Nielsen’s *Saul and David* and Italian opera

Paolo Muntoni

The popular image of Carl Nielsen is more strongly associated with his symphonies and songs than with the theatre, even though he wrote two operas that are among the finest Danish examples of their kind. If *Maskarade* has always been regarded as a success, and has recently begun to attract international reappraisal, however, *Saul and David* has remained in the shadow of its younger sister. The ‘great and strange material’ that Nielsen chose as the basis for his work became an overwhelmingly difficult and absorbing task.¹ And yet, he later stated that he would not wish to change anything in his first opera, unlike his other compositions (including *Maskarade*):

Isn’t it strange … that when *Maskarade*, my later opera, recently came forward again, I would have thought of various passages differently and concede to both displacements and cuts, but for what concerns *Saul and David*, I basically wouldn’t like to change anything at all. And the reason must be that when you are merry, you don’t take it so neatly, but when it is about the tragic and elevated – as it is the case here – you must have thought a big deal about it before.²

The destiny of *Saul and David* was in fact similar to that of many other operas from the period which were not based upon a realistic subject. After winning favour in France and later Italy, *verismo* or naturalistic opera marked the final phase of an operatic genre that had been in crisis across the whole continent. The situation was particularly critical in Italy, where the long tradition of Italian opera, predominant for three centuries, was in its twilight, forcing composers to look elsewhere for suitable models. It is therefore

---

¹ ‘This great, strange material … captivated me and pursued me, so that for long periods I was totally unable to be free of it’, quoted in Niels Bo Foltmann, Peter Hauge, and Niels Krabbe, ‘Preface’, in Carl Nielsen, *Saul og David* (The Carl Nielsen Edition, I/4; Copenhagen, 2002), xiv. The full interview, ‘Før Slaget’, by Hugo Seligmann, for Danish newspaper *Politiken* (26 February 1929) can be found in John Fellow (ed.), *Carl Nielsen til sin samtid. Artikler, foredrag, interview, presseindlæg, værknoter og manuskripter* (Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1999), 519–20.

² ‘Er det … ikke mærkeligt, at mens jeg, da *Mascarade*, min senere Opera, for nylig kom frem igen, udmærket godt kunde tænke mig adskilligt anderledes og gaa med til baade Forskydninger og Forkortninger, saa kan jeg i Grunden slet ikke tænke mig nogen son helst Forandring i *Saul og David*. Og det ligger vel i, at naar man er lystig, saa tager man det ikke saa nøje, men naar det som her drejer sig om det tragisk-ophøjede, saa *har* man tænkt sig om og set sig for’, ibid. 519. All translations, unless otherwise stated, by the author.
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It is my intention, in the case I am awarded such a major travel grant, to take one year’s residency in Italy, partly in order to study the art of singing, partly, at the same time, in order to plan and compose an opera, Saul and David, for which Mr. Einar Christiansen has provided me with the text.3

In this essay, I will focus on the music cultural context in which Saul and David was composed, as Nielsen approached opera for the first time. This will cast new light on his independence and originality, but also offer the possibility for some seemingly unlikely comparisons, revealing that the work is more tightly integrated with Nielsen’s broader European musical experience than has previously seemed – especially as an alternative to naturalism. I will therefore consider the Italian context before, during and after the rise of verismo, focusing particularly on the anti-naturalism debate, to which Saul and David also belongs. Nielsen’s work follows a path that parallels the shift from the so-called noir dramas (‘melodramma nero’) of the 1880s, which will be briefly presented later, to the work of Ildebrando Pizzetti, via the almost completely unknown operas of Antonio Smareglia. Unusual as it may be, I believe that this comparison will support the idea of a composer who, while working in the genre of musical drama, was in constant dialogue with his European contemporaries.

I will start by presenting the challenges faced by composers in writing an opera in the late nineteenth century, and then reflect upon the musical and dramatic quality of Saul and David. I will argue that Nielsen was able to enhance his drama by providing it with a highly original musical characterisation and by alternating moments of stasis to moments of action. The most important element in this respect was his use of the chorus, which led some commentators to suggest similarities with oratorio. This fact, together with Nielsen’s interest in Renaissance polyphony, suggests a comparison with Italian contemporary composer Lorenzo Perosi, whom Nielsen met while in Rome. Subsequently, by viewing Saul and David as an anti-naturalistic tragedy,4 I will discuss how it anticipates some of the future tendencies of Italian opera, as expressed first by Busoni, who saw the necessity of a new anti-naturalistic musical theatre, and then by the composers of the so-called ‘generation of the 1880s’. One of them in particular, Ildebrando Pizzetti, can be related to Nielsen in terms of aesthetic principles. Finally, I will reflect on the similarities based on the choice of topic and in the shape of the drama between Saul and David and Pizzetti’s Débora e Jaêle, the only biblical opera written by an Italian composer in the first part of the twentieth century.

With these comparisons, I do not presume any direct influence on Nielsen’s work (or vice versa). I simply suggest some similarities of a musical, dramatic, and structural nature, in order to reflect on two aspects: the broad common currency of operatic language at the turn of the century, and Nielsen’s versatility and receptivity toward his cultural and musical environment. The fact that Saul and David is in many respects an unusual and peculiar work, which reveals very little trace of influence or derivation, does not mean it should be regarded as an isolated phenomenon; on the contrary, I believe that considering it within its contemporary cultural context only enriches our understanding of the work, as well as enhancing our appreciation of Nielsen’s ability to capture and synthesize diverse aesthetic impulses, ultimately producing something highly personal. It is this eclecticism that, allied with his deeply individual poetics, became one of the most characteristic elements of the composer’s mature work from the Fourth Symphony onward.

1880s and 1890s Italian opera between anti-naturalism and verismo

Previous commentators have generally placed Saul and David far from either Wagner or Italian opera, even though echoes of both worlds can be identified. We know of very few statements about Italian opera from Nielsen himself, but the fact that he chose to work

---

5 Balzer compares Iago’s monologue in Verdi’s Otello to Saul’s defiance of God in the first act of Nielsen’s opera, Jürgen Balzer, ‘The Dramatic Music’, in Jürgen Balzer (ed.), Carl Nielsen. Centenary Essays (Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag, 1965), 81–82. Saul’s monologue is again called Iago-like in Reynolds, ‘Nielsen’s Saul and David as Tragedy’, 253–54, as well as in Roger Noel Clegg, The writing of Carl Nielsen’s Saul og David (MA-Thesis; University of Leeds, 1989), 10–13. Recently, Patrick McCreless has also reflected on the ‘unlikely’ match Nielsen – Wagner in Patrick McCreless, ‘Strange Bedfellows. The Hebrew Bible and Wagner in “Saul and David”’, Carl Nielsen Studies, 4 (2009), 107–44, while Nielsen’s use of the half diminished chord (also known as Tristan chord, and as such the bearer of associations with the Wagnerian musical world) has also been examined in Reynolds, ‘Nielsen’s Saul and David as Tragedy’, 244–53. Even though Nielsen almost ignored Verdi – he mentioned him very seldom in the available written sources – Otello was performed in Copenhagen while the composer was a member of the second violins section of the Royal Orchestra. According to Clegg’s list of the operas that were played at the Royal Theatre in Copenhagen between 1883 and 1903, Otello was premiered in Denmark 20 April 1898 and was also repeated in the following season 1899–1900, Clegg, The writing, 135–36. Cf. also Balzer, ‘The Dramatic Music’, 78.

