Celedonio Flores’s “Sonatina”: Lunfardo Parody and Post-Modernist Esthetics

In “Musa rea,” the tango lyricist and Lunfardo poet Celedonio Esteban Flores (1896-1947) writes:

Yo no le canto al perfumado nardo
ni al constelao azul del firmamento.
Yo busco en el suburbio sentimiento...
¡Pa' cantarle a una flor, le canto al cardo! (25)

These lines, the second quartet of a hendecasyllabic sonnet, render homage to the poetry of Spanish-American modernism (“perfumado nardo,” “constelao azul”) even as they assert an aesthetic of difference, based on the feelings inspired by the rough edges of a modern city. In a note on his tango “Margot,” Flores makes clear the importance of modernist poetry in his development as a poet:

A esa edad en que se hacen versos, ensayé los míos. Quise escribirlos delicados, sutiles, finos ... pero había grandes contras en aquel camino. ¿Cómo te ibas a tirar contra Amado Nervo o Rubén Darío? El nilaje no daba pa' tanto, hermano. Entonces, un día que estaba bien seco, en uno de esos días en que uno sueña con la lotería sin tener el billete, me abrí de aquella parada elegante y escribí Margot (Rossler 3178).

Flores situates himself, then, within the tradition of Nervo and Darío, and yet somehow against it. One of the most fascinating instances of his use of this tradition “against the grain” is his parodic rewriting of the quintessential modernist poem, Darío’s “Sonatina.”

Flores is the author of some of the best-known tangos of the 1920’s—“La musa mistonga” (the first tango recorded by phonograph in Argentina), “Mano a mano,” “Tengo miedo,” “Viejo smoking.” Discovered by Carlos Gardel and José Razzano in 1914, while still in his teens, Flores was particularly favored by Rosita Quiroga, the celebrated singer and personality of the tango world, in her programming for RCA Victor. Preeminent among the early lyricists for the tango, Flores was particularly noted for his roots in popular poetry, and was adept at using Lunfardo vocabulary to evoke the speech and ethos of underworld Buenos Aires. Besides his tango lyrics, as Blas Matamoro has noted, Flores was a boxer, the featherweight champion of Argentina in 1923, and the author of two books of poetry, Chapaleando barro y Cuando pasa el organito (45). These poems circulated widely, especially after his death. In them, Flores uses Lunfardo vocabulary and the cynical world-view familiar from his tangos to evoke the popular culture of the poorer neighborhoods of Buenos Aires. Oddly enough, he was also the author of serious poetry in the modernist vein, poetry which has apparently remained unpublished.

Flores’s poem “Sonatina” is a striking parody of Rubén Darío’s famous poem of the same name. Darío’s poem is one of the most familiar texts in Spanish, memorized by generations of school children. The Mexican poet and critic Jaime Torres Bodet has this to say of the Darío poem:

Impresionaron mucho, a los lectores de entonces, poetas que han perdido — con el tiempo — gran parte de su encanto: la Sonatina, Era un Aire Suave, y otros... [La Sonatina es] una composición que es, para la poesía de Darío, como La Donna e移动 en la partitura del Rigoletto: la romanza fácil y contagiosa, irritante a los buenos conocedores, pero grata, siempre, a los no iniciados... La Sonatina — que sedujo a los lectores de 1896 — hablaba a quien querían manjar diversas y más positiva sustancia y almibares más sutiles (122, 131, 309).

That Darío’s “Sonatina” was familiar more specifically to tango audiences is shown by the quotation of the first stanza of the poem in Gardel’s recording of Enrique Cadicamo’s “La novia ausente.” In that recording a man
recalls a moment in the past when his beloved, now dead, recited the Darío poem. The princess’s anguish is used, then, as a point of reference for a narrative of frustrated love at a more humble level of society.

Flores, on the other hand, undertakes a more radical enterprise. Instead of quoting from the Darío poem (as in the Cádiz tango, in which the original text is left intact), he translates the rarefied atmosphere of its princesses and fairy godmothers and exotic luxury goods into the seedy world of a Buenos Aires prostitute, whose fantasies are of a more mundane and material kind. The humorous possibilities of this translation are almost infinite, as for example when the “princess” aspires not to be a swallow or a butterfly, but to have cash and power, or when her Prince Charming turns out to be her pimp, or her fantasy turns out to consist of a *menage à trois*. Darío’s princess desires a unity with a natural world which is imagined with a lyrical intensity. Flores makes clear that his princess’s heaven is a purely social one.

