THE FIRST SYMPHONY OF CHARLES IVES:
A HISTORICAL AND ANALYTICAL SURVEY

A Thesis

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Master of Arts in the
Graduate School of The Ohio State University

by

Timothy Wellington Muffitt, B.M.E.

***

The Ohio State University
1986

Master's Examination Committee:
Dr. Marshall Barnes
Dr. Peter Gano
Dr. Keith Mixter

Approved by

Adviser
School of Music
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Peter Gano, my adviser, for his guidance during the writing of this thesis. Also I wish to thank Dr. Marshall Barnes and Dr. Keith Mixter who served as members of my reading committee and provided many useful comments and suggestions concerning this document. Many thanks also to Mr. Brian Gaber for his work in preparing the musical examples. Finally, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my parents for their generous support and encouragement.
VITA

June 26, 1961 .................. Born - Bridgeport, Connecticut

1983 .......................... B.M.E., Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1983 - present ................ Conductor:
   - Metropolitan Chamber Orchestra, Columbus, Ohio
   - Upper Arlington High School Orchestra, Columbus, Ohio
   - Mansfield Symphony Youth Orchestra, Mansfield, Ohio
   - Columbus Symphony Cadet Orchestra, Columbus, Ohio

FIELD OF STUDY

Major Field: Music History
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................ ii
VITA .................................................. iii
LIST OF FIGURES ....................................... v

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ....................................... 1
II. IVES' MUSICAL TRAINING .......................... 20
III. ANALYSIS OF MOVEMENTS I-III ................. 32
IV. FOURTH MOVEMENT ANALYSIS ..................... 47
   Form .................................................. 47
   Structural Materials: Melody and Rhythm .. 52
   Harmony ............................................. 61
   Texture and Orchestration ...................... 67

V. CONCLUSION ......................................... 71

APPENDICES

A. DISCOGRAPHY OF SYMPHONY NO. 1 .............. 73
B. FORMAL DIAGRAM OF FOURTH MOVEMENT .......... 75

BIBLIOGRAPHY ........................................... 77
LIST OF FIGURES

Figures Page

1. Formal outline of fourth movement ............... 48

2. Diagram of first theme extension in the fourth movement ......................... 49
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Although Charles Edward Ives' (1874-1954) compositional career spanned only slightly more than half of his lifetime, (ca. 1887-1926) he was a very prolific composer. The body of works which he produced includes over 200 songs, several choral works, solo works for both piano and organ, chamber music, many works for small orchestra and varied instrumental ensembles, and numerous works for large orchestra including four numbered symphonies. These symphonies span a large portion of Ives' creative career and provide an informative means by which one can observe his development as a composer as they vary a great deal in many respects. At the same time, however, each symphony demonstrates many of the style traits inherent in most of Ives' output. The discussion that follows will examine the events and influences that led to the First Symphony (1898), and will, by using the First Symphony as an example, point out Ives' abilities as a composer.

While much attention has been given to the later symphonies of Ives, to some they fail to provide an accurate measure of Ives' abilities as a composer. This is
largely due to the style in which they were written which, because of its uniqueness, does not allow comparison to works of other established composers. The First Symphony, however, shows Ives' compositional style within traditional boundaries, and therefore makes possible a comparison of Ives' style and techniques with those of other composers—composers who established what is today considered to be the traditional Romantic style. As will be shown, this comparison reveals in Ives, a composer of great skill, inventiveness, knowledge, and originality.

The musical public's image of Ives as a composer is widely varied, generally ranging from strong disfavor to polite respect and ultimately to total support. The development of support has been a long process which began from a point where the composer was completely obscure in musical circles, because his vocation was not music but insurance, and because he at first felt it was not the composer's place to promote his own music. The situation was further complicated by the fact that in those rare instances where Ives did take the opportunity to share some of his music with other musicians, they did not understand it, and therefore they would generally regard it as worthless. Further, they felt that since Ives was not a professional musician he could not possibly be a composer worth serious consideration. However, as his business activities decreased due to poor health, Ives was able to
devote more time to preparing his music for the public, and with the help of such colleagues as Henry Cowell, John Kirkpatrick, and Aaron Copland, among others who were responsible for securing important performances of Ives' music, interest in the composer's works slowly began to increase.

However, as the level of exposure Ives received grew, it did not follow that his music received acceptance at the same rate. It was only through the diligent work of a small group of his champions, that Ives acquired the status presently afforded him. Fortunately, that position continues to rise.

One writer who supports Ives is H. Wiley Hitchcock. In his book *Music in the United States* Hitchcock considers Ives to be of such importance and uniqueness that he devotes an entire chapter to the composer, while in all other instances in the book, several composers are grouped together to form a chapter, based on the specific movement or style period with which they are associated. Hitchcock further emphasizes his stand on Ives by calling him "the most extraordinary and significant American composer of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries."¹

Henry Cowell, along with his wife Sidney were two of Ives' most energetic and faithful supporters. They

authored *Charles Ives and His Music*, one of the most authoritative of Ives' biographies. Cowell notes that Ives' style is completely unique because no other composer shared his musical and philosophical background before or since in America. He also points out that, at least up to 1955 (the date of the book) it was not possible to identify any type of musical behavior that could not be found, "sometimes in embryo, sometimes fully worked out, in the music of Ives." Cowell continues by noting that "His (Ives') manuscripts contain a whole new world of music, prophetically suggesting or developing aspects of music whose 'discovery' was to make other men famous for years to come."

Cowell also calls Ives one of the four great composers of the twentieth century, grouping him with Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and Bartok. It is to Bartok that Cowell sees Ives as being the most similar in that both men explored music of their national heritage and brought it to the attention of the modern world by incorporating it into their art. He further points out that, although Ives is often called "the father of American music," one cannot expect that his music had much influence on the developing

---


3Ibid.

4Ibid., 4.
styles of American composers in the first half of the century since his music went unnoticed for so long a time. However, Cowell observes that around 1950, Ives' influence could be heard in some scores for film and stage such as Alex North's music for Death of a Salesman, Bernard Herman's score for the film Anna and the King, and Jerome Moross' ballet The Last Judgment. Cowell finds the music of Otto Luening and Vladimir Ussachevsky as being influenced by some ideas of Charles Ives. Even the multi-directional music of Henry Bram, and others which involved groups under several conductors, shows the influence of Ives.5

While these instances noted by Cowell point out that the public awareness of Ives is on the upswing, Ives' importance lies not in his influence on modern composers as much as in the purely American nature of his music. Charles Hamm attributes Ives' ability to write such truly American music when so many of his peers failed to the following three reasons:

- The indigenous musical material on which he drew—hymns, patriotic songs, band music, popular tunes, ragtime—was at the core of his own musical vocabulary. Using it was not a deliberate or patronizing act, it came naturally and often unconsciously to him.
- His attitudes towards aesthetic and cultural issues were based on American traditions and literature.

---

5Ibid., 5.
-He was the most talented composer of his generation.6

The writings cited above demonstrate that there is a contingent of musical scholars who strongly support Ives and who recognize a great deal of significance in his output.

However, as was previously mentioned, there are also those who fail to see the merit of Ives' music. This is somewhat understandable, especially when considering that those who developed their negative opinions earlier in the century had no previous exposure to music which even remotely resembled Ives' style. Therefore, they had nothing against which they could make a value judgment. It is unfortunate that this problem is even further magnified when the person making this judgment is in a position of public influence, such as a critic. The root of the problem is that when a composer's best-known works are non-traditional, the chances are even greater that he will be misunderstood and inaccurately categorized.

Such has been the case with Ives. As Rosalie Perry points out, Ives has been called by many, a "primitive."7 She continues by stating that in no way was he primitive, naive, or untrained, but rather, "his education and


7Rosalie Sandra Perry, Charles Ives and the American Mind (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1974), 1.
background were the best heritage of German-American education available in North America." Thus the First Symphony of Ives is tangible musical evidence of the education and background of which Perry speaks as it was written as a thesis for graduation from Yale under his advisor and composition teacher, Horatio Parker.

