A view of Charles Ives has grown up in which he is somehow entirely disconnected from the European past and, while his music parallels contemporary developments, it is seen as separate from them—as if his rugged individualism would be tainted by the influence of any “foreign entanglements.” This portrayal might be captioned “Ives, American Pioneer.” Aside from its jingoism, which would have offended Ives, it has two related deleterious results: first, that it makes any analysis of the music, in any terms whatever, difficult to support; second, that it allows practically anyone to claim Ives as a precursor and model. The latter would not be so distressing if the composers staking their claims were not of an aleatoric bent. That they are tends, unfortunately, to enhance the former result of the image of Ives, his resistance to analysis. That is more serious.

The analytic situation is not improved by the lack of an established theoretical overview of early-twentieth-century music. This places the would-be analyst of Ives’s music in the awkward position of having to provide elaborate justification for every statement, since very little is commonly agreed upon. I hope to relieve myself of some of this burden by adapting Heinrich Schenker’s model of tonal music to the task—though any such adaptation is itself subject to the need for justification. One of my reasons for thinking that such an adaptation is not out of place
is that Ives’s materials, the hymn tunes and patriotic songs, are tonal. They are also used such that the pitches involved have meaning beyond mere association; the quotations, far from being arbitrary, are incorporated into the harmonic structure and are subservient to its unfolding. In this article, I hope to show that the piece analyzed, *The Fourth of July*, is built upon a structural framework that involves a bass arpeggiation and an upper-voice descent in the background. Furthermore, I will point out motivic references in the foreground to long-range unfoldings.

There will remain those who cannot be convinced that Ives’s music is tonal, no matter how loosely one defines tonality (not that loosely, in my case). Even so, application of Schenker’s voice-leading principles is not necessarily amiss: Ives writes with a richness of inflection like that of a composer working with familiar materials rather than the simplicity and directness one might expect from a composer exploring new ones. He is not interested in discarding the tradition of Western music but in building on it.

In any case, some form of functionality must be taken for granted. By analyzing *The Fourth* in Schenkerian terms, I also hope to show that the insights gained by that approach to earlier music, when applied to such transitional works, can lead to a better understanding of the music of our own century.

I do not posit any general theories. (The breakthrough in knowledge comes, as theoretical biophysicist Francis Crick has pointed out, when a person takes several successive steps, neither omitting any step nor “arriving” prematurely.1) The purpose of this article is to analyze Charles Ives’s tone poem and not to establish a theoretical overview of twentieth-century music. I shall, however, provide substantiation from the literature. If this interrupts the line of argument excessively—making the reader feel as if she had to get up to change sides of an old “78” in the middle of a movement—it is because the theory of twentieth-century music is still relatively primitive. [comment, 2014: A review in the same issue of *Theory and Practice* as this article mentioned that despite a thoroughly worked-out and widely (if not universally) accepted harmonic framework, music theory still had almost no way to discuss twentieth-century counterpoint. Last time I looked, this remained the case, some thirty years later.]

The Fourth of July is the last-composed of four tone poems, written between 1897 and 1913, that Ives grouped as a “symphony” called Holidays. Because all the works are rather similar in mood and general form, they are rarely performed together. In his autobiographical notes, Memos (c.1932), Ives claimed that his intention was, all along, to write a symphony, not four separate pieces. But Ives’s idea of a symphony was uncommon (and aggressively so): he thought that one needn’t treat such a work as a unit. He follows up his discussion of the origin of the idea for Holidays by describing his unsuccessful attempt to get an organist to use separate movements from Brahms symphonies to replace the insipid devotional music he heard in church. His nonchalance is also evident in his description of the organization of the “symphony”:

In putting these movements together as a kind of a symphony, the Washington’s Birthday [winter] would go first, the Decoration Day [spring] second, The Fourth of July [summer] third, and Thanksgiving [autumn] last. But these movements have been copied and bound separately, and may be played separately.4

Ives wrote two versions of a descriptive postface for The Fourth; the shorter of the two appears in the published edition of the score.5 The longer was printed in Memos:

It’s a boy’s ’4th—no historical orations—no patriotic grandiloquences by “grown-ups”—no program in his yard! But he knows what he’s celebrating—better than most of the county politicians. And he goes at it his own way, with a patriotism nearer kin to nature than jingoism. His festivities start in the quiet of the midnight before, and grow raucous with the sun. Everybody knows what it’s like—if everybody doesn’t—Cannon on the Green, Village Band on Main Street, fire crackers, shanks mixed on cornets, strings around big toes, torpedoes, Church bells, lost finger, fifes, clam-chowder, a prize-fight, drum-corps, burnt shins, parades (in and out of step), saloons all closed (more drunks than usual), baseball game

3. Ibid., 95.
4. Ibid., 96. Also note (ibid., 150) that in one of Ives’s lists of his compositions he refers to Holidays as an “Orchestral Set” (not a symphony).
5. Published in association with New Music Quarterly by Edition Adler (Berlin, 1932).
(Danbury All-Stars vs Beaver Brook Boys), pistols, mobbed umpire, Red, White and Blue, runaway horse,—and the day ends with the sky-rocket over the Church-steeple, just after the annual explosion sets the Town-Hall on fire. All this is not in the music,—not now.\textsuperscript{6}

The work can be divided into three sections, each ending in what Ives called a “take-off,” an imitation in music of some nonmusical sound. The first take-off is a mere firecracker (bar 39, rehearsal letter F), the second a more prolonged blast (b.76–77, r.M+2–3), and the third an extravagant explosion that manages, as indicated in the postface, to set the town hall on fire (b.111–120, r.X–Z).\textsuperscript{7} (There is also a notation in a sketch of the score, according to John Kirkpatrick, at letter X: “Town Hall fireworks blow up, skyrockets, firecrackers. . . .”) Ives’s early attempts at such sound pictures were rather mechanical (see the description of the General Slocum explosion in Memos\textsuperscript{9}), but by the time he composed The Fourth his method was considerably refined.

Aside from their programmatic significance, the take-offs have structural harmonic meaning. As can be seen in examples 1e, 2a, and 2b (showing progressively more elaborate versions of the middleground), the take-offs not only set the sections off from each another but mark important goals of motion: the first, a neighbor chord prolongation of the initial harmony (b.39); the second, a return to V in root position after an extended bass arpeggiation, preparatory to the move to the tonic (b.76–77); the third, the arrival of the final tonic harmony (b.116–120).

Harmonically, The Fourth is built on two mutually exclusive hexachords, one with the pitch classes D♭, E♭, F, G♭, A♭, B♭, which is the “tonic” hexachord, and the other, its complement, G, A, B, C, D, E.\textsuperscript{10} In the piece they are initially juxtaposed as a chord in 4ths and a chord in 5ths,

6. Kirkpatrick, 104, n.1. Ives probably never had any intention of including all of these “pictorial” effects.
9. Ibid., 105.
10. The ensuing discussion may at times give some the impression that Ives composes with “pitch-class sets.” (Those who receive this impression will be at some pains to find these sets—at least literally—in the actual music.) Such an impression, though perhaps the inevitable result of a requisite simplification of
respectively (b.8–12). When arranged in 4ths, the former runs, from the lowest note up, F–B♭–E♭–A♭–D♭–G♭, so I have designated it the “F to G-flat” chord (written F–g♭); in a similar way, the complement, arranged in 5ths, is the C–b chord (see ex.3). Example 1 shows step by step the elaboration from the original tonic hexachord (ex.1a) to the chord in 4ths (ex.1b). The reinterpretation of F and B♭ as V and I, which results in a bass arpeggiation, is next (ex.1c); this, in turn, is elaborated by various motions to inner voices, and an upper-voice descent is introduced (ex.1d). Finally, further prolongations by double neighbors and elaborations of the upper-voice descent are shown (ex.1e).

To understand the harmonic materials of The Fourth of July, particularly the use of mutually exclusive hexachords, it will be helpful to look at the development of that technique. Certainly, Ives was not the first early-twentieth-century composer to use such organization. Similar grouping of pitches have been noted by analysts in other works of the “free atonality” period.\(^{12}\) The music, is not intended: the analysis is of necessity an interpretation of the music, and one based on hearing. From a perspective informed by the tonal tradition, it may seem that I am too cavalier in using words like tonic; nevertheless, from here on, I will dispense with the scare quotes. [comment, 2014: I haven’t rewritten this note, but it now seems to me that instead of clarifying my position, which is what it was supposed to do, it will have the effect of creating more difficulty. (My position hasn’t changed that much.) Let me try again, briefly: Ives uses collections, but his way of thinking about them and thus the way he uses them differ from set theory in two ways: (1) he constructs them by a recipe (“six-note chord in 4ths”) rather than focusing on set identity—which I believe he hears—naturally, the resultant set is always the same if you follow the same recipe; (2) he makes connections, as I mention elsewhere, tonally. This is why the first distinction (which may seem one without a difference) is crucial. See the appendix for a fuller discussion.]

11. Uppercase is used to designate the lowest tone of a pitch collection, particularly if it functions as a bass tone. Pitch classes are generally referred to in uppercase, but specific pitches are referred to with registral superscripts (middle C = c\(^1\)).

It would seem that the pairing of mutually exclusive collections substituted for the effect of harmonic movement between tonic and dominant once that progression began to be avoided. Yet there must have been a source of pressure with the music itself that forced composers into avoiding simple triads: that is, the greater prevalence of chromaticism and, especially, the use of whole-tone harmonies. Indeed, whole-tone chords probably were the model for other divisions of the twelve tones of the chromatic scale into two mutually exclusive collections.

Whole-tone chords were, in a manner of speaking, a fifth column with the tonal system. In the ascending melodic minor scale, from steps 3 to 7, there already existed a substantial segment of the whole-tone collection; when a Phrygian 2 was used, a complete whole-tone collection resulted, covering the augmented 6th from b2 to 7. Because the tonic was the only tone foreign to this collection, and because the leading tone was included in it, the whole-tone chord took on the function of the dominant. One of the earliest examples of whole-tone music that results from such a melodic use of b2 with an ascending melodic minor scale is the chorus of vagabonds in the final “forest” scene of act 4 of Boris Godunov, “Gaydá! Raskhodílas, razgulyálas / Udal’ molodyétska” (rehearsal numbers 29–51).13 A canonic development of the melody at number 47 commences a dominant pedal point that lasts till two bars before number 50. In the course of the pedal point, a whole-tone chord, arising from the canonic counterpoint, is substituted for the dominant chord.

Another early example that is at least susceptible to an interpretation that invokes whole-tone chords is the much-discussed Prelude to Tristan und Isolde. If we hear the g#1 of bar 2 as an incomplete neighbor of the a1 to which it moves (rather than as an anticipation of the V chord at the end of the phrase), then bars 2 and 3 can be heard as a juxtaposition of the two whole-tone collections—at least momentarily—until the resolution of a1 to b1.14

---

14. While Wagner surely meant the chromatic line from g#1 to b1 to be taken as a 3rd progression (given the slur), the change of harmony that William J. Mitchell hears from I to #VII at the beginning of bar 2 is
In the Mussorgsky example, the whole-tone chord is introduced as a mediator between $b\text{II}$ and $V$ (i.e., between two major triads a tritone apart).\(^{15}\) In the Wagner, the whole-tone chord acts like a French 6th chord; such chords have some of the qualities of both $b\text{II}$ and $V$ (or $b\text{VI}$ and $V$ of $V$ in the Wagner example).\(^{16}\)

However readily whole-tone chords are integrated with triads in functional terms, they can consist of up to six different tones; resolving them to triads might have created a problem of consistency as the number of voices in the harmonic texture, except that at the same time whole-tone chords were being introduced, triads were gaining an accretion of “added tones.”

In music history there seems to be at work a force that causes relationships that arise contrapuntally to become solidified as vertical entities; the 7th chord is a well-known example. Originally the result of passing motion or suspension, it gradually became a semistable chord. The augmented 6th chord, too, arose contrapuntally. In the nineteenth century neighbor tones began to be sounded simultaneously with their resolutions (the way having been paved, aurally, by inversions of the 7th chord). Among the results were the so-called “added-2nd” (not to be confused with a 9th chord) and “added-6th” chords. The added 6th in Debussy’s *Prélude à questionnable*: see “The Tristan Prelude: Techniques and Structure,” *The Music Forum*, 1, 174ff. We can hear $f^1$ in bar 1 as a displacement of E because E is a consonant tone in the tonic triad, but to insist as Mitchell does on $d^1$ as a displacement of $D\flat$, which is a dissonance both in $b\text{VII}^7$ and $V^7$, does violence to what is heard. The $d^1$ is not a respelled $E\natural$; it displaces an $e^1$, which is elided in bar 3. But there is no E in a $b\text{VII}$ chord in A minor. Therefore the $d^1$ must be heard *temporarily* in its own right as a chord tone of an embellishing chord that is not conveniently describable by roman numerals, but which functions somewhat like a French 6th chord (see Liszt’s use of whole-tone embellishing chords in the song “Ich Scheide”). Hearing the $D\flat$ as a chord tone briefly opens up the possibility of the chord being interpreted, however mistakenly, as whole-tone.

15. A more subtly composed version of the idea occurs in the Brahms Intermezzo, op. 117, no. 2, where there is a whole-tone passage in bars 65–67. The diminished 4th from $\flat$ down to $\natural$ in minor is reinterpreted here as a major 3rd. This leads to a “mistaken” $b\text{II}^7$ chord, which is then “corrected” to $V^7$ in bar 69.

16. Another example in which a complete whole-tone collection is used as a French 6th chord will be found three bars before rehearsal number 19 in the second movement of Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1911; 1952), piano-vocal score (new arrangement by Erwin Stein, 1942), 32.
l’après-midi d’un faune, which never quite resolves (because of its motivic significance), is an example of an added tone acting as if it were a full-fledged chord tone. The added 6th and 2nd in the last movement of Mahler’s Das Lied von der Erde also never resolve. (The identity of the upper 4th, e\textsuperscript{1}–a\textsuperscript{1}, of the final chord with the initial motto of the first movement suggests that with the use of added tones, relative major and minor grew less distinct from one another: they had always shared the same “pitch-class collection,” but the roles of the members of the collection, because defined by different tonics, had differed. As the pitch-class collection, as a collection, gained compositional significance, the roles of the members grew more fluid. This will be seen in the case of The Fourth of July, as well.)

To return to the problem of integrating whole-tone chords with other harmonic materials, in Debussy’s Voiles, the whole-tone collection of the beginning moves in the middle section to a pentatonic collection—also called a “black-note” cluster (in reference to the black keys of a piano)—which allows the composer to maintain the higher number of chord tones with greater consistency.

Clusters can have a striking effect when used sparingly. Two examples are Ives’s Piano Sonata No. 2 (“Concord, Mass., 1840–1860”) in the “Hawthorne” movement, and Alban Berg’s Lulu, where clusters characterize the acrobat. Because so distinctive in sound, clusters are of limited expressive value, but the pitches can be rearranged to form other chords that are more generally useful.

