* (an Andalusian parochialism and populism). I argue there that conditions under which this book was published explain the oscillations between these popularist positions, and the degree of political accommodation between flamenco and Spanish nationalism, seen as a metonymic extension of “*lo andaluz*”—and foreshadowing the coming propaganda of the Franco regime.

Keywords:

Flamenco, Fandango, Fandanguillo, Fernando el de Triana, Andalucismo

FANDANGOS, FANDANGUILLOS Y FANDANGAZOS: FERNANDO EL DE TRIANA, LA MÚSICA POPULAR Y EL FLAMENCO

Resumen:

Arte y artistas flamencos (1935) es un texto de referencia obligada para conocer la “Edad de Oro” del género flamenco y sus protagonistas, según la visión del guitarrista y cantaor Fernando el de Triana (1867-1940). Testigo de un tiempo en el que el fandango vive una verdadera revolución morfológica, despliega posiciones y razonamientos patrimonializadores acerca de este estilo que complejizan las dicotomías aplicadas al mundo flamenco, al afrontar sus formas territoriales, artísticas y personales.

Fernando el de Triana intuye las diferencias entre el flamenco popular, flamenco y el fandanguillo de moda, en cuya exposición se destilan las influencias del andalucismo de las primeras décadas del siglo XX. Sugerimos que las condiciones de edición del libro explican los vaivenes entre estas posiciones popularistas, y cierta asimilación política del flamenco respecto a “lo español-nacional” como generalización metonímica de “lo andaluz”, que anuncian el propagandismo por venir.

Palabras clave:

Flamenco, Fandango, Fandanguillo, Fernando el de Triana, Andalucismo

Cruces-Roldán, Cristina. "Fandangos, fandanguillos and fandangazos: Fernando el de Triana on popular and flamenco music". *Música Oral del Sur*, n. 13, pp. 105-126, 2016, ISSN 1138-857

INTRODUCTION

In 1935, the Spanish dancer “La Argentina” travelled from Paris to Madrid for what would be her last performance in the capital. The following morning she left for Brussels. Her destination was to support the benefit performance that would take place on June 22 at the Teatro Español to raise funds for the publication of *Arte y artistas flamencos*, a book written by an elderly *cantaor* and guitar player, Fernando el de Triana (Fernando Rodríguez Gómez, Sevilla, 1867-1940). The small volume was a compilation of biographies, anecdotes, and tales of singers, dancers, and guitarists whom Fernando el de Triana had known from the late-nineteenth century **up to** the 1930s. Accompanied by a rich collection of photographs, this vivid portrait of flamenco’s “Golden Age,” published in Madrid in 1935, has **since become an obligatory reference point for any** researcher of the history of flamenco.

However, more often cited than scrupulously analyzed, *Arte y artistas flamencos* goes beyond a simple series of portraits. Beneath its apparent lack of pretense (Navarro, 1998), the book should also be understood as an evaluation and memoir of diverse aspects of flamenco from the author’s past and present. De Triana participated in flamenco’s past as a first-hand witness. And he evaluated the changes in the genre with a heavy heart. Part of this somewhat apocalyptic discussion is centered on the fandango, about which de Triana wrote an interesting chapter: “In Defense of the Legitimate Fandango” (261–279).¹ De Triana situated this musical style at the center of the long-standing controversy over “authenticity,” in the historical, social, and theoretical context of the 1930s, which, we should understand, explains the fandango’s later vindication and reevaluation.

¹All citations are from the facsimile edition from Editoriales Andaluzas Unidas S.A. y Biental de Flamenco Ciudad de Sevilla, Sevilla, 1986.

I present here a theoretical analysis of Fernando el de Triana's view of the fandango, along with the historical, stylistic, and ideological reasoning which, in my judgment, guided him. In particular, de Triana's view of the fandango reveals an andalucismo—that is, an Andalusian parochialism and populism—which, despite following in the footsteps of Blas Infante's federalism, would nevertheless be contextualized and re-oriented toward notions of Spanish nationalism. I view the fandango as a case study in a wider series of categorizing mechanisms with which de Triana approached his book, as he found fandango in the midst of a fundamental aesthetic and morphological shift. This made it impossible for de Triana to judge the fandango according to the aesthetic categories of the late-nineteenth century regarding purity, authenticity, and the established dualisms used in the evaluation of other musical styles. It was necessary to develop a new theoretical model, whose structure we propose along these lines.

THE FANDANGO AS A REFLEXIVE OBJECT FOR YET-UNBORN FLAMENCOLOGY

Fernando el de Triana was a unique flamenco personality. Born a year before “La Gloriosa,” he appears to us as a flamenco guitarist, singer, popular poet, memoirist, as the creator of a personal taranta-malagueña (Ortega, 2009). He recorded the wake of the *salones de variedades* (variety houses) and the world of the *cafés cantantes*, where, in addition to fairs, *tabancos* (roadside stalls), working-class *tablaos*, theaters, and dancing schools, de Triana performed. Over the course of his long professional life he spent time in Sevilla, Madrid, Málaga, and Nador, finally returning to Sevilla, where he lived at first in Coria del Río, and later, in his final years, in Camas. In both towns he opened drinking establishments where guests such as his friends Manuel Torre, Pepe Torre, or “El Gloria,” could entertain, offering classes—without great success—in flamenco and classical guitar.²

At the then advanced age of sixty-eight, Fernando el de Triana wrote *Arte y artistas flamencos*. These were the final years of his life, when he was exhausted and characterized himself as physically incapable of continuing in the “exercise of the profession that for half a century I practiced with the applause of audiences all over Spain and even many outside of Spain” (262). This work, which in time has become indispensable, was published in de Triana's sad twilight years: after his death, his widow, Paca “La Coja,” peddled the last remaining copies on the streets of Camas.³

²For biographies of de Triana, see Bohórquez (1993), and Antequera (2012).

³Until the publication of de Triana's *Arte y artistas*, flamenco had occupied a marginal place in historical accounts, memoirs, narrations, libretos, inspired song collections, manuals, essays, and the odd lecture. Only Antonio Machado y Álvarez's *Colección de Cantes flamencos recogidos y anotados* (1881) and Guillermo Núñez del Prado's *Cantaos andaluces. Historias y leyendas* (1904) compiled biographical information relevant to flamenco of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Machado had broad folkloristic aims, and Núñez del Prado was more concerned with deploying his bombastic writing style, heavy with ellipses and blurred lines between lyricism and reality. Not until 2001 was the splendid memoir of the era of the *cafés cantantes* (and other subjects): *Recuerdos y*

There is still no consensus about whether, in fact, Fernando el de Triana was considered by his peers as the “Deacon of the *Cante Andaluz*,” as he referred to himself, or if he was perhaps nothing more than a second-tier artist known only within certain circles of the flamenco world of Sevilla. Little is known either about the fidelity and veracity of his “recollections,” which he insisted on qualifying as “rigorously historical” (58). Was he the sole author, or was this book a collaboration among several? Certainly, the writing has a cultivated touch which seems somewhat incongruous; some stylistic turns and even some of the book’s content raise doubts. But the literary abilities of the author of *Arte y artistas flamencos* are verifiable in other personal documents, and de Triana’s vital connections with flamenco, the art world, and poetry granted him a unique stature among flamencos of his era. In any case, none of these questions are relevant here; let us turn to his entirely fabulous text.