Parodic poetry works in counterpoint to canonical texts, since familiarity with them is necessary to the appreciation of the humor of the parody. In Linda Hutcheon’s terms, “its repetition is always of another discursive text” (43). The original work must be palpable even in the parody: thus we find Flores observing Darío’s intricate metrical pattern (alexandrines composed of heptasyllabic half-lines with caesura) and rhyme scheme (AABCCB, with stressed final syllables on B). Similarly, Flores employs some of the same vocabulary, replicates the cast of characters of the Darío poem and a great deal of its narrative and thematic structure.

Osvaldo Rossler has commented in his analysis of Flores’s “Mano a mano” on the fact that Flores uses a sparse number of Lunfardo terms to reshape not only the content but also the sound and form of Spanish verse. Analyzing the use of the octosyllable in this famous tango, Rossler notes:

Los tres primeros versos, tal cual señalan los mejores usos, golpean en la tercera sílaba, y sin embargo la inveterada musicalidad del verso de ocho ha sido destruida. Esto se debe a la introducción de voces lunfardas, que le dan desde un comienzo una tremenda fuerza coloquial a la composición (3189).

Similarly, in “Sonatina” the mannered harmony and musicality of the Darío poem are undone by the introduction of the Lunfardo elements, which function in jarring counterpoint to the original melody.

The first stanza of Flores’s poem is quite close to the Darío poem. Darío writes:

La princesa está triste… ¿Qué tendrá la princesa? Los suspiros se escapan de su boca de fresa, que ha perdido la risa, que ha perdido el color. La princesa está pálida en su silla de oro, está mudo el teclado de su clave sonoro, y en un vaso, olvidada, se desmaya una flor (556).

Flores rewrites:

La bacana está triste, ¿qué tendrá la bacana? Ha perdido la risa su carita de rana y en sus ojos se nota yo no sé qué penar; la bacana está sola en su silla sentada, el fonógrafo calla y la viola colgada aburrida perece de no verse tocar (63).

Flores’s first line follows Darío’s except for the change from “princesa” to “bacana,” a highly charged Lunfardo term whose meanings range from “concubine” to “rich” and “elegant” or pretending to be so. Both the princess and the concubine are described in similar terms: “ha perdido la risa,” “está… en su silla.” The melancholy of both is expressed by reference to the silencing of music: of the princess’s piano and the concubine’s phonograph. Darío’s last line, memorable because of the hyperbaton (“y en un vaso, olvidada, se desmaya una flor”), is echoed in Flores (“la viola colgada/ aburrida parece de no verse tocar”), with a similar metonymical displacement from the melancholy maid to the things of her world, indeed with the same conventional association of women with flowers and musical instruments. The key changes in the first stanza are few: from “princesa” to “bacana,” from “silla de oro” to simply “silla,” from “clave sonoro” to “fonógrafo.”

In the following stanzas there are similar translations of key terms that define a world. Darío writes:

El jardín puebla el triunfo de los pavos-reales. Parfanchina, la dueña dice cosas banales, y vestido de rojo piruetea el bufón. La princesa no rie, la princesa no siente; la princesa persigue por el cielo de Oriente la libélula vaga de una vaga ilusión (556).

Flores’s version:

Puebla el patio el berrido de un pebete que llora tiran bronca dos viejas y chamuya una lora mientras canta “I Pagliacci” un vecino manghín, la bacana no atiende, pobre cima, no siente, la bacana parece que estuviera inconsciente con el mate ocupado por algún berretín (63).

The garden of the princess’s palace, with its
peacocks and dragonflies and the exotic splendor of the Oriental sky, has become the patio of a tenement in Buenos Aires. In a most interesting series of displacements, the talkative duenna has turned into two quarrelsome old women (thus preserving the idea of idle chatter), and the princess’s clown has disappeared, recalled only through a musical allusion, when the Italian neighbor sings “I Pagliacci.” As before, much of the narrative is left intact in the rest of the stanza, though there are radical shifts in language. The fourth line suffers a change from “princesa” to “bacana,” and the last line of the stanza retains its original sense—the women are both caught up in fantasy—but the lexicon for expressing poetic fantasy is quite different, since Flores’s princess is occupied not with the pursuit of vague dragonfly-like illusions but instead has her head (mate, literally “gourd”) full of whimsical ideas.