Black-note and white-note clusters divide the twelve tones into two mutually exclusive groups of five and seven tones, respectively, both roughly approximating the hexachord of tonal music (see ex.4). [comment, 2014: A feature of the music that I neglected in the original article (as I recall, it seemed to add too much complication to an already fairly complex picture) was the presence of collections of more than six tones, especially the septachord 013568T, which initially results from the combination of the pedal C and the F–g\textsubscript{b} hexachord in the first section. In the second section, however, it contributes a distinctive sound that seems to me characteristic of The Fourth, and which I believe to be based on the presence of the two semitones in the subset 0156. I have labeled this subset in several places on the graph (ex.2a, 2b).] As was noted, hexachordal clusters can be rearranged as chords in 4ths. One of the clichés of twentieth-century music, stemming from Schoenberg’s Kammersymphonie, op. 9, in which chords in 4ths are built up note by note, seems to rely on an effect inherited from older music. Steps 1 to 6 of the major
scale had often been used harmonically in a series of dominant–tonic relationships, III→VI→
II→V→I(→IV), by analogy with the primal bass arpeggiation, V→I. Schoenberg thus links his
4th chords to tradition by invoking this arpeggiation.

Aside from its use of 4th chords, the Kammersymphonie parallels *The Fourth of July* in the
role played by whole-tone chords. Their original embellishing function has evolved into one of
“modulating” between clusters or chords derived from them (see ex.5). Interestingly enough,
considering the evolution of the use of whole-tone chords, the Kammersymphonie also
prominently features the Phrygian harmonic relationship. Example 6 is an analysis of the first
twenty bars of the work. The whole-tone chord in bars 6–7 modulates between collections a
tritone apart (recall whole-tone mediation between triads a tritone apart, e.g., bII and V). The first
collection is a six-note 4th chord (d−e♭, b.4–6); the second, the diatonic collection of E major. (A
similar use of whole-tone chords pervades *The Fourth*.) The whole-tone chord of bars 9–10
serves as an embellishing chord analogous to the common-tone diminished 7th chord of
traditional tonal music. (Again, a similar usage will be seen in the Ives piece.)

Besides rearranging clusters as 4th and 5th chords, in *The Fourth of July* Ives uses six-note
clusters in the form of a triad with the triad of its upper neighbors superposed. His friend
Cornelius Griggs admired similar chords in another piece, saying they had “something of the
Puritan character to them”17 (see ex.7). These “Puritan” chords serve as “inversions” of the more
structural 4th and 5th chords. Just as a tonal composer might use V7→I6 to combine melodic
closure with a lack of harmonic closure, in an analogous way, the Puritan chords represent the
structural 4th chords but imply further movement. They are in effect composed-out fermatas that
express a tense stasis which precedes contrapuntal motion.

Over the division of the twelve tones into two hexachords, Ives superimposes a more
traditional interpretation of the material, as can be seen in examples 1c and 1d. The notes of the
F–g♭ chord are the reordered hexachord, scale degrees 1 through 6, of D♭ major; its relative
minor is B♭, which, it will become clear from the climactic quotation of “The Red, White and
Blue” (“Columbia, the gem of the ocean”), letters S–X, is the tonic of the piece. Tonally, the
analysis interprets the piece in B♭ major-minor, with the F in the bass at the opening as the
dominant. (A commonplace about Ives, first noted by the Cowells in their biography, is that he

often starts with development.\textsuperscript{18} Given that, it makes sense that he starts with the dominant, since tonal composers often treated the development as a prolongation of the dominant. Moreover, nontonic beginnings of pieces were not at all uncommon in tonal music: to cite works by two of Ives’s favorite composers, Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony and the Brahms Rhapsodie, op. 79, no. 2.)

Thus we have two harmonic criteria operating in the piece: the division of the chromatic scale into two mutually exclusive six-note chords and the superimposition of a more traditional bass structure, \( V \rightarrow I \); in fact, with the F in the bass, the \( F-\text{fb} \) chord is treated as a kind of \( V^{7/9} \). When the \( B_b \) arrives in the bass at the end, the same chord is reinterpreted as \( I \). That the same constituent tones are used for both the dominant and the tonic should not be surprising, since, as Schenker points out, the V can exist a harmonic scale-step \( [\text{Stufe}] \) with tones other than those of its triad.\textsuperscript{19} (For example, in Beethoven’s Piano Sonata, op. 110, in bars 114–115 of the last movement, \( I^5 \) substitutes for \( V \).) Ives exploits the fact that the complement (\( C-b \)) has the 5th of \( F \) in the bass to prolong the \( V \) by a traditional bass arpeggiation, treating the complement somewhat like \( V \) of \( V \) (see examples 1d and 1e).

The juxtaposition of mutually exclusive hexachords has linear consequences that Ives also interprets in a more traditional way. As my example 8 shows, every pitch in the hexachords (except for the outer notes, \( F, G_b, C, \) and \( B \)) has two semitone neighbors in the other chord. Consequently, in \textit{The Fourth} important tones are decorated by semitone double neighbors—even some of those excepted above, because Ives judges importance tonally. Thus, both \( F \) and \( C \) receive double-neighbor elaboration that they ought not to have if the piece were merely based on the logical consequences of dividing the chromatic into two hexachords, because they also function tonally as \( V \) and \( V \) of \( V \), respectively. The main upper-voice tone, \( D (\tilde{3} \text{ over } B_b) \), also gets double neighbors, as does \( B_b \) in the bass. Note that although the \( D \) doesn’t arrive as a structural upper-voice tone until the climactic quotation of “The Red, White and Blue” at letter \( S \), it is already hinted at in bar 3 and again at bar 12, in the flute (the first nonstring timbre heard


\textsuperscript{19} Heinrich Schenker, \textit{Harmony}, ed. and annotated by Oswald Jonas, trans. by Elisabeth Mann Borgese (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), 141ff, and especially example 117 (p.151).
in the piece),\textsuperscript{20} surrounded by its double neighbors, $c^\#_1$ and $d^\#_1$. A typically Ivesian quirk, which tends to confirm the overall reading presented here, is that two violins sustain these neighbors of $d^1$, in the same register, $pppp$, \textit{con sord.}, all the way to letter $Q$—that is, until the arrival of $B_b$ in the bass as $I$; at that point they resolve to $D$ above the $B_b$—first, as part of an embellishing whole-tone chord, and then, as the 3rd of $B_b$ major proper. Of course this is inaudible most of the time, but it is a good example of the influence of Transcendentalism on Ives: it is something not directly perceptible, yet it confers meaning in an ideal, or even spiritual, sense.

Another linear consequence that Ives achieves by expressing one hexachord in 4ths and the other in 5ths is the melodic interval of a 4th separating the highest notes of the chords, $G_b(F\#)$ and $B$ (see ex.3). The interval of a 4th also figures prominently in the tune of “The Red, White and Blue” (see ex.9),\textsuperscript{21} and it is not unreasonable to suspect Ives of punning on the 4th of July.

There are two additional pieces of evidence in the work that Ives’s use of pitch was not arbitrary: first, in his quotation of one of his own songs, “Old Home Day,” in bars 44–53.\textsuperscript{22} The climax of the song’s introduction (not quoted in \textit{The Fourth}), in its sixth measure, is reached on an e–f 4th chord, and the tune that follows is in D minor (see ex.10). In \textit{The Fourth} the tune

20. $d^1$ in the flutes (b.122) is also the last woodwind timbre heard.

21. The following notes apply to example 9: (1) Ives introduces a parallelism (to $f^2$–$\phi^2$–$d^2$, b.1–2), $b_b1$–$a^1$–$g^1$, in bars 2–3. He can do this because he hears that the connection between $F$ and $G$ in the ascending 3rd $f^1$–$g^1$–$a^1$ (inner voice, b.1–4) is clear enough without repeating the $F$. The descent to $G$ also provides a link between $f^2$–$\phi^2$–$d^2$ and $c^2$–$b_b1$–$a^1$ (b.3–4), thus underlining the similarity between the ascending 3rds $b_b1$–$c^2$–$d^2$ (b.1–2) and $f^1$–$g^1$–$a^1$ (b.1–4). (2) Ives doesn’t use the Chorus, with its reiterations of the $\hat{3}$ (b.18 and 20); instead, he modifies bar 15 to emphasize $D$. (The passage was originally identical to bar 23.) His modification of the upbeat to bar 13 implies a continuation of the overreaching pattern of bars 9–12, again for the purpose of emphasizing $D$. David Shaw, the composer of the tune, probably heard it as shown in example 9b, i.e., as a descent from $\hat{5}$, with a large-scale repetition of the opening motive; Ives’s changes and his omitting the Chorus make it most likely that he heard a descent from $\hat{3}$, with $F$ as a cover-tone—just as it is in \textit{The Fourth}. (The same variants in the tune are heard in his Symphony No. 2.)

22. Number 52 in \textit{114 Songs} (reprint; [published jointly, for the National Institute of Arts and Letters, by New York: Associated Music Publishers and Peer International, and Bryn Mawr, PA: Theodore Presser, 1975]), 115–18. This song quotes the “Battle Hymn of the Republic,” and is thus the source of the references to it in \textit{The Fourth}. 
appears in A minor, in association with the C–b 5th chord (identical in pitch content with a b–c 4th chord). In other words, both the tune and the chord are transposed up a 5th, hardly necessary if transposition level were unimportant for Ives. Second, there is the evidence of an unusual (for Ives) use of substantially identical material twice in the same piece: bars 86–98 of The Fourth correspond very closely to bars 23–31—though extended and elaborated—transposed up a 5th. Why bother unless the pitches have functional significance? [comment, 2014: Beyond its formal role the repetition of the passage has programmatic ramifications. The “build-up” in bars 23–31 seems to peter out (although after a few more measures the first take-off erupts—a surprise nicely enhanced by what precedes it). When it starts up again it has gained in intensity by being thwarted before—the memory of the first passage contributes to the vividness with which the listener shares the child’s experience of the waves of holiday excitement (and boredom).]

Before discussing the graph of the middleground (ex.2a, 2b), several of its idiosyncratic features should be explained. The term unfolding should be taken in a somewhat looser sense that in conventional Schenkerian usage. Because of the dissonant nature of the harmonic materials (clusters) and the double harmonic criteria (tonal and nontonal), it is not always possible to determine the precise function of every note. It is, however, usually clear in a general way which harmony is being composed out. I mean to say that in effect, the middleground is clearer than the foreground; that this is middleground music (like much Impressionism) with very little foreground harmonic movement—perhaps of necessity, given such dissonant harmonies and such rhythmic and motivic complexity in the foreground. The use of the word unfolding here asserts that one can still sense the extension in time of a given group of tones that do not necessarily sound simultaneously. A complicating factor, also related to Ives’s Impressionist tendencies, is the blurring of harmonic lines: tones are suspended and anticipated—yet, while blurred, the borders between areas governed by different harmonies are not rendered invisible. [comment, 2014: The somewhat awkward visual metaphor is not quite so bad if one keeps in mind that musical Impressionism is so called by way of a metaphorical resemblance to Impressionist painting.]

A name of a tune between the staves of the graph refers to the governing tune of the section; that is, the tune most fully exploited and provides most of the motivic material. A tune cited along a beam refers to a significant quotation—sometimes on a large scale. (Such large-scale
references to the popular songs Ives quotes in the foreground have not been noted previously and, indeed, are among the most speculative aspects of this analysis.

The notes in the graph (ex.2) are shown in their actual register for the most part. Where linear connections are of overriding importance, register has sometimes been ignored, however: for example, at letter Z\textsuperscript{2}, bars 121–122, the outer voices are correctly placed, but the inner voices are somewhat scrambled. Important departures from accurate registral representation are noted in the body of the discussion.

The obligatory register of the descent is e\textsubscript{b}²–d\textsuperscript{2}–c\textsuperscript{2}–b\textsubscript{b}¹, but as in any large work, there is duplication in several registers. The octave above the obligatory register is used for the delineation of long-range connections; the structural 3 first appears as d\textsuperscript{1} (cf. ex.1c, 1d); appears in hiding, as it were—because it is “midnight” when the boy’s “festivities” begin?

The designation F–g\textsubscript{b} should be familiar by now; in short, it refers to a six-note diatonic cluster, which, when rearranged in 4ths, runs upward from F to G\textsubscript{b}.

Spelling of pitches has been changed where necessary to clarify vertical relationships—usually Ives’s sharps have been changed to flats. His extraordinary sensitivity to subtle distinctions between enharmonic tones is not mocked by this\textsuperscript{23}; yet, G\textsubscript{b} and F\# (for example) can be said to be functionally fairly equivalent in the piece—especially in chords.

We take up the discussion of the graphs with example 1d (ex.1a, 1b, and 1c have been described as showing the elaboration of the original cluster and the superimposition of a tonal interpretation; they are otherwise self-explanatory). In example 1d we reach the stage where structural elaboration begins to articulate the form of the piece, in this case into three parts. Given a tonal interpretation, the F in the bass gains a major triad. First heard in the lower strings in bar 1, this triad unfolds in the bass during the first two sections, the underlying motion to B\textsubscript{b} being completed only in the third.

The weight C receives in the piece—it is a pedal through most of the first section and the lowest tone in the brass at the culmination of the last take-off—can be explained in two ways: First, C functions as the root of the complementary hexachord, C–b. In the context of mutually exclusive collections it is thus analogous to a tonal dominant (though in terms of the tonal

\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Kirkpatrick, 189ff.
criteria at work in the piece it functions more like V of V, as was mentioned). Second, its resolution to B♭ in the bass (see ex. 1d, 1e) can be seen as fulfilling in the background what is not a very fulfilled upper-voice descent in the foreground—the last take-off interrupts the descent even as much as it fulfills it; for that reason, the main graph, example 2b, shows 3 – 2 – (1) over the descent. (The B♭, 1, is present on the downbeat of bar 114 (W + 1) in the flutes, oboes, clarinets bassoons, first and second horns, trumpets, trombones, tuba, first cellos, and basses—but the forward drive of the music into the final take-off dissipates most of the cadential effect.)

In the upper voice the first section is a prolongation of G♭ as a neighbor to the F in the bass; the second section presents its linear resolution to a superposed F. But the main event of the second section is the emergence from an inner voice of the structural neighbor tone E♭, the 7th of the V♭7 chord. In example 1e the fundamental roles of F and G♭ are clear, for they are restored in superposition as the main voice moves from E♭ to the structural tone, D(3) (b.80 and 99–100). Recall that F serves a similar function, as a cover-tone, in the tune of “The Red, White and Blue,” analyzed in example 9.

The last feature of example 1d to note is that the C of the C–♭ hexachord, the main harmony of the second section, supports E, the lower neighbor of the superposed F—the F arrives with the A, the unfolded 3rd of the dominant triad, in the bass. Playing the outer voices of this example will reveal just how traditional the contrapuntal underpinning of the piece is.

In example 1e the main elaborations of the background are fully laid out. The first section introduces the complementary hexachord—which will articulate the middle section as V of V—functioning in the same way but more locally (with C supporting a lower neighbor E, just as it does later). The first take-off also involves E as a lower neighbor of F, but it is supported by a chord, D♭–♭, parallel to the one supporting the upper neighbor, G♭ (♭–♭), probably to emphasize the upper-voice tones’ common function as neighbors.

In the second section example 1e shows only two new elements: first, the introduction of upper and lower neighbors to the C in the bass (which actually arrives as an inner voice over the bass A, having been displaced by these neighbors); second, the anticipation—if that is what it is—of the D in the upper voice. One can imagine a similar situation in the foreground, where it would be equally possible to consider the D an anticipation or a lower neighbor (see ex.11). Here the determination is even more academic.
The third section of the example shows the previously mentioned restoration of the superposed F in the highest voice. Note that E is once again supported by C, although E is now a passing tone. (The linear role of C, its resolution to B♭, has been discussed.)