6 The only witness of Nielsen attending a performance of a local opera in Italy can be found in his correspondence from the 1891 trip: ‘I have heard “Cavaliere Rusticana” [sic]: absolutely nothing new in that music, but well made!’ letter from Carl Nielsen, Florence, to Høther Ploug, Copenhagen, 22 May 1891, CNB 1, 229–30. That Nielsen didn’t appreciate Verdi’s operas from his ‘middle period’ is evident from these words: ‘The dominating Italian opera style was organized first of all with the purpose of giving the singers an occasion to shine with all the possible singing techniques, no matter if they were appropriate to the dramatic situation or not. You will still be able to experience rehearsals of this insane nonsense when you go to the Royal Theatre for Trovatore or Traviata’, Carl Nielsen, ‘[Gluck, Haydn og Mozart]’ (1905), in Fellow (ed.), Carl Nielsen til sin samtid, I, 65. The composer praised on the contrary Verdi’s last work, Falstaff, as it is reported by his son-in-law Telmányi: ‘We
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in Italy during the composition of Saul and David can arguably be seen as an indirect reflection of his attitude towards Wagner. Nielsen might have been indifferent towards Italian music theatre, but he had pretty strong opinions about Wagnerian music drama. Italy allowed him to distance himself from Wagner, not least since Danish composers traditionally gravitated to Germany because of geographical and cultural proximity.

There is no reason to doubt Nielsen’s claims that he had much to learn from the Italian tradition, especially regarding vocal scoring and technique, even though the presence of his wife Anne-Marie in Rome must have contributed to his application. What is unclear is whether he was referring to an older or a newer tradition, especially given his inclination towards Palestrina and his fondness for polyphonic passages, particularly in choral writing. Moreover, this was exactly the period when Palestrina had become an almost mythical figure in the history of counterpoint, a topic to which we will return later in the essay.

At the same time, however, contemporary Italian opera was struggling. Though the sudden success of Mascagni’s Cavalleria Rusticana, and the rising popularity of Puccini would assure a prominent place for Italian opera in Europe and beyond for decades, there is little evidence of a distinctively Italian approach to the genre in the work of the ‘Giovine Scuola’. In other words, it was much easier for Nielsen to rely on a highly got caught by a brilliant performance with amazing singing displays … Carl Nielsen was so captivated by the first two acts that he poked me. He eventually wanted to greet the maestro [Toscanini], Emil Telmányi, Af en musikers billedbog (Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busck, 1978), 175.

7 After an initial infatuation during his Grand Tour to Germany in 1890, Nielsen started to get tired (after only a few days, as Clegg observes) of Wagner and especially of his use of the leitmotif technique: ‘I admire Wagner and find that he is the greatest spirit in our century; but I do not like the way he spoon-feeds his audience. Every time a name is mentioned, even though its bearer has been dead and buried for many years, we are given his leitmotif. I find this highly naïve and it arouses a comical effect in me’, Clegg’s translation in Clegg, The writing, 13, cf. Nielsen’s diary, Dresden, 15 September 1890, CNB 1, 117. Four years later, after a performance of Tristan, Nielsen wrote highly appraising the first act and the first part of the second one, but adding these words: ‘as an entity I am … a long way from being carried away by Wagner; I find such a quantity of bad taste and hollow effect in this as in all his next operas – perhaps excepting Meistersinger – that I can find it impossible not to be offended by it’, Clegg’s translation in Clegg, The writing, 13, cf. Nielsen’s diary, Vienna, 9 November 1894, CNB 1, 383. This is however not the place to discuss Nielsen’s relationship with Wagner. Moreover, as already mentioned, the topic is covered exhaustively in McCrless, ‘Strange Bedfellows’.

8 Anne-Marie had already been granted a scholarship and the possibility to study with one of the leading French sculptors of his generation, Hugo Segoffin, at that time based in Rome.

9 This was the name given by scholars to most of the Italian composers that were contemporary to Nielsen. Sometimes the adjective ‘verista’ is added at the end, so that musicians like Pietro Mascagni, Ruggiero Leoncavallo, Umberto Giordano, Francesco Cilea and, though with some caveat, Giacomo Puccini – and to a lesser extent Antonio Smareglia, Alfredo Catalani and Lorenzo Perosi, sometimes joined by Franco Alfano – are said to belong to the ‘giovine scuola verista’. But it would be appropriate to avoid the adjective ‘verista’, firstly because some of these composers were only remotely influenced by verismo; secondly because even composers like Mascagni and company experimented with a variety of subjects, which sometimes brought them far from the realistic world, which the most famous of their operas depicted.
established tradition – polyphonic vocal writing from the Renaissance – and to reinterpret it within his own musical world, than to approach the very eclectic and uncertain field of Italian contemporary opera.

Verdi’s mature works, which had already incorporated elements from other traditions, especially French Grand Opera,\(^{10}\) suggest an unprecedented balance between vocal and orchestral textures, as well as the almost entire abolition of closed forms, even though lyrical singing is still present. This was a consequence of the rising popularity of Wagnerian music drama, with its complete synthesis of music and dramatic action. Before becoming influential in matters of musical character, however, Wagner gained popularity among a group of intellectuals, artists and writers known as the ‘Scapigliati,’ literally meaning ‘dishevelled.’ One of the artists who was associated with the ‘Scapigliatura’ was Arrigo Boito, composer and poet, author of the opera *Mefistofele.*\(^{11}\)

The movement influenced many opera composers especially during the 1880s, with its post-romantic propensity for the fantastic and the supernatural, and its predilection for the magic element, especially black magic: this decade’s operatic plots and librettos are often set in Nordic environments or taken from the realm of myth and legend. The musical theatre that was later called ‘melodramma nero’\(^{12}\) is exemplified by works such as *La Fata del Nord* (1884) by Guglielmo Zuelli, Puccini’s first two operas, *Le Villi* (1884) and *Edgar* (1889), *Flora Mirabilis* (1886) by Spiros Samara, *Asrael* by Alberto Franchetti (1888), and Alfredo Catalani’s *Loreley* (1890), a revision of the earlier *Elda* (1880).