This symphony has received relatively little attention in both performance and discussion compared with his more established works such as the Piano Sonata No. 2 ("The Concord Sonata") the Orchestral Sets, and the later symphonies. Illustrative of this neglect is Gilbert Chase's section on Ives' symphonies in his book America's Music. While Chase clearly recognizes Ives' importance, (devoting like Hitchcock an entire chapter to Ives) he literally does not even acknowledge that the First Symphony exists. His section on the symphonies of Ives begins: "The Second Symphony..."8

It is probable that this neglect of the First Symphony is due to its apparently conservative style, along with the fact that it is a "student work." However, its status as a student work is certainly no reason for dismissing it as having no merit. One should consider the fact that Ives was twenty-four when the work was completed and that his formal education was nearly finished. While one does not

---

necessarily expect the work of a twenty-four-year-old to have the depth and maturity of an older, more experienced composer, his age is certainly no reason for ignoring the work. For example, Verklärte Nacht by Arnold Schoenberg (1874-1951), written only one year later than the Ives First Symphony, has received a great deal of attention and is considered a representative work from Schoenberg's first period, all of which sounds much more appealing than the term "student work," yet both are close in meaning. This is in no way an attempt to compare the artistic merit of the two works in question, but is simply an example to point out the potential importance of the early works of a composer.

Typical of the majority of the accounts of the Ives First Symphony is Hitchcock's discussion in his book Ives. He notes, "The First (composed 1898) is a remarkably competent graduation exercise; written at Yale in a traditional but not old-fashioned manner under Horatio Parker's guidance (and strictures); it shows both an influence and mastery of Brahms' and Dvořák's symphonic styles."\(^9\)

Hitchcock's essentially positive remarks regarding this work point to one of the most important aspects of this symphony. As an aside, Hitchcock mentions the "strictures"

---

which were imposed by Parker upon Ives in this work, and essentially amount to the "rules" of late-nineteenth century composition. Ives' adherence to these stricures call to mind Stravinsky, who, when referring to his self-imposed stricures of neoclassicism in composing his opera The Rake's Progress said: "Art is freer when it is more limited, more finished, canonical, dogmatic."10 It is certainly conceivable that this principle could also apply to Ives with his First Symphony, even though the situation is different. It is very likely that the framework imposed upon him in this work enabled him to express his musical ideas in an efficient and coherent manner.

In his Memoirs, Ives shares some of his thoughts on the First Symphony, not all of which are entirely positive. It should be remembered, however, when reading them that Ives was a rebellious thinker in many ways and would possibly react more strongly than he really felt; thus, he sometimes appears to overstate his case. An example of this is seen in the following quote in which he describes his feelings for the First Symphony and describes the circumstances of composition of the work. This quote, so it seems, represents Ives' rebellion against Parker's overly conservative views, rather than—as it might at first seem—the condemnation of his own work:

This music, at least the last three movements, is, if not the worst (No), one of the worst (No), poorest, weakest things (No), I've ever written. (The last time I played it over, a year or so ago, I felt more like it, I liked it well, and didn't feel the way I did once.) It was written ('written' is the right word) for a degree—that is, to complete my four years academic course at Yale. This was as a kind of an examination, as in the other courses, all of which had to be passed before the B.A. appeared. In other words, the better and more exactly you imitate the Joneses, the surer you are to get a degree. I know, because I got one—Yale '98 B.A.—titulo: Artium Liberatium Bacca-laurei."11

As there was obviously a time when Ives was not especially proud of this piece (although he seems to have changed his mind upon reflection), it is reasonable to assume that his dislike was not so much due to discontent with the craftsmanship of the work, but rather with the style of music which it represented. At this point in his life, his dislike for music which did not challenge the listener, but which instead appealed to "nice ladies,"12 was especially strong. Therefore, one can assume that, because the work was relatively conservative, Ives felt that he must denounce it to be consistent with his beliefs. In other words, it is not so much that he felt the First Symphony was a bad piece, he just felt it was an archaic one.


12Ives frequently used terms such as this to denote anyone, male or female, with what he considered to be, overly conservative musical tastes.
Ives' notion of "imitating the Joneses" brings up another important point regarding his First Symphony. By his remark, it should be understood that the work is partially or entirely a conscious effort at imitating the late nineteenth-century masters, rather than simply a work with some very obvious influences. Through this idea then can be seen Ives' remarkable skill in the craft of composition along with a thorough understanding of the late nineteenth-century style traits which is not always easily recognizable in his later orchestral works because of their non-traditional style.

It should be noted, however, that while imitation of other composers is involved in portions of this work, the symphony always maintains Ives' own style. As will be shown in the subsequent analysis, when Ives interjects sections imitating other composers, the passage is usually insignificant in relation to the entire movement, and never subordinates the strong Ivesian character.

Finally, as David Wooldrige points out, the importance of the First Symphony extends beyond the piece itself and into the large body of songs Ives has written, particularly "Rough Wind," with text by Percy Bysshe Shelley. This song, based on the first movement of the Symphony No. 1 was a part of the original collection of 114 Songs. It seems, however, that Ives was not entirely pleased with "Rough Wind" since, in 1923, while he was preparing a carefully
selected anthology of 50 of the *114 Songs*, "Rough Wind," along with such other orchestrally-based works such as "The Housatonic at Stockbridge," "The Camp Meeting," "The Cage," and "Tolerance," was not included. Wooldrige continues by pointing out that this omission was because Shelley's text was merely superimposed on the music, and since the First Symphony was not written with Shelley's text in mind, it lacked the necessary integrity and therefore became unacceptable.13

It was quite some time before Ives ever actually heard any of the Symphony No. 1. In 1910, one of Ives' business acquaintances convinced Walter Damrosch, then conductor of the New York Symphony, to try some of Ives' music. By this time, of course, Ives had written many of his more radical works, yet he chose the First Symphony to give to Damrosch, assuming it would be appropriately conservative. According to Cowell, Ives took further precautions against "too violent protest" by offering only the last three movements of the work, omitting the first because its combination of keys kept it from ever winning Parker's approval.14

The reading took place on Saturday morning, March 19th, the events of which Ives reports as follows:


14Cowell, *op. cit.*, 68.
...he [Damrosch] tried them over at a rehearsal. 'Tried' is a good word. He started with the second movement (Adagio), an English horn tune over chords in the strings. (When he heard the pretty little theme and the nice chords) he called out 'Charming!' When the second themes got going together, and the music got a little more involved (but not very involved), he acted somewhat put out, got mad, and said it couldn't be played without a great deal of rehearsing. When I showed this score to a modern orchestral conductor a few years ago and told him this story, he fell into a swoon.15

Considering Damrosch's ultimate reaction, this was undoubtedly an unpleasant experience for Ives, but it did, however, serve a very important function. As Cowell points out, what Ives needed was to hear some of the music he had written "come to life" so that he could find out if it really sounded the way he thought it did, and if he himself liked it.16

As public performances of the First Symphony have been quite infrequent, the body of discussion of this work from a critical or even descriptive standpoint is limited primarily to reviews of the three commercial recordings (see Appendix A), plus discussions found in writings in which the First Symphony is simply a part of a broader topic. In Lawrence Starr's article on the early style of Ives, for example, there is a brief discussion of the First Symphony, but it is dismissed rather quickly to facilitate

15Ives, op. cit., 87.
16Cowell, loc. cit.
his discussion on other works. His remarks, however, are positive and accurate. He notes:

The First Symphony in its final version, is a highly competent and (for Ives) cautious attempt to emulate the European masters of symphonic composition by writing a big, self-consciously 'serious work' along traditional lines; the symphony clearly reflects its genesis as a project for Horatio Parker's course at Yale.17

Unfortunately, since Starr doesn't elaborate on how the work "reflects its genesis," it is not possible to determine exactly what he means. If what he is calling traditional lines refers to the broader characteristics of the work such as movement structure, large scale tonal relationships, orchestration, and general spirit of the work, then yes, he has arrived at an accurate assessment of the First Symphony. If, however, Starr is referring to all facets of the work as traditional, including such details as short-term harmonic relationships, melodic design, motivic elaboration, and textural relationships, then he has missed a great deal since, as will be shown in the analysis, the work strays considerably from traditional lines in these areas.

A discussion of the First Symphony is found in Badolato's dissertation on the four symphonies of Ives, where he attempts to prove Ives' ability as a composer (he notes in his introduction that there are many skeptics on

the issue of Ives' competency). He achieves this through a discussion of many important facets of Ives' composition- al techniques that are found in these four works. The discussion of the First Symphony is accurate and, with the exception of a few oversights, it is generally reliable.