The third stanza similarly follows the Darío poem quite closely. Darío writes:

¿Piensa acaso en el príncipe de Golconda o de China, en el que ha detenido su carroza argentina para ver de sus ojos la dulzura de luz, en el rey de las islas de las Rosas fragantes, en el que es soberano de los claros diamantes, en el dueño orgulloso de las perlas de Ormuz? (556)

Flores transforms the exotic Prince Charming into various princes who are much nearer at hand:

Piensa acaso en el caso que la espera en la esquina?
En aquel que le dijo que era muy bailarina
con tapín de mafioso, compadrito y ranán?
En aquel que una noche le propuso el espiante?
En aquel cajetilla, entallao de elegante?
O en aquel cafetera que es un gran pelandrún?

This stanza is one of the most dense with Lunfardo terminology, since like the various other forms of slang in Spanish it has a particularly rich vocabulary for dealing with pimps, prostitutes and thieves. One curious feature of this stanza is that Flores echoes the u sound so notably used by Darío in the third verse (“la dulzura de luz”), but he does so by using two Lunfardo terms that are far from musical, “ranún” (a rascal) and “pelandrún” (a sluggard).

Flores uses the principle of substitution to most comic effect in the fourth stanza. Darío’s original reads:

¡Ay!, la pobre princesa de la boca de rosa
quiere ser golondrina, quiere ser mariposa,
tener alas ligeras, bajo el cielo volar,
ir al sol por la escala luminosa de un rayo,

saludar a los lirios con los versos de Mayo,
o perderse en el viento sobre el trueno del mar (556-57).

Flores rewrites:

¡Ah! la pobre percanta de la bata [de] rosa!
quiere tener menega, quiere ser poderosa,
tener “apartament” con mishe y gihuoló,“
muchas joyas debute, un peleche a la moda.
Porque en esta gran vida el que no se acomoda
y la vive del grupo, al final se embromó (64).

Darío’s princess aspires for the only thing she does not have: unity with the natural world, with flowers and wind and birds. The “bacana” in Flores’s version aspires for money and luxury goods, and for a curious economy of self-sufficiency, an apartment with both a “mishé” (sugar daddy) and a gigolo. The money she is paid for her favors she will pay in turn to another for her pleasure. Her morality is posed rather baldly at the end of this stanza: one must “vivir del grupo,” through thievery or deceit.

The next stanza comes closest to replicating the rhyme scheme of the original poem, with three of the same rhyming words used: “corte,” “norte” and “sur.” Darío writes:

Ya no quiere el palacio, ni la rueca de plata,
ni el halcón encantado, ni el buñón escarlista,
con los miserables en el lago azul.
Y están tristes los flores por la flor de la corte,
las zanjas de Oriente, los nelumbos del Norte,
de Occidente las dalias y las rosas del Sur (557).

Flores’s version:

Ya no quiere la mugre de la pieza amueblada,
el bacán que la shaka ya la tiene cansada,
se aburrió de esa vida de continua rata;
quiere un pibe a la guerta que en el baile con corte
les dé contramoquiño a los reos del Norte,
los sifi del Oeste, los cañasillos del Sur (64).

“Corte” here is not the princess’s palace but the “baile con corte,” the tango, whose central steps, the “corte” and “quebrada,” were long considered indecent. The north and south of Flores’s poem are not exotic regions far away but the other neighborhoods inhabited by the lowlife of Buenos Aires.