The first anti-naturalistic phase of Italian opera, however, proved to be very short: Mascagni’s great success with *Cavalleria Rusticana* (1890) imposed *verismo* as the new dominant genre and prompted many turn-of-the-century-composers to choose realistic subjects in order to achieve a similar fortune. Some of the works that followed *Cavalleria* have actually little to do with the *verista* paradigm, as they are set in urban environments, while the origin of *verismo,* as a literary movement, was rural. Historical dramas, Traviata-like love stories and vernacular tales imbued with exoticism, are unified only by the common naturalistic frame. For this reason many scholars prefer the term urban naturalism for most of the works of the ‘Giovine Scuola,’ leaving the *verista* label only to dramas set in the countryside. Besides being justified by its broad spectrum, the variety of the subjects inside the naturalistic genre hides an anxiety, which is evident in composers’ ceaseless search for suitable subjects. Whether we use the terms *verismo*

---


11 Boito was particularly influential in Italy, while abroad he was probably best known for writing the libretto for Verdi’s *Otello.* His first opera, *Mefistofele,* had a curious history: its première in 1868 was a failure. After two revisions (first in 1875 and then again in 1876), however, the work gained a fair amount of success, leading opera composers to new paths in terms of subject choice.

or urban naturalism, the choice of a realistic plot was in fact no guarantee of success: among the composers usually associated to the ‘Giovine Scuola’, only Puccini managed to achieve lasting and prosperous fortune, while Mascagni, Leoncavallo, and to a lesser extent Umberto Giordano and Francesco Cilea, only experienced real and enduring success with one opera each.\(^\text{13}\)

This desperate search for a suitable subject, combined with the fear of failure, haunted also those composers who did not work best in naturalistic dramas (such as Catalani and Smareglia), but who Nevertheless tried their hand in the genre. It is these composers who presented a valid alternative to verismo in the twenty years around the turn of the century: the realistic frame that surrounds the story in La Wally, for example, cannot be compared to that of other verista composers, which justifies the claim that the opera ‘creates a balance between dream and reality’.\(^\text{14}\) Even less naturalistic are some of Smareglia’s operas, particularly La Falena (1897), Océana (1903) and Abisso (1914), which represent the products of the collaboration between the composer and the poet Silvio Benco. Particularly significant in this respect is La Falena, which, despite its evident Wagnerian influence in the musical language, anticipates some of the future tendencies of anti-naturalistic theatre, while the element of black magic is reminiscent of the noir dramas of the 1880s. The opera’s thin plot (not much more than a parable), undefined settings, and evanescent characters (not much more than allegories) are all elements that portrait it as a part of the symbolist world that can be connected to Gabriele D’Annunzio, one of the main representatives of the European decadence. The author of influential literary works as well as of several opera librettos, D’Annunzio would become a constant reference for composers of tragic operas in the first two decades of the twentieth century, a point we will come back to later in the essay.

The legend created by Benco in La Falena, which by his own admission can be summarized as ‘an idyll overturned into tragedy’,\(^\text{15}\) also stands out for another reason, notably its absence of lightness or irony. This is even more striking in relation to the dominating trends dictated by verismo composers, who merged high and low, elevated and plebeian, tragic and comic registers, according to a recipe that was reminiscent of early 1800’s opera semiseria. Even in the most tragic of the verista operas there is place for light and cheerful moments, as in the first acts of Tosca and Madama Butterfly.\(^\text{16}\) These characteristics make La Falena the linking point between melodrama nero and decadent tragedy, which would gradually distance itself from the Wagnerian influence to acquire a more specific musical identity, particularly with the works of Zandonai.

---

\(^{13}\) Respectively with Cavalleria Rusticana (1890), Pagliacci (1892), Andrea Chénier (1896), and Adriana Lecouvreur (1902). The rest of the four composers’ work are hardly represented nowadays.

\(^{14}\) Salvetti, ‘Dal Verdi della maturità a Giacomo Puccini’, 401.

\(^{15}\) See for example Guido Salvetti, La nascita del Novecento (Torino: EDT, 1991), 243.

\(^{16}\) In both the operas the germs of an imminent tragedy manifested themselves at the end of the first act, while the beginning of it is occupied by more trivial matters. It is the second act’s role to unveil the tragedy and the third one’s to bring it to a dramatic climax.
and Pizzetti. At the same time and despite the substantial aesthetic differences between the two composers, we can identify some similarities between Smareglia’s opera and *Saul and David*. The thoroughly tragic sense, the element of black magic (limited to a few scenes in Nielsen’s opera,\(^\text{17}\) more pervasive in *La Falena*), and the sense of indefiniteness and atemporality are connected to the out-of-this-world-quality both works express.

**Musical characters and dramatic choruses: Nielsen’s individual touch**

The ‘globalisation’ of opera at the turn of the century was responsible for important changes, and its consequence was the gradual abandonment of the principles that had made Italian opera during the eighteenth century, namely the use of closed numbers (and the separation between action and reflection); the supremacy of vocal melody; and the social and musical distinction between opera buffa and opera seria (and between high and low genres).\(^\text{18}\) As a result of this, the need to maintain dramatic cohesion without giving up lyrical singing became a problem of major importance for opera composers. In order to do so, the transition from recitative to closed numbers had to become smoother, hence the more frequent use of the recitativo arioso. Another major preoccupation was to avoid unnecessary pauses in the action; for this reason, closed numbers were placed either at the beginning or at the end of the act, or, in some cases, took the form of musical episodes of diegetic character.

In *Saul and David* Nielsen makes extensive use of some of these devices. The most striking example of music perceived diegetically occurs at the beginning of the second act, after the prelude, when David sings for the sick King Saul.\(^\text{19}\) The episode is notable because of the clarity with which Nielsen outlines two musical planes: David’s performance is accompanied by the harp, an instrument strongly associated with the act of singing, while the orchestra, representing the plane of the dramatic action, interrupts his song and eventually stops it. Later in the act David sings again and is once more interrupted. But even in the first act, he is associated with singing as a therapeutic means of soothing Saul’s troubled mind – although we initially do not hear the harp, the stage indications reveal that David is actually singing and is accompanied by the

17 *Saul and David*, even being far from this symbolist realm, maintains a loose relationship with the narrative devices of noir dramas, both in the king’s curse operated by Samuel, which is responsible for Saul’s mind to be controlled by an evil spirit, and especially in the last act’s opening’s scene, when the prophet’s spirit is evoked by the witch of Endor.

18 Although there are many examples of opera semiseria, where both tragic and comic elements and characters from high and low classes were mixed, the distinction between opera buffa and opera seria stands until verismo.