Turning to example 2, we see that the piece opens with the effect of so-called “bitonality”: a sustained F major chord that supports a distorted quotation of “The Red, White and Blue” in D♭. (In the score it is notated in C♯; in the graphs flats are used to bring out the identity of the opening measures with the F–♭G♯ collection.) But this is not simple bitonality: it is the announcement of the twin harmonic criteria of the piece, and in particular, the double role of F in the bass: that is, as lowest member of the F–♭G♯ chord in 4ths and as V in B♭ major-minor. An imaginary ideal listener, following all structural subtleties as they unfold, would not know at this point that the notes of the hexachord of D♭ major make up a harmonic entity; by the occurrence of the 4ths in bar 8, however—or surely by bar 12, when they recur—this listener would have realized the identity of the opening with the F–♭G♯ chord: bar 12 sounds like a full cadence, after the I–V effect of F–♭G♯ moving to C–♭. The whole-tone chords in bars 9 and 11 mediate between the tonic and its complement. Note that the choice of whole-tone chord is consistently based on the lowest note of the hexachord not governing the section: that is, in the first section (where F–♭G♯ governs) the whole-tone chords contain C; in the second section (where C–♭ governs) they contain F; and in the third section (F–♭G♯) they contain C again.

One can hear a connection between the b1 in bar 2 and the B1 in the bass, bar 4. The heavy stress on E in the bass in bars 6 and 7 also helps create a link with the e2 in the second measure, as each follows an F♯. This exemplifies the blurring of chord changes by suspension and anticipation characteristic of the piece (and of Ives’s music in general). In the F♯–E motive of these measures we get perhaps an inkling of the double-neighbor motion G♭–E in the background.

The notes f♯2–e2 in bar 2, besides constituting a two-note motive, are part of a three-note descent, g♯2–f♯2–e2, which not only prefigures the main melodic descent of the piece, D–C–B♭,

24. The e♯2 in the tune (b.2) doesn’t make its key D♭(C♯) minor. Rather, the lowered 3 is the first distortion of the tune (a half-step off). The next note, b♭1 is even more off (a whole step away from the right note); by the g1 the tune has been lost. In the local counterpoint e♯2 is heard as a displacement of the d♯(e♭)2 in bar 1.
transposed by a tritone, but is—in the same register—a foreshadowing of the main descent of the second section (b.50–52).

The transposition of the motive relies on the transpositional

25. It will be objected that the $g\sharp^2 – f\sharp^2 – c^2$ is $\hat{5} – \hat{4} – \hat{3}$ here and $\hat{3} – \hat{2} – \hat{1}$ later, but in this case pitch identity is more important than definition of the motive by harmonic context. The following historical explanation is suggested: As the framework of the diatonic scale lost some of its definition through increasing chromaticism, the motive, which derived its meaning from diatonic context, receded in importance to be supplanted by sets of identical pitches. Thus, where in earlier music $\hat{5} – \hat{6} – \hat{5}$ could be transposed to different scale degrees and maintain its motivic identity, in a more chromatic context a specific set of pitches (G–A–G, for example) became more useful as a constant. This was concomitant with the increased length of prolongations in later music: if only seeming changes of harmony take place within a contrapuntal prolongation of a single harmony, it makes sense for the motive to remain untransposed—that is, to maintain its relation to the background harmonic context rather than follow foreground contexts that result from contrapuntal motion. This represented a shift of emphasis rather than the replacement of one procedure by another. Certainly older music had maintained pitch identity, especially in the background: in any number of sonata movements in minor the $\hat{5}$ over I becomes $\hat{3}$ over III. With increased foreground complexity perhaps this began to apply to finer detail in the interest of clarity.

The first movement of Beethoven’s Third Symphony provides a number of examples of the retention of specific pitches in foreground motives despite local change of harmony. I will mention two.

The double-neighbor motive (bracketed in ex.A) that begins the transition to the second theme (b.45ff) of course recurs transposed up a 4th in the recapitulation (b.448ff); but note in the example that the motive also occurs untransposed (in slightly longer values) earlier in the recapitulation (b.404–408).

The ultimate source of that double-neighbor motive is the descending diminished 3rd $\phi – d – c\#$ (b.6–7). This motive is itself retained untransposed in a most unusual context: In the development section there occurs a “new theme” (b.284ff)—actually a somewhat elaborated version of the “horn call” motto of the opening (noted by Schenker in Das Meisterwerk in der Musik, Jahrbuch III [Munich: Drei Masken, 1930; reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1974], 50). Despite the fact that the new theme is in E minor, the motive of the descending diminished 3rd occurs with the same pitches (now spelled $d\flat^1 – d\flat^1 – c\sharp^1$), as example B shows. Of course the meaning of the pitches is entirely altered by the context, but there can be little doubt about the connection with the opening measure—why the $D\flat$, otherwise? Note also that when the new theme recurs at bar 322, transposed to Eb minor, the “invariant subset” (in Allen Forte’s term) is again $\phi(d\#)^1 – d^1 – d\flat(c\#)^1$. (See Forte, The Structure of Atonal Music, 29ff.)
relationship between the collections: each pitch in the C–b hexachord is a tritone away from a pitch in F–g♭.)

Note also the first appearance of the double neighbors of C, C♯ and B, in bars 4–7 in the bass. The compositional attention paid to d₁ and its semitone neighbors has already been mentioned, but note in addition that D is the last tone of the chromatic scale to be sounded. In bars 86–98 it will be singled out again in the same way (see ex.2b).

Bars 12–40 present the large-scale double-neighbor motion about F in the upper voice, G♭(F♯)–E, supported by parallel chords, F–g♭ and D♯–e, prolonged by the replacement of the downward diminished 3rd by an upward augmented 6th, which is in turn subdivided G♭–B♭–D–E. This is clarified registrally (and instrumentally by the use of the piccolo), for the initial tone is first transferred up an octave to g♭(F♯)³ before the upward movement commences from the original register. The prolongation can be thought of as a reference to the tune of the “Battle Hymn of the Republic” (at the words “Glory Hallelujah!”—see ex.12). To what extent this has meaning in performance is moot, certainly, but given the transparency with which the middleground shows in the piece, and given the unity of the upward gesture, perhaps the reference is audible in some subliminal way—especially since it is supported by parallel chords. Besides, as example 12 shows, the shape of the tune is well matched to the structural function of the gesture: culminating on the lower neighbor note, E, for the first take-off (on the upbeat); subsiding to F in the bass to round off the first section (on the downbeat); then ending on the transitional whole tone chord over C♯ (corresponding to the unaccented final syllable of the word “Hallelujah”).

Near the beginning of the prolongation (b.16) a Puritan chord (equivalent to C–b), with its static quality, creates an expectation of motion and thus acts a signal that motion is about to begin.

The C♯–d chord (b.26–32), one of the parallel chords supporting the large upward gesture, doesn’t actually occur registrally as depicted in example 12. As example 13 shows, the notes of the chord are squeezed into the space c♯₂–d³; below this register they are doubled, and neighbors suspended from the preceding A–b♭ chord embellish them. But these neighbors also from part of a whole-tone collections with the g♯ in the cellos; this sound underlies the whole prolongation (b.12–42), giving the music a transitional feeling. It thus helps to make clear the long-range connection between the F–g♭ and D♯–e chords, the origin and goal of the prolongation,
respectively. Note that $G\#(A\flat)$ is a tone common to the two chords—there will be more on the role of this pitch class below.

Before we leave the first section several other details ought to be mentioned. In bars 17–18 the motive $C–B–G\#$ is introduced as an extension of the hesitant $F\#–E$ motive in the bass, bars 5–7. When the tempo picks up at letter E (after a short reference to “The Battle Cry of Freedom”) the motive becomes part of an ostinato in the cellos and bassoons, along with the alternation of $f\#^2–e^2$ in the violins. $C–B–G\#$ is a diatonic inversion (which preserves the dyad $B–C$) of the motive $B–C–E$, which figures prominently in the second section as part of the tune “Old Home Day” (b.44ff); that both motives outline 4ths is noteworthy as well. (We hear $C–B–G\#$ as a diminished 4th because of the B.)

There is an instance of Ives’s “experimental” proclivities that shows up in the graph just before the first take-off (b.37–39). At this juncture, as if to signal the culmination of the large gesture, he combines a reference to the opening notes of “The Red, White and Blue” (corresponding to the words “Columbia, the gem of . . .”) with, in diminution, the closing notes of its verse and the opening notes of its Chorus—this by way of transferring $e^2$ up an octave while outlining a 4th, $d\#–g\#$, in the bass. But note that the chords supporting the quotation are composed successively of 4ths, 5ths, minor 7ths, and major 7ths.

One additional compositionally fruitful aspect of the first section is the tension between $A\flat$ and $A\flat(G\#)$. It is part of the very first sound we hear in the composition (between the violas and the violins); it is inherent linearly in the juxtaposition of the $F–g\flat$ and $C–b$ chords (see ex.14), as are $E\flat–D$ (i.e., the structural neighbor and head-tone of the upper voice) and $G\flat(F\#)–E$ (double neighbors of the superposed bass tone, F). In the hypothesized reference to the “Battle Hymn” in the middleground the A in bar 25 is a “mistake” (for $A\flat$) that might be heard as “corrected” by the reiterated $G\#$ (in the cellos and bassoons), which accompanies the $C\#$ in bars 26–32.

The tension between $A$ and $A\flat(G\#)$ continues to be linear in the second section. This is especially interesting when one considers that the harmony of the section is the $C–b$ chord, the tritone transposition, as noted, of the tonic $F–g\flat$ chord— for in this transposed context $A–G\#$ is identical to $E\flat–D$ (structural N4–3) in the context of the tonic. It is little surprise therefore that

26. The “trick” is in effect a Schenkerian analysis of the tune that reveals a hidden motivic repetition in the middleground.
although the section is in something like A minor (see b.50–52, especially), A–G♯ is treated like N4–3. This works well in tandem with the structural importance of E as lower neighbor to F, supporting its predominance as a local melodic goal, and allowing it to be treated as 1 melodically even though it is heard as 5 (or 3) harmonically. (This, in contrast to the opening, we might more appropriately consider to be true bitonality.)

The second section opens with a transitional whole-tone harmony (b.42–44) in which the g♯(f♯)² has moved to g♯² as an incomplete neighbor (echappée) before proceeding to e² in the succeeding measure (summarizing the large-scale double-neighbor motion just completed). The incomplete neighbor motion is taken up in an inner voice, f♯–g, bars 45–46, continuing until the two tones merge in the Puritan chord in bar 48, which, though the result of suspension (see ex.2b) and not a functional harmony, once again signals the breaking loose of the contrapuntal motion after a stasis (as another Puritan chord did before the “Battle Hymn” prolongation). The motion combines a conventional bass progression in A minor with a descent, N–3–2–1, in E major. As discussed before, bars 45–52 are taken, more or less verbatim, from Ives’s song “Old Home Day” with only a little orchestral elaboration. (The “wrong notes” in the strings in bars 51–52 are programmatic, not functional, yet they involve cross-relation of dyads with structural significance, F♯[G♭]–F♯ and D♯[E♭]–D♯.)

In bars 52–61 in the upper voice we again have a prolonging motion upward; this time the motion accomplishes the resolution of the large-scale lower neighbor, E, to the superposed bass tone, F. Example 2a shows how register is used to clarify this large motion, with g♯³ (b.15–18), having moved to e³ (b.33–39), now completing the motion to f³ (b.61). (The background shown in example 1d is thus presented in the foreground, marked by an isolated register.) The arpeggiation through a 9th, E–A♭–D♭–E♭–F and then on to an inner-voice D♭, consists of what could be taken to be another long-range reference to the “Battle Hymn”—actually two references, one “nested” in diminution within the other (see ex.15); recall the use of diminution leading to the e³ at the end of the first section, bars 37–39. The nested quotation here is also a last reminder of the double neighbors of F in that it runs from G♭ up to E♭, the augmented 6th resolving to the F in octaves. Compare the similar resolution, in the obligatory register, in bars 86–98, shown in example 2b, where the octave F’s are the inner voice and its superposition as a cover-tone in the tune of “The Red, White and Blue.” [comment, 2014: I showed the large-scale quotation quite differently in the original version of this article and was with some justice
criticized for “plucking notes” by an expert (see J. Peter Burkholder, *All Made of Tunes: Charles Ives and the Uses of Musical Borrowing* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995], n.27, p.496). I now believe that my perception of the middleground quotation of the “Battle Hymn of the Republic” was, however, correct but that I failed to understand its workings and therefore misrepresented the passage in my analysis. (Burkholder’s stated reason for rejecting my reading—that the motive occurs in “several instruments amid changing figuration”—is specious: changes in the figuration reflect the contour of the tune.) There are two features that I think help to make the large-scale quotation audible: the sequence of alternating 4th and 5th chords (see ex.2b, b.55–57) and a kind “reaching over” in the upper voice in which the $\text{Ab}^2$ and $\text{Db}^3$ of the quoted tune are approached from above by chromatically filled major 3rds (see ex.15). This may be hard to hear at first because the 3rd motions overlap, but the harmonic sequence helps.

The general motion of the bass in the middle section is clear—from c to A (b.60) and then to F (b.76–77)—but the details are more difficult to determine. The bass C in bar 52 seems locally to be the resolution of its neighbor, C#: it comes at a cadence, for one thing (though the local tonic is in first inversion and ambiguous, in any case). The C# had been marked as unstable by a whole-tone chord (b.42–44), but now the return to C½ is itself destabilized both by a hint of a whole-tone sonority (the outer voices C and E are joined by a Bb in the clarinet) and an elision (the new phrase in the horns overlaps with the end of the melodic extension of the quotation of the “Battle Hymn,” which is quoted in “Old Home Day,” bar 53). So C is in a larger context better considered a passing tone, as frequently happens with the tone of resolution of a double-neighbor motion (for example, the cadential formula $2\rightarrow1\rightarrow7\rightarrow1$, where the first 1 passes between the upper and lower neighbors and the motion is completed only with the second 1). While it may be pedagogically sound to insist that a given pitch is “merely a passing tone” when teaching the principles of voice leading and analysis, music is often not that clear-cut; tones can sometimes have several meanings of varying degrees of importance. [comment, 2014: The value of a Schenkerian approach is obviously not being called into question here, and it is necessary for it, as a structural approach, to reduce ambiguity to as near to zero as possible. Music unfolds in time, however, and ambiguity is an inescapable element in the experience of a listener in the course of the “telling of the tale.” Any adequate critical practice ought to allow for both perspectives.]
The bass C passes to B and then to A (which in bar 56 is what Schenker called an “auxiliary I,” for it initiates a root progression that truly arrives on A only in bar 60). On the surface, E, as the dominant of A, appears to receive enough emphasis to be considered the main bass tone in these measures (it is their lowest note, for example). Closer examination of the passage—one in which Ives is deliberately “muddying the waters” with rhythmic displacements—reveals, however, that while the motion in whole steps from F♯ down to B♭ and G♯ has a dominant function in its entirety, the dominant itself, E, within it is a passing tone. Example 15.1 shows several pairs of concurrent whole-tone and chromatic interval cycles characteristic of the voice leading in the middle section. One pair of cycles in the trombones converges on octave F♯’s (third eighth of b.58); from that point on the octaves remain as the line passes over E to D and on down in whole steps to G#. [comment, 2014: Perhaps coincidentally, the motion of F♯, over E as a “mere passing tone,” to D occurs just as the large double-neighbor motion, G♭(F♯)–E, in the upper voice is about to resolve. Or does it show the kind of easy mastery of the “life of tones” that we glimpse in the work of great composers?]