Flores chooses not to rewrite the next two stanzas of the Darío poem, which provide the climax of that poem. The sixth stanza of Darío’s poem tells of the princess’s feeling of being a prisoner in her palace, a palace defined in hyperbolic and fantastic terms:

¡Pobrecita princesa de los ojos azules!
Está presa en sus ojos, está presa en sus tules,
en la jaula de mármol del palacio real;
el palacio soberbio que vigilan las guardias,
que custodian cien negros con sus cien alabardas,
un lebrel que no duerme y un dragón colossal (557).
The seventh stanza provides an emphatic expression of her desire to escape from her prison, juxtaposed with a delicate echoing in parenthesis of lines from the first stanza:

¡Oh, quién fuera hipisipila que dejó la crisálida!
(La princesa está triste. La princesa está pálida.)
¡Oh visión adorada de oro, rosa y marfil!
¡Quién volara a la tierra donde un príncipe existe
(La princesa está pálida. La princesa está triste.)


mas brillante que el alba, más hermoso que Abril! (557)

In the Flores poem the confrontation of reality and fantasy is not mediated in this way: her fantasy of a sugar daddy and a gigolo contrasts sharply with the reality of the “cosa que llega,” her pimp. In addition, the delicate muted tones of the parenthesises in Darío’s seventh stanza have no place in Flores’ parodic version, his heroine’s situation seemingly excluding such delicacy or hushed lyricism.

Darío ends the poem with the fairy godmother promising the princess not a life as a butterfly or a swallow but a life with Prince Charming:

“Calla, calla, princesa—dice el hada madrina—;
 en caballo con alas, haza acá se encamina,
 en el cinto la espada y en la mano el azor,
 el feliz caballero que te adora sin verte,
 y que llega de lejos, vencedor de la Muerte,
 a encenderle los labios con su beso de amor” (557).

Flores’s poor princess already is suffering because of her prince, who arrives at the close of the poem to demand his share of her earnings:

— ¡Vamos, vamos pelandrén! —dice el coco que llega —,
 esa cara de otaria que tenés no te pega,
 levantate ligero y unos mangos pasá.
(Éstá el patio en silencio, un rayito de luna
 se ha colado en la pieza) mientras la pelandruna
 saca vento de un mueble y le dice: — ¡Tomás! (64)

Flores heightens the pathos of the scene by juxtaposing the Lunfardo description of the interior of his princess’s room with a pastiche of a modernist description of nature. The contrapuntal nature of the parody is emphasized by the parenthesis, which encloses (and separates) the alien element of an idealized element of the natural world.

This “Sonatina” is of a piece with the world of the tango, and uses the refraction of a tanguera perspective to highlight the impossible distance between the real and seedy world of the Buenos Aires prostitute and pimp and the melancholy world of fantasy of Darío’s princess.

Flores’s parody of “Sonatina” is of course part of a whole body of poetry that rejects the rhetoric and themes of Spanish-American modernism, the most famous example being Enrique González Martínez’s sonnet “Tuércele el cuello al cisne.” Modernist poetry was susceptible to parody by virtue of its very stylization: it is baroque according to Borges’s definition of that term, which considers baroque those works of art which verge on being parodies of themselves (291). Indeed, in Lugones there is something of the same incorporation of the urban setting and its material concerns, in poems such as “Luna ciudadana.” What was implicit in much of late modernist poetry, however, became explicit in the next generation of poets. The postmodernist poets often sought for prosaic language, everyday themes and an unidealized view of life to highlight their break with modernism, which was criticized for its cosmopolitan perspective, considered escapist and “un-American” by some. Storni, López Velarde, Mistral, Carriego and others tried to write a poetry of the working poor, the suffering and the marginal elements in society. A new esthetic of marginality is proclaimed by Borges in a 1921 essay in which he says “Lo marginal es lo más bello” (“Crítica del paisaje” 197), and was developed by him at greater length in his biography of Evaristo Carriego, with its celebration of the neighborhoods of Buenos Aires: their language, music and poetry, rituals and ethos.

The “tango-canción” coincides, perhaps not so fortuitously, with these developments in the language and themes of Spanish-American poetry. The music and dance of the tango had already been popular in socially marginal zones of Buenos Aires for decades, and had made their social debut in Paris and in the high society of Buenos Aires in 1912. The “tango-canción,” however, comes into its own in 1917, with Pascual Contursi’s “Mi noche triste,” and the remarkable outpouring of tango lyrics and related phenomena (sainetes with tangos, Lunfardo poetry, etc.) in the next fifteen years is indicative of the propitiousness of the genre in the historical and cultural circumstances of the moment. José Gobello has seen in the tango lyrics of this period an expression of anesthetic of ugliness and poverty (Las letras del tango 18-23), while Noemí Ulla has emphasized the new importance of the neighborhood and the home in these works (53-58). The same tendencies that mark the poetry of post-modernism, then, characterize
many of the tango lyrics of the period. These lyrics appealed to audiences elsewhere in Spanish America, confirming that the new esthetic had the continental appeal that modernist poetry had enjoyed in the previous decades.