19 The ‘meta musical’ quality in David is also noted by McCreless, with a reference to ‘what Carolyn Abbate calls “phenomenal performance” – music “that the onstage audience can hear as music”’, McCreless, ‘Strange Bedfellows’, 131.
instrument, while Saul’s reactions to the young man’s appearance also point to his song (cf. example 2). The end of the first act is also a perfect example of Nielsen exploiting a natural break in the action in order to create a musical opportunity. The love duet between David and Mikal takes place immediately after everybody has been called to war. A similar device is used to situate the duet between brother and sister, Jonathan and Mikal, at the beginning of Act 3, in a way that does not interfere with the rest of the action.

While the elements presented above show Nielsen operating in a way that is in line with most of his contemporaries, there are aspects of his musical and dramatic shaping of the work that justify the independence of thought and originality for which Saul and David has so often been praised. An example of this can be found in the second act, where Nielsen incorporated the song of a thrush he heard in the garden of Villa Medici in the orchestral score of Saul and David. What had the potential to become an impressionistic touch – a common practice in many works of the period – was handled by Nielsen in a totally different manner: had he been a verista composer, he would have reported the song verbatim, to add a touch of reality to his work. Instead, he incorporates it into the score in a way that makes it almost impossible to recognize the original melody. Similarly, he incorporated in the musical discourse elements from musical traditions other than the operatic, such as popular song and Renaissance sacred polyphony.

Another original feature of Nielsen’s musical discourse in the opera is the prevalence of the diatonic element over the chromatic. While both the anti-naturalist and the verismo composers shared a post-romantic aesthetic, inclined towards the chromatic regions, Nielsen, in contrast, preferred a personal and idiosyncratic diatonicism, which is sometimes pushed to an extreme, when the independence of the single voices results in dissonances in a way that resembles Busoni’s concept of a fully developed polyphony. Nielsen does employ chromaticism in the opera, but its function is more illustrative of the action or of a particular character (notably Saul), which is to say that chromaticism

---

20 Nielsen, Saul og David, Act 1, bb. 643ff. (rehearsal number 37): [David] ‘steps forward a bit and sings to the harp’. The harp is though silent until bb. 692ff. (rehearsal number 40), when David intonates a psalm. He will be doing the same, again accompanied by the harp, in the already mentioned episode at the beginning of the second act. The full score from the Carl Nielsen Edition is available at www.kb.dk/en/nb/dcm/cnu/download.html.


23 Michael Fjeldsøe, Den fortrængte modernisme – den ny musik i dansk musikliv (1920-1940) (PhD diss., University of Copenhagen, 1999), 143–47.
is used in a manner close to that in pre-classical music, where it was the bearer of a specific extra-musical meaning.

If Saul’s at times chromatic singing is a key to understand him as a character, it is not an isolated attempt of musical characterisation. On the contrary, the creation of musical types revealing a perfect cohesion with their respective dramatic role is one of the most notable features in Saul and David.²⁴ Being the motor of the opera’s plot, Saul is given an aria that forms the dramatic climax of the first act; almost all of its musical weight, however, is carried in the orchestra, with no extended lyrical passages for the singer. The traditional balance of the aria is hence transformed into something new.²⁵ The rest of Saul’s arioso passages are similarly brief, including the first section of the two-part aria before his suicide. Such type casting, however, is not limited to Saul alone. David is a warrior, a shepherd and a king-in-waiting, but he is first of all a musician, hence offering the composer the perfect opportunity for lyrical expansiveness. His first appearance in the opera is perfectly in line with this characterisation: his aria di sortita (ex. 1) is cleverly disguised as a song (as we have seen when speaking of diegetic musical episodes), of the same kind as that in Mascagni’s Cavalleria, where Lola’s first lines are the verses of a Sicilian stornello (ex. 2). Having established himself this way, David retains his role even when he is not singing diegetically, as in his love duet with Mikal. Nielsen thus intensifies the first of the symbolic contrasts upon which the opera is built: Saul as the personification of drama, and David as the personification of music.

Example 1, Carl Nielsen, Saul and David, David’s entrance, Act 1, bb. 640–50.

²⁴ The use of musical characters in Saul and David is also discussed in Ludvig Dolleris, Carl Nielsen – En musikografi (Odense: Fyns Boghandels Forlag, 1949), 72–73.
²⁵ Even more than in Iago’s monologue with which the Israeli king’s so often has been compared: in the passage from Otello Verdi does provide the orchestra with a prominent role, but Iago’s vocal part maintains a typical Verdian melodic quality.
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(Ex. 1 continued)

This characterization by musical types is supported by the other characters: Abner rarely abandons dry recitative, almost constantly accompanied by militaristic trumpets; Samuel’s succession of declamation and psalmody, which by no means lacks lyricism, is neatly aligned with his dramatic role as the servant of God (and, as Patrick McCreless observes in his already mentioned essay, as his deputy).

One role in particular illustrates both Nielsen’s approach to characterization and also why he may have referred to a specific Italian vocality when he applied to study in the country. The fiery quality of characters such as Turiddu in Cavalleria Rusticana, Canio in Pagliacci, Michele in Tabarro, and Tosca in Puccini’s eponymous work all reflect archetypical, sometimes even stereotypical, representations of an ‘Italian temperament’.
This idea of a fiery personality also describes Mikal, Saul’s daughter, who, according to Torben Schousboe, demands a typically Italian vocal style. And it is true that her music is more passionate than lyrical, and exhibits some of the traits that characterize verista vocal writings, especially the use of wide intervals, the passages when she sings in a quasi declamato style, and her sudden dynamic changes (ex. 3). These are evident both in the second act, where she’s waiting, together with her maids, for news from the battle between David and Goliath, as well as in the third, when she openly stands in the way of her father, defending David and then escaping with him. But already in the first act’s love duet it is clear that it is David, and not Mikal, who will be responsible for the scene’s lyricism, with his lover instead displaying strong and even martial traits. Her temperament is announced even in the first measures by a change in tempo (marked agitato), while later, imagining David as a victorious warrior, she is accompanied by trumpets, an instrument that in Saul and David always recalls war. The trumpet motif is then taken over by the oboe, which represents David’s pastoral nature and introduces a new lyrical phase, once again for the male character.

Example 3a, Carl Nielsen, Saul and David, Mikal’s vocal line, Act 1, bb. 883–91.

Example 3b, Carl Nielsen, Saul and David, Mikal's vocal line, Act 3, bb. 61–69.
Nielsen most probably wrote the scene from the second act during his stay in Italy, whereas there are contradictory statements regarding the composition of the love duet in the first.\textsuperscript{27} The nocturne that opens the third act, one of the most poetic moments in the score, was written in Denmark, but is still perfectly in line with Mikal’s character: here it is Jonathan, rather than her, who sings lyrically, while her part is notable for its sudden changes of tempo and dynamics as she worries about David’s whereabouts. A sudden dynamic change (\textit{molto accelerando}) from Andante con moto to Allegro and then Allegro non troppo introduces her singing, while her vocal line is fragmented and more notable for its dramatic quality then for its melody.