Critical reviews of commercial recordings of the First Symphony vary in the degree of insight they offer as to the public reaction to the work. Wayne Shirley's review of all three of the recordings, plus other works included in each record set, begins by discussing the problematic term "symphony" as applied to Ives' output, contending that there are other works aside from the four numbered symphonies which might also fall into the "symphony" category. His musical references to the First Symphony are few, since instead he prefers to discuss the individual attributes of each of the different recorded performances. When they do occur, such musical references are usually indirect, and only serve to clarify or reinforce another

18 James Vincent Badolato, The Four Symphonies of Charles Ives (Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1978, Washington, D.C.), 10-62. Mr. Badolato's dissertation approaches the First Symphony from a purely theoretical standpoint, focusing only on the general style traits. The present thesis differs from Badolato's in that it considers the significance of the four symphonies as a unit, rather than focusing on the First Symphony as an individual work.

19 Wayne Shirley, "The Challenge of Ives Brings a New Round of Challengers," High Fidelity/Musical America XVIII/6 (June 1968), 80.
point. For example, within the context of his discussion of the advantages of owning a complete set of all the symphonies, Mr. Shirley points out that this allows the record owner to hear the similarities and differences between these works. He then provides his example of the similarities between the First and Fourth Symphonies, this being that they both end with march sections which he describes as "one Tchaikovskian, one cosmic."\textsuperscript{20} Within its obvious aim of pointing the potential buyer towards the performance with which he will be the most satisfied, Shirley’s article is well-written and helpful. However, it falls short as a historical resource in that it doesn’t provide a barometer of public response to the First Symphony.

Arthur Cohn’s review of the premiere recording of the First Symphony (produced 68 years after the piece was finished) contrasts with Shirley’s in that it focuses primarily on the attributes of the piece itself. In general, Cohn greatly admires the work (and the performance, conducted by Morton Gould), likening parts of it to Schubert, Dvorak, and Mahler. Of the first movement, Cohn says: "(It is) neatly contained, this music achieves its objective without dynamic violence. There are no

\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Ibid.}, 81.
rhetorical gestures (a few will be found in the finale) and style maintenance is expressively significant. "21

The only weak point which Cohn finds is in the last movement. Of this he says: "Only the finale is out of proportion though it is the most dramatic section. It is weakened by a wider range of ideas than is required for a symphony movement, and also it limps because it is muci-
laged by sequence."22

Earlier in the article, Cohn noted that usually a composer's early works show some "kinship" with the more mature pieces, and that this symphony was an exception saying it is "of separate creative maintenance." This remark indirectly provides a possible solution to the question Mr. Cohn presented in his observation of a "wider range of ideas than is required for a symphony movement." Perhaps Mr. Cohn has mistaken what is in fact an embryo of a mature Ivesian trait, namely, diversity of musical materials within a given work, for a lack of proportional sense on Ives' part.

Bernard Herman's article on the four symphonies was written while public awareness of Ives was beginning to increase, but his music was still seldom performed, and the


22Ibid., 1032-33.
First Symphony had not yet received its first performance. These circumstances prompted Herman to attempt to dispel such contemporary misconceptions as the notion that all of the orchestral music is beyond the technical abilities of the orchestras of that time, and that all of the symphonies except the Fourth are uninteresting.

Herman's article then, contains a description of each of the four symphonies with musical examples in an effort to further acquaint his readers with the true nature of these works. In discussing the First Symphony, Herman suggests that Ives modeled much of it after such composers as Mendelssohn, Tchaikovsky, and the German composer, Joseph Raff (1822-82). Herman is highly positive in his remarks on the First Symphony, citing orchestration, "architecture" and melodic design as being especially fine. The discussion is brief yet detailed in the points being presented, which very accurately exemplify some of the more characteristic features of this work.

Unfortunately, James Deane's review of the premiere performance lacks any detail whatsoever, presenting only the historical essentials and briefly revealing Deane's favorable impression of the work. It appears as though this is because Deane had to be economical with his remarks since this one article reviewed the entire 1953 American

---

Music Festival, and several other works needed to be mentioned. Deane's discussion of the Ives work is given below in its entirety:

This year's American Music Festival at the National Gallery of Art numbered seven concerts and no less than 15 world premieres, including--oddly enough--that of Charles Ives' First Symphony. The Ives work, in D minor, was completed in 1898, the year he was graduated from Yale. It is striking, even if a bit long-winded, and its neglect seems unaccountable.24

CHAPTER II
IVES' MUSICAL TRAINING

The germ of every new type of musical behavior that Charles Ives developed or organized can be found in the suggestions and experiments of his father ... At the same time, it was due to his father's insistence that Charles Ives as a boy was trained in all the conventional ways of treating music too.25

This view, from Henry Cowell, reflects the strong influence of Charles' father, George Ives (1845-94), on his musical development.

One of the reasons that George's influence was so strong was because he himself was a very accomplished musician. He had a solid background of musical study as a child and by age 17 was directing the union band for the First Connecticut Heavy Artillery. This appointment from Colonel Nelson White (leader of the regiment and George's father's first cousin), made him the youngest bandmaster in the Union Troops and, as the familiar story goes, in describing the band to Lincoln, Grant called it the best in the army.

Following the war, George Ives returned to Danbury, where he earned a somewhat unstable living as a professional musician. In this capacity, he taught violin, piano, brass, woodwinds, harmony, sight reading, and ear-training. He was also involved in directing the local band and orchestra, leading church choirs, and directing the music at camp meetings. Frank Rossiter points out that George Ives' musical preferences were different than those of other professionals in the area. Along with playing the standard classical and popular music of the time, he was also a "restless musical experimenter," interested in all different kinds of sound. Rossiter continues:

His interest was not that of a composer who employed these sounds in written music, or of a theorist who studied sound in a scholarly fashion, but simply that of an enthusiast who was fascinated by new and unusual aural experiences, both those produced by nature and those artificially created, both the accidental and the planned.26

The stories of George Ives' experimentation in creating new sounds abound in the literature, and they are most fascinating. Charles, being enormously proud of his father, promulgated this information whenever possible. Examples of George's somewhat unorthodox behavior include the story of him standing in a pouring thunderstorm while the church bell next door was ringing, and then rushing into the house to the piano and then back outdoors again.

trying to figure out the "new chord" he kept hearing.
Charles discussed another of his father's even more
unusual, and surprisingly forward-looking, experiments in
his article, "Some Quarter-Tone Impressions:"

My father had a weakness for quarter-tones
(roughly, the tones between adjacent keys on a
piano, not reproducible on the piano)--in fact he
didn't stop even with them. He rigged up a
contrivance to stretch 24 or more violin strings
and tuned them up to suit the dictates of his own
curiosity. He would pick out quarter-tone tunes
and try to get the family to sing them--but I
remember he gave that up, except as a means of
punishment--though we got to like some of the tunes
which kept to the usual scale and had quarter-tone
notes thrown in. But after working for some time
he became sure that some quarter-tone chords must
be learned before quarter-tone melodies would make
much sense and become natural to the ear and so for
the voice.27

The connection between the nature of Ives' musical
output and his father's influence is very clear. George
Ives' experimenting and remarkable open-mindedness towards
new ideas form a substantial part of his son's musical
style. Charles' musical training began when he was around
eight years old when his father found him banging on the
piano, imitating rhythms he had heard being played by the
Danbury Band. His father's reaction to this type of
behavior was that it was acceptable as long as young
Charles knew what he was doing. To ensure this, George
took Charles to receive instruction on the drum, and he

27Charles E. Ives, "Some Quarter-Tone Impressions,"
Franco-American Musical Society Quarterly Bulletin
(March 1925), 27.
soon reached a level of proficiency that enabled him to play in his father's band. In addition to these drum lessons, his father also started him on piano, violin, cornet, sight-reading, harmony, and counterpoint.