FLAMENCO AS A CATEGORY FOR FERNANDO EL DE TRIANA: A DIFFERENTIATED GENRE

De Triana conceived of flamenco as having its own unique identity, different from other musical forms, other dance styles, and other protocols for art making. He saw flamenco as centrally situated within a series of binary oppositions that, naturally, he never articulated in a systematic way:

1. Firstly, flamenco is different from “music,” understood as legitimated by “elite culture,” a primarily instrumental genre notated and transmitted in musical scores. Flamenco dance, though he writes more often about the song than about the dance, is also for Fernando el de Triana a specialty distinct from its closest relative in terms of formal structure and presence on stage: the “*bailles de palillos*” (castanet dances), which “until the appearance of the *viejas ricas* (a popular group of the 1880s performing carnival dances, called “tangos,” from Cádiz), were the only dances performed in the flamenco *cuadros* (performing groups)” (210).⁴

2. Accurately, Fernando el de Triana defines flamenco as a localized art, associated with a particular geographic territory. The Andalusian provinces of Sevilla and Cádiz wove together the wicker of what was “*jondo*” (deep), delineating a relationship of “belonging versus exclusion” that affected the legitimacy that de Triana attributed to flamenco forms.

confesiones del cantaor Rafael Pareja de Triana, which coincides in many ways—not only in its content—with Fernando el de Triana, published. Like de Triana, Pareja was also a singer, he also wrote flamenco verses, he was a nuanced critic of flamenco ways, and he supplemented his writing with a personal collection of photographs of artists.

⁴J.M. Sánchez Reyes, “Los tangos sevillanos de 'Las viejas ricas', en la Biblioteca Nacional,” *Diario de Cádiz*, January 1, 2014,

<http://www.diariodecadiz.es/articulo/cadiz/1867288/los/tangos/sevillanos/las/viejas/ricas/la/biblioteca/nacional.html> (accessed June 14, 2016).

De Triana viewed origin and birthplace as lucky circumstances that led inevitably to one or another path of music and repertoire (and that led him to label certain singers as “systematic flamenco singers,”) and described criteria for de Triana’s assessment of greater or lesser interpretive quality. The land, as an inheritance of nineteenth-century nationalism, is understood as a space of naturalized production, unique and inimitable: “Why is the town of Morón so important for this artform?” asked de Triana in remembering luminaries like Silverio, Niño de Morón, and Pepe Naranjo (256). The fandango, as we will see, also raised questions of geography, but postulated as an alternative to the fixed relationships between music and land. In the fandango there was no geographic polarity between “insider” and “outsider”; its natural style, the basic “*chico*” (light, or small) fandango, was ratified throughout Andalucía, whereas the fandanguillo, an artistic creation, would be strictly the product of an individual.

3. A third duality that de Triana saw in flamenco has to do with the opposition between “femininity” and “masculinity.” This division flows out of the technical and sexual division of labor, the qualification of interpretive faculties and flamenco’s gender-classified repertory. This is noted in content, as, for example, the association of women with dance and men with song, the elimination of women playing the guitar from the cuadros of flamenco tablaos, and the separation of the descriptors of the feminine voice (clear, easy, soft) from those of the masculine (hard, *de garganta* [from the throat], *de pecho* [from the chest]). That which is “hard” is for de Triana close to that which is “masculine,” and as we will see, this quality is also close to “*lo viejo*” (that which is ancient) and, in consequence, that which is “authentic.” Dolores la Parrala “had a predilection for *cantos machunos* (macho songs),” he said (78). We note that, while the popular fandango is preferentially assigned to masculine voices (even though he does take note of some female singers), Fernando el de Triana discredits personal stylizations of fandanguillos because of their symbolic “feminization,” in terms of musical structure, execution, and in the professional identity of its singers (almost all were men).

4. All of the above-mentioned merits reach still greater heights when protagonized by Gitano artists. That which is “Gitano” is for our author the authenticized substrate of flamenco, and it is genealogically transmitted—it is part of nature. This quality of *pureza* (purity), combined with the label of primitivism, bloodline, inheritance, and other ineffable categories, construct de Triana’s thinking, imprisoned by an essentialized and racialized discourse. For de Triana it is not a question of whether the Gitanos have contributed this or that aesthetic or interpretive peculiarity: it is a question of their way of doing things, their ways of presenting themselves on and off stage, their rush of song, their stylistic patrimony: for de Triana the Gitanos *are* the essential flamenco. “The strangeness of such a melody with such a brusque aspect” (53), he said: tragedy, vocal power, disconcerting gesture, and effort all function as racialized signs that are exalted in ways of describing flamenco song—“*grande*” (great, large, grand), “primitive,” “viejo”—all synonyms of the sublime.

5. Finally, the dualism between that which is “viejo-primitive” and that which is “new-modern” becomes an essential vector of artistic work. The difference lays between flamenco which is venerable, and arcane, and that which is daily labor for new, professional interpreters. The orthodoxy of flamenco *cantaos* and repertoires, the autobiographical comparisons between the past and the present, the classificatory models of songs and styles... these questions are extended to the authenticity of flamenco in the face of its evolution into a commercial art, and the criticism directed towards “*flamenquismo*”: flamenco-ness. “Modernist gray” contrasts with “*cante cumbre*”—the peak of flamenco song—and the school of modernity contrasts with the “*escuela antigua*” (the old school). Speed and ornamentation on the guitar contrast with the old ways of accompaniment. The author alludes to an era that is “*desgraciado*” (unfortunate, shamed), and to a “condemned” flamenco—he affixes blame for this folly on the audience. A theological tone, a sensation of loss, of the inexorable disappearance of an era that will never return, runs throughout the book. Seen in this light, the *cantes nuevos* (new flamenco songs), spurious and adulterated, are placed in opposition to the genuine, old, and classic songs: *seguiriyas*, *soleares*, *caña*, *polo*, *serranas*, and “*malagueñas* of those who sang when people knew how to sing” (204). In this last group would figure, each in their turn, two distinct eras: the foundational moment of Silverio, and the era of the malagueñas of Chacón (84). Fernando el de Triana’s model scales both chronologically and in terms of classification: the initiation of flamenco pioneers anticipates the later appearance of Chacón and Fosforito, whom de Triana describes as the “first revolutionaries of the cante andaluz.”