All three passages (where Mikal has a major role) were added by Christiansen and Nielsen to give the opera’s leading female character greater prominence than she has in the biblical account, where her importance is limited to the act of saving David once. Although Nielsen and Christiansen maintain her alliance with David, they also allow her to defy Saul openly at the end of the third act. The editors of the Carl Nielsen Edition agree that ‘the biggest departure from the Bible story is the character of Michal’.\textsuperscript{28} They

\textsuperscript{27} Art historian Vilhelm Wanscher, one of Nielsen’s friends, states that Nielsen was composing part of the first act while in Rome: “The old-fashioned traffic in the street did not bother the composer, who worked on the first act of his opera “Saul and David”. From the text it appears that Nielsen was composing specifically the love duet: ‘He thought only of David and Michal’, Vilhelm Wanscher, ‘Erindringer om Carl Nielsen’, \textit{Politiken}, 8 June 1935, quoted in Foltmann, Hauge, and Krabbe, ‘Preface’, xiv–xv. According to the editors, Nielsen ‘composed large parts of Act Two in Italy’, ibid. xv. Meyer, on the other hand, states that only the celebration scene after David’s victory was composed in Italy, cf. Meyer and Schandorf Petersen, \textit{Carl Nielsen}, I, 175–77. It is tempting to believe that from the end of the first act to the celebration scene (the part of the opera where Mikal is almost constantly on scene) the opera was in fact composed in Italy. If we accept this hypothesis we would have to contradict Meyer, but we could accept both Wanscher’s and the editors of the Carl Nielsen Edition’s claims.

\textsuperscript{28} Foltmann, Hauge, and Krabbe, ‘Preface’, xxv.
also suggest in the preface to the score the possibility of Christiansen knowing a libretto by Hans Christian Andersen:

It is difficult to imagine that Einar Christiansen knew nothing of Hans Christian Andersen’s opera libretto *King Saul* when he wrote his libretto for Carl Nielsen’s opera. Einar Christiansen’s plot, the selection of episodes from the Old Testament and a number of the respects in which the text differs from the Biblical account very accurately reflect Andersen’s text.29

But there are also evident similarities with the 1784 tragedy *Saul* by the Italian poet Vittorio Alfieri. In this work Mikal (here called Micol) is similarly provided with a significant role, and also appears together with Jonathan (Giònata in the Italian), where brother and sister are awake during the night and Mikal wonders about David, comparable with the scene that opens Nielsen’s third act.30

It is not possible to verify whether Nielsen was influenced by Italian vocality when he wrote Mikal’s part, in the absence of any explicit commentary on *verista* operas; it is nevertheless true, that she is the closest character to the Italian *soprano drammatico* that dominated the musical scene of early twentieth-century Italy, and supports Nielsen’s statement that ‘especially as regards singing and vocal scoring there is much to be learnt here’.31

The use of the choir is the element with which Nielsen most definitely departs from the paradigm of contemporary Italian opera. This has less to do with the fact that Italian fin-de-siècle opera never provided the choir with such a leading role as in *Saul and David*,32 than with the position of the choruses within the structure of the work and

29 Ibid. xiii.
30 The nocturne scene in the Italian tragedy can be found in the third scene from the first act, Vittorio Alfieri, *Saul* (Torino: Lattes, 1954), 23–24. It is not possible to verify that Christiansen knew the play, but it is compelling to believe so, otherwise we would have to speak of a striking coincidence. Also the character of David is, like in the opera, depicted without the flaws he has in the biblical account, fact that gives him less dramatic weight and concentrate the whole attention on Saul. Alfieri was also conscious of the musicality of the subject: in the fourth scene of the third act, David is provided with an interlude, where the actor is instructed to either recite or sing the verses, accompanied by an instrument (ibid., 52–58). It is also interesting that, as in the opera, David’s singing is preceded by Giònata’s words: ‘move your voice so he can calmly recompose himself, o brother. In sweet obliance already many times you brought him with celestial chants’ (‘la tua voce, a ricomporlo in calma, muovi, o fratello. In dolce oblìo l’ hai raitto già tante volte coi celesti carmi’), ibid. 52. These words are quite similar to Jonathan’s in *Saul and David*: ‘Sing to him, David, often your singing has comforted me’ (‘Leg paa din Harpe; trøst ham som ofte du trøstede mig’), Nielsen, *Saul and David*, Act 1, bb. 632–35; and ‘So take your harp and sing him to rest’ (‘Tag Harpen frem og syng ham til Ro’), ibid. Act 2, bb. 944–46.
31 From Nielsen’s application to extend his Roman residency, letter from Carl Nielsen to the Ministry of Church and Education, 9 March 1900, CNB 2, 172.
32 Maybe with the exception of Mascagni’s *Iris*, whose highlight is the initial Hymne to the sun.
with their musical character. The most striking thing about the choral parts in Nielsen’s opera is their musical significance. Each act has at least one big chorus: the two-part offertory scene in the first (divided into male and female choir); another two-part chorus (‘Hallelujah’ followed by ‘Frydesang Paukesang’), preceded by a scene where Mikal sings with a choir of maids in the second; the third act has only one chorus, but it is the most majestic in the whole opera and probably its highlight; the fourth also has a single chorus, but it is similarly of large proportions, and it has the ‘responsibility’ of closing the work. Patrick McCreless has reflected on the role the choir, as an ensemble, has in Saul and David, where it impersonates the community of the Israelites, and argues that this is one of the reasons why the opera should not be confused with an oratorio, where the chorus serves a contemplative or illustrating functions rather than a dramatic one. In this respect Nielsen’s work can be compared with Verdi’s Nabucco, another opera where the Israelites’ destiny was at stake, and where the People’s actions and perspective are reflected in the choruses.

The position of the choruses is often significant. As we have seen Nielsen was careful to place the opera’s ‘closed’ numbers of the opera either at the end or at the beginning of the acts, in order to allow the action to flow freely (Saul’s monologue is only a partial exception because it doesn’t have the characteristics of a traditional aria). The choruses in the second and third acts, however, are precisely in the middle of each section, and although they are dramatic (celebrating David’s victory in Act 2, and Saul and David’s reconciliation in Act 3), their weight and length is such that the action is stopped. Moreover, with its strict counterpoint writing, ‘Herren er vidne’ (God is our witness), draws attention as a musical rather than a dramatic number. The only reason Nielsen would have wanted to create a pause in the action was for dramatic purposes, and the temporary break accentuates the sudden turning point both in the second act (when Saul’s illness returns and he tries to hit David with a spear) and in the third (when the appearance of Samuel turns out to be the real crux in the second part of the opera).