Flores's parodic version of “Sonatina” is in fact a better example of the post-modernist reaction to modernism than is “Tuércele el cuello al cisne.” The González Martínez poem expresses the death of modernism thematically, but the language of the poem is still modernist. Flores's parody, on the other hand, proposes a translation of the Darío poem into the radically different lexicon of the underworld of Buenos Aires, and the change in poetic language also heralds a brave new world where money determines social position, where love is a business proposition, and where poetry celebrates the sordid and the marginal.

That parody can function to open new possibilities for literature is suggested by the preeminent example of Don Quijote, at once a parody of chivalric and pastoral romance and the foundational text of the modern novel. Its very quality of being a “parasitic” genre makes it a quintessentially literary discourse. Pierre Macherey, in fact, states: “We have defined literary discourse as parody, as a contestation of language rather than a representation of reality” (61). Furthermore, parody is inherently polyphonic, at once undermining and affirming the parodied text (Hutcheon 28; Bakhtin 75-76). That Flores genuinely admired the poetry of Rubén Darío is demonstrated as much by the fidelity of his parody of “Sonatina” as by the fact that he left a sheaf of unpublished modernist poems. His admiration for modernism was tempered, however, by his desire to capture in his poetry the bleak immediacy of the life of the poor in Buenos Aires, and by his consciousness of himself as a spokesman. José Barcia comments: “el negro Cele era un auténtico poeta popular, con claro sentido social” (99).

Curiously, the world Flores evokes in his poem was much closer to the reality of Rubén Darío's life than was the idealized world of the princess. Flores was surely conscious that his poetic master lived much of the latter part of his life, and indeed died, in the most sordid of circumstances, caught up in a hopeless, demeaning love affair with Rosario Muri-
mango | Argentine peso, money
menega | money
mishé | sugar daddy
otario | naive or innocent person
pbebe | child
pelandrín, pelandrúa | lazy person
pelleche | improving fortune and dress; here, a fur coat
percanta | woman viewed as sexual object
pipe | boy or man viewed affectionately
ragi | hunger
ran, ranín | astute person, pl. caro
rno | bum
shacar | to cheat money from someone
vento | money

Information in this glossary is derived from the following sources: José Golbelo, Diccionario Luñfardo, Diego Abad de Santillán, Diccionario de argentinismos, and Fernando Hugo Casullo, Diccionario de voces luñfardas y vulgares.

NOTES
Ressler terms this poem Flores’s “Arte poética” (3204).
In another poem, “Señora,” he asserts his own cultural sophistication, at the same time that he explains his decision not to write in cultivated language:
Leo al viejito Tolstoy
Amado Nervo, Almahuete
y todo lo que la suerte
me coloca donde voy….

Y no vas a creer que escribo
en este lenguaje rante
por iras de interesante
ni por pasarme de vivo.

Si no, porque no hallo bien,
ni apropiado, ni certero,
el pretender que un carrero
se deleite con Rubén….

Por eso es, que pongo rienda
al verbo altivo y sonante
y escrito en lenguaje rante
“para que el vulgo me entienda” (33-34).

Cf. the comments by Margaret Rose on Bloom’s notion of “misreading”: “What Professor Bloom says about the necessity for ‘strong readings,’ which change, or seek to evade their models, also holds true (and has always been true) for the parody which attempts to reconstitute critically a literary work from within another literary text… In parody the internalization of the fiction text within a form of criticism which is itself a fiction-text, thus achieves a ‘strong reading’ of another work at the same time as it expands the creative literary tradition” (104).