FANDANGOS, FANDANGUILLOS, AND FANDANGAZOS

In light of de Triana’s polarizing and evolutionary conceptualizations of flamenco, the fandango is theorized in *Arte y artistas flamencos* as an entangled complex of contemporary forms, categorized on three levels: according to their popular origins, according to whether or not they are personal creations, and according to their relationships to the flamenco aesthetic. The fandango is a heterogeneous style, necessitating a plural theoretical approach based on three basic principles:

- a) The “legitimate” fandango is not really a flamenco style.
- b) In its most modern state, that of the present time and its contemporary artistic context, the fandanguillo is a deformed style.
- c) Between these extremes, the flamenco fandango, in the hands of certain “modern cantores (flamenco singers),” is elevated, and becomes larger, grander.

These three levels, reordered according to socio-stylistic criteria, in turn limit three musical forms which lie on a gradient between authenticity and degeneration, as seen above: popular fandangos; noble, flamenco fandangos; and the fandanguillo. The first contrasts radically with the third, which the author calls the “new way of singing,” and the

fundanguillo is the adversary of the *cante grande*—deep song. Yet some artists somehow manage to establish a liminal space between one another, where the flamenco fandango wisely nests.

The Popular Fandango

Considered to be the “natural” fandango (de Triana calls this its “legitimate name”), the authenticity of this first musical form is ratified not from a flamenco perspective, but rather in view of its territorial diversity, its poetic simplicity and directness, its age, and its non-professional character.

1. The locality of the popular fandango is expressed through what Fernando el de Triana calls “systems”: the system of Almería, of Málaga, of Alosno, etc. Here, the land as artistic resource does not function in the same way that it does in flamenco; rather, it becomes part of a multiplicity of musical manifestations signifying local identity. “This is my fandango!”—These popular fandangos represent not only an artistic genre, not only ethnic or professional identity, but are sung as an ode to local identity (261).

The paths of these folkloric fandangos (which de Triana sometimes also calls “fundanguillos”) crisscross the entire map of Andalucía, with special qualities for different provinces: the fandangos of Lucena are simple and sweet; those of Málaga are luminous, rhythmic, accompanied by finger cymbals and guitars, and are danceable; the *cantes de besana* from Herrera are precocious: there a certain “Currillo” turned their local fandango into a *cante grande*.

We touch here upon one of the central ideas of de Triana’s exposition: the interpreter is the actor who elevates this minor song which, in the absence of said intervention, would remain a popular and amateur form. África la Pezeña sang the hard “fandangos de la Peza” in the Café de Silverio “creating a furor with his *cante*,” and the fandangos of Granada sung by “Calabacino, Paquillo el del Gas, and El Tejeringuero” became *cantes grandes* through the voice of Frasquito Yerbabuena (271).

Fernando el de Triana saw the *fandangos de Huelva*, which he called “not grandes,” as expressing the ideal purity of the popular (268). In contrast, he qualified the fandangos of Alosno as “grandes”; for him, the fandangos of Alosno were the greatest popular fandangos. De Triana’s devotion to Huelva was neither simply theoretical, nor was it objective. The province of Huelva was on his professional touring route for years.

2. Other virtues of the fandango natural are simplicity and straightforward poetry: “*¡Yo soy chico, pero soy completo!*” (I am small, but I am complete!) (261). In this, the *cante* verse and music were molded together. It is *coplero*,—sung not by professionals, but by villagers with a talent for verse—“a light song, yet sublime in its rhythmic simplicity and unique style” (261). In this rustic “village style”, the music is revolved around “the *casticismo* (pure traditionalism) of its verses” (262). De Triana highlights the rural and popular

foundation of these fandangos, eschewing the bourgeois theatrical values of other musical forms. Fandangos “*arrieros*” (fandangos of the muleteers), fandangos of the roadways, of transport, of zones historically identified with the Moriscos (Christianized Moors expelled from the Iberian Peninsula in 1609), fandangos of “lungs of bronze” and of “throats of metal,” fandangos “with a clear voice and pure village style” (272)—these descriptions are symbolically masculine: these village songs are “*valiente*” (brave) and “*machunos*” (macho), sung with a “chest voice”: with strong lungs, these cantes *de pulmón* are “honorable” and serious.

3. Antiquity is tied to geography as a third variable which for Fernando el de Triana accredits this “basic” fandango as flamenco: “it has great value and supreme importance because of its antiquity and because of its air, so difficult for cantaores (flamenco singers) from outside of Andalucía, where this song was born and where it evolved, to execute” (261). The requisite for singing this form well is not professional, but rather collective and social. It is a style that holds great social value, but little market value. De Triana describes a day at the fair of Güéjar-Sierra, where the young men

according to local custom go out every year on these fair days to serenade their beloved (...) Each young man in the group sings just one verse at the window of his betrothed; and I confess that I had never heard, nor have I ever heard since, voices like those, or such country verses (272).

The popular fandango is ancient, and yet still living. It is under assault, this is true, and at risk of disappearing, but it is preserved in the voices of Rengel, Isidro, Antonio Garrido, Manuel Blanco, and Marcos Giménez. It is “a light song, yet sublime in its rhythmic simplicity and unique style” (261).

4. Governed by *compás*, or rhythm, Fernando el de Triana sees the fandango as related to malagueñas, *rondeñas*, and *granáina chica*, which in his day were measured by their rhythmic and folkloric nature. Gay and festive, these social dances were just developing a commercial dimension: de Triana describes groups of professional, itinerant “*verdiales*” singers who start singing at the fair in Molinillo and finish in that of La Trinidad, from spring to fall, passing through all the Málaga neighborhoods” (274). And he tells how, on a stage honoring the Prince of Almería, couples prepare to dance, sometimes to the accompaniment of singer-guitarist duos, sometimes “with the voice of just one singer I have seen more than a hundred couples dance in a beautiful promenade; all the women have castanets ... (all the dancers are amateurs)” (274).

This description furnishes an important detail: in these fandangos the singers tended to be men and the dancers women. Nonetheless, in indicating that this fandango natural was sung with guitar accompaniment, he also mentions a woman: Dolores la de la Huerta, “who accompanied herself with her small guitar, without adornments nor variations, as a fandango should be” (268). De la Huerta played the guitar, de Triana emphasizes, “without

FANDANGOS, FANDANGUILLOS AND FANDANGAZOS:
FERNANDO EL DE TRIANA ON POPULAR AND FLAMENCO MUSIC

falsetas (guitar melodies) nor variations”—that is, with popular as opposed to flamenco techniques.