The linear tension between A♮ and A♭(G♯) is restored at this point (b.60) to its original vertical form, connecting the passage with the beginning, as the trombone’s quotation of “Columbia, the gem of the ocean!” in the key of D♭ (b.62–63), as in bars 1–2, confirms. Another possible connection with the opening of the piece here is the resemblance between, on one hand, the bass motion from F♯ (the root of the G♭–f embellishing 5th chord, b. 61–62) to B (the whole-tone chord, b.63–65) and then to C (b. 66–69) and, on the other, the repeated F♯–B’s in the bass solo, bars 4–7, that move on to C in bar 8, the beginning of the long pedal on that pitch in the first section (see ex.2b, below the staff, b.61–69). These references back to the start of the piece clarify A’s role as the 3rd of F (cf. ex.1d, 1e). Recall that it is also at this point (b.56–61), where the relationship between A♮ and A♭ becomes vertical again, that the double-neighbor motion, G♭–E, which has thus far occupied most of the piece in the upper voice, finally resolves on F.

In the passage from bar 55 to bar 60 the C–b collection is presented in 4ths, B–c (note how “Reveille” in the horns and trumpets gives B–E and G–C—in effect a shorthand for the chord). The collection is presented in 4ths here, rather than in 5ths as before, because it is the governing harmony of the middle section; the F–g♭ collection is now therefore locally the complement, and when f♯ is reached (b.61), it is supported by that collection, but now in 5ths (G♭–f). In other
words, in a section governed by the complement, where the complement is the local tonic, the
tonic is presented locally as the complement.

Once the double-neighbor motion is resolved to \( f^3 \), the structural \( N3 \), \( E_b \), appears in various
registers, in the strings and clarinets (b.63–65; it is shown as \( \text{e}_b^3 \) in ex.2, but it appears in that
register only momentarily, in the first violins). Note the connection with bars 42–44 created by
the whole-tone sonority, which underlines the continued displacement of \( C \) by the double-
neighbor motion (the neighbors, \( C# \) and \( B \), are members of the same whole-tone collection) but
at the same time encourages the expectation that of the resolution is about to take place.

The long-delayed resolution is interrupted, however, by the arrival of a fife-and-drum corps
(b.66), which can be heard as the first movement back to the tonic \( F–g_b \) harmony for several
reasons: the \( F#'s \) in the piccolo’s middle register recall the first section (e.g., b.24); the tune
features the descending 3rd \( F#^3–e^3–d^3 \), echoing the transformation of the \( F#(G_b)–E \) neighbor
motion to passing motion in the bass of the previous measures as if to affirm that the structural
business of the section is finished; by being an interruption, it has inherited the expectancy
aroused by the whole-tone chords; despite the paucity of clearly functional pitches (the piano
part is almost pure percussion), \( F_b \) and \( C \) are the centers of the percussive clusters—akin to the
core pitches of bass and tenor drums—that accompany the \( F# \) in the tune (thus suggesting \( F–g_b \)).
In the next few bars, after another stasis via Puritan chords that leads into the second take-off, the
\( F–g_b \) collection is indeed restored as the governing harmony, confirming one’s expectation.
Other aspects of this passage also seem to summarize the completion of the double-neighbor
motion about \( F \): note the repeated motion \( E–F \) in the first and third violins at letter \( M \),
immediately before the second take-off. The bass, too, summarizes its own unfolding of the
dominant triad, \( C–B_b–A \) and then \( F \). As the graphs (ex.1e, 2a, 2b) show, \( A \) is the pitch being
prolonged here: the reference to “Old Home Day” in the horn, starting in bar 70, begins on \( C \)—
that is, a major 3rd lower than its main quotation (b.44ff)—and the bass has also moved down a
major 3rd, from \( C# \) (b.44) to \( A \) (b.73).

Once the double neighbors resolve to \( F \) in the upper voice, \( E_b \) emerges as the main upper
voice tone, and it will move to \( D \), the head-tone, \( \hat{3} \), of the climactic quotation of “The Red, White
and Blue.” Yet, as has been discussed, the \( d^3 \) in bars 70–73, is approached by a diatonic
reinterpretation of \( G_b–E \) as \( F#–E \), or \( 3–5 \) to the \( D \)’s \( \hat{1} \), much as the \( E \) prolonged through most of
the second section was approached \( g^#^2–f^#^2–e^2 \) in bars 51–52. (The piccolo’s solo built around the
F♯–D 3rd is prepared by a similar motion in the violins in bars 64–65.) The sense that the D comes from the F♯ over E♭ is thus undercut by the alternative 3rd from F♯, and indeed, the apparent linear 3rd F♯–D is not a feature of the background. The E♭ returns in the take-off supported by the F, which is restored to its essential role as a bass tone and root of the F–G♭ harmony. During the take-off the G♭ is the most prominent member of the harmony in the upper voice; as such it may appear to be a likely candidate for the tone from which the structural descent takes place. It would create a tonal space of a minor 6th that might be viewed as filled by a whole-tone descent, G♭–E–D–C–B♭; such a reading would be arguable based on the music. However, the role of the superposed F now becomes clearer: by raising the cover-tone 5 of the original tune to the status of an important element in the background of The Fourth Ives counteracts the weight of the division of the chromatic scale into mutually exclusive hexachords and allows the tonal interpretation of the materials to “hold its own,” as he himself might say, against this more radical alternative.

The quiet moment before the second take-off is the occasion for one of Ives’s most obscure jokes. Starting with the piccolo at letter M (b.74) and passing to the flute an octave lower, the oboe an octave below that, and finally to the bassoon yet another octave lower is the tune of “London Bridge is falling down.” Almost inaudible in performance, but a witty joke on the page, it might be related to the last vague evocation of “The Red, White and Blue” in bars 121–122 (see ex.17) where that tune is also spread across several registers.

The reading of the second take-off in the graphs may appear arbitrary. But, as he explained in Memos, Ives was very careful about the pitches in take-offs—particularly the “musical sense” of the individual parts. The following passage from that book reveals two sides of Ives’s personality, the practical musician:

It is not absolutely essential that these notes and rhythms be kept to literally. It would be very difficult to have it done this way.

and the defensive outsider who knows that most people view him as a crank:
[T]he worse these places sound to Rollo [his musical nemesis, who likes nothing but “pretty sounds”], the better it is.\textsuperscript{27}

Notice that Ives says it is “not absolutely essential—not that “it doesn’t matter in the least.” Moreover, his care with the pitches is quite evident, as can be seen in the trumpets and trombone parts (which, Ives says, “have the main outlines”). The brass clearly move within the F–g\textsubscript{b} collection and come to rest on it at the end of the take-off (just before b.77).

The graph of the third section is, of necessity, highly schematic (see ex.2b). What happens can be summarized as follows: The D is established as the main upper-voice tone over B\textsubscript{b}, initially as part of an embellishing whole-tone chord (b.80–82), then as the head-tone of the tune “The Red, White and Blue.” (b.99ff). In the intervening bars, 86–98, the D (as was mentioned previously) is the one tone of the twelve not given any prominence, either in the ostinato accompaniment (based on bars 26–32) or in the quotations of the first phrase of “The Red, White and Blue” in various keys.

Let me remind the reader that at letter Q the two violins, which have been quietly holding the neighbors of D, c\#\textsuperscript{1} and d\#\textsuperscript{1}, since letter A, finally resolve by joining the rest of the firsts to play a distorted quotation of “Yankee Doodle” that emphasizes D. Also at this point (Q + 2) the trombones, which have been stopping short of D in their quotation (in B\textsubscript{b}) of the first few notes of “The Red, White and Blue” (compare the basses in bars 4–7), finally reach it. Immediately, the three-measure snare drum roll begins, leading into the apotheosis of the tune at letter S.

It is incontrovirtible that despite programmatic wrong notes (“shanks mixed on cornets”)\textsuperscript{28} and a furious swirl of sound that almost engulfs it, “The Red, White and Blue” is heard in B\textsubscript{b} major. Ives is very careful to provide a straightforward conventional bass line supporting the tune all the way, in the basses, the tuba, and the contrabassoon and second bassoon.

The third take-off, while even more extravagant that the second, can also be heard to project the F–g\textsubscript{b} chord. As example 16 shows, the notes of the parallel chords quoting “The Star-Spangled Banner” (“Oh, say! Can you . . . see?”) in bars 114–116 establish F–g\textsubscript{b} as the

\textsuperscript{27} Kirkpatrick, 105f.
\textsuperscript{28} Ives’s postface (see pp.3–4, above).
prevailing harmony. These chords are then the basis of what the trombones and tuba play in the last take-off. Also note that the highest and lowest tones at the fermata before letter Z\(^2\) are \(g_{b}^{4}\) in the piccolo and \(B_{b}^{1}\) in the basses (discounting the \(D_{b}^{1}\) in the contrabassoon, which is undoubled in that register). The inner voices shown in example 2b are well doubled in the orchestra, particularly in the extreme registers. The brass have eleven tones.\(^{29}\)

Example 17 shows how the several members of the F–\(g_{b}\) chord resolve one by one to the complement in the sudden quiet that follows the end of the take-off. For the last two bars of the piece, they vacillate individually (\(E_{b}–D\), \(G_{b}–G_{b}\), \(F–E\), \(A_{b}–A_{b}\), \(D_{b}–C\); all dyads that have become quite familiar). The first two pairs are shown for convenience in the bass staff—at first, everything sounds two octaves higher than written; the last three pairs have downward stems connected by beams in the treble. The beam of the upward stems in the treble connects the notes of the complement, the C–b collection, but also reveals an oblique reference to the tune that sets the words “Hooray for the Red, White . . . ,” but the words “and Blue” are omitted (or perhaps sighed at the end, c\(^1\)–b); this may be justified because the expected notes, F\#–G, have already been sounded so conspicuously (see ex.2b, b.120–121) or perhaps simply by Ives’s wanting to end on a dying fall.\(^{30}\) The resemblance of the voice leading to bars 42–44, especially \(G_{b}–G_{b}\) in the upper voice, suggests a continuation, here cut short, an unrealized section again governed by the complementary harmony. Ives liked to consider his pieces segments of an infinite stream of music; here there is the additional programmatic significance that the boy of “It’s a boy’s ’4th’”\(^{31}\) can’t help but feel that the day is over too soon.

While it cannot be proved that Ives heard his own music tonally in some sense (however likely it may be, given his training), it is possible for us to hear it that way. And while possibilities are not

29. The missing tone is E. In Ives’s Second Symphony, which ends with another eleven-note chord (and also concludes with a “big tune” treatment of “The Red, White and Blue”), the missing tone is, as here, a tritone away from the tonic.

30. \textit{[new, 2014]} Or perhaps, after a rousing unison rendition of the first part of the phrase, the singer who has the tune has paused to take a sip of beer while the one who is good at putting on a barbershop-style harmony (D–C\#–C\#–B) has continued for a moment, till the realization has dawned that the harmony has been left high and dry.

31. Ives’s postface.
probabilities, especially in music, it seems eminently more probable than not that our impression that Ives is a great composer whose works make sense has some demonstrable basis in the music itself.

While my reading of the background can be argued with, I hope to have shown—in the middleground at least—that the music works coherently. Far from using pitches at random, far from constructing a mere hodgepodge of patriotic songs, instrumental effects, noise, and so on, Ives uses pitches and harmonies consistently. As in traditional tonal music, the pitches function with respect to one another in predetermined ways. Whether the explanation for their behavior in their several roles is purely contextual (which I am inclined to doubt) or relates to some evolving form of tonal organization yet to be mapped by music theory, I cannot say.

Music theory, in its role as “higher criticism,” has not kept pace with compositional developments since the turn of the century. Now we have reached a point where some composers would relieve their sense of neglect by writing in a simplistic mode that has no need of higher criticism to be appreciated. But it is probably not too late for music theory to commence covering the ground that has come to separate theory and practice.

Appendix, 2014–15

_Ives and Memory_

The following letter was sent to _The New York Review of Books_ in response to a fine article, “Ives Wins!” by the pianist Jeremy Denk, but not published:

_To the editors:_

I am deeply grateful that Jeremy Denk began his essay on Charles Ives [NYR, June 19] with the assertion that Ives’s “real impulse was affection [not “scorn,” as Stephen Budiansky writes in the book under review32]: a desperate affection for the past, and for the joys and

32. I have since read Budiansky’s book _Mad Music: Charles Ives, the Nostalgic Rebel_ [Lebanon, NH: ForeEdge (University Press of New England), 2014] and think Denk gave a somewhat distorted impression of the book’s stance in his review, which was more concerned with airing his own ideas about Ives (of interest, certainly) than with discussing the book. Indeed, Budiansky makes several of the same points I make in my letter.
possibilities of music-making.” Ives had strongly negative reactions to many things, some of which are in the music, but Denk gets to the heart of the matter with those words.

Here are some other thoughts provoked by the essay. The idea that Ives is overrated (which Denk rejects) was, first, a corrective to the ill-conceived valuing of his music for its supposed use of revolutionary techniques before anyone in Europe. This was neither true nor, even had it been, what was most important about his music. Second, I suspect that all four people giving voice to that idea (three in the typically trivial *New York Times* article and Elliott Carter everywhere else) were conveying the opinion of one person: Elliott Carter; it is noteworthy that they were all associated with Juilliard when Carter was. I have nothing to add to Denk’s questions as to Ransom Wilson’s judgment, but I think it is accurate to describe the remaining two as American composers of less than the first rank. Anyone who has spent time with composers knows that they can be uncharitable, especially to their betters (much like other artists, I imagine—as a composer, I’ve been guilty of it). As for Carter, one has to wonder about his motives given that Ives was an early influence and supportive of his desire to pursue composition. That there was some oedipal element in it probably can’t be entirely ruled out.

To say that Ives was an amateur composer is a different kind of mistake. First, the very idea of professionalism in an art form is questionable at best. One can be professionally trained in the *techniques* of composition, but the minimum level of reliability in practice that we expect of, say, doctors cannot be guaranteed in creative artists—in the most ambitious of them perhaps least of all. (A professional composer can be relied on to write a piece of music that is playable and will “sound,” and will keep the audience’s attention, and maybe even give it some pleasure, but obviously, there can be no guarantee that it will be a profound work of art that will live forever.) Second, Ives did have the professional training and was capable of writing according to the standards of his training. He decided, however, that he couldn’t make a living writing the kind of music he wanted to write, a judgment that was inarguably true—and remains true for most composers in this country to this day. (Virgil Thomson, who was critical of Ives on this score, didn’t make his living from writing music, either.) Even more to the point, though, was that his professional training was of little use to him in writing the kind of music he wanted to write. The professionals of his generation are
largely forgotten because they couldn’t overcome their professionalism; Ives is remembered because he did.