This solid education in the fundamentals of music, plus exposure to several families of instruments, played a large part in the command of the orchestra which Ives was to develop. Combined with this, as is seen in the Memos, was a certain amount of supervised "boy's fooling", as Ives calls it, where his own experimental tendencies begin to take shape. Ives gives his description of this early musical exploration:

Father used to say, 'If you know how to write a fugue the right way well, then I'm willing to have you try the wrong way--well. But you've got to know what you're doing and why you're doing it.' It was his willingness to have the boys think for themselves--within reason--that I look back on later as quite remarkable, but it didn't seem so to me then as a boy. I had to practice right and know my lesson first, then he was willing to let us roam a little for fun. He somehow kept us in a good balance. It was good for our minds and our ears. As for example (as in making chords a boy's way), if two major or minor thirds can make up a chord, why not more? And also, if you can play a tune in one key, why can't a feller, if he feels like it, play one in two keys? 28

There was another force which entered into his development during the Danbury years, a force which many writers see as being very significant. This force comes from society in Danbury in the late nineteenth century and

28Ives, Memos, op. cit., 47.
concerns their attitude towards music and, even more specifically, Ives' interpretation of this force as it applied to both him and his father. Rossiter notes that the people of Danbury seriously questioned the worth both of music and especially of those who made it their profession. Naturally, it played an important part of everyday life through church, camp meetings, and public concerts, however, these were activities for the off-hours, not something to which one would devote his life.29

There was also, in Danbury during this time, a certain degree of effeminacy which society associated with musical activities. Music was generally an activity (more so than an art) which occupied the leisure time of women who were then its principal proponents. The man’s position with music usually involved enduring an evening’s concert to keep his wife happy. As Perry points out, "Good music was precisely the product of the sentimentalizing taste of the nineteenth century, a taste fostered by the stereotyped woman-as-weakness-and-harbinger-of-gentility."30

As Rossiter concludes, both the questionable worth and effeminate associations which Danbury placed on music put George Ives in a very awkward position. When he committed himself to music as a profession, he naturally faced a great deal of social disfavor. In doing so, he had

29Rossiter, op. cit., 12.

30Perry, op. cit., 2.
breached the traditions of his family and society and had violated what was expected of "an American, a man, and an Ives." 31

That Charles Ives felt these social pressures along with a great deal of resentment for the community's view of his father is unquestionable. His own personal writings abound with remarks which have grown from these feelings he developed. He incessantly defends his father's musical pursuits, often indirectly, by sharp criticism of the music of others which he felt was responsible for emasculating music as an art form, namely, those composers who were afraid to write dissonant music.

It is from these social pressures that Ives developed his interest in what he called vernacular music—the marches, revival hymns, minstrel show songs, and other traditional forms of American music which found its way into Ives' compositions. This he considered to be strong music, and it was all a part of his boyhood.

Drawing together all of the major forces shaping Ives' early musical development, his extensive and thorough training, his father's experimental tendencies, the strong social pressures and his attachment to the vernacular music tradition, one can easily see how his musical point of view took shape and from where he drew his totally unique musical language. Evidence of these forces is readily

31 Rossiter, loc. cit.
noticeable in his music, especially in the case of the First Symphony and in his writings and opinions of his work. With a firm musical and philosophical foundation in place, Ives moved on to the final stage of his formal education--study with Horatio Parker.

Parker joined the Yale faculty as Battell Professor of Music Theory in 1894, the same year in which Ives enrolled. He was very well known in his day as a member of the group known as the Boston Classicists, a school of American composers strongly influenced by European traditions. Parker’s two principal teachers had been the American composer George Chadwick (1854-1931) and the German composer Josef Rheinberger (1839-1901). Perry notes that Parker’s music often was modeled after such composers as Mendelssohn, Franck, Liszt, Gounod, Brahms, Wagner, and Dvorak, in addition to certain Baroque and Renaissance composers. However, this is not to say that his music was entirely old-fashioned, as many of his major compositions were very innovative. In fact, he was frequently criticized for not adhering closely enough to the established rules of composition.32

Parker’s colleagues on the musical faculty at Yale included Samuel S. Sanford, Professor of Applied Music; Harry B. Jepson, Instructor in Organ; and Isidor Trostwyk, Instructor in Voice. However, as indicated by Kirkpatrick

in one of the appendices to the Memos, Ives' work within the music curriculum was limited to classes taught by Parker. These included Counterpoint, Instrumentation, Strict Composition, Harmony, and Music History. Along with these, Ives' study over the four years in Yale's strict academic curriculum included among others Greek, Latin, German, French, English Literature, Mathematics, Philosophy, Political Science, and History.\textsuperscript{33}

Ives was also very active socially, as he was a member of such organizations as He'Boule', Delta Kappa Epsilon, and the prestigious secret fraternity Wolf's Head. Concurrent with these pursuits, he was also actively writing for fraternity shows, playing ragtime with the Hyperion Theater Orchestra, and playing football and baseball. It is interesting to note that in spite of his rigorous extra-curricular musical activities, he was not mentioned as a musician in the class yearbook. This factor shows that the attitude displayed towards music and musicians by his home town was not necessarily unique to that community but even extended into the Yale society as well.\textsuperscript{34}

There are many opposing views to the significance of Ives' study with Parker. There are those, like Howard Boatwright in his preface to Ives' book Essays Before a

\textsuperscript{33}Ives Memos, op. cit., 180.

\textsuperscript{34}Cowell, op. cit., 35-36.
Sonata, who say that Ives gained very little from this experience. He contends that these studies were no more than repetition or possibly some expansion of techniques with which Ives was already familiar, pointing to Ives' father as actually the only significant influence on him.\textsuperscript{35} While this notion is further reinforced by Ives himself in the Memoirs, it should be noted that, as was mentioned earlier, Ives would tend to overstate his case, especially when it concerned his father. Actually, based on descriptions of Parker's music and philosophies, it seems very likely that he might have played a much more significant role than is often attributed to him.

For example, Perry points out that, although Ives often reacted very strongly to Parker's "musical authoritarianism," Ives employs in his music many of the philosophies and musical ideas for which Parker was also known. These include such devices as opposing rhythms and tonalities and employing quotations from popular songs in his own music. Perry also notes that Parker advocated experimentation in music, although there is little doubt that Ives' notion of experimentation and that of Parker were on a substantially different scale.\textsuperscript{36}


\textsuperscript{36}Perry, \textit{op. cit.}, xvii.
Ives describes his personal regard for Parker in what appears to be a sincere appraisal from the *Memos*:

I had a great deal of respect for Parker and most of his music. (It was seldom trivial—his choral works have a dignity and depth that many of his contemporaries, especially in the field of religious and choral composition did not have. Parker had ideals that carried him higher than the popular) but he was governed too much by German rule, and in some ways was somewhat hard-boiled.37

It seems only natural that any teacher would respond to a student such as Ives in a similar manner as Parker apparently did—hat is, by focusing on and ensuring that the rudiments of music were thoroughly understood. There is little doubt that Parker recognized Ives' enormous creative potential and that his regimental approach to Ives was not an attempt to reroute or impede his creativity, but rather to ensure that he had the essential knowledge and technique to express himself coherently. Ives, however, interpreted it as Parker's lack of interest in his student's more radical side, as can be seen in Ives' description of a typical session with Parker when he would bring in a project that strayed from tradition. He said that Parker was seldom mean, and rather than criticize Ives for his unconventional ideas and technique, Parker would "just look at a measure or so, and hand it back with a smile, or

---

37Ives, *Memos*, *op. cit.*, 49.
joke about hogging all the keys at one meal and then talk about something else."^{38}

It appears as though the composition of the First Symphony was a somewhat troublesome process for Ives under the parameters set by Parker, as the Memos indicate. This is understandable when one considers the scope of the work. Surely in smaller compositions Ives could adapt to Parker's strictures by taking a fairly academic approach to the compositional process. However, in a work of this magnitude, where a certain degree of spontaneity is necessary to achieve a workable flow and cohesiveness, it was probably much more difficult for Ives to keep restricting himself. Ives discusses some of the process of working with Parker on this project in the following:

The first movement was changed. It (that is, the symphony) was supposed to be in D minor, but the first subject went through six or eight different keys, so Parker made me write another first movement, but it seemed no good to me, and I told him that I would prefer to use the first draft. He smiled and let me do it and said 'But you must promise to end in D minor.' (and also he didn't like the original slow movement, as it started on G-flat--he said it should start on F. Near the end, 'the boys got going'--so at the request of Parker and Kaltenborn, I wrote a nice formal one--but the first is better!^{39}

In spite of the apparent struggle between these two men during the production of the First Symphony, Parker did finally accept the work as satisfactorily completing the

\(^{38}\text{Ibid.}\)

\(^{39}\text{Ibid.}, 51.\)
requirements. However, according to the note on the title page of the manuscript, the first movement which was published is different from that which he turned in to Parker. The note reads: "Second and Fourth (and Third) accepted as part of thesis, Parker course June 1898--not the first. First Movement composed over for Professor Parker (not kept)." 40

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF MOVEMENTS I-III

The musical language for which Ives is best known is a departure from tradition. Typical traits associated with his music are polytonality, and polyrhythm along with quotations from standard American folk and popular melodies. The First Symphony, however, is largely lacking in the above mentioned qualities, and is instead a generally more conservative, Romantically conceived work relative to much of his better known output. There are, however, within this conservative framework, several features which suggest a more radical Ives, and which point to his music to come. These features, as will be seen in the analysis that follows, are quite pronounced within the generally reserved nature of this symphony.