The Fandanguillo

On the other extreme we find what Fernando el de Triana considers the “fashionable” fandanguillo, to which he devotes a good deal of discussion throughout the text and whose dissonances with the fandango natural are summarized in the table below:

Fandango	Fandanguillo
Popular	Professional
Territorial diversity	Personal creation
Ancient	Modern, “modernist cante”
Collective/individual expression	Individual expression
Danceable	Singable
Coplero: sung by non-professionals	Artist
Elevated by individual interpreters	Spoiled
Lyrical	Melodramatic
Of the village	Artistic
Precise measure	Disarranged
Rhythmic	Without rhythm, or with reconstituted rhythm
Natural	Forced, contrived
Of chest, lungs, and throat	Of the lips and jaw
Masculine (<i>valiente, machuno, serio...</i>)	Feminine (<i>bonito, small</i>)
Basic: a model with local variants	Promiscuous
Primitive, of pure blood	Contaminated
Performed “ <i>sin trampa ni cartón</i> ” (without gimmicks)	Adulterated
Sentimental, lyrical	Melodic
Legitimate name	Illegitimate name
Poetic directness	Coarse and vulgar
Oriented toward popular daily life	Oriented toward undiscerning audiences
<i>Quintilla</i> – original, five-line verse	Romance, ballad
Sincerity	Foolishness
Kings of the cante	“ <i>Niños más o menos cuajaditos</i> ” – more or less fully formed boys
Attentive audiences listening with “religious silence”	Passive audience
Authenticity	Falsification
Proper names of artists, pieces, and flamenco <i>palos</i> (forms)	Erasure of proper names, reference to fashionable pieces and <i>palos</i>

Qualified as an “illegitimate name,” the fandanguillo is for de Triana the contradiction of all the values he articulates pertaining to the popular— understanding this term not in its concrete local geography but rather as a social and cultural value, a marker of a collective ethos—fandango. If the fandango is territorial, simple, primitive, and popular, the fandanguillo is personal, complex, modern, and professional. In de Triana’s words, “it is the only style that opposes itself.”

1. Developed within the modern context broadly known as the *Ópera Flamenca*, the fandanguillo, or artistic fandango, is a creative, personal form. Far from esteem, de Triana considers this origin a demerit, judging the fandanguillo not only as out of rhythm, but also as “*chabacano*” (coarse, vulgar) and “adulterated,” unnatural. Among the elements that, for de Triana, contribute to the fandanguillo’s “dishevelment” are its excessively elaborate vocal, musical, and lyrical styles. Traditional techniques, such as the natural and throaty styles of the popular fandangos, become in fandanguillos a play of lips and jaw. Which introduces a new critical element: while the popular fandango is executed “sin trampa ni cartón” (without gimmicks), the fandanguillo the result of “profanity.” The fandanguillo’s falsification would reach its greatest heights with the fashions for “*cantar de pie*” (singing standing up), the fandanguillo accompanied by an orchestra, and “flamenco duets.”

2. On various occasions Fernando el de Triana criticizes the copla (the “*cantares*,” or songs) of the new fandango. Like their flowery vocal lines, which he calls “tragic and funereal soap operas” (262), the new verses are oriented toward “undiscerning audiences”:

The foolishness of today is unheard of. The other night I heard one of the top singers of today sing the following:

*A mi me habían sorteao con el hijo de un millonario,
y a los dos nos había tocao a Melilla,
y como el otro tenía dinero
se había quedao a serví en Sevilla.
¡Qué desgraciao es el hijo del obrero!*

*(I was drafted along with the son of a millionaire
and we were both sent to Melilla
but because he had money
he stayed to serve in Sevilla.
What a terrible life is that of a workingman!)*⁵

⁵This verse refers to the draft for the wars fought in the Rif Mountains of North Africa between 1909 and 1926. This attempt to reassert Spanish imperialism in the wake of the 1898 defeat in the Spanish-American War was a bloodbath for Spanish troops, especially because of inept military command, as in the terrible 1909 “Barranco del Lobo” massacre on Mount Gurugú on the northern coast of Morocco. The verse denounces the fact that in those days anyone who had enough power or money could obtain a safe post, such as Sevilla, for his children to complete their obligatory military service. On the other hand, the children of the poor and laboring classes had to confront their fate in the war of

FANDANGOS, FANDANGUILLOS AND FANDANGAZOS:
FERNANDO EL DE TRIANA ON POPULAR AND FLAMENCO MUSIC

Is it possible to say anything more ridiculous? (277).

The author seems to challenge the reader to compare this verse with the traditional verses of the popular fandangos. In his dedication of the book to famed flamenco singer Manuel Vallejo (1891–1960), de Triana defines other censurable elements of the *fandango artístico* (artistic fandango), such as the elaborate relationships, the ridiculousness of the verses, or the lack of sincerity on the part of the artist:

In addition, I respect this artist because he doesn't abusively employ the Crime of Cuenca, which is what I call those ballads that almost all modern singers sing in place of a well-measured *cuarteta* or *quintilla* (four- or five-line verse). Just the other day I heard a modern professional sing this story as a fandango:

*Pa toítos los difuntos doblaban las campanas,
y pa la pobre de mi mare no lo hicieron:
no fue porque no se confesó,
fue porque no tenía dinero
y sin que a la pobre de mi mare le doblaran las campanas se enterró.*

*(For all the deceased the bells toll,
and for my poor mother they did not:
it was not that she didn't confess her sins,
it was because she had no money
and without any bells tolling
my mother was buried.)*

Is that singing? Can things continue in this way? Is there no cultural organization that can come to the defense of the divine art of poetry and protest the many foolishness things that the immense majority of bad so-called artists sing today?

The coplero (writer of the verse) may have better or worse luck in developing an idea, but the copla must be just so, and in many cases the coplero sings so as to make the verse come out right, but the so-called artist takes the verse and squeezes the ideas out of it, dresses it in a mask and ends up claiming it as his own and claiming himself as a poet, just because he spoiled something that was never his to begin with and [before he got his hands on it] had been well done (38).

Melilla.

In other words, this negligible, “so-called” artist claims the right to appropriate the original fandango, snatch away its idea, take it away from the people with whom it originated, disguise, and spoil it. De Triana’s condemnation (not by chance, of course, as he himself was a recognized author of coplas) is overwhelming. It is true that some of the affirmations of our protagonist contradict his own autobiography, in which he highlights his dexterity in adapting *tangos* (what we would today call “*tanguillos*”) verses, delighting his audiences with more or less complacent blandishments and fashionable stage themes, from a complement to Barcelona to an exalted chronicle of a family crime (176–182).

3. A different and distinctly human problem appears with the fandanguillo: the *grey nueva* (new gray) of professional flamencos, which supported and reproduced modern, bloated styles. The fandanguillo is critiqued not only in comparison to the fandango natural, but also with respect to the cante grande: “The fandango is a routine! And I ask: —Why does the paying public not obligate this legion of machos, bolstered, by no right, with the title of artists, to learn to sing first before exploiting the cante professionally?” (16). We should underline the disdain for these false artists in de Triana’s assertion that these types of fandanguillos are performed with ignorance (without knowledge of the cante) and in a repetitive, almost industrial exercise. The true professionals—those of the cante machuno of the fandango natural, and of the cantes grandes—are different. The sin lies at the feet of the artistic fandango, a commercial genre that, in addition, will never be Gitano.