I think Denk may be wrong about the harmonic structures of Ives’s larger pieces—they may have tonal underpinnings and the materials may not be as incompatible as people usually assume—but his appreciation of Ives’s ability to “navigate these harmonic extremes [and make] their incompatibility mean so much” again shows deep insight. Ives’s difficulty settling on final versions of his pieces reflected his lack of a system, but to tax him with this is ahistorical. He was writing in an era (sometimes called the “free atonality period,” 1905–1920) when no one else had a system, either. He had to write with his ears, and I must take issue with one thing Denk says in that regard: “At times, most damningly for the sensitive musician, [the dissonances are] there just because Ives liked the sound of them.” I’m sorry, but “sensitive” ought to be in scare quotes.

Finally, I think Denk is on to something quite significant with the idea of doubt as a theme of Ives’s music—the survival of the way of life reflected by the music Ives loved was becoming ever more doubtful, so what is usually thought of as Ives’s nostalgia is better understood as an attempt to capture and preserve the things he valued before they disappeared. He knew it was a lost cause, which is why the music is not a simple exercise in naïve nostalgia but is messy and full of memories just beyond its grasp and ends so often with a “dying fall.”

One is reminded of Mark Twain’s mot about Wagner (now there’s an overrated composer!) that his music is “better than it sounds.” It is understandable when Ives’s music is judged as not always very good, but Denk is absolutely right to maintain its greatness.

Arthur Maisel
New York City

It seems to me that the role memory plays in Ives’s music has never quite been successfully formulated. As Denk says, for Ives the motivation for remembering is not “nostalgia,” which rather cheapens the music. There is of course a strongly emotional element in Ives’s memories of

33. Actually, Twain quoting his friend the humorist Edgar Wilson “Bill” Nye.
his father’s heyday—but while thinking back to your own youth can be nostalgic, many people would find that label mildly offensive if applied to their memories of their parents. Denk’s idea of “doubt” names one aspect of the emotional tug—for the past is unrecoverable and, as much as Ives regrets that, he knows it too well.\(^\text{34}\) So his music is intentionally ambiguous in a number of ways, as my article tries to show, just as the past must retain an element of ambiguity in memory.

People dismiss nostalgia for the very good reason that it makes the present subservient to the past: the cliché verb *to wallow* with its porcine association conveys well that indulging in nostalgia can be “disgusting” and literally a waste of time. But memory, as we now know from science (what we knew anyway),\(^\text{35}\) is constructed in the present: As an artist, Ives aims to bring the past “to life.” His relation to memory as a tool of composition is, however, radical, both in his customary avoidance of repetition and in his use of “found” materials. (When he does use repetition, it is with a canny ability to make it meaningful beyond the merely formal use it traditionally had in music.\(^\text{36}\) For an example, see the first “comment, 2014” on p.12, above.) Ives—maybe even consciously—uses radical means to engage the listener’s memory in new ways; when he succeeds, the past does *become* the present.

Ives’s incorporation into his music of what could be described as prefabricated chunks of cultural “memory”—what would be called *memes* now—has obvious relevance to his “substance”:\(^\text{37}\) capturing and preserving the world of his youth, his father’s world. He might also have felt the need of a lingua franca or a common set of references to help his listeners past the difficulties of his at times intensely chromatic language. Yet even in his more conventional early works, such as the second symphony, alongside the quotes of patriotic and popular songs and hymns, he quotes freely from the “three B’s” sacred to Germanophilic American musical culture. Remember that as an American born just before the Centennial of Independence, Ives was from

\(^\text{34}\) See below for the deeper historical connection of the theme of doubt with memory.  
\(^\text{35}\) Note, for example, the common verb *re-collect*, with its sense of putting together.  
\(^\text{36}\) Following Plato’s idea that all art was “imitation,” Schenker proposed in his early book on harmony (cited in n.19, above) that repetition in music, particularly motivic repetition, takes the place of representation in literature and the plastic arts, given that music is intrinsically nonrepresentational.  
\(^\text{37}\) In the *Essays Before a Sonata*, one of Ives’s themes is the distinction between “manner” and “substance.” *Essays Before a Sonata,* *The Majority,* and Other Writings, ed. by Howard Boatwright (New York: Norton, 1962).
the cultural periphery (though the United States would during his lifetime move to the center),
His-affording specifically American music, such as “The Red, White and Blue,” status beside
and, as in that tune’s final apotheosis in the symphony, above the music of the B’s, while open to
misinterpretation as simple-minded, flag-waving “patriotism,” can be seen as akin to the musical
nationalism that was being promoted throughout Europe as a response to German hegemony.
That is, it was a response to a *musical* problem at least as much as to a cultural or political one.

Ives must also have felt *belated* (in Harold Bloom’s term) with respect to the tonal
tradition—yet another remove. Ives faced two crises: There was the post-Wagner crisis of
tonality that confronted all his contemporaries; there was also the personal crisis of how to be a
composer in the everyday practical sense of making a living—especially in a time and place both
belated and culturally removed from the main channel of the European tradition. (This sets aside
that one American response to the United States’ remoteness was to denigrate the tradition, a
response Ives himself at times adopted defensively). I think these two clusters of problems might
well have merged in his mind—we often have to look for ways to deal with several difficulties at
once and are therefore disposed to seize on a solution that addresses more than one of them. For
Ives, his spatial and temporal remove from the core of the tonal tradition could have interacted
with the loss of his father just as he was setting out as an adult so as to make memory his theme,
his substance. The stored impressions of the world of his youth, including tonality, came to
constitute a *fund* on which to draw; it could not replace what was lost, but it could compensate.

Compare his solution to the problem of income! It seems probable that the reason Ives was
an extraordinary insurance man, famously inspirational to his colleagues and employees, is that
he didn’t view buying life insurance as a simple financial transaction but as a form of *caring*—in
the deepest possible sense—for one’s loved ones, a commitment with what may be called a
spiritual resonance. In our world, belated with respect to a belief in the ideology of capitalism, a

38. One who is musically gifted, like Ives, may explore generalized feelings of loss or alienation through
music and compose music that embodies them, but is also liable to experience those feelings as music
itself. Cf. Arnold Schoenberg on George Gershwin: “Many musicians do not consider George Gershwin a
serious composer. But they should understand that, serious or not, he is a composer—that is, a man who
lives in music and expresses everything, serious or not, sound or superficial, by means of music, because
it is his native language.” In Merle Armitage, ed. *George Gershwin*. (New York: Longmans, Green,
1938), 97.
world in which such profound concepts are deployed as sales tactics and debased in the service of commerce, it is difficult to understand or believe in the sincerity of Ives’s view of insurance and financial planning—except that to think of him as a huckster is impossible.39 (In the young Ives’s world, too, the insurance industry had become corrupt, and as Budiansky relates, the clearing away of its leaders in the wake of the New York state legislature’s Armstrong committee hearings of 1905 left room for Ives and his partner, Julian Myrick, to rise more rapidly than they would otherwise have done—especially given Ives’s idealistic approach.40)

Even as he evolved into his later style, in which quotation became less profuse and at times largely disappeared, memory continued to be essential to his music. If we take the *Universe Symphony* as the ultimate version of his compositional model, then it is evident that Ives understood memory to be a key element in a transcendent spiritual consciousness; for Ives apparently sought to portray the entire history of the universe in the symphony, an ambition some might view as both grandiose and oddly naïve.41 Then again, *The Unanswered Question*,

39. *Charles Ives in the Mirror: American Histories of an Iconic Composer*, by David C. Paul (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2013), a recent revision of the protean “Ives legend”—one that portrays itself as finally having cut through all the mythopoeia, as several previous revisions have also done—suggests that Ives transferred his business skill in writing advertising to the promotion of his own music. The proponents of this view argue that in business, Ives showed no reluctance to engage in salesmanship (or at least in the training of effective salesmen), though even they freely admit that Ives’s idealistic view of insurance was sincere. One difficulty with this view, however, is that you have to wonder why Ives lost his touch so completely when he came to write copy to sell himself. How could he have so thoroughly misjudged his “prospects” to think that his essays would help them hear the music? It seems to me that the only alternatives are either that the vaunted, supposedly obvious analogy between selling insurance and selling oneself as an artist is a flawed artifact of our own culture or that Ives’s failure to transfer his skill reflected a repugnance on his part toward the marketing of art, such as he always claimed to have. The failure to acknowledge that he meant what he said is a failure of empathy and imagination.


41. In a latter-day attempt at something similar, one of the fine cartoon segments in *Allegro non troppo* (1976), itself a take-off on Walt Disney’s *Fantasia* by the Italian master animator Bruno Bozzetto, the portrayal of evolution cannot completely evade being comical.
while in scale and complexity a kind of sketch for the symphony, has a similar historical ambition. As philosophers have long pointed out, human consciousness finds itself inherently situated in time; it is essentially historical. This may be in part because consciousness is the processing of data that has been stored (whether received by the senses under a second ago and in a kind of temporary “buffer” or retrieved from more permanent, longer-range storage), so it is, indeed, largely made of memory.

Be that as it may, tonality relies on the listener’s ability to remember the tonic. In short pieces, such as popular tunes or Baroque dance movements, no effort is involved for most listeners. As pieces got longer, however, it became ever more essential to follow the harmonic process and less likely that even highly trained listeners would recognize the return of the tonic without some reinforcement by signs such as thematic return. By the classical era, composers had begun to play on listeners’ expectation of coordination between motivic and structural harmonic elements to create the pleasure of the unexpected: for example, the “false recapitulation,” in which the composer presents in another key a motivically recognizable “theme” associated with the tonic. To remember the tonic over the hours of one of Wagner’s operas was beyond anyone’s ability, so Wagner elevated the reinforcing signs to what he considered to be a structural principle. In fact, the use of leitmotivs tended to undercut the structural primacy of tonality, which was already attenuated by the length of the works and their more pervasive use of chromaticism.

42. In this discussion, I do not ever intend to imply “with full consciousness” by the word *remember* or with reference to memory. As the recognition of a familiar face normally requires no mediating consciousness, such as *“Hmm, that’s a face I know—oh, yes, it’s my mother,”* people brought up listening to tonal music “just know” when the tonic comes back, assuming the digression to other harmonies hasn’t been too lengthy. It ought to go without saying that I am not referring to people with absolute pitch, who have a special kind of involuntary memory.

43. Schenker, the archconservative—but also radicals of varying degrees, such as Debussy, Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and Ives, among others—recognized that the kind of representation enshrined in the use of the leitmotiv in Wagner’s music had become a compositional dead end. For the radicals, however, it was not just the tyranny of the motive, which must have seemed the inescapable future of tonality (and certainly was widely promoted as such), but also tonality itself that had reached if not a dead end then at least a turning of the way. Unlike later generations who could simply reject tonality (or unthinkingly embrace its
Ives may have had some such thought as the following: Suppose one uses tunes that listeners already know to help them keep track of what’s going on motivically in a piece. This gibed neatly with his emotional investment in conveying his love for a way of life that was disappearing. One has to acknowledge that in historical terms, Ives’s halcyon days are exactly the same era as lampooned in Mark Twain and Charles Dudley Warner’s book, *The Gilded Age*, and in Henry Adams’s *Democracy*, so Ives chose to focus on small-town ways in contrast to how things were already becoming elsewhere. In line with the profound role that memory plays in his view of life, Ives tends to present these geographically disparate modes of life as historically disparate, for instance in his song “The New River.” I don’t mean to suggest willful distortion on his part or obviously any ignorance of the facts; Ives could simply adopt a Romantic trope that aligned two dichotomies: *rural–urban* and *past–present*—but anyway, as for many of his contemporaries, the rural world was his past, the urban his present.

Ives’s preservationist stance may appear to contradict his forward-looking musical practice, and as such obvious notions frequently do, it has become a received idea. In writing about Ives it is often taken for granted that the two must be in conflict (witness even so thoughtful a commenter as Denk). To extend my examination of why, for Ives at least, the apparent conflict could have provided a way forward, I will turn to a consideration of his relation to posttonal music and its theory. We can be certain that Ives was aware of the issue of self-contradiction, both because to deny the hold on the soul of logic’s rejection of self-contradiction was a well-known tenet of Transcendentalism and also because Ives’s own self-presentation, in the *114 Songs*, for example, evokes Whitman’s Emersonian dictum, “Do I contradict myself? Very well, then, I contradict myself.”

44. *114 Songs* (cited in n.22, above), number 6, 13–14.
45. *Song of Myself*, section 51; compare Emerson’s “Self-Reliance”: “Suppose you should contradict yourself; what then?” (¶13) Whitman’s *then* seems to echo Emerson’s. Leon Botstein’s “Innovation and Nostalgia: Ives, Mahler, and the Origins of Twentieth-Century Modernism,” in *Charles Ives and His World* (cited in n.40, above), 35–74, despite its characteristically glib manner (reminiscent of a breathless textbook survey), has much of real substance to offer; it finesses the preservationist/innovator conundrum in a nuanced if not thoroughly convincing way.
Ives and Set Theory

My statement (in n.10, above) about pitch class set theory and Ives’s music can be mistaken for a general rejection of the theory, and specifically, of Philip Lambert’s work in *The Music of Charles Ives*.\(^4^6\) It is neither. Ives’s own terminology reveals both how he thought about music and the ways in which that terminology inevitably conditioned his thought. Given when he lived, it ought not to be controversial to say that he thought in tonal terms and didn’t compose with pc sets. Were a set theorist to claim that Ives was feeling his way toward such a theory, it would seem suspiciously teleological at best and, frankly, self-serving at worst. Lambert is refreshingly free of anything of the sort.

As a systematic description and classification of all possible harmonic entities in music based on the octave’s division into twelve pitches, pc set theory has much the same value as the combination of figured bass with roman numerals for the harmonic functions of the several steps of the diatonic scale. One might have specific reservations (concerning, for example, the *analytical* applicability of set complementation), but the theory’s usefulness has been proved over several decades. It also has the same potential dangers as post-Rameau harmonic theory (in the case of current neo-Riemannian attempts to describe posttonal voice leading, *precisely* the same), for although it looks complete, it is not.

As Schenker showed, only by coordinating contrapuntal and harmonic descriptions of tonal music can we approach “higher criticism” of artistic uses of tonality. The source of the value of this coordination lies in the mutually metatheoretical relationship between harmony and counterpoint, and we simply have no critically useful theory of posttonal counterpoint (though Lambert demonstrates several potential elements of it). Nor do I believe that the pursuit of the neo-Riemannian program can get us any closer—true though its findings may be in a structural sense (because fundamentally deductive, or “analytic” in Kant’s use of the term).

Tonal counterpoint had the historical advantage of having been constructed before the influence of the scientific method became pervasive. Rules for voice leading were established and elaborated based on nothing more than the subjective judgments of musicians. But this had perfect validity because the experience of music *is* subjective: tonal counterpoint describes the

experience of people who have been molded by the Western musical tradition, including both ordinary listeners and its greatest artistic practitioners.

Ives, like others of his generation, recognized that highly chromatic music required new means to structure it; he also absorbed from his father—and perhaps via Emerson et al.—a kind of nineteenth-century Hegel-derived view of history as progress. Lambert shows Ives exploring different systematic ways to structure twelve-tone music, but it seems doubtful to me that Ives thought of this as a replacement of tonal structures rather than as an enhancement of them. This was not for him an intellectual exercise but a way, as he would have put it, of “stretching his ears.” Lambert rightly rejects the notion of mere experimentalism (i.e., simply for its own sake), for it is clear that Ives’s goal was always to discover new expressive resources. As Lambert points out, Ives was self-critical enough to distinguish “experiments” that had musical value from those that did not (see n.9, above, which refers to Ives’s discussion, in Memos, of the General Slocum take-off).