The discussion to follow will survey the general style of this symphony through an examination of the distinctive features of the first three movements. A detailed examination of the fourth movement in the following chapter will conclude this discussion by examining the means by which Ives creates the style of this work.
The symphony follows the traditional four-movement format with two fast movements framing the work, a slow movement second, and a scherzo and trio third. The orchestra for which it is written employs doubled woodwinds (with second oboe doubling English horn), ad. lib. contrabassoon, four horns, two trumpets, three trombones, tuba, strings and timpani. The score used for this analysis was published by Peer International Corporation.  

Fundamentally, the style is comprised of clearly tonal harmony, defined formal features on all levels, and standard symphonic instrumentation—essentially a very traditional European framework. Within this framework, however, there is the adventurous spirit of Ives in the form of unexpected harmonic moves, (usually within an otherwise clearly tonal phrase), unusual formal proportions and treatments, and fresh, original, thematic material. There is also a touch of the satirical humor of Ives in the form of "homages" to some well-known European Romanticists which, as can be deduced from Ives’ own comments, were most likely included solely to please Parker. In spite of these limitations and Ives’ somewhat flippant attitude, the symphony also shows many of Ives’ true abilities such as

imagination, resourcefulness, and fine skill in the craft of musical composition.

The first movement follows a sonata-allegro design quite clearly, but is notable in the proportions of the main sections. Most obvious is the exceptionally long exposition, (228 mm.) which acquires its length in part from the use of three themes (in three different keys), and the frequent repetition of these themes. This section is even further expanded by the long transitional passages between theme groups and repetitions alike.

The development section is constructed in three distinct parts, each based on different thematic material from the exposition, and is only 105 measures in length, less than half as long as the exposition. The recapitulation is also substantially shorter than the exposition, lasting only 132 measures, although no thematic material is omitted. Instead, Ives condenses this material by eliminating the repeats of thematic material and combining the material that connects those sections into one transition. The coda is similarly brief at fifty-two measures in length.

The thematic material of this movement is tonally designed and generally conservative. Themes I:1 and I:342

42The themes are numbered according to the movement in which they first appear (represented by the Roman numeral), and the order of appearance within the movement (represented by the Arabic numeral). Lower
are subdued and relaxed in their gentle rhythms, flowing melodic shape, and slow harmonic rhythm (one change per measure) (Ex. 1).

Example 1a: Theme I:1 (mm 2-16)

---
case letters refer to motive fragments within each theme.
Example 1b: Theme I:3 (mm. 158-61)

Theme I:2 however, contrasts with I:1 and I:3 through its rapid rhythmic figures and disjunct melodic line. This theme also moves in a much quicker harmonic rhythm and avoids emphasis on the downbeat (Ex. 2). The three themes together follow a traditional tonal pattern with I:1 in the tonic, I:2 in the relative major, and I:3 in the sub-mediant.

Example 2: Theme I:2 (mm. 112-15)

The development section brings still another theme which, in view of the entire symphony, is quite significant. Although it is first suggested in measure 236, Theme
I:4 first appears in its entirety in measure 270. From that point on, it appears frequently throughout the development, and reappears in each succeeding movement, usually in a situation where it is subordinate to other material (Ex. 3).

Example 3: Theme I:4 (mm. 270-74)

While the thematic material of the coda of the first movement is all from the body of the movement, the way in which it is treated strongly suggests influences (many approaching quotation) of Tchaikovsky. The most prominent of these influences is found in measure 469. Here motive I:1b (which has been slightly modified and transposed to minor for the coda) is answered by an appoggiatura figure which begins on the second half of beat two (Ex. 4).

Example 4: (mm. 468-71)
The harmonic and rhythmic features of the passage in Example 4 are reminiscent of a similar figure which makes its first appearance in measure 285 of the first movement of Tchaikovsky's Symphony No. 6. The harmonic similarity is in the function of the non-harmonic tone. In both excerpts, the non-harmonic tone is a second above either the root or the fifth of the chord, and resolves downward. The progression is identical between the Ives excerpt and measure 287 of the Tchaikovsky excerpt as both move in a $b$ 6-5 resolution. The rhythmic similarity comes from the fact that in both instances the dissonant pitch is in a highly conspicuous position in the measure and is longer than the initial resolution. Also, both excerpts occur in a moment of heightened intensity in the movement due to a broadening of tempo in an otherwise predominantly allegro movement (Ex. 5).

Example 5: Tchaikovsky Symphony No. 6, first movement
(mm. 284-87)
The second movement is in a three-part form, A-B-A'.

The A section is a four-part series of short themes strung together with the opening theme returning at the end (Ex. 6a-d). Of these, Theme II:2 has special significance as it returns in its exact form as the closing theme of the fourth movement exposition and recapitulation and appears in a substantially varied form in the trio of the third movement. The entire A section is presented with a very simple harmonic scheme (the opening tonic lasts three-and-one half measures before moving to the sub-dominant), and the texture is entirely homophonic with the exception of measures 21-23 (Theme II:4) where a moving bass line forms the accompaniment.

Example 6a: Theme II:1 (mm. 1-8)
Example 6b: Theme II:2 (mm. 9-12)

Example 6c: Theme II:3 (mm. 17-18)

Example 6d: Theme II:4 (mm. 21-24)

The B section involves primarily the repetition and elaboration of a single theme, II:5, which like the themes of the A section, is constructed over a simple harmonic and textural scheme, and it is at this point that Theme I:4 is again encountered, this time as a accompanying figure to Theme II:5 (Ex. 7).
Aside from the harmonic and textural similarities between the A and B sections, the B section contrasts greatly with A in its quicker rhythmic activity (which is further reinforced by the Più Moto designation), and the more chromatic nature of the thematic material.

The most notable feature of this movement is clearly the construction of the A' section (mm. 81-113). Here Ives forms a conglomerate of all the thematic material from this movement and some from the first movement. This section opens with the combination of Themes II:1 (Ex. 6a) and II:5 (Ex. 7) and leads into measure 89 where Theme II:2 (Ex. 6b) is presented, this time accompanied by itself in diminution along with Theme I:1 (Ex. 1). The remaining themes, II:3 and II:4 (Ex. 6c and d) follow the same sequence in which they were presented in the A section. This all takes place to the accompaniment of Theme II:2 (Ex. 6b) or a reinforced version of the accompaniment used in the A section. As the A section closed with a restatement of theme II:1, (Ex. 6a), so does the A' section, only now the English horn is doubled by two violins.
Except for the last ten measures, which are texturally similar to the A section, the combining of themes in the A' section serves primarily to intensify the movement by greatly increasing the level of textural complexity which, as was mentioned earlier, was simpler in both the A and B sections. By increasing the textural complexity and by presenting the thematic material from both the A and B sections, Ives has created a condensed version of a sonatina form which, much like the unusual formal proportions of the first movement, shows his tendency to slightly vary standard designs to suit his ideas of musical presentation.

The third movement presents a combination of an essentially classical form--the scherzo and trio--with the traditionally baroque fugal texture. While in one respect, this sets it apart from the other movements, whose styles are clearly romantic, it also ties them together. Once again, Ives is experimenting with traditional formal designs, and as has been pointed out, they are always recognizable, but invariably distorted.

While the style of the scherzo is very similar to that of a fugue the fact that each voice enters in the same key keeps it from entirely following the traditional scheme. In this respect, the first 19 measures could be considered a canon except that in viewing the scherzo as a whole, one finds subject-counter-subject, and exposition-episode
relationships that more strongly suggest the influence of fugal design.

The scherzo is in a rounded binary form with the A section being made up of two fugal expositions. The B section could also be considered an episode, and of course the A' section is a return of the fugal exposition. A' varies from A only in a very slight change of instrumentation (oboes are added to measures 70-73) and the six-bar stretto at the end.