4. Throughout the book we can also track another aspect linked to the assessments discussed: de Triana’s harsh criticism of the “indigestible” *Ópera Flamenca* of his day. Already on the first pages of *Arte y Artistas* the prologue’s author, Tomás Borrás, ticks off this theatrical form as “staged in one of those ‘monumental’ cement coliseums” where one must “listen to the petulance of the *milonga*, the *colombiana*, and gramophone fandanguillos one after another, insults to poetry in the form of pedantic verses and an absolute lack of tradition, artistic sincerity, and taste” (7). Nor does Fernando el de Triana bite his tongue in parting company with the popularity of the fandanguillo on stage; he denounces bankrupt interpreters in the same breath as conniving audiences.

Often at a show of the badly named *Ópera Flamenca*, the first to appear onstage are a handful of *niños más o menos cuajaditos* [more or less fully formed boys] (among them some are so bad that they cry out for the reappearance of Herod). We already know what to expect from these niños: fandangos and more fandangos, but all of them are the same fandangos; and if the audience has the poor taste to ask for an encore, they follow with [popular songs such as] “Sordao herío” or “Juan Simón.” And so we have said passive public, greeting [these songs] with the same enthusiasm and happiness as that with which they receive an excellent session of soleares or seguiriyas (16).

In another text de Triana repeats his condemnation of this repertory almost word-for-word, although in this case he saves the fandango from the fire: “We must work,” Fernando el de Triana writes, in a lecture delivered in Coria, “for the resurgence of the primitive songs, leaving aside the ‘Sordao herío’ and ‘Juan Simón,’ because these two ballads (as they are

sung today) completely steal the virtue of the delicious airs of the Cante Andaluz.” In an interview with Irish musician and folklorist Walter Starkie given at about the same time, de Triana roundly repeats his repudiation of these *Ópera Flamenca* artists for not being well rounded and for not being knowledgeable of the “authentic” styles:

Times have changed, and with them the cante, which a handful of characters who have no more lungs than a *señorita* (maiden) does sing today. They are all children. Herod should take them all away. They all sing fandanguillos in the same way, and nothing else (Starkie, 1944, 402).

In contrast to the cantes machunos, the fandanguillo is a cante of “niños”: “pretty,” and apt for the “lungs of a señorita.” A “spoiled” “mask,” an adulteration of machunos and *serios* cantes flamencos, these are small, contaminated, “modernist” cantes. They are, according to de Triana, “mercantilist [expressions] of these *cantes machunos* which gave such a glorious name to (...) an infinity of great singers” (263). We note here a certain demagoguery more fitting to the context of class struggle (within which this work was written) than to a literary essay: “as my child is my art, I suffer seeing him handed over to the many exploiters who steal his virtue and annihilate him to the point that he is now practically homeless” (ibid).

For even greater derision, Fernando el de Triana does not even name the new singers in the way he names legendary flamenco singers Silverio Franconetti (1831–1889) and Antonio Chacón (1869–1929). The fandanguillo singers are erased, alluded to as no more than “children,” “un puñado de niños más o menos cuajaditos.” They are cited only indirectly (those who “call themselves the stars of today,” 277) as de Triana defends his harshly critical stance (“I hear that there are some modern singers who censure my attitude against the fandango” 263). The reader can infer names and styles within this lachrymose and stigmatized *corpus*: the songs popularized by the Niño de la Huerta (**Francisco Montoya Egea, 1907–1964**) in 1929 with the guitar of Manolo de Badajoz (Manuel Álvarez Soruve, 1892–1962), and the popular drama *La Hija de Juan Simón* which, brought to the theater in 1930, would have its cinemagraphic premiere in 1935 with Ángel Sampedro “Angelillo” (1906–1973) as the singer and protagonist.

This invective of dishonor and humiliation is extended to audiences: “Would someone go today from one theater to another to hear these niños... of the *milongas*?” (18). Definitely not. Evoking flamenco legends Pastora Pavón “La Niña de los Peines” (1890–1969), Vallejo, and Paco Mazaco (1898–1949), he affirms:

... these three luminaries of the cante andaluz always justify their artistic caliber, and the serious cantes of these three powerful singers are never sung by kids on the street, nor by the maids sweeping doorways, as happens with the cantes of other singers, who rummage for a *cuplé* (ballad) or just any kind of little song, they offer a verse that sticks in the ear, they make recordings and in three days everyone, from three-year olds to Englishmen, is singing them, and that’s the end of the artist” (266–267).

We find ourselves before an opposition between the masses and elite art. The milonga and the fandanguillo are popular songs, yes, but not in the vein which de Triana understands as “traditional.” Traditional songs, for de Triana, fall into only two categories: either the anonymous songs of festive villagers, or the erudite and passionate devotion of flamenco’s earliest interpreters. Fandanguillos are “fashionable” songs from “fashionable” artists—they are passing fads. For de Triana, vain fashion is one thing, and true fashion, epitomized for de Triana by Pastora Pavón, is another. Never mind that Pastora managed to launch a career and win over audiences first with the tango, then, with bulerías, then, the “*Patenera*” and, after that vogue had passed, the *taranta*. All of these trends were received with great acclaim, but “she never finished any performance without the audience demanding her cante *por seguiriyas* (...) and despite many years spent selling records, the cante of La Niña de los Peines always triumphs” (267–268). Another of several internal contradictions within the book: Pastora was the only example of the world that Fernando el de Triana and others criticized. She sang fandanguillos, she sang duets, she bowed to (or set) the latest musical trends, she mixed flamenco with the cuplé, she recorded and sold records like nobody’s business. Yet, for Fernando el de Triana none of this gave offense to the pure flamenco style that she represented.

The Fandango Flamenco

Neither did de Triana question the flamenco of some modern cantaores, whom our chronicler accepts because of their ability to sing flamenco in its noble form, even though they took liberties and made concessions to young aficionados. Fernando el de Triana conceived of a third modality for the fandango: the “fandango flamenco.” With their stylistic diversity, Pepe Marchena (then known as the “Niño de Marchena,” 1903–1976), Manuel Vallejo, and Manuel Ortega Juárez “Manolo Caracol” (1909–1973) make the case for a fandango favored and admired by he who has shown himself to be a savage critic of the artistic fandanguillo.

Of the 313 artists chronicled in his book, with the exception of those included in the chapter “In defense of the legitimate fandango,” Fernando el de Triana named only these three singers as being significant in the world of the fandango. In an interview with Manuel Alarcón for the magazine *Estampa*, de Triana discussed the legendary flamenco singer Manuel Soto Loreto “Manuel Torre” (1878–1933):

Q: Didn’t he also sing fandangos, even though they are a modern song?