For this reason, we find ourselves in front of a musical drama that is more based on the contrast between action and stasis than on a sense of continuity. The fluidity of action that Nielsen is perfectly capable of creating is deliberately interrupted. The opera has on various occasions been criticized rightly because of this, commentators regarding the lengthy choruses as an unnecessary moment of stasis. And it is interesting that Saul and David can be perceived as lacking in drama, while several of Nielsen’s orchestral work (particularly his last three symphonies and the two concertos for flute and for clarinet) are often praised for their dramatic quality. It appears, however, that in Saul and David the way he animates his drama is consistent with one of the most important elements in his music, namely the conflict – or contrast – between two opposed forces. The dualism between stasis and action can be added to many others in the opera: the characters of Saul and David, with their contrasting temperaments and personifications

of drama and music; Saul and God (as proposed by McCreless); David and Mikal (as lyrical character versus passionate), and so forth. For this reason it is clear that in Saul and David Nielsen was already working along a path he would pursue throughout his whole career.

Nielsen, Perosi, Busoni and Pizzetti

The choruses are in fact the key to fully understand the originality of Nielsen’s opera. Their counterpoint – in a 1900 opera – was something of a sensation, revealing at the same time the composer’s interest into Italy’s polyphonic tradition, especially Palestrina. Nielsen had previously been inspired by Palestrina’s style in Hymnus Amoris, his first great choral piece. According to Torben Meyer, the Dane studied the Italian master’s technique during the work’s gestation, something he would return to later in his life during the composition of the Three Motets op. 55. The choice of Palestrina as a model is not surprising, given his almost legendary status in the nineteenth century. The rising of the Cecilian movement in several parts of Europe, beginning with Germany, had emphasized the need for clarity and simplicity in music, principles that Nielsen himself held dear.

During his stay in Rome Nielsen and his friend Thomas Laub, who had similar aesthetic beliefs and with whom he would later work on Danish popular song, met Lorenzo Perosi, the composer who was then hailed as the new Palestrina. The author of many masses and much other sacred music, Perosi became a real phenomenon in the final years of the nineteenth century, and his oratorios enjoyed particular success both in Italy and abroad. Perosi’s works, according to the most positive reviews, revealed genuine emotion and affinity with the sacred word, while at the same time maintaining a stylistic balance of modern tonal techniques, modality and Gregorian chant.

In reality, his oratorios use Palestrina only as a reference, instead adopting a musical language that was entirely post-Romantic, in line with contemporary operatic trends. Even though he never composed an opera, Perosi was often associated with the ‘Giovine Scuola’, because of the highly affective and often dramatic quality of his works;

34 Meyer and Schandorf Petersen, Carl Nielsen, I, 132.
35 The Cecilian movement was an attempt to renew church music, by pursuing values such as objectivity, intelligibility of the sacred word, collectivity against individualism, sobriety and simplicity. As a means to purify church music, it addresses attention towards the need for composers to look back to the music of the past, especially the music of the great polyphonic masters from 1500. The movement was initiated by the German composers based in Regensburg, especially Haberl and Haller. Cf. Arcangelo Paglialunga, Lorenzo Perosi (Roma: Paoline, 1952), 25, 53. In Denmark a Cecilian association was founded in 1851 by Henrik Rung, cf. Niels Martin Jensen, ‘Denmark’, in Stanley Sadie (ed.), The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians (London: Macmillan, 2001), vol. 7, 207.
36 This point of view can be found particularly in Adelmo Damerini, Lorenzo Perosi (Milano: Bietti, 1953), as well as in the already mentioned Paglialunga, Perosi.
the comparison was often meant as a criticism, alongside the sentimental tendency of verismo operas. This was also Laub’s opinion, who attended a performance of one of Perosi’s works and found it deeply annoying. It is not clear whether this happened before or after his meeting with the composer in Rome, but it is clear that he wasn’t enthusiastic. We don’t know of Nielsen’s opinion, but it is hard to imagine that Perosi’s blend of mysticism and devotion would have appealed to the much worldlier Dane. The only point where the two composers converged was in their use of Palestrina, a model that in both cases was filtered through their own musical personalities: Perosi owed much to Wagner, whereas Nielsen sought liberation in objectivity, simplicity and clarity.

After his sudden success, Perosi became a rather obscure figure; in retrospect, his importance for early twentieth-century Italian music lay in drawing attention to vocal music of the pre-classical era. This element proved crucial for later composers such as Pizzetti, Respighi, Malipiero, Casella and Zandonai. That is not to regard Perosi as a precursor to the so-called ‘generation of the 1880s’, to which all the composers named above are associated. Unified not only by similar stylistic traits and aesthetic beliefs, but also by the common intent of liberating contemporary music from Romanticism, they had a real spiritual father in Ferruccio Busoni, rather than in Perosi.

Only one year younger than Nielsen, Busoni grew up, like the Dane, in the Romantic era: in Nielsen’s early compositions the post-Romantic influence is obvious, and only later, convincingly and steadily, he began to distance himself from Romanticism. Busoni, meanwhile, immediately reacted against it and developed the concept of Junge Klassizität, whose chief characteristics have several parallels with Nielsen’s aesthetics:

With Young Classicism I include the definite departure from what is thematic and the return to melody again as the ruler of all voices and all emotions (not in the sense of a pleasing motive) and as the bearer of the idea and the begetter of harmony, in short, the most highly developed (not the most complicated) polyphony.

The influence Busoni could exercise upon Italian composers was limited both because of his decision to live and work outside Italy and also because of his choice of German for

37 Paglialunga, Perosi, 198.
38 ‘An oratorio of the new Italian Lorenzo Perosi, “of whom it is said that he resurrected the old music” annoyed him strongly: “modern bang effects mixed together with some quite pretty, strongly old-fashioned, not exceptional things”. Povl Hamburger, Thomas Laub – Hans Liv og Gerning (Copenhagen: Aschehoug Dansk Forlag, 1942), 75.
39 ‘Perosi can in this sense be considered as the joining link between the auric Italin polyphonic tradition and the modern revival of the Pizzettian choir’, Damerini, Perosi, 54.
his opera librettos (with the exception of *Arlecchino*). But inevitably works such as his satirical musical comedy *Arlecchino* and his musical fable *Turandot* (both premiered in 1917) anticipate the new wave of anti-naturalistic operas that would characterize Italian music in the 1910s and 1920s.

Besides comedy and musical fable, the other important genre at the beginning of the twentieth century was decadent tragedy, represented by operas such as Franchetti’s *La figlia di Iorio* (1906), Mascagni’s *Parisina* (1913), Zandonai’s *Francesca da Rimini* (1914), Pizzetti’s *Fedra* (1915), and Italo Montenezzi’ *La nave* (1918). Their librettos were all written by the already mentioned Gabriele D’Annunzio. These works, which, as we have seen, had a precedent in Smareglia’s *La Falena* (it is not a case that the librettist of *La Falena*, 21 years old Silvio Benco, was a great admirer of D’Annunzio), aspired to literary richness, and evoked atemporality or temporal remoteness (notably the ancient or medieval world).