The formal design of the trio is, like the scherzo, rounded binary, but here the imitative texture is dropped in both the A and the A' sections. The trio's B section does involve imitation, but not in the fugal style of the scherzo. Instead, Ives uses two-part imitation where the second voice is an inversion of the first (Ex. 8).

Example 8: Theme III:6 (mm. 110-114)

Ives repeats this figure after six measures, changing the roles of the two voices. One more statement of both the ascending and descending lines appears in measure 126, only this time they sound simultaneously, providing the final intensification of the texture before the return to A'.
The thematic material of the scherzo is idiomatic for imitative writing in its outlining of triads and scale passages, which makes for clear harmonic alignment between the imitating voices (Ex. 9).

Example 9: Theme III:1 (mm. 1-6)

Like Theme III:1, the episode melody (Theme III:2) also strongly suggests a clear tonal center, but the high level of chromaticism in the accompaniment obscures much of the tonal sense (mm. 38-49 in the score).

A similar pattern is found in the trio where the tonality of the A section is very clearly pronounced, but the tonality of the B section is obscured by the previously mentioned contrary motion (Ex. 8). The first theme of the trio (III:4) is derived from two sources. First, it acquires the shape of the first two measures, from Theme II:2 (Ex. 6b), as was previously mentioned, and secondly, the rhythmic and melodic shape of the remainder of the theme is derived from the fifth and sixth measures of Theme III:1 (Ex. 9). The combination of these two results in a theme that is reminiscent of the style of Brahms (Ex. 10).
Example 10: Theme III:4 (mm. 95-103)

One other motive which has special significance in this movement appears in measure 107. This polyrhythmic figure returns in the A' section of the trio accompanying Theme III:4. Also, along with this, is the reoccurring Theme I:4, in its usual subordinate role.

This movement is notable for its frequent use of sudden contrasts of texture, style, and rhythm. The first of these contrasts is seen in measure thirty-eight where the clearly tonal fugal section is interrupted by a section with obscured tonality and two-voice, non-imitative texture. This contrast with the fugal section is further intensified in measure fifty-two where the first of several diminished chords appears, giving this section a very romantic sound. Just as the change in harmonic style entered this section abruptly, it is cut off abruptly in measure 69 to allow for the return of another fugal section.
The beginning of the trio is another striking contrast in its relaxed character, homophonic texture, and major key compared to the intensely energetic, imitative, minor key scherzo, but even more severe is the return to the scherzo following the trio. Here, a three-measure sequence is, much like the scherzo's return to A; from the B section, abruptly interrupted by the downbeat of the scherzo, removing any sense of completion from the trio.

As can be seen in the preceding discussion, much of the uniqueness of this work lies in the presentation of highly original material within a traditional framework. The following chapter will, through a more detailed analysis, show the means by which Ives creates this original material.
CHAPTER IV
FOURTH MOVEMENT ANALYSIS

Through the previous discussion of the first three movements, the general nature of the symphony has been shown by focusing on the most striking features of each movement--those which show Ives' manipulation of the Romantic style to fit his musical ideas. This discussion of the fourth movement will deal not only with those features which are strikingly Ivesian, but also will survey, in more detail, all of the basic categories of musical style in an attempt to fully demonstrate Ives' command of symphonic musical forces.

Form

The fourth movement is in a sonata-allegro design and, with few exceptions, follows the traditional pattern very closely as can be seen in the diagram below: (See Appendix B for a detailed formal diagram).
Figure 1 Formal Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st theme group</td>
<td>2nd theme group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Major</td>
<td>A Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-58</td>
<td>59-74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st theme group</td>
<td>2nd theme group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The body of the movement is symmetrically proportioned in that the recapitulation is almost the same length as the exposition (differing from the first movement). The variance in length (three measures) comes from seven measures added to the first theme group extension in the recapitulation (mm. 219-25). As two measures of exposition material are dropped here, the net increase in length is five measures. To balance this increase, Ives trims two measures of material in the transition that follows, leaving the net increase for the entire recapitulation at three measures.

Within each section of the large formal divisions, one finds very clearly defined phrases, articulated by motive, harmony, and orchestration. For example, the first theme group opens with two statements of the first theme, one
immediately following the other, with the second varied
only by a reversal of the string-wind roles. Also, by
moving the first note, which was previously in the tympani
but is here in the cellos and basses from D to B, a new key
area is subtly suggested (the notes of the thematic
material, however, remain the same (Ex. 11).

The extension, however, is much more complex and
fragmented as can be seen in the following diagram:

Figure 2 Extension (mm. 21-58)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A'</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B'</th>
<th>A''</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motive</td>
<td>IV:1a,b,c,d</td>
<td>IV:1a,b,c,d</td>
<td>IV:1b,c,d</td>
<td>IV:1b,c,d</td>
<td>IV:a,b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Much like the opening of this movement, Ives extends the A
material by repetition with varied instrumentation, forming
the A' section, again reversing the string-wind roles. The
B material, however, is extended by sequencing the IV:1c
motive which is used to close each of the above sections,
excluding the last (A'').

The second theme group is much less complex than the
first, as both the theme and the extension are each divided
into only two sections, both being repetitions (Ex. 12).
Like the first theme, the second is also made up of two
statements of the thematic material, one immediately
following the other. Here again, they are varied by
instrumentation, only in this instance, the added woodwinds
simply reinforce the material in the strings (in which the
theme has undergone a peculiar shift from second violin to first) rather than the reversal of roles we saw in the two earlier instances.

Example 11: Theme IV:1 (mm. 1-11)
Example 12: Theme IV:2 (mm. 75-82)

The extension flows naturally out of the theme area, carrying on the IV:2a motive, and after four measures, it repeats the same figuration transposed up a minor third. Six measures of elaboration on the IV:2c and d motives form a brief transition into the closing theme which is stated twice with, as one might expect, a reversal of string and wind roles. Accompanying this theme are fragments of IV:2 and two statements of I:4 (Ex. 3), all of which overlap beginnings and endings of other phrases, giving this section a very dense and complex texture.

The pattern of string and wind reversal continues into the development section, only at this point it is in a more concentrated form as two-measure fragments of IV:2, rather
than the complete phrases of the exposition, are exchanged throughout the first section. This pattern is further concentrated in the B section where, following a six-measure transition, the new theme of the development IV:3 is presented canonically between the strings and winds and is repeated in the B' section in D-flat major with varied instrumentation but still retaining the canonic treatment.

The longest section of this movement is the coda, lasting 134 measures. Within the coda are three sections of similar length plus a transition as seen in Figure 1. The A section consists of five relatively short parts (the longest being 12 measures) strung together without any type of transition. The B section, however, is considerably more unified in a clear two-part form--a a'. Each of these subsections is exactly the same length (20 mm.) and presents the same material, but with different instrumentation and accompaniment. The fragmented nature of the coda's A section returns in the C section which is also constructed in several short parts. This section is more unified than A, however, in that the sections follow a pattern similar to a rondo form with unifying material returning after each departure.

**Structural Materials: Melody and Rhythm**

The most prominent feature of the thematic material Ives has created for this movement is its potential for
development. By constructing his melodies with great rhythmic variation and motivic richness, these themes are easily fragmented and developed, providing the strongest unifying factor of this movement. It is also this quality which makes for the easy flow between sections as, because of Ives’ imaginative employment of these fragments, each section appears to grow out of that which precedes it.

This is all clearly evident in the first theme of this movement, IV:1 where, as shown in Example 11 above, it is simply a joining together of very individual motives into one long musical idea which is held together by the accompaniment figure of the first six measures and the sequencing of the last four. The theme is typical of this symphony in that, while it is generally diatonic and clearly tonal, there are some harmonic peculiarities which give it its freshness such as the mode mixture on the iv chord (mm. 4 and 6), sustained nonharmonic tones (mm. 1 and 2), and the immediate move to the dominant in the first measure.

The second theme, IV:2 contrasts substantially with the first in virtually every respect. It is shorter, softer, and more triadic than the first, primarily scalar, theme, and is texturally simpler with the accompaniment provided by long pedal points rather than the highly active figures of the first. It does, however, show some common traits in the form of subtle harmonic ambiguity (the melodic
outlining of vi over I harmony mm. 75 and augmenting the I triad in the melodic line in mm. 77), and the fragmentary nature of its construction (Ex. 12 above).