A: In answer to that question I will tell an anecdote which speaks to [Manuel Torres’s] temperament. One day the two of us were in a tavern in the [Sevilla neighborhood] the Macarena, and I asked him, speaking of cante: “Do you like the fandango, Manuel?” He returned the question, until I gave my opinion, and then, as if pronouncing judgment, he said, “*Pues eso pa mí está en inglés*” [well, for me this is unintelligible]. And in spite of his aversion to this cante, from one moment to the next he began singing the fandango “de la paloma,” which is now set in stone:

FANDANGOS, FANDANGUILLOS AND FANDANGAZOS:
FERNANDO EL DE TRIANA ON POPULAR AND FLAMENCO MUSIC

*A un arroyo a beber
bajó una pobre paloma.
Por no mancharse su cola
se fue sequita de sed.
¡Qué paloma tan señora!*

(A beautiful dove
Came to a stream to drink.
In order not to wet her tail
She flew away still thirsty.
What a womanly dove!)

Which we would call a fandango (a great fandango). A fandango for all time, although this terminology may be flexible and confusing (in the sense that “fandangos” might also refer to those employed by those seeking only the dramatic effect so well-received by audiences). The fandango flamenco is a new, free cante, susceptible to becoming the new standard. This is what de Triana says of Pepe Marchena:

Supported by the freedom which modern aficionados have granted the fandango, Marchena makes real filigrees of the fandango, and as he gives it more sauce than others, it turns out that Marchena’s fandangos are the most classical and difficult. Besides, when he wishes, he does such beautiful things that even the strongest contrarians of modernism are pleased (32).

Manuel Vallejo is a different case, as he stands out not for his ornamentation, but rather for the quality of his singing, which goes across styles:

He is very precise in his singing. His *media granatina* is very well done, and even though his execution is not extremely difficult, his cante is very moving and very in *compás*; he sings fandango and bulerías very well, and por siguiரியas he is very precise and moving” (38).

Manolo Caracol, that great Gitano artist, is the object of particular praise for his syncretic capacity. De Triana tells an anecdote, in which the colossal singer from [Seville’s] Alameda [de Hércules, a center of flamenco life in the first decades of the twentieth century], *a palo seco* (with no guitar accompaniment), began to sing in a *fiesta* (flamenco party). He did a *temple* (opening intonation) por siguiரியas and the first part of a verse of El Viejo de la Isla: “solera añeja.” When he deviated toward the fandango in these first musical phrases, far from being offended, our author was admiring. He reasoned that a song like this could not possibly be a fandanguillo, as that denomination was synonymous with spoiled cante and this, clearly, was not spoiled. Although it was not a fandango, either. Caracol called it “*caracolera*,” and so his reasoning leads to a question of denomination: “This is what they all should do: don’t call something which is not a fandango a fandango; thus, each singer will have his own version, called what he will, and the best and luckiest ones will be the most applauded and in demand” (276).

Permit me one final note to this section. Fernando el de Triana included himself within the group of artists who dignified the fandango. Not the fandango flamenco, not the fandanguillo, but the fandango natural. A devotee of the “authentic” fandango, he claims to be “the first person to sing a fandango from Alosno on stage” (264), even though Rafael Pareja also claimed that credit. The fame of the *fandango de Alosno* was due, we are told, to the outward expansion of people of that town as tax collectors on consumer goods. Aficionados of the cante and of the café, gathering in their leisure hours, they demanded the presence of the person they called “our own Fernandillo” (264). That is, the fandangos de Alosno of Fernando el de Triana were not only popular but also popularized: our author always included them in his repertory, contracted to be performed onstage as “the idol of the people of Alosno”—yet another contradiction to his condemnation of commercialized fandangos (264).

THREE NOTIONS ABOUT THE FANDANGO AND A HYPOTHESIS ABOUT ANDALUCISMO POPULAR

I view the three fandango modalities, that can be read in the writing of Fernando el de Triana, as related to the questions of flamenco authenticity and Andalusian identity that emerged soon after the birth of flamenco, as a genre in the mid-nineteenth century, and especially in the first decades of the twentieth century. Due to limitations of space, it is not possible here to compare them thoroughly, nor can we examine here the relationships between de Triana’s artistic colleagues, whom he partitions into defenders of edgy, obscure flamenco, heir to the Golden Age of the cafés, versus partisans of flamenco renovation and reinvention. But we should briefly note the theoretical context of what I call the “andalucismo popular”—Andalusian populism—of the first decades of the twentieth century, out of which flow, I argue, the most important ideas shaping de Triana’s book.

As we know, *Arte y artistas flamencos* was published during a historic and transitional moment for flamenco. Still in the future were the theoretical renovations of the 1950s and 60s, spear-headed by Antonio Cruz García “Antonio Mairena” (1909–1983), on the basis of race, territory, genealogy, the impulse toward classification and renewed concepts of “purity.” But in 1935 the Golden Age of the cafés was but a memory. At the brink of Civil War, mass spectacle moved with the *Ópera Flamenca* into the narrative and folkloric scenes that lent picturesque flavor to minor theatricals. On the other hand, small-scale flamenco—intimate flamenco—oscillated between what Miguel Frías de Molina “Miguel de Molina” (1908–1993) remembered of the bars of Seville’s Alameda as “second-rate flamencos, cantaores, and bailaoras, waiting to see if some rancher or feisty torero would land and organize a *juerga* (flamenco fiesta) to earn a few *pesetas*” (1998, 64), and the unlikelihood of hearing “cantes grandes in a moment when they had almost disappeared until their resuscitation in the 1950s” (ibid, 69).

But from the perspective of social and political movement, the frame within which we should situate this moment is that of the resurgence of an Andalucía that rejects nineteenth-

century exoticism and aspires to a newly minted regionalism. Blas Infante was, as is widely recognized, a fundamental protagonist of this movement, and his relationship with Fernando el de Triana is well-documented: they both resided in the municipality of Coria del Río, Blas Infante transcribed a lecture by our author, if not the entire book (Manuel Barrios, by comparing the manuscript with typeset spelling errors, argued that this was the case), and wrote an epilogue for the book which was never published. Why doesn't this citation appear in *Arte y artistas flamencos*? Why wasn't the epilogue included? This ellipsis has only one possible explanation: it must have been political.