Ives’s experiments were frequently systematic, following through with fairly straightforward algorithms to see what would result; occasionally, he would like the result—like how it sounded—enough to incorporate it into one or two pieces. His compositional choices were not systematic in any sense, however. Ives composed by ear. That could account for his sometimes peculiar spelling; and why else would he have had to stop composing when he came to feel that nothing sounded “right” anymore? One might think therefore that what Ives was hearing, what patterns can be discerned in his choices, ought to be the focus of analysis, but for the most part it has not. This is especially disheartening with the work of a composer who made such a fuss

47. As so often, Emerson appears to come down on both sides of the issue of progress. I will suggest later that this is because, instead of arguing toward a fixed proposition, he is most concerned to let the reader watch him think.

48. One of the disappointments of Lambert’s book is that the introduction’s promised discussion of Ives’s distinction between manner and substance is never satisfactorily fulfilled. This may simply have been due to the well-known attritional aspect of dissertation completion, or it could reflect what I may describe as a justifiable avoidance of risk (hoping to escape a charge of sour grapes). In the academic milieu it is always safer—though not necessarily easier, granted—to describe than to interpret. Taxonomy does pay the bills and is, therefore, the favored model for the pursuit of knowledge; Vico was wrong about science and nature, so what he was right about—our knowledge of the world we create—has had little influence.
about the difference between manner and substance. Labeling the quotations, not a valueless enterprise to be sure, is still largely an exploration of the surface, of manner, even if it can provide clues to substance. The substance of music is in its pitches and their relationships, and even if Ives was making his choices based on what sounded “right” (in other words, relying on “intuition,” that is, a subconscious grasp of the patterns he was employing), we are in a better position to attempt to discover the basis of that sense of rightness than he was simply because we are not in the thick of the process of making those choices.

Ives’s words sometimes verged on mysticism, but no composer can ignore the essentially physical facts of music in favor of pronouncements about deeper meanings without risking the integrity of the music. (Obviously, in terms of pursuing a career, pronouncements can be quite sufficient, but that is something for social scientists, not musicians, to examine. Anyway, though Ives made pronouncements, he didn’t rely on them.) One can set up several devices to play a number of tunes at various times, but the value of the music, its substance, will largely depend on how carefully the tunes are selected and how rigorously their interrelationships are controlled. (To leave it to the audience to find coherence—or impose it, as they can be relied on to do willy-nilly—may make a philosophical or psychological point, but it is to avoid one’s role as an artist, which is to make choices; to make choices in the moment, something Ives was fond of at times, is still to make choices. And while it is true that the layers of sound he created in certain pieces are not strictly coordinated, their generally diaphanous or repetitive nature hardly requires strict coordination.)

Taxonomies of the tunes quoted or of the gestures and textures deployed or of the generic styles adopted are obviously all good ways to initiate analysis of a piece of music, but they are all aspects of a structure that is made of pitches.\(^49\) A reading of a poem would hardly be considered adequate if it stopped with a description of its rhyme scheme and meter, or a discussion of its unity or diversity of register, or even an exploration of the sources of its imagery and metaphor, and didn’t go on to the meaning of its words and their organization. Ives’s music

has sometimes been found wanting in coherence, although few have questioned its integrity. Yet its coherence cannot be demonstrated nor can the source of our sense of its integrity be revealed without looking at the notes. Yes, “all made of tunes,” indeed! But how made of tunes, and with tunes that go how?

**Ives the Romantic: Imagination and Memory**

Because Ives was not only a practitioner of a craft and an artist but also a reader of philosophy and a thinker, the exploration of his relation to memory seems to me to require that he be situated with respect to some major trends of thought since the Renaissance. J. Peter Burkholder’s book *Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music*\(^5^0\) ought to have settled these issues, and is perhaps assumed by those who have not read it to have done so. An inspired scholar who writes well, Burkholder has become one of the foremost academic experts of his generation on Ives. His discussion of Ives’s ideas, while careful and characteristically methodical, is, however, unfortunately plodding and conventional when it comes to engaging with the ideas themselves. For example, Burkholder makes much of Ives’s “dualism,” but dualism is not what Burkholder seems to think it is: a habit of mind or expression that tends to couch ideas in terms of conflict between two points of view. That is an accurate description of one aspect of Ives’s manner as a writer—it has its resemblance to a Quixote-like “duelism”—but it is less so when we consider Ives as a thinker. In any case, dualism is not a habit of mind or expression, but a philosophy that holds that reality cannot be reduced further than to two principles (usually some such pairing as *body and mind* or *material and spiritual*). Ives is not a dualist, and Burkholder’s own discussion of the manner versus substance issue shows that he understands that substance is primary for Ives; other instances include Burkholder’s acknowledgment that Ives wished to overcome such dichotomies as *art versus life* and *vernacular versus classical music*. I could make similar complaints about the term *idealism*, which Burkholder uses with its everyday connotation. He makes no attempt to distinguish it from the philosophical tradition around Kant; in many contexts this would be perfectly acceptable, but given the importance to his argument of Transcendentalism, an offshoot of German Idealism, he ought to have been more mindful—note that I don’t want to say he should have been more *careful*.

---

It is not that Burkholder is wrong about much of what he says but that he is superficial, seemingly more concerned to sort ideas into categories than to grapple with them. Ives the thinker is often out of his depths, which is why he flails so much and why it can be difficult to make sense of his writing. Burkholder is without doubt sincere in his wish to rescue Ives as long as he can stay seated in his boat. But there are, after all, situations when you can be more helpful getting in the water yourself, though that is certainly more risky. I have neither the knowledge nor the training to satisfy any desire for a comprehensive treatment of Ives’s relation to major trends in Western thought since the Renaissance—but I also have much less to lose than Burkholder does by looking “all wet.” Even so, I acknowledge at the outset that my discussion, if accurate as far as it goes, must be distorted by omission and lacking in nuance. Still, it appears to me that my choice is either to leave this essay incomplete or to concentrate on those salient points of this intellectual history most connected to Ives; I don’t see any alternative to the following brief survey. Finding a form for it has been very difficult. I have finally decided to put the potted history as much as possible in the footnotes; it can be safely ignored. Any original ideas in it are in the nature of minor comments, which might be helpful or amusing. I do think this so-to-speak parallel text is worth reading—if only to discover how I could have gone so drastically wrong in my main discussion—but perhaps the best way to read it is contrary to what its form implies: that is, to read the main text through and then to read the notes through (or vice versa). I have retained the footnote format because it seemed to be the most convenient way to indicate the links between the two texts. Anyway, in an Emersonian spirit of “whim,” I will contend, however vainly, with some of the ideas Ives contended with.

It is generally accepted that Descartes’s *cogito*, by admitting doubt and then in a judolike move turning it on itself—doubt implies a doubter, which is thus the one thing that cannot be doubted—effectively placed subjectivity at the heart of philosophy, and thought in general, for more than three hundred years. In the ensuing centuries of philosophical debate (which

51. Obviously, I can do little more here than refer Ives’s concern with memory to the huge crux of Western philosophy represented by the *cogito* and the responses to it in the centuries that followed (Hume, Kant, etc.) and the responses to the responses—in particular, German Idealism (Schelling, Hegel, etc.), which, by way of the American Transcendentalists, in turn, may have had the most immediate impact on Ives’s thinking. (Burkholder’s demonstration of the limits of the influence of Transcendentalist thought on Ives—because it was “only” [?] Emerson and Thoreau, and because it probably came later in
continues as the debate concerning consciousness), when Schlegel wrote, “Es ist gleich tödlich für den Geist, ein System zu Haben und keins zu haben,” he was registering the fundamental

Ives’s life and not so much influence as confirmation and clarification—has some value, if only as yet another corrective to the Ives myth.) Descartes had been considering physical change (with a ball of wax) and had been forced to conclude that all of an object’s most distinctive properties were changeable; were we deluded when we saw it as the same object even though all its properties had changed? Descartes’s answer was that though what our senses deliver changes, we perceive the object with our minds. (Notice the resonances with Exodus 3, also concerned with an object that “was burning, but . . . was not consumed” [3.2], and the model provided by “I am that I am” [3.14]). But this opened up a gap between the physical world and our minds, and called into question both the reliability of sense data and the status of subjectivity itself. The cogito was Descartes’s attempt to shore up the subject. The move recalls Anselm’s ontological proof of God’s existence both in its strategy and its failure to satisfy many beyond its author. (Descartes’s proof of God’s existence also partly resembles Anselm’s.) But if a failure in its immediate goal of staving off radical epistemological skepticism, Descartes’s argument did prove to be a massively fruitful one—in part because of its reinforcement of mind-body dualism, alas. Newton’s subsequent feat of bringing change under the rubric of mathematics with the calculus and his demonstration of the mechanistic aspect of the universe with the law of gravitation suggested that mathematical relationships inhered in nature and threatened the special place of subjectivity, especially given Descartes’s failed attempt to ground it metaphysically.

52. “It is equally fatal to the spirit to have a system and not to have one.” Athenäum Fragmenta, no. 53. Kritische Friedrich-Schlegel-Ausgabe, vol. 2 (Munich, 1967). First published in the Schlegel brothers’ journal, Athenäum (Berlin), 1798. Kant is famously difficult, in part because he uses many new terms or familiar terms in new ways, and because he sometimes uses more than one term for what appears to be the same thing, and occasionally even uses one term for two different things. What he was attempting, however, was very difficult, as well: to establish purely by logical inference what must be the case in matters that are not directly observable—basically, what goes on in our heads when we have “experience.” He also wanted to put both physical science and religious faith on firm foundations. Kant had hoped that at what he considered the small cost of putting the real physical world completely beyond our reach, he could allow human experience to be again what it had previously seemed to be: an accurate reflection of that world. Experience had to be shown to be more than the simple everyday accumulation of sense perceptions because the collection of data in science was a special instance of it, one that had become a serious (i.e., economic) issue with the industrial revolution.
incompleteness of Reason that Kant had demonstrated in response to radical skeptics, such as Hume. Thus the need for some faculty of the mind, the aspect of the Judgment that Kant calls the Imagination, that could bridge what after Descartes looked like a gap between the physical world and what we receive through our senses. The Romantics seized on the imagination as more than a philosophical workaround, however. For them, it came to be intimately connected with memory.\textsuperscript{53} Memory has a specific and essential role in Kant’s picture of how experience is created, but it may also be that the connection arose in Romantic thought simply because memory seems to demonstrate the workings of the imagination, assembling sense data into

53. Recall Wordsworth’s famous formulation, “emotion recollected in tranquility,” in the preface to the second edition of \textit{Lyrical Ballads} (1800). This was of course composed at the urging of Coleridge, who had tried and failed to write a prefatory essay. The two poets had had extensive discussions and Coleridge also provided Wordsworth with his fragmentary attempts; certainly, some of the ideas in the preface can be traced back to Kant, by way of Coleridge’s reading of Kant and Schelling. Most to my present purpose, some of Emerson’s understanding of Kant may have come through his reading of Coleridge. It should be noted that Kant, unlike those in his wake and unlike the everyday understanding of the term \textit{imagination}, used it in the much more limited sense of an ability to form a mental image. Coleridge’s definition of imagination in \textit{Biographia Literaria} (ch.13) reveals its connection to the discussion initiated by the \textit{cogito}: “The primary Imagination I hold to be the living power and prime agent of all human perception, and as a repetition in the finite mind of the eternal act of creation in the infinite I Am.” (Although those last two words specifically refer to God, note that Coleridge has in mind an analogy of \textit{any} moment of perception with the original moment of Creation.) Coleridge divided the storage of perception as memory (normally operated on by what he termed the \textit{Fancy}, which he considered to be passive) from the imagination, which was creative but still completely dependent on memory. Ignoring Coleridge’s division of the imagination into primary and secondary aspects, it was, for him, the faculty that “dissolved” the separation of subject and object in perception and memory—thus his reference to it as the “agent” of perception and to its “living power.” It \textit{healed} the dualist rift. (Coleridge, like many others, thought that Kant had not gone far enough in this regard and had accepted too easily the impossibility of knowing the \textit{Ding an sich}.) Emerson seems to have adopted Coleridge’s distinction between fancy and imagination in his essay “Nature” (ch.1, ¶3): “When we speak of nature in this manner, we have a distinct but most poetical sense in the mind. . . . It is this which distinguishes the stick of timber of the woodcutter from the tree of the poet.” Both men had planned to become ministers and so perhaps saw a link between skepticism (the impossibility of any real connection with the world) and the sin of despair.
meaningful patterns that were not necessarily inherent in the data but cannot easily be dismissed, despite memory’s notorious fallibility; after all, even skeptical arguments rely on it.54

We need to bear in mind that as basically a nineteenth-century thinker, Ives shared this Romantic view of imagination as the force behind a multiplicity of human endeavors: music and poetry, naturally, but also science and commerce; not only did these endeavors have a common source but they informed one another.55 The term scientist was not coined till near midcentury, but Goethe was one, and just as poets like Keats (a onetime medical student) and Shelley were fascinated by and kept up with developments in science, it was not uncommon for those we remember as scientists also to be composers (William Herschel) or poets (Humphrey Davy).56 Because the several pursuits of the imagination were considered multiple expressions of a unitary faculty, the evident progress of technology brought many thoughtful people in the nineteenth century to infer that there would inevitably be similar progress in spiritual, artistic,

54. Memory already had a significant role in Kant’s discussion of the imagination, which Coleridge may have misunderstood or simply disagreed with. In response to Hume’s reliance on mere association (subjectivity being little more than a sum of associations), Kant incorporated association into the faculty of the Imagination: sense data is stored as an “image” under this faculty and is unconsciously associated with other images in the time-space manifold of (mental) representations. Once this happens, memory enters the process with the application of concepts, which connect past representations to present ones. But therefore, for Kant (and thus for much nineteenth-century thought), conscious experience is impossible without both concepts and memory. (The line dividing the unconscious creation of a manifold of representations from the creation of consciousness in coordination with the application of concepts might be Kant’s answer, were he alive now, to the question as to why AI has been so hard to achieve.) As to the fallibility of memory, Coleridge assigned it to the fancy; the imagination, because creative, and indeed transformative, was (paradoxically) not susceptible in the same way.

55. See the quote from Ives’s essay on life insurance, “The Amount to Carry,” in Budiansky, Mad Music, 157.

56. See Richard Holmes, The Age of Wonder: The Romantic Generation and the Discovery of the Beauty and Terror of Science (New York: Vintage, 2010). The coinage of the word scientist by William Whewell not coincidentally coincided with his advocacy of the position that a probabilistic, that is, inductive, basis for science is adequate to all practical needs. The search for a solid deductive basis for epistemology thereupon retreated to the cloister, until artificial intelligence (a new way for capitalists to reduce labor costs) made it worth thinking about again.
and even political matters.\textsuperscript{57} But Ives’s own idea of progress depends on a view of history unlike, say, Lenin’s. Ives thought that what will be new in the future will not require a new humanity so much as a humanity that has recovered the essential nature weakened by society and culture over time; like that of some of the other Romantics, his view might be called a “conservative progressivism.”\textsuperscript{58} For Ives, the dialectic implied by that term is not, however, between elements of the past on the one hand and elements of the future on the other; it is between those elements of the future that were and were not also elements of the past. He points to this dialectic, perhaps a bit confusingly because of the terms of reference, in the “Emerson” chapter of his \textit{Essays Before a Sonata}:

Let us settle the point “for good,” and say that a thing is a classic if it is thought of in terms of the past and romantic if thought of in terms of the future. . . . Hence, we allow ourselves to say that Emerson is neither a classic or romantic but both—and both not only at different times in one essay, but at the same time in one sentence—in one word. And must we admit it, so is everyone.\textsuperscript{59}

Like Emerson in some moods, Ives viewed the romantic with a measure of suspicion (but also the classic, inasmuch as it was a “dead hand”). Dreams of the future are well and good, he seems to be thinking here, but it is on a combination of what we remember from the past with the romance of the future that we can and ought to rely. Most important for Ives is that the future be one that we ourselves forge. Despite Ives’s interest in quarter tones and in modes of pitch organization that in retrospect seem to move toward pc set theory, the role of memory in his artistic practice must be seen to encompass the countervailing claims on him of tradition,

\textsuperscript{57} In retrospect it is quite easy to see the irony that much of the technological progress derived directly from Newton’s contributions, which had brought these problematic issues into focus and made them unavoidable; only a “madman” like Blake saw it at the time.