With Ildebrando Pizzetti’s *Fedra* in particular, we are in front of a composer who, while embracing the refinement of decadent aesthetic and its dramatic *topoi* – here the reference is to Greek tragedy – did not indulge in extreme aestheticism. His writing, in contrast with the poetic text, was severe and controlled: the musical restraint in *Fedra* was inversely proportional to the quality of the libretto, and was necessary to avoid verbosity. Already with his first opera Pizzetti demonstrated a special affinity with tragedy; this genre became for him the most powerful way to express his theatrical ideas, which echo Busoni’s but are also strikingly similar to some of Nielsen’s thoughts about the relationship between words and music. According to Pizzetti’s point of view, opera is first of all a musical drama, that is to say the representation of activity and not contemplation: therefore it has to avoid unnecessary lyrical pauses. It is therefore necessary for composers to create a dramatic musical language, in which words don’t obey to any musical necessity, but only to the requirements of the drama they create.41 Regarding the relationship between poetry and music, Pizzetti believed that the former provided ideological characterization, while the latter was able to enhance this characterization from a spiritual point of view, since music is able to reach the audience in a way that goes beyond the merely linguistic level. Poetry, however, has to be granted major prominence, otherwise dramatic music would risk to appear as a body without a skeleton.42

The following commentary by Nielsen can also be related to this aesthetic belief, which is once again perfectly in line with Pizzetti’s ideas about musical theatre:

> What is the relation of music to words? We have to admit that it is a purely decorative relation; not, it is true, in the generally accepted sense of the word decorative, but in the sense of the sun’s relation to things, illumining and colouring them,
radiating and imparting lustre to them, besides warming and vitalizing them, so every potentiality can develop … Hence it is nothing degrading for music to regard itself as decorative and to serve humbly.43

Besides being inspired by the spirit of Greek tragedy, Pizzetti tried to capture it musically by studying the Greek modal scales. But his success in this field was doubtful: Greek scales and modes still remain unclear, and were even more so at the beginning of the twentieth century, when they nevertheless constituted an object of great interest among musicians. Nielsen himself gave a public lecture on Greek music44 and was a member of the ‘Græsk Selskab’ (founded in 1905 by himself, J.L. Heiberg, A.B. Drachmann, Harald Høffding and Georg Brandes). But Nielsen and many other composers resorted to the better known modal language of the Latin church, with the aim of achieving ‘an integration between the liturgical gravity in the melodic design, the archaic harmonic colour and the personal means proper of the artist, filtered through a balanced modernity’.45

Saul and David versus Débora e Jaële

By viewing Saul and David as a tragedy, as Anne Marie Reynolds has suggested,46 it is hence possible to compare it both with opera seria, with its elevated tone, and with Pizzetti’s music dramas. It is clear that the choice of an elevated style and subject, and the absence of any light-hearted or comic element (which in Pizzetti’s case was consistent with his choice of Gabriele D’Annunzio as a librettist) was an anti-verista move, which suited the aesthetic beliefs of the 1880s generation, who favoured a return to the schemes of early opera.

In this sense Nielsen’s choice of subject, besides being in line with Busoni’s thought,47 is therefore more closely aligned with the future of Italian opera than with its present. The same is true of his biblical setting, something highly unusual in fin-de-siècle opera. Verdi’s two ‘biblical’ operas, Nabucco and Aida, for example, owe little to the Scriptures other than Old Testament atmosphere. It is therefore worth noting that the only early twentieth-century biblical opera by an Italian composer was written by Pizzetti. Débora e Jaële, his second major opera (premiered in 1922), is usually recognised as his best.

44 The lecture was held on 22 October 1907, Carl Nielsen, ‘Græsk Musik’, in Fellow (ed.), Carl Nielsen til sin samtid, 99–110.
45 The comment is expressed by musicologist Cesari and reported in Abbiati, Storia della Musica, 125.
46 Reynolds, ‘Nielsen’s Saul and David as Tragedy’.
While maintaining the dramatic principles and musical qualities that had characterized *Fedra*, the new work reveals a renewed freedom in the relationship between text and music, caused by the fact that Pizzetti himself wrote the libretto, loosely based on Chapters 4 and 5 of the *Book of Judges*.

It is of course tempting to compare the narrative and musical strategies the two composers used in the construction of an opera based on a biblical subject, especially given their aesthetic similarities. But the operas are relatively far apart chronologically, since *Saul and David* predates *Débora e Jaële* (composed 1917–21) by 20 years. For this reason, Pizzetti’s modally coloured diatonicism is more far-reaching than Nielsen’s. In the choice of topic and in the shape of the drama, however, the two works display striking similarities. In this respect it should be noted that Christiansen’s plot was closer to the Scriptures than Pizzetti’s. Even though he altered some characters, displaced some episodes, and cut other passages, the core of Christiansen’s story in *Saul and David* is faithful to the biblical narrative: the contrast between an old and a new order, represented by Saul and David respectively, and the tension between human and divine law, represented by Saul and Samuel. Pizzetti had to work on much slenderer material both in terms of plot and characters: in the Bible, Déborah and Jaële are both depicted as strong women, with little difference between them in terms of personality. To create a suitably dramatic work, Pizzetti therefore had to intervene more drastically, and reinterpreted Jaële’s character from scratch. He also made Sisera, that in the Bible had a minor weight, the third main character of the drama, and invented a love story between him and Jaële. Like her counterpart in the Bible, she eventually kills him, but does so out of mercy, in order to save him from the Israelites, and only after she realized that her previous attempts, discovered by Débora, had been in vain.

With these changes Pizzetti created a story which, like *Saul and David*, was centred on the contrast between divine and human law, with Samuel and Débora (as prophets of God) as representative for the former, and Saul and Jaële for the latter. The contrast is between an infallible order and one that contemplates the possibility of change, mistake, freedom, forgiveness, elements that stand in conflict with the necessity, impassiveness and immutability represented by the Prophets and divine rule. The sense of Jaële’s rebellion, prompted by love, can thus be compared to that of Saul, prompted by his freedom of will, which simply doesn’t fit within the system. And even though Nielsen’s opera is titled *Saul and David* and not ‘Saul and Samuel’, as McCreless notes, its real tension is between Saul and God (with Samuel as his messenger). Both dramas are hence based on the interplay between three main characters: a divine representative (Samuel / Débora) and two human beings, whose relationship is doomed to failure, even in an antithetical way: David, called to be Saul’s servant but who ultimately becomes his enemy, and Sisera, supposedly Jaële’s enemy, with whom she falls in love and eventually kills.