Let's proceed step by step. I sense the literary and ideological aroma of the "father of the *patria andaluza*" in many of the essentialist concepts that form the backbone of the relationships between flamenco and the *pueblo andaluz* in de Triana's book, with inconsistencies, of course. Blas Infante, who would be vilely murdered for his ideas just days after Francisco Franco's *coup d'état*, did not focus precisely on the social marginalization of the Spanish Roma, nor did he focus on artistic bohemianism. For Blas Infante, flamenco's artistic subject is the people, the soul of all Andalusians. He sees, on the road to virtuosity, that the professional loses something of flamenco's mysterious freedom.⁶

From this expansive viewpoint, Blas Infante said of *Arte y artistas flamencos* that "among the ideas that its reading suggests is the pure sense of Andalucía, which one experiences in reading these pages. An intense emotional comprehension of Andalucía will be the norm that every reader will place before the verb 'Fernando de Triana'" (Infante, 1980, 183). And it is within this conception of "lo andaluz" that we find indisputable theoretical connections between de Triana and Blas Infante. "*The pueblo andaluz, pure and authentic, is one found in rural zones: landed or landless peasants, among whom, relatively, there is no admixture of Andalusian with foreign blood, such as was common in the great urban centers,*" wrote Infante (1980, 90). The admiration of the rustic, country enclave, the collectivity, the escape from the urban world, form the basis for Fernando el de Triana's theories of the fandango popular. Race, Gitano essence, the venerable past, and cante grande constitute the conceptual marrow of flamenco seen as a popular, autochthonous, and collective expression of its "natural" enclave: Andalucía.

Certainly Blas Infante went further. In some of the writing in *Orígenes de lo flamenco y secreto del cante jondo*, we sense how from his metaphoric arguments about flamenco and the "*tragedia informativa*" (informative tragedy) it contains, we slip toward an arena of greater political engagement: the history of the subjugated *pueblo andaluz*, and its cry for dignity. Flamenco's historical proscription, its supposed inferiority and the oppressive stereotypes of "local color" are transmuted into a metaphor for Andalucía, appealing to the "discourse or subterranean flow of the true Andalusian style—persecuted, condemned."

⁶José Carlos de Luna set forth many of these ideas in 1926, presenting an idealized vision of how, along the streets of Andalucía, "your steps will be surrounded by sonic vibrations that recall the *siguriya*, the *serrana*, the *fandango*, the *malagueña*, and the *martinete*" (2000, 9). On Blas Infante's concepts of flamenco, see Cruces, 1998.

This leads to its “moving creation of unique forms, confounded or identified in their manifestations with lowly manifestations of the picturesque,” and its ability to “please tourists from superior and more civilized nations as to shame the servile Spaniards, of whom Europe made an archetype.” Blas Infante reclaims, to the contrary, the “buried remains of that marvelous culture of *Al-Andalus*; persecuted to the death by hostile, utilitarian, materialistic culture, that of conquering and self-important Europe” (ibid, 184–185).

Of course, this last assertion wades into murkier waters. In fact, although Infante did not direct a truly nationalist movement, he elicits in his associates the most important political project of identity construction for Andalucía in the first half of the twentieth century. In his essays he included essentialist notions, and many historical ambiguities and theoretical shortfalls. But his is also an egalitarian project, which earned him not a few enemies. His qualification of Andalucía as a “land of laborers,” his central idea of land as constituting culture, his call for Andalusian rebirth or “regeneration” seen through the lens of Georgism and physiocracy, and his goal of lifting the laboring classes into a rural middle class, able to pay land rent, quickly alienated him from the dominant classes. Above all, after the publication of *La verdad sobre el complot de Tablada y el Estado Libre de Andalucía* in 1931, the question of labor’s starvation wages and the problems of land, engendered a real political reevaluation. We must add here Blas Infante’s support of the anarchist vote during the Second Republic, his participation in the *Anteproyecto de Bases para el Estatuto de Autonomía de Andalucía* and his leadership of the *Juntas Liberalistas de Andalucía* in 1933, among other things.

When *Arte y artistas flamencos* was published, a movement toward Andalusian autonomy was emerging, that, as we know, was impelled forward by the victory of the *Frente Popular* in 1936, but whose implantation was aborted by the Civil War. And this is no small thing. I don’t think that many of the names cited as contributors in *Arte y artistas flamencos* would have shared these ideas. The sequence of events seems clear. Initially, de Triana obtained miscellaneous support from writers, artists, and intellectuals of the agitated worlds of the performing arts, literary ambitions, and Andalusian regionalism. But in the end only one party would emerge victorious: the “poets of the day,” those who benefited from the event at the Teatro Español and sponsored the book’s publication. The notable group included the above-mentioned Tomás Borrás, Máximo Díaz de Quijano, and José Rico Cejudo, all mentioned in *Arte y artistas flamencos*. Blas Infante’s name never appears.

We know that Tomás Borrás was the one who interceded with La Argentina to support the elderly artist with a festival that, not by chance, would include a large number of literary figures, who were “flamenco adherents,” such as Manuel Machado, Antonio Quintero, César González Ruano, Fernando Villalón, José María Pemán, Manuel Dicenta, and Tomás Borrás. The cohort leaves no doubt of its nationalist and reactionary political tendencies—which troubled later Andalusian autonomists. Borrás was a declared Falangist, and González Ruano was a Nazi collaborator. After General Franco’s coup, however, all of

these figures would demonstrate their sympathies for the fascist regime, although without abandoning their populist Andalusian inclinations.

Here is where flamenco pulls away from Blas Infante's "informative tragedy." There is nothing about misery, hunger, sickness, poverty, and class divisions in Borrás's prologue to *Arte y artistas flamencos*. On the contrary, Borrás contrasts cante flamenco with [songs that are] "funereal, of cemetery and cypress, of the dead body abandoned by the side of the road and the dying mother" to the verses of Rodríguez Marín where "there is almost nothing lugubrious." And he raises, against the standard of flamenco's longed-for past, the figures of Falla, Turina, González Marín, and Argentina who, although flamenco, we know represent the polar opposite of Gitano roughness (10–13). "If we once spoke about the copla andaluza," Borrás writes, what rose to the surface was the *probesita mare* (poor mother), *el pare ajustisiao* (executed father), *el cimiterio* (the cemetery), prison, *la puñalaita* (stab wound); all of this is grotesque if taken seriously. It is ridiculous that 'refined invention' should draw caricatures" (2000, 10). Borrás prefers to concentrate on the "the village folk beneath everything, blacksmiths, drivers, farm workers, fishermen, wives and mothers of humble means..."—he sees these characters as the negation of any association with the "theater districts" (11).

A new epic and paternalistic discourse is here engendered. It is the germ of what would be adopted just a few years later, after the defeat of the Republic, as a dominant propagandistic formula of Francoism. It envisions a new nation in which any trace of dishonesty had to be erased; invoking, in regional diversity, the vision of an innocent people within an organic and self-determining community, and a vision of flamenco as political metonymy for the nation as a whole. In Borrás's prologue, "flamenco is the quintessence of Spain."