\textsuperscript{58} In individual cases, the implicit dialectic resolved on one side or the other; the trope \textit{young progressive–old conservative} is often enough true to life: Wordsworth, a well-known example, began as a radical supporter of the French Revolution but became very conservative over the years.

including tonality, both in his manner and his substance. Rather than a conflict between contradictory stances, preservationist and progressive, it is again more appropriate to see dialectic: a Hegelian nugget, as it might be, glinting behind Emerson’s and Whitman’s dismissal of apparent contradiction as a problem to be solved. Self-contradiction had been viewed since Aristotle as destructive because it undermines logic and therefore reason itself. For Ives, as for the Transcendentalists he admired, self-contradiction, far from being destructive, had to be more than inescapable; they asserted that it is innate to and constitutive of any constructive process. To experience is to undergo a continuous test or “experiment.”\(^60\) Because the essence of the self is to be in time, a process, it must always be something now that it wasn’t and won’t be then.

Ives was also belated with respect to Emerson, almost one hundred years further into the era of the “majority,” of mass society. Emerson was no democrat in the restricted sense that we now use the term, but he did believe that it was given to anyone and everyone to become a self—to discover or recover what he calls the soul: what is most essentially one’s own. So Emerson is difficult for Ives politically because Ives was in essence a democrat: the deep connection to the materials he felt were most his own—the ones that, to put it baldly, meant the most to him—he had to recognize was widely shared.

Emerson’s value for Ives, like his value for anyone and everyone, is, first, that Emerson shows what thinking looks like. He starts from the broad model of the New England sermon. “Where do we find ourselves?” begins his essay “Experience”—and the sermon would have answered, “drowning in sin,” and gone on to offer rescue by faith. He combines this with Montaigne’s essay form: “I have noticed something; what have others had to say about it?” Such a manner of modeling the process of thought, bluff or blunt by turns and always forthrightly emotional, must have appealed strongly to Ives the artist. (Despite Emerson’s oft-expressed qualms about the superficiality of art and artists, he was one, too.) Second, Emerson addressed—frequently, if also obliquely—the crux of Ives’s difficulty in how to parse his relationship to his materials: the seeming paradox that what was unique to him was at the same time what he had most in common with others. (This may be a paradox, but it is necessary to communication.)

Most artists are belated, and the belated artist must reclaim someone else’s thought or

\(^{60}\) From Latin experīrī: ex- [to bring into a state of] + perīrī, to be tested or in danger (cognate with English peril).
words—or world—for the self. In Heideggerian terms, we must dwell, meaning both to reside and to think, where we are thrown (where we find ourselves; recall that Emerson was much admired by Nietzsche, and Nietzsche by Heidegger).

Emerson opens “Self-Reliance” by describing how artists make what they find their own:

To believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart, is true for all men,—that is genius. Speak your latent conviction, and it shall be the universal sense; for the inmost in due time [1st edition: for always the inmost] becomes the outmost. (¶1)

But notice that Emerson is doing the opposite of what he is saying: He is referring to “some verses written by an eminent painter. . . . The sentiment they instil is of more value than the thought they may contain”—the sentiment instilled in Emerson being to “believe in your own thought.” He goes on to refer to Moses, Plato, and Milton, saying that their “highest merit” was that they “set at naught books and traditions, and spoke not what men, but what they thought.” So Emerson’s highest merit, too, must be not the thought his words may contain but that they are his thoughts, for which he gives as examples . . . books and traditions. I don’t believe this is any confusion on his part but rather his warning that (in Wittgenstein’s Tractatus image) the reader, having climbed the ladder that Emerson has provided, must throw it away. In his biblical register, he makes quite clear how uncompromising his stance is. All that is settled (books and traditions) must be abandoned, and, playing on the trope of Matthew 10.37, one must leave behind “father and mother and wife and brother” (¶7) to follow, not Jesus, but Whim. At times misunderstood as a turn away from the outer world to the inner, or the source of “individualism,” it is better seen as a rejection of the foreign, the distant in time, to concentrate on what is near and now: “[T]hough the wide universe is full of good, no kernel of nourishing corn can come to him but through the toil bestowed on that plot of ground which is given him to till.” (¶2) Or as he says in “The American Scholar,” “I ask not for the great, the remote, the romantic . . . I embrace the common, I explore and sit at the feet of the familiar, the low.” (¶40) The aim is to realize

61. The influence of Stanley Cavell’s readings, collected in Emerson’s Transcendental Etudes, David Justin Hodge, ed. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003), is so pervasive here that it resists footnoting. Cavell notes (24) that “romantic” seems at odds with romanticism’s embrace of the “low.”
the deepest essence of what one is, what Emerson calls the soul; in “Self-Reliance” again:

“Whence then this worship of the past? . . . These roses under my window make no reference to former roses or to better ones; they are for what they are.” (¶22, 23) This is utterly other than the vulgar Randite brand of individualism.

In “The Over-Soul,” Emerson writes:

All goes to show that the soul in man is not an organ, but animates and exercises all the organs; is not a function, like the power of memory, of calculation, of comparison, but uses these as hands and feet; is not a faculty, but a light; is not the intellect or the will, but the master of the intellect and the will; is the background of our being, in which they lie,—an immensity not possessed and that cannot be possessed. (¶4)

But how does the “low” bring us to the soul?

We grant that human life is mean, but how did we find out that it was mean? What is the ground of this uneasiness of ours; of this old discontent? What is the universal sense of want and ignorance, but the fine innuendo by which the soul makes its enormous claim? (¶1)

Stanley Cavell has claimed Emerson for philosophy, as Ives claimed him for music: It is not to “understand” what he says that Emerson asks—to “stand under” an authority is precisely a position he rejects, or thinks cannot be held—but to claim him for ourselves; as I claim Ives for myself. Again, this is not the self narrowly defined. In what Emerson calls a “dream” in the essay “Experience,” he finds his “temperament” to be a trap, a “certain uniform tune which the revolving barrel of the music-box must play.” (¶6) But this is an illusion that mirrors the determinism of science, a world that is “all outside; it has no inside.” (¶12) Let the doctors say,

‘But, sir, medical history; the report to the Institute; the proven facts!’ . . . [I]t is impossible that the creative power exclude itself. Into every intelligence there is a door which is never closed, through which the creator passes. The intellect, seeker of absolute truth, or the heart, lover of absolute good, intervenes for our succor, and at one whisper of these high powers we awake from ineffectual struggles with this nightmare. (¶7)
Emerson can be confusing—on the topic of memory, for example: he refers to it twice in the selfsame essay, “Self-Reliance,” as what recalls us to ourselves, the “sculpture in the memory” (¶2) but also as what imprisons us in consistency, the “corpse of your memory.” (¶13) Still, as Ives’s sense of himself as a vigorous man began to founder with the onset of the chronic physical problems that burdened his last thirty years, and whether or not lack of recognition had taken a toll, it must have been irresistible to him to look for a foundation in a thinker whose place in American culture was indubitably fundamental—but apparently beginning to crumble, a relic of Santayana’s “Genteel Tradition.” (Ives’s lack of recognition remains a vexed issue because he was so ambivalent about acknowledgment, both seeking and shunning it. Such ambivalence communicates itself to those whose help one seeks.) Does it make any sense to think that in finding a footing in Emerson, Ives may have subconsciously displaced the “weakness” he was feeling onto the seer of Concord—as if he could in fantasy rescue this father figure? Thoreau seems to have been linked in Ives’s mind with George Ives—that flute heard from across the pond in the last movement of the Concord Sonata is freighted with an emotion that comes of a far deeper acquaintance with the player than Ives could have had with Thoreau. There is an additional ironic burden to all of this, given that Ives’s role in music was potentially more like Emerson’s in the culture, that of a founder—though Ives’s potential has yet to be realized. In any case, various fathers came to be increasingly central to Ives’s own myth of himself, which provided the basis for elements of the Ives legend in those years; his late song on “Full fathom five” from The Tempest might be viewed as coming out of these currents of feeling and thought.

Ives had unconventional ideas and deeply felt opinions; he thought for himself. But as a thinker he was, to be honest, if highly idiosyncratic, also conventional. Ives’s attempts to wrestle with abstractions can be embarrassing—though the favorable reception of his essays by some of his contemporaries suggests that his style suffers for us now in part from being too much of its time. Partly this is an issue of manner, based on Ives’s democratic instincts. He will be plainspoken and address himself to the common person. In the prologue to the essays,62 Ives overindulges (at least by our standards) in rhetorical questions about the source of music in memory, whether “subjective” (e.g., the composer’s impression of someone’s character) or “objective” (e.g., the composer’s impression of a beautiful physical manifestation, such as a

mountain). He is ostensibly trying to tease out the legitimacy of “program music”—and thereby, of one of his characteristic uses of memory with musical quotation, although he notably avoids direct reference to that issue. Ives thinks that program music has become debased by literalism: he later uses Richard Strauss as an exemplar (perhaps following Daniel Gregory Mason or, as Burkholder suggests, perhaps recalling Horatio Parker’s classroom criticism of program music), but the more contemporary figure of Strauss should be seen as a stand-in for Wagner, always in the back of any composer’s mind in that era, as I suggested.63

Ives is clearly torn, because he knows that he might be accused of similar literalism, so he has to talk around the issue with references to Herbert Spencer’s view of music as pure sensation and the like. One difficulty Ives sees is that the sensation of the composer’s experience has to be translated into the sensation of music, the experience to be conveyed unavoidably becoming mixed with the composer’s other experiences and the emotions and thoughts aroused by those experiences. Making allowances for his philosophical amateurism, we can perceive this as an attempt to “problematize” music with respect to its ability to communicate anything at all. Though we may with growing distress watch him become hopelessly lost in this Emersonian labyrinth (with Immanuel Kant in role of Daedalus), it is most noteworthy how he extricates himself from it—with an Icarian leap.

63. The reference to Strauss is ibid., 83. In Geoffrey Block, Ives: Concord Sonata, Cambridge Music Handbooks (Cambridge University Press, 1996), 65–66, Mason’s book Contemporary Composers (1918), which Ives read on his vacation in Asheville, North Carolina, after his “heart attack,” is said to have influenced his views on program music. (During this vacation the essays and the Concord Sonata both took the forms in which Ives self-published them in 1921.) Burkholder’s suggestion is in Charles Ives: The Ideas Behind the Music, 63 (see n.50, above). On Strauss as a stand-in for Wagner: An old Viennese amateur musician once told me that in his youth there was a saying in Vienna: “When we refer to Strauss, we mean Johann, and when we refer to Richard, we mean Wagner.” Program music of the most literal kind has been a frequent target of satire by American humorists. One fine early example, by John Phoenix (pseudonym of George Horatio Derby), available online, republished from a letter (c.1854) to the San Diego Herald, is in Phoenixiana; or, Sketches and Burlesques (New York: D. Appleton, 1856), 42–50; (reprint of 1903 edition, Toronto: University of Toronto Libraries, 2011), 47–57; it can also be found as “Critique of The Plains: Ode Symphonie by Jabez Tarbox,” in Native American Humor, James R. Aswell, ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), 238–41.
A problem widely supposed to have been discovered by French philosophers in the twentieth century was already an issue for Emerson in the nineteenth: the inability of words to fully communicate. As Ives sees it, taking musical communication to be analogous to communication by words (or other nonmusical images) might be the root of the problem. Whether he knew it or not, Ives aligns himself here with Mendelssohn’s well-known assertion that rather than being impoverished and indefinite in meaning, music is more definite and can say more than words; many composers feel this way, of course. So Ives ends the prologue quite abruptly and unexpectedly, asserting a hope that music will progress in its expressive power until it truly becomes a universal language (such as some claim it to be already) far beyond words in its ability to communicate soul to soul.

64. One of Kant’s aims in developing his analysis of human experience was to demonstrate the existence of the immortal soul. At one stage *The Critique of Pure Reason* presented a symmetrical picture of a physical world of things “in themselves,” beyond direct experience, mirrored by a soul equally isolated and unapproachable. But because his picture of Reason relied on self-consciousness, he ultimately tried to draw a distinction between the self that has experience, which he believed had to be more than Hume’s bundle of associations, and the soul. Emerson’s “Experience” exemplifies the soul’s remoteness with its strange passing mention of his son’s death, abruptly raised, then apparently dropped, which he compares to the loss of a “beautiful estate,—no more.” (¶ 3) Do we detect, however, an oblique reference to Eden, and thus the Fall of Man, which Emerson believes now appears as Kant’s epistemological problem? (¶ 18)

65. *Die Leute beklagen sich gewöhnlich, die Musik sei so vieldeutig; . . . und die Worte verständte doch ein Jeder. Mir geht es aber gerade umgekehrt. Und nicht blos mit ganzen Reden, auch mit einzelnen Worten, auch die scheinen mir so vieldeutig, so unbestimmt, so mißverständlich im Vergleich zu einer rechten Musik. . . . Das, was mir eine Musik ausspricht, die ich liebe, sind mir nicht zu unbestimmte Gedanken, um sie in Worte zu fassen, sondern zu bestimmte. (People often complain that music is too ambiguous [vieldeutig] . . . , whereas everyone understands words. With me, it is exactly the opposite, and not only with regard to an entire speech but also with individual words. These, too, seem to me so ambiguous, so vague, so easily misunderstood in comparison to genuine music. . . . The thoughts which are expressed to me by music that I love are not too indefinite to be put into words, but on the contrary, too definite.)* Letter to Marc-André Souchay, October 15, 1842, from *Briefe aus den Jahren 1830 bis 1847* (Leipzig: Hermann Mendelssohn, 1878), 221; translation from Felix Mendelssohn, *Letters*, ed. Gisella Selden-Goth (New York: Pantheon, 1945), 313–14. From en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Felix_Mendelssohn, with cuts and edited for style.
In view of the foregoing, Ives’s own lyric to his song “The Things Our Fathers Loved,” “I think there must be a place in the soul all made of tunes,” can be seen to point toward the way memory was for him a key to the future “people’s world nation.” To remember is to recover a connection to one’s own soul and specifically a part of the soul that is shared with others—the “over-soul.”