Cátulo Castillo terms him “verdadero prócer de la musa porteña” (introduction to Chapaleando barro [13], also quoted in Lara [353]).
Ressler asserts a link between the boxer and the poet, though his phraseology is (perhaps unintentionally) comic: “Con Mano a mano diste en el plexo de la gloria, con Corrientes y Esmeralda en la mandíbula de la inmortalidad” (3207).
José Barcia states: “Y fíjate lo que son las cosas: cuando se publicó la segunda edición de Chapaleando barro, … la visada de Celedonio Esteban Flores, la dulce y pesada María Luisa, tuvo que anular muchos ejemplares en su casa, porque ni los libros ni los lectores se lo quisieron llevar. Ahora, en cambio, no encontrás el libro y si de casualidad aparece alguno inesperadamente, te lo quieren cobrar como si se tratase de un incunable” (99-100).
Ressler: “Si la fórmula combinada de tradición y novedad es una de las efectivas para perdurar habrá que convenir que el autor de Mano a mano es acabado exponente de ello. Que es tradicional lo revela su manejo de los metros clásicos. En este aspecto nada tiene que envidiarle a los llamados representantes de la poesía culta. Hasta se impuso la tarea de escribir sonetos con proverbial soltura de los virtuosos de la forma. La novedad está determinada por el uso del luñfardo, no porque fuese el primero sino porque es quien lo aplica con más convicción en el terreno del tango” (3170).
Barcia adds: “Flores dejó, escrito de puño de letra, un grueso cuaderno con material inédito, de carácter distinto, sin embargo, de su poesía tanguera. Son, todos, poemas de corte modernista, en los que se percibe la influencia de Rubén Darío y, a veces, la del romanticismo llorando amores imposibles. Esa otra muestra de su talento creador no permanecerá ignorada por mucho tiempo, pues ahí anda su fortelio Manuel tratando de colocar el libro inédito. Y lo va a conseguir” (100). None of the poems included in the most recent editions of Chapaleando barro or Cuando pasa el organito meet this description exactly, however, suggesting that there are still unpublished manuscript poems “de corte modernista.”
For other writings on parody, see Tynianov, Shklovsky, Jump, Rose, Dusit, and Genette.
Tynianov asserts in his 1923 essay “La notion de construction”: “Le mètre, par exemple, peut s’effacer quand il fusionne d’une manière complète et naturelle avec le système accentuel de la phrase et avec certains éléments lexicaux. Si nous remettions ce mètre en contact avec des facteurs nouveaux, nous le renouvellerions, nous réveillions en lui de nouvelles possibilités constructives (c’est le rôle historique du pastiche poétique)” (118).
In the Cancionero edition these two lines read: “la bacana no rfe, la bacana no siente, / la bacana parece que ha quedado inconsciente” (104), a version that is a bit closer to the Darío original. The Cancionero edition also differs markedly from the text of the poem given in Cuando pasa el organito in that many of the long lines are broken in hemistichs, presumably because of the requirements of the small pages of the series in which the volume appeared.
Though “Oriente” often has the sense in Spanish only of east (as direction), the “cielo de Oriente” of the Darío poem implies the exotic East (as region of the world), as much because of the capital letter as because of the geographical locations mentioned in the poem.
This word is missing in both the Cancionero edition and in Cuando pasa el organito, but is necessary for the meter. An alternative possible reading, which makes better sense yet also preserves the hendecasyllable, would be: “[Ah! la pobre percanta de la bata rosada,” though the adjective “rosada” instead of “rosa” would make the description all the more homely.
The Cancionero text here reads “tener departamento con mishé y gígilō” (105), which is more colloquial and easier to scan. The reading given in Cuando pasa el
organito, with "apartament" instead of "departamento," is, however, also an alexandrine in accord with the metrics of Dario’s poem, in which stressed final syllables at the end of a half-line are counted twice, as is also the practice at the end of full lines.

*Gwen Kirkpatrick has analyzed in depth this self-parodic tendency in modernist poetry, particularly in the poetry of Leopoldo Lugones, in her forthcoming book with the University of California Press.

*Hutcheson comments: "Parodic works like this one — works that actually manage to free themselves from the background text enough to create a new and autonomous form — suggest that the dialectic synthesis that is parody might be a prototype of the pivotal stage in that gradual process of development of literary forms” (35).

"See Roberto Ledesma (49-50). For a fuller account, though not a very frank one, see Edelberto Torres (466-505).

"His parody is, then, in Hutcheson’s words, "both a personal act of supersession and an inscription of literary-historical continuity" (35).
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