Thus, Fernando el de Triana's proclamations circulate within a swirl of concepts and ideas. Some sections of his book adopt an idea of "*lo andaluz*" which, as it is for Infante, is distinct from the Spanish Roma and which directly applies to the fandango, using such terms as "Andalusian genre," "Andalusian art," and "Andalusian cante" (280, 284). But in other passages, de Triana proudly claims, with nationalist pride, the symbolic rewards that flamenco brings to Spain. For example, in the forward, our author speaks of the audience as being the "only caretakers of what we might call the natural and untranslatable glory of Andalucía, and therefore the undisputed and honorable prize of Spain" (16). Fernando el de Triana closes his text advocating for the consideration of flamenco as a national treasure (of Spain, as opposed to Andalucía, which he euphemistically describes as the "South")—this position is very different from those taken in other sections of the book:

... it is well known that there is a literary and artistic renaissance oriented toward the poetry, music, and character of the South, besides the enthusiastic interest in the dance and the guitar. All of these are indications that we Spaniards are returning to our own, disdaining foreign modes and seeking true gold in the font of our own soul (280).

Whether de Triana was actually the author of this passage or not is something we will probably never know.

CONCLUSIONS

Arte y artistas flamencos is a testimony to a transitional moment, recording past ways of thinking about flamenco and presaging the imagery of later eras. The architecture of Fernando el de Triana's arguments chronicles the tensions that revolve around the still-untold story of ideas about flamenco of the 1930s, an era of constant and tumultuous upheaval for both Andalucía and Spain.

The book takes positions and outlines interests in a musical system which found itself in a moment of great uncertainty, and of which various factions claimed ownership. In the case of Andalucía, the value placed on regionalism aimed to reclaim the past and validate the authenticity of the region's unique historical experience. But we should see this impulse, influenced by its contemporaries, its "friends," as a "patriotic and artistic" labor slipping toward the coming nationalism of the Franco regime.

The objectives of *Arte y artistas flamencos* were to classify, interpret, and in a certain sense to patronize flamenco. Nonetheless, the fandango's awkward fit within that genre obligated the book's author to reconcile old concepts of tradition with the new processes of hybridization that would open the door to modernity for music and for flamenco. De Triana attempts this reconciliation out of admiration ("I like the fandango more than they do," he said of its critics, 264) but also out of paternalistic melancholy: "I find myself in the circumstances of a father whose child is ill and whose only thought is to save his life. My art is my child, and I am its father" (263).

We must attend to the historical context in which this book was written; in 1930s Spain, modernity had already produced flamenco for the mass market. We should remember that *Arte y artistas flamencos* was published a year before the beginning of the Spanish Civil War. When the war ended, extinguishing the hoped-for end to the "*las dos Españas*"—the hoped-for end to deep societal divisions of class, religion, and politics—the Franco regime would utilize this form of modernity in service of its national interests. But in 1935, flamenco was still a distinct genre that, although shaken and looked down upon by the well-to-do, produced forms that de Triana saw as legitimate. Furthermore, he was a poet, a singer, a guitarist, and connoisseur of the anonymous and folkloric versions of Andalusian cantes.

Within his literary limitations, Fernando el de Triana was an able and wise interpreter of these expressions. He adopted an evolutionary and comparative approach to flamenco, contrasting past with present, and an apocalyptic view of the future with a redemptive tone. He classified the fandango into three coexisting, living forms, while expressing his predilection for the first: he uses the word "fandango" in reference to a "completely pure"

style—untouched and unadulterated—without even artistic admixture. For Fernando el de Triana the fandango was a regional and local musical form free of ethnic references, extended across the broad Andalusian countryside as a sentimental and lyrical style, in whose execution we find neither tragedy nor the darkness of flamenco Gitano. For de Triana the fandango was an ancient and popular—and thus genuine—song.

The fandango typology in *Arte y artistas flamencos* exemplifies a polymorphous solution, an intelligent and more nuanced framework than that of the binaries underlying the terms “cante grande,” “jondo,” or “flamenco.” The dualistic construction of the flamenco world has no place here: the fandango demands that we problematize the conceptual schema of flamenco of the past, present, and the dark, jondo, future. In chapters providing biographies of artists, Fernando el de Triana substantiates flamenco as a professional and distinct genre, shaped by Gitano greatness; and he defends the “legitimate fandango,” thus characterized with the aim of reinvesting this form with popular and Andalusian character. In some parts of the text, this “Andalusian-ness” is considered to lend the music a “local” essence, but finally, the fandango is considered to be a “national” music, thus generating a certain semantic confusion about identity, and gesturing toward the ideological rifts laid bare by the political vicissitudes of 1930s Spain.

Although the concepts de Triana uses are not the same for the fandango as for flamenco, in which he only participates from the sidelines, they share a common enemy: the new cantes of the *Ópera Flamenca*. In service of this argument, the author takes up a doubled play of distinct yet comparable authenticities (“popular” vs “flamenco”), in order to oppose what he considers a degenerate expression: the “artistic” fandango. Their essential values—in the popular: territoriality and the straightforwardness of the people; in flamenco: race and lineage—oppose the spurious modern fandanguillos, contaminated, governed by fashion, fame, and commerce, and confined by false professionalism (as if the professionalism of the elder artists of the cafés were not equally false).

This ideological construction, which was not unique for its era but is clearly delineated in *Arte y artistas flamencos* would not disappear with Fernando el de Triana’s death in 1940, in absolute misery, and buried, as he feared, “in who knows what cemetery” (263). The work endures, though perhaps its complexity is not always recognized, as an essential part of the ideological armature of flamenco in the second half of the twentieth century.

REFERENCES CITED

Antequera Luengo, Juan José. *Fernando el de Triana (1867-1940)*. Sevilla: Facediciones, 2012.

Bohórquez Casado, Manuel. *La Sonanta*. Sevilla: Caja San Fernando, 1993.

Cruces Roldán, Cristina. “Orígenes de lo flamenco y secreto del cante jondo, de Blas Infante.” In *Cristina Cruces, ed. La Bibliografía flamenca, a debate*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía, 1998, 89–119.

De Luna, José Carlos. *De cante grande y cante chico*. Edición facsimil. Madrid: Escélicer, 2000 /1926.

Infante, Blas. *Orígenes de lo flamenco y secreto del cante jondo*. Sevilla: Consejería de Cultura, Junta de Andalucía, 1980.

Molina, Miguel de. *Botín de guerra*. Salvador Valverde, ed. Barcelona: Planeta, 1998.

Navarro García, José Luis. “Fernando el de Triana. Arte y artistas flamencos”. In *Cristina Cruces, ed. La Bibliografía flamenca, a debate*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía, 1998, 73–89.

Ortegartega Castejón, José Francisco. “La taranta o malagueña de Fernando el de Triana.” *Revista de Investigación sobre Flamenco “La Madrugá,”* n° 1 (2009), <http://revistas.um.es/flamenco/article/view/83891/80841> (accessed June 16, 2016).

Rondón Rodríguez, Juan. *Recuerdos y confesiones del cantaor Rafael Pareja de Triana*. Córdoba: Ediciones de la Posada del Potro, 2001.

Starkie, Walter. *Don Gitano*. Edición facsimil. Granada: Diputación de Granada (original *Don Gypsy: Adventures with a Fiddle in Barbary, Andalusia and La Mancha*, 1936), 1985 / 1944.