The closing theme II:2, as was previously mentioned, made its first appearance in the second movement where it was used with slightly different harmonic treatment and textural situation shown below. Notice that the chorale style texture of the second movement passage is simplified by the strings in the fourth movement, but the overall texture is made even more complicated with the addition of other voices with different motivic material in an almost random presentation (Ex. 13a and b). Further discussion of the textural make-up of this movement will follow in this chapter.

Example 13a: Theme II:2 (mvt. 2, mm. 9-16)
Example 13b: Theme II:2 (mvt. 4, mm. 102-105)

The development theme (IV:3) is one of a most unusual character relative to the others in this symphony, but when compared with the thematic material Ives uses in much of his total output, it seems quite ordinary as it is clearly more American than European. The tune itself is very brief (4-measures), although it is always extended, and derives its strong American character primarily from the fourth measure of the figure where the manner in which the phrase closes strongly suggests the character of a colonial American fife tune. One other notable feature of this theme is that it always appears in canonic treatment which, assuming Ives designed it for such use, accounts for the consistent repetition of the same rhythmic figure, allowing one voice to move while the other sustains the dotted quarter-note (Ex. 14).
Example 14: Theme IV:3 (mm. 134-37)

In the coda, one finds still further development of the movement's thematic material, as well as the evolution of previously used motives into new themes. It is also here that Ives has his last chance to show Parker his ability to write like the European masters and, as a result, parody of late 19th century composers abounds. One of the most prominent motivic features of this movement is the consistent presence of Theme I:4 (Ex. 3 above) either in its usual subordinate role, or transformed into a new theme. As an accompaniment figure, it appears both in its usual half-note form, but also is frequently applied in diminution as quarters (mm. 305-07 et al.), and as eighth notes as the movement draws to a close (mm. 405-06).

Instances of diminution are quite common elsewhere in this section. For instance, in the first part of the coda motive IV:2a (Ex. 12 above) is at first used exactly as it was with the opening of the development. In place of the development theme which followed, however, Ives continues IV:2a in the same alternating string/wind pattern, only this time in diminution. Another more extended passage of diminution is found from measure 305-310 which is an exact diminution of measures 130-141, involving, as was pre-
viously mentioned, Theme I:4, but even more prominently, Theme IV:3 (Ex. 14 above).

Charles Ives' musical wit is readily apparent in the parody that is found in the new themes that evolve in this movement. The first striking instance of parody begins with the B section of the coda (m. 336) and is brilliantly prepared by the transition preceding it (m. 316). This transition serves a number of functions including moving from A-flat minor to D Major, but more importantly, it facilitates a transition of musical character between the playful nature of the Theme IV:3 in diminution (304-315) and the march-like exuberance of the B section. In this transition, Ives creates three distinct musical "planes" which gradually move in or out of prominence based on which is departing and which is arriving. The two departing ideas are the descending quarter-note figure accompaniment and the triplet passage in the violins and violas which is a stylized version of the general activity of the preceding passage. Along with these two planes, Ives introduces the new idea, the dotted eight-sixteenth, which originates in the lower strings and gradually works its way into the woodwinds and brass as well. The departing ideas give way completely in measure 330 where one of the most blatant instances of parody occurs, as Ives clearly mimics Tchaikovsky in the third movement of his Symphony No 6 (Ex. 15).
The parody continues out of the transition as the theme of the new section is also strongly reminiscent of the same Tchaikovsky movement and is found in a similar relationship with the material preceding it. The Ives material, a transformation of Theme I:4, is not only in the same character as Tchaikovsky’s but also contains two of the strongest rhythmic features found in the same model (Ex. 15). This connection is further reinforced by the eighth-note scale passages that follow in the Ives lower brass and strings which are clearly from the same Tchaikovsky movement and function similarly with regard to the phrase.

The work also closes in a parody, only this time the subject is Brahms in the fourth movement of his Symphony No. 1. In this instance Ives borrows two very brief, but prominent, ideas from the coda of the Brahms, the Più Allegro motive (which is based on the first theme of the symphony), and the ascending subdominant immediately preceding the final tonic, closing the symphony on a plagal cadence. The Brahms Più Allegro motive is first found in Ives at the Allegro con Fuoco (m. 376) and, it, like the Brahms figure, appears frequently from that point to the close (Ex. 17). The subdominant figure begins seven measures from the end of both symphonies, and both employ nearly identical orchestration (Ives adds a tuba). The figure itself is only slightly varied (Ex. 18).
Example 15a: (mm. 330-31)

Example 15b: Tchaikovsky Symphony No. 6, 3rd mvt. (mm. 223-24)
Example 16a: (mm. 336-39)

Example 16b: Tchaikovsky Symphony No. 6, 3rd mvt. (229-32)

Example 17a: (m. 376)

Example 17b: Brahms Symphony No. 1, 4th mvt. (mm. 391-92)

Example 18a: (mm. 408-9)
Example 18b: Brahms Symphony No. 1, 4th mvt. (mm. 451-52)

Harmony

Much of the freshness of this work can be attributed to Ives' imaginative use of harmony. The dissonance level is very low, and chords generally fall into patterns of functional harmony, however, these patterns and their corresponding key areas are often very short and quickly give way to new, frequently far-removed tonal areas. This fleeting tonality is especially typical of episodic or developmental sections and, in its contrast with the more tonally stable theme areas, aids in articulating the form.

The first theme extension of this movement is a clear example of this harmonic drift (Ex. 19). These eight measures fall into two four-bar sections with the second repeating the material of the first in a new key with, of course, the same harmonic progression. The tonal areas are D Major and C Major respectively, which are enough unrelated to give the passage an unexpected turn of events, while still retaining a smooth flow between sections. The modulation here is facilitated by the V/V in D Major in
measure 23 which resolves with a model shift to a minor v, briefly establishing a minor which eases the move immediately following to C Major. This minor third relationship has been very pronounced throughout the entire symphony and, as we shall see, serves some very important functions in this movement as well.

One example of an extended minor-third relationship is seen in measures 41-44. Ives uses root movement outlining a descending fully-diminished seventh chord as the basis for a sequence of secondary dominant resolutions on motive IV:1c (Ex. 11 above). This results in a most unusual effect but one which is cohesive and progresses naturally (Ex. 20).
Example 20: (mm. 41-44 derived from IV:1c)

Similarly, a sequence built on an ascending fully-diminished seventh chord, the same chord used in mm. 41-44, is found a few bars later, where the IV:1b motive (Ex. 11 above) is treated in alternating fashion between horns and strings. The harmonic rhythm here is also the same as measures 41-44, with tonal areas changing 1 per bar.

While these examples show Ives' harmonic language within sequential patterns, it should be noted that his harmony behaves similarly in non-sequential passages such as measures 128-133 (Ex. 21). As in the previously-cited passages, we see a new tonal area in each bar, all connected by the melodic activity which these chords support. The tonal motion is primarily stepwise moving from C Major to B-Flat, then on to D Major in the third bar and, soon, the most irregular activity comes in the progression from the last beat of measure 133 to the first beat of measure 134. While, as was previously mentioned, the motion by enharmonic thirds seen here is typical; what is unusual is
the voice leading employed in moving from iv in E Major (beats 3 and 4) to iv in the following A-flat Major by fourths in half-step parallel motion.

This device is quite common in this movement, and also points to another broad facet of this work, the chromatic motion. It occurs not only on the detailed level of voice leading, but also on the broader level of form (for example, the movement from the first section of the development in A Major to the second section in A-flat Major (see Appendix B), and the intermediate level of harmonic motion within sections. One of the clearest
examples of this type is found in the passage from measures 253 to 266, where the harmonic plan is governed by a chromatically ascending bass line. This section begins with the elision between the end of the second theme area and the beginning of the extension and functions to move from the A Major of the second theme to the G-flat major of the closing theme. The bass line and, therefore, the harmonic rhythm fluctuates between moving one chord per bar and one chord per two bars in a relatively strict pattern, so that some rhythmic regularity is perceived in the passage (Ex. 22).

Example 22: (Harmonial outline mm. 253-65)

It should be noted that here again, even within the chromatic framework, movement by thirds is still suggested when one examines the phrase grouping and their harmonic points of origin. Between measures 254 and 261, a four-bar figure is repeated twice, the second time a minor third
higher than the first. The next phrase grouping begins in measure 262, again a minor third higher than that preceding it, creating a pattern of tertian movement with the chromatic tones between serving as passing tones.