If *Saul and David* is the tragedy of a single man, however, *Débora e Jaèle* is the tragedy of a man and a woman, victims of a rigid and severe order that does not contemplate forgiveness. Both Jaèle and Sisera express their humanity in contrast to the indifference of God: when the heroin is asked by Débora in the final moments of the opera, after she has reluctantly killed her lover: ‘Have you heard the Lord’s voice?’, she answers: ‘Not of your God, of another one you don’t know’,49 and Sisera, finding himself lost before he can enter Jaèle’s tent, cries out: ‘Invisible inimical God, I call on you, I call on you and defy you!’50 Nielsen’s character expresses similar defiance from which he retreats both in his Act 1 monologue ‘Kunde jeg rejse mig mod dig’ and especially in his final words:

My Lord and my tempter, forever thou mockest in heaven! Thou hast racked me with endless disasters that thou hast prepared for my soul! Thou grim old mocker, that taunteth my afflictions! Lo, I spatter my blood on Thy heaven! Wash Thy self clean of my sin, if Thou canst!51

The opening pages of the two operas are also similar: in Nielsen’s work, Saul and the people await the arrival of Samuel and the King’s question ‘Kommer han?’ (‘Is he coming?’) is immediately repeated by the people (ex. 4). Pizzetti generates a similar feeling of anxious agitation: the Israelites await the arrival of their prophetess Débora. At first her arrival is questioned by two of the characters (the Blindman and Scillem, ex. 5a), and then is invoked by the people, who have in the meantime entered the scene (ex. 5b). This emphasis on the people, whose destiny is at stake because of the war, is given appropriate musical support by the choir, who gain prominent roles in both operas.


49 Ildebrando Pizzetti, *Débora e Jaèle*, rehearsal score (Milano: Ricordi, 1922), 463.
50 Ibid. 386–87.
(Ex. 4 continued)

Example 5a, Pizzetti, *Débora e Jaèlé*, Waiting for Débora, the Blindman and Scillem (rehearsal score, Ricordi, pp. 5-6). © Casa Ricordi, Milano, 1922. Reproduced with kind permission from Casa Ricordi.
(Ex. 5a continued)

Il Cieco

Scillèm

Laggiù, sopra lo stagnodi Me. ròm, il cir.co. lo dèlcie.lo si ri.
dolcemente

m. s.

ppp

Il Cieco

Schiara. Pazienta unaltro poco!

Credi tu che

Scillèm

E come no?

Dé. bo.ra vor. rà mostrarsi al po. po. lo, sta. ma. ni?
Example 5b, Pizzetti, Débora e Jaële, Waiting for Débora, the People’s invocation (rehearsal score, Ricordi, p. 15). © Casa Ricordi, Milano, 1922. Reproduced with kind permission from Casa Ricordi.
Similarities between the two works can also be identified in their final acts: both start with an orchestral prelude (very short in Pizzetti’s opera) recalling a storm; and both close with a celebratory chorus, alternating homophonic and polyphonic textures, a characteristic that received considerable attention from their reviewers.\(^{52}\)

According to the available source material, Nielsen and Pizzetti never met. Their personalities were very different: Pizzetti, like his dramas, was thoroughly serious, while Nielsen had a flair for humour, evident both in his letters and his music. But at least in *Saul and David*, this lightness is totally absent, so that Nielsen here, like Smareglia in *La Falena*, anticipated what Salvetti called ‘the tragic hieraticness of Ildebrando da Parma’.\(^{53}\) Nielsen’s initial intentions to ‘learn from Italians’ did not prevent him from thinking outside the box and creating a work that, without being directly influenced by local composers, parallels the line that runs from the noir dramas of the 1880s and 1890s through *La Falena*, the tragic and larger-than-life story portrayed in *Débora e Jaële*. And while in other respects the similarities exist only in the conception of a ‘tragic drama’ and the occasional use of modal colour, we can reasonably maintain that Nielsen anticipated some of the aesthetic tendencies and musical characteristics that would later be fully expressed in Pizzetti’s work.

It is tempting to imagine Nielsen working on a similar opera in the 1920s, the period of his stylistic maturity. But it is difficult to believe he would have chosen another tragic subject, given the success of his comic opera, *Maskarade*, and the direction the rest of his music took from the *Wind Quintet* onwards. Most of his works from the 1920’s are notable for expressing a special kind of musical humour, alternating with more ‘serious episodes’. That is particularly the case in the Sixth Symphony, where the title of the third movement, ‘Proposta seria’ might equally well apply to the first, whereas that of the second, ‘Humoreske’, could also refer to the fourth movement. It is true that after the drama and gravitas of the Nielsen’s Fifth Symphony, the irony expressed by the Sixth, sometimes caustic and sometimes more cheerful, led to a new type of composition in which the tragic (or better, the serious) and the comic exist side by side. The duality expressed by the Fifth–Sixth symphony pairing is in this sense the same as that between *Saul and David* and *Maskarade*, whose comedy offers food for thought on more than one occasion.\(^{54}\) It is easier to imagine another opera of this kind than a larger-than-life drama such as *Saul and David*.

\(^{52}\) The high level of Pizzetti’s choirs is also documented by Waterhouse and Gatti: ‘An outstanding feature of most Pizzetti operas (and the main saving grace of some of the weaker ones) is his richly imaginative, often highly dramatic choral writing’, John C. G. Waterhouse and G. M. Gatti, ‘Pizzetti, Ildebrando’, in Sadie (ed.), *The New Grove*, vol. 19, 819.

\(^{53}\) Salvetti, ‘Dal Verdi della maturità a Giacomo Puccini’, 463.

Looking at Nielsen's opera production, we confront two totally different works, which offer the image of a composer who remained extremely receptive to the stylistic and aesthetic environment in spite of his musical independence. For this reason, different as they may be, the two works are both expressions of that eclecticism which was a substantial part of Nielsen’s poetic thought, and which aligned him with his contemporary European experiences in a way that goes beyond local or national traditions, and which demonstrates that even in an era of ideological nationalism, European musical language was assuming an increasingly global character. Nielsen’s Saul and David can be seen as the first, monumental example of this utterly personal and individual musical syncretism.
Abstract

In this essay, I will focus on the music cultural context in which Carl Nielsen’s Saul and David (1899–1901) was composed, as Nielsen approached opera for the first time. This will cast new light on his independence and originality, but also offer the possibility for some seemingly unlikely comparisons, revealing that the work is more tightly integrated with Nielsen’s broader European musical experience than has previously seemed – especially as an alternative to naturalism. I will therefore consider the Italian context before, during and after the rise of verismo, focusing particularly on the anti-naturalism debate, to which Saul and David also belongs. Nielsen’s work follows a path that parallels the shift from the so-called noir dramas of the 1880s to the work of Ildebrando Pizzetti, via the almost completely unknown operas of Antonio Smareglia. Unusual as it may be, I believe that this comparison will support the idea of a composer who, while working in the genre of musical drama, was in constant dialogue with his European contemporaries.
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