Another feature that occurs several times in this movement is striking not only in its harmonic irregularity, but also in its contrary motion and understated application. This figure can be found in measure 152 on beats three and four, moving to the downbeat of the following bar. The harmonic progression after the initial eight-note is an ascending, whole-tone series of major chords A-flat - B-flat - C - D. This follows two bars of clearly diatonic music and leads into a section which is also clearly diatonic. When one considers that this harmonic jolt takes place in two short beats at the end of a phrase, it is obvious that its effect is most noticeable without being overstated. This figure reoccurs several times in the coda, often at important climactic points where the effect is further pronounced but still without losing its essential character, that of simply independently moving lines gravitating towards a harmonic focal point at the downbeat. (This effect is very similar to the contrary motion found in the second section of the third movement trio.)
Texture and Orchestration

The textural make-up of this movement is essentially homophonic, but operating with various, simultaneous levels of rhythmic activity, with these levels often further distinguished through instrumentation. It is, in part, through manipulating these levels of activity, that Ives controls the general intensity level of a given section and emphasizes key structural areas. This is accomplished, as shall be seen, not only through the number of levels of activity, but also through the relative congruity of the different lines such that in structural arrival points the levels of activity are more likely to mesh while in developmental or transitory areas there is a freer, at times almost random, association between these levels.

A clear example of congruity between levels of activity can be seen in the very opening of this movement. At this point, the highest level of activity is in the violins, which are playing the theme itself under which the next level of activity, the running eighth notes, are sounded in the lower strings. Finally, the woodwinds are given the lowest level of activity with simple harmonic reinforcement in primarily half-notes and whole-notes. All of these lines, although quite different in appearance, are closely related, and as a result, give a strong sense of stability to this section. Most of this stability is provided by the two lowest levels of activity, which are bar-line oriented,
and provide a strong harmonic sense, while the melody itself avoids bar-line emphasis, and without the underlying harmonic reinforcement, would be tonally vague (Example 11 above).

It should also be noted that the orchestration here is typical of what is found throughout the movement. Ives often assigns definite roles to specific instrument families, and as a result, clearly defines their functions in a particular section for the listener through consistency of timbre. Here, the division of the orchestra into upper strings, lower strings, and winds, is a very common grouping for this movement, and understandably so, as the resulting balance allows the most important voice to be clearly audible while the others freely contribute to the density of the texture.

The extension that follows this theme area provides a good example of a less congruous relationship between levels. The most obvious difference here is that the level of activity between the three lines becomes less distinct. In the first theme, the levels of activity were substantially different, but here, especially the lower two levels, they are very similar with the result being a "busier" texture, and less focus on any one line. This focus is further removed since, while the groups of instruments remain the same (upper strings, lower strings,
woodwinds), they change roles very quickly, always diverting the listeners' attention to new timbres.

Another feature of this symphony (and Ives' later symphonies as well) is the use, within the levels of activity, of many different motives simultaneously. In the closing theme, for example, we find four levels: 1) a pedal point in the lower strings, 2) half-notes in the horns, 3) the theme itself in whole and quarter notes played by the violins, and 4) quarter note triplets, eights, and other rhythmic patterns in the woodwinds, all drawing on different thematic material (Example 13 above). The texture is further complicated by the consequent portion of the closing theme (mm. 106-9), where the motives have shifted rhythmically such that none of the levels align in terms of their phrases. For example, in measure 106 is seen the beginning of a phrase of the closing theme in the violins, the third bar from the end of a phrase from Theme IV:2, (Example 12 above), along with another fragment from IV:2 in the horns, echoing the flute motive from a bar earlier. Similarly, in measure 108, a statement of Theme I:4 begins in the middle of a phrase of the closing theme. The effect of all of this is, again, one that assists in clarifying the formal divisions for the listener, and it is very clear that when all of these disjunct lines finally settle at once on a downbeat, a new section is beginning.
From this examination of the style traits that Ives employs in this symphony, one can see many of the traits associated with his later works in their embryonic form. More importantly however, considering that Ives had to work within Parker’s conservative guidelines, it is evident that Ives possessed the skill to mold his ideas into different forms such that he could adapt his personal musical language to fit a framework that was not instinctively his. It is this skill that, when combined with his thorough training and remarkable originality, produced the wide variety of works that secured for him a position of lasting importance in the history of American music.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

Lawrence Starr notes: "two rewards beckon the scholar who investigates the early works of a major composer: Familiarity with neglected works worthy of study and appreciation, and deepened insight into the composer's creative maturity.\textsuperscript{43} As the preceding discussion has shown, this statement is applicable to the study of the First Symphony of Charles Ives.

As has been shown through analysis, there is a great deal in this symphony which renders it not only worthy of study, but also worthy of performance. In this work, Ives has demonstrated a remarkable knowledge of 19th century style, along with fine craftsmanship and a broad expressive palate. It is a work filled with originality, even when references to other composers are made, yet it never loses touch with the musical ancestry on which it is based. It stretches the limits of tradition which were imposed upon it without over-extending them.

In terms of providing insight into Ives' creative maturity, the First Symphony is a tremendously valuable

\textsuperscript{43}Starr, \textit{op. cit.}, 71.
resource. In Ives' case, the works of his maturity are written in a style which had been unprecedented. However, through study of an early work such as the First Symphony, one is able to grasp Ives' musical language in its early stage of development. The First Symphony shows many of his forward-looking traits such as harmonic and formal experiments, polyrhythms, and so on, which are quite conspicuous within their otherwise traditional surrounding. To view these traits in their embryonic state, where their significance may be more readily apparent, is to be better equipped to approach the later works.

Finally, the First Symphony provides concrete evidence of Charles Ives' extensive and thorough training. Through this work one can see that he truly was a very capable composer and, perhaps through familiarity with the First Symphony, those who were skeptical of Ives' abilities can now approach the later works from a different perspective. This symphony proves that the later, more unconventional works are not the result of a composer who was unable to work within a traditional style, but rather of a composer who found that style too limiting.
APPENDIX A

DISCOGRAPHY OF SYMPHONY NO. 1
APPENDIX A

Discography of Symphony No. 144

Chicago Symphony Orchestra; Morton Gould, conductor
Recorded Orchestra Hall, Chicago, Illinois,
November 6, 1965

Issued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>RCA Victor</td>
<td>LM-2893</td>
<td>(stereo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>RCA Victor</td>
<td>LSC-2893</td>
<td>(tape; 7.5 i.p.s., 4 track)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>RCA Victor</td>
<td>FTC-2221</td>
<td>(tape; 3.75 i.p.s., 4 track)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>RCA Victor</td>
<td>TR3-5011</td>
<td>(stereo tape cartridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>RCA Victor</td>
<td>R8S-5051</td>
<td>(stereo tape cartridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(England)</td>
<td>RB-6687</td>
<td>(stereo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(England)</td>
<td>SB-6687</td>
<td>(stereo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-This recording is no longer commercially available

The Philadelphia Orchestra; Eugene Ormandy, conductor.

Issued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>MS-7111</td>
<td>(stereo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>MQ-991</td>
<td>(tape; 7.5 i.p.s., 4 track)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>MS-7152</td>
<td>in set D35-783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(England)</td>
<td>SBRG-72683</td>
<td>(stereo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Issued:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Vanguard</td>
<td>VCS-10032</td>
<td>in Set VCS-10032-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardinal Series</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanguard</td>
<td>VSL-11039</td>
<td>(stereo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Richard Warren, Charles E. Ives: Discography (New Haven: Historical Sound Recordings, Yale University, 1972), 75-76.
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FORMAL DIAGRAM OF THE FOURTH MOVEMENT
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## APPENDIX B

Formal Diagram of the Fourth Movement

### EXPOSITION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1st Theme</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>D Major</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>E pedal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2nd Theme</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Closing Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>F-sharp minor</td>
<td>D-flat Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEVELOPMENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>b'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>A Major</td>
<td>A-Flat Major</td>
<td>D-flat--G Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RECAPITULATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>1st Theme</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>D Major</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>A pedal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>2nd Theme</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Closing Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>D Major</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>G-flat Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CODA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>D Major</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>D Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key:</td>
<td>D Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure:</td>
<td>376-414</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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