There is a deep paradox that underlies what we might call the “erotics” (in contrast to the “aesthetics”) of our experience of art—I want to be explicit that I mean the following to apply both to the audience and to the artist; I believe that they do not essentially differ in their experience with respect to the artistic object, inasmuch as an artist must be in some sense the first audience. Time, fundamental to all experience, enters the erotic in a special way, for the erotic consists paradoxically in the presence of an absence; specifically, the present absence of a future fulfillment. Desire is for wholeness, now apparently remembered from before desire made one aware that wholeness is missing. Although it could be said that desire is what creates the perception of a lack, it seems to the lover that the perception is of a previously unperceived lack, and it comes precisely when the future restoration of wholeness by the beloved becomes what is desired. The aforementioned paradox that what a composer shares is ideally of the utmost

66. “The Things Our Fathers Loved (and the greatest of these was Liberty)” is number 43 in 114 Songs (cited in n.22, above), 91–92. See Ives’s lyric to the song “He is there!” (capitalization per Ives), number 50 in ibid., 107–11. Ives writes in an unusually distinctive “idiolect”; when he wants to say, for example, that an act of imagination entails a transformation of memory, he says that “something personal tries to be ‘national’ suddenly . . .” (“Essays Before a Sonata,” 42). His music, probably because of his isolation, has similar characteristics, which may be why taxonomic approaches to the analysis of it can seem beside the point.

67. See Anne Carson, Eros the Bittersweet (Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive, 1998; first published Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986). Though some might wonder what Emerson would have thought about experience being described in these terms, he might surprise them. The formulation using now and then above (p.43) follows Carson in her discussion of the Greek poetic word dēute (an ejaculation that means something like “what is happening now has happened before!”; from dē [a temporal particle indicating the present, i.e., now] + aute [again]). It has no connection to the German verb deuten (to explain)—as in Mendelssohn’s vieldeutig (ambiguous; i.e., having multiple [viele] explanations)—but it’s a lovely coincidence. Carson’s book provided the kick (in two senses) that let me start to end this essay.
specificity, unique to his or her own experience, and as such, most like the unique experience of each listener is a closely related one. For they are both forms of the paradox of experience itself: always utterly of the present, but unthinkable apart from precisely what must appear ever absent, the past and the future.

Artistic choices, both conscious and not, will inevitably color any narrative, and in the process, a narrative can become a repository of experience and emotion, and even wisdom. The choices an artist makes are the source of the sense, much denied in our time but persistent because true, that some works of art speak more profoundly than others. We need not be led into the error of pretending otherwise because of our welcome postmodern release from the need to dismiss less profound works as of less rather than of different value. It is the tyranny of the market that imposes the false game of competitive valuation. Just as no civilized meal is made up of all one kind of food, no aesthetic life consists of all one kind of experience. Ives, who made a home in the market when it came to selling insurance, had a visceral sense that music was an altogether different kind of transaction. In reclaiming that ‘place in the soul all made of tunes,’ Ives’s music reaches out of his own experience and into that of each listener, an erotic act for both. Isn’t this what really offends in the commercialization of sex: not that eroticism by nature taints, but that it is tainted by the market?

It may also be this erotic element of creation that accounts for Ives’s reluctance to fix some of his compositions. As Anne Carson shows in an extended discussion of Plato’s dialogue *Phaedrus*, Sokrates holds that a written (and therefore fixed) speech—such as the ἐρωτικός λόγος by the sophist Lysias that Phaedrus has with him as they walk in the country and talk—can create mischief similar to the anti-erotic conduct of a love affair proposed by Lysias. Briefly, Lysias argues that a young object of love ought to prefer a clear-headed older lover who keeps

---

68. Ibid., 123–74. I follow Carson’s spelling of Greek names.

69. It’s a nice literary touch of Plato’s to have them walk away from the agora, which not only enhances the sense of the dialogue itself as an erotic encounter—Sokrates later compares his own pursuit of knowledge with erotic love—but emphasizes that the instrumentality of transactions in the marketplace is what Lysias’ proposed manner of erotic engagement most resembles. This is also played up in the reference to the story of Midas, who is like an eternally frustrated lover from one standpoint but, from another, has put himself in a fatal quandary by his conversion of the erotic into greed for something he can hold in his hands, gold, which is both dead and thus deadly.
the end of the affair in view so as to avoid the temporal paradoxes that Eros encourages. This unbesotted lover can avoid the destructive behavior that those paradoxes will otherwise lead him into (e.g., trying to keep the beloved from changing, neglecting family responsibilities, etc.). Sokrates acknowledges that such behavior is bad, but denies that the stance will have the salutary effect and insists that in any case, erotic madness is a precious gift of the gods and thus has a value that outweighs the dangers. Plato’s distrust of the fixed quality of written language surely explains why he used a dialogic form (though he did of course commit his work to writing). This may well seem odd to us who tend to see a text’s being in written form as a guarantee of its trustworthiness, but even in a time when writing had been common among the Greeks for several hundred years, Plato held to a view much more like the first generations of poets to write their works down (Sappho and Anakreon, for example), who are notable for, among many things, their care to give an impression of immediacy. To describe a text with the phrase “in black and white” can serve both as a recommendation of dependability but also as a reminder that “shades of gray” may more accurately reflect lived experience.

Ives well-known ire, visible often in his writings and widely reported by those who knew him, did not begin after he stopped composing; he apparently had had the sort of outbursts a shy person whose self-restraint suddenly gives way might be subject to in social situations from early on in his marriage—to such an extent that the Iveses stopped attending many social functions. The ire may have increased in his later years, however. Naturally, his ill health (diabetes, cataracts, perhaps depression) contributed, but in light of the foregoing discussion of the erotics of creativity, I want to suggest an additional source for the ire.

The energy that informs the state of divine madness common to the lover and the person (again, audience member or artist) having an aesthetic experience will need another outlet if the aesthetic experience is thwarted. When Ives lost the ability to compose—when that day arrived that he came down from his workroom in the attic of the brownstone on 74th Street and in tears told his wife that “nothing sounds right” (c.1926)—one form of frustration turned into another. Recall that desire entails frustration, and the pleasure of being in a state of desire is concomitant to it; frustration is what the lover enters into, being the experiential form that the altered perception of time takes. Frustration in this context is called ecstasy, meaning to stand apart: both from the norm of experience, which is immersion—literally, merger with the object of experience—but also from the object of experience itself. At the most fundamental level,
composers control time, playing with the desire both to reach the end and to defer it. Tonality serves a definite purpose of taking complete choice away (note that I do not say “taking choice away completely”). In order to “play out” the music, to defer the ending of the erotic moment, the end must have the ability to impose itself just as the beginning does. (Carson believes that this is why Sokrates has Phaedrus read the beginning of Lysias’ speech several times: to show that it has nothing akin to the sudden awareness that one is already in an erotic moment [“now, again!”], such as occurs in the poems of Sappho et al.) Without the resistance provided by having no choice in the end, deferral means little, play is arbitrary, willful. Ives’s choice of nontonic beginnings could well have been his way of assuring that the achieved memory is always ahead of him, and we see again what his deferring finishing his pieces was about. But it needs to be stressed that two kinds of time are at work in music: a time of continuity, where we truly experience time as a dimension, in which a melody is something more than one note following another; and the time that we know better, in which each moment takes us farther from the past and closer to the future that awaits us all.

The irony of Ives’s resistance to program music, given that he often wrote what arguably can be called just that, must be familiar to many artists: that one ends up making the art one does despite intentions or ambitions to the contrary. (The artist’s essential powerlessness in this regard is again characteristic of the erotic.) But Ives’s resistance, defensive though it may have been, is at the same time a resistance to a real limitation of much actual program music, that is, its self-limitation to a rote mere portrayal of things in the world in musical terms. Yet the higher value placed on “absolute” music, especially by those under the influence of German culture, is also a partial blind spot, for Ives’s music demonstrates that program music can do more than illustrate the trivial details of life: it can give us Life; it could have given us the Universe. Ives was a great composer.

Besides, as an artist friend of mine, who proudly calls himself an illustrator, tells his students: illustration, too, must do more than picture the world; it must tell a story. To tell a story does not mean simply to imitate events, whether verbally or pictorially or musically, one by one in order—if that is even possible. Then again, the very compilation of such a “list” in and of itself opens up a space within which each picture can become not just one moment in a series but a charged moment, a moment transcendently lit by paradox, in which memory is always of the future.
Appendicitis, 2015

The appendix may be considered sufficiently inflamed—it has swollen to the size of the original article—but renewed consideration of analyses by others of a song that plays a pivotal role in my argument, “The Things Our Fathers Loved”—specifically Larry Starr’s in *A Union of Diversities* (pp.57–67) and J. Peter Burkholder’s in *All Made of Tunes* (pp.306–11)—took me to the piano to see what else I could discover fairly quickly. The brief analysis below of course benefits from my years of familiarity with the song, but I had never given it any analytical attention previously. Some of the detail was developed in the course of writing it up, naturally, but the basic outline of the analysis, shown in example 18, really only took a few minutes to become clear.

The most striking sound in the first few bars is what Ives told Bernard Herrmann he called “shadow counterpoint.”\(^70\) The piano echoes, two beats later and a major 3rd higher, the first three notes, E–D–C, of the voice part; then in b.3, a second descending 3rd in the voice, A–G–F, is again echoed a major 3rd higher, this time almost in rhythmic unison. The echoes add a whole-tone sheen to the otherwise purely diatonic harmony, presenting five of the six tones of each of the two whole-tone collections. By 1917, the given date of composition, Ives apparently realized that the listener could distinguish “layers” of harmony without the need for them literally to persist. The effect, almost magical, is of two presences in the same space, a C major tonality so pure that it lacks even the tension of the leading tone (the b in the piano, b.2, belongs to the shadow counterpoint) and an almost complete chromatic that consists of ten of the twelve pitch classes.\(^71\) It is an uncanny image of the moment memory intrudes into present consciousness.

The two pitches of the total chromatic not yet sounded are the main upper- and lower-voice tones of the next harmonic event: In b.4, the A in the soprano moves to B\(^\flat\) and the F in the bass

\(^70\) Vivian Perlis, *Charles Ives Remembered: An Oral History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974), 161. In some songs (e.g., “The Housatonic at Stockbridge,” number 15 in *114 Songs*, 31–35) Ives notated shadow counterpoint in small notes, but in this song he marks the piano part *pianissimo* twice and leaves it to the accompanist’s sensitivity not to play the line too loudly.

\(^71\) As will soon become clear, unlike Starr, I don’t believe the tonality is C major at all, but the listener cannot know that in the first few bars. I use pc numbers in the graph (ex.18), but for stylistic consistency with my original article, I will use them sparingly in the text.
moves by way of an incomplete neighbor (echappée) F♯(Gb) to its lower neighbor, Eb. Besides being what we begin to suspect is a motion from 3 to its upper neighbor, A–B♭ can be heard as the continuation of a chromatic line that starts with an implied g1 over the initial C major chord in b.1, then moves to the g♯1 of the shadow counterpoint in b.2, and to the A in b.3; the B♭ moves to b♭1 in b.6, c2 (just touched on by the voice) in b.8, c♯2 in b.10, and ultimately, the d2 in b.15 on the word (fortissimo—shades of Sappho!) “Now!” The chromatic line thus fills a perfect 5th from G up to D. The motion is not structural in a voice-leading sense, but it confers a kind of rhetorical unity that underlies the disjunctions of the foreground that Starr focuses on. It also outlines an interval in what should be understood as the tonic harmonic collection, a hexachord in 5ths, B♭–a (T50729), which is most actively composed out in b.7–9 and especially in b.11–13, the exact middle of the twenty-two-bar song (“The village cornet band . . .”). That the c♯2 in b.10 resolves up to d2 momentarily but D turns out to be just a neighbor of Cn in the succeeding bars is a clever way for Ives to make the truly climactic D in b.15 both surprising (because not led into chromatically) yet completely convincing (because thoroughly prepared).

On the surface b.10 feels like a real disjunction—a physical sensation suddenly felt again (“Summer evenings . . .”) within a memory. However, it refers back to b.4–5, the initial evocation of the “tunes of long ago,” and musically it is a summarizing recomposition in inversion of those bars. The motion A–B♭ is now in the bass, and in the soprano the interval F♯(Gb)–Eb is reversed (spelled D♯–F♯) and chromatically filled in (presenting the remaining pitches of the chromatic not given by the filling in from G to D). Referring to the graph, one can also see that the four-note whole-tone segment C♯–B–A–G (labeled 1 E 9 7 in the graph) that has grown out of the initial three-note shadow counterpoint segments and represents a shadow counterpoint in the background of b.4–10 is also summarized, passing from the voice part, c♯2–b1, to the accompaniment, a2–g2.

The bass motion from F to D in b.14 is chromatically filled—the Eb is implied by parallel motion in the inner voices but not literally present, perhaps because Ives wants to hold it in reserve for the end. Note the parallelism between the vocal lines in b.14 and 21, d1 stepwise up to b♭1/a♯1. The d1 that the voice has come to rest on several times (b.7, 9) is finally transferred up an octave in b.14 to the vocal part’s first d2 on the downbeat of b.15; in b.21, the ascent is
interrupted by a breath mark—like a catch in the throat after the word “Fathers”—before falling back to g♯₁, the pitch that began the chromatic ascent to d₂, on the word “loved.”

The melodic reference to the refrain of “The Sweet By-and-By” by Joseph P. Webster (to Ives’s words “Now! Hear the songs! I know not what are the words / But they sing in my soul of the things . . .”), b.15–21, seems to want to shift the tonality to something more like the G major adumbrated by the reference in b.6–7 to the tune of Paul Dresser’s “On the Banks of the Wabash, Far Away.” This is possible without destroying the structural coherence of the song because mixed harmonic criteria are in operation, as in the *Fourth of July*. That is to say, the B♭—a hexachord can be composed out as the diatonic hexachord of F major (most of b.1–13), but the composing out of the chromatic ascending line from G to D as well as several salient references in both the voice and accompaniment to that dyad (b.6, 7, 9, 12) allow for a rival “gravitational field” to assert itself. In addition, although the hymn tune already emphasizes the notes D and G, Ives changes the original B on the downbeat of b.18 (“words”) to another G. In fact, the suppression of B in the melody has a structural purpose that will soon become clear (recall the lack of that pitch as leading tone in the opening bars, which seem at first to be in C major).

The presence of G as a potential tonal center enacts our experience of memory: that it seems to pull us out of the present. It also provides a *musical* justification for the open ending: As in *The Fourth of July*, the ending of the song suggests a continuation by evoking earlier moments: the initial neighboring motion of b.3–7, F–A to E♭–B♭ and back, is recalled by the E♭ triads (spelled in D♯), first major, then minor (labeled 36T in the graph), in the bass, b.21–22; the interval created by the shadow counterpoint in b.2, C–G♯ (now spelled B♯–G♯; 08) is recalled by

72. Ives gives no meter signature, but most of the notated bars are in 4/4; the only two in 5/4 are b.10 and 14. This is not just expressive license, however: the quotation in the accompaniment of the chorus of “The Battle-Cry of Freedom” by George F. Root (“The Union forever! . . .”) begins on what would have been the downbeat of b.11 if b.10 had been in 4/4. Memory is, so to speak, “two times at once.” (The vocal line in b.11–13 is a characteristically rhythmically distorted paraphrase of the verse of the tune.)

73. There are several other structural similarities of the song to the larger piece, such as starting on what turns out to be the dominant harmony. Might that be why Ives does not place the C major chord on the downbeat of b.1?

74. I am reminded of a line in another Ives lyric, for “Old Home Day” (see n.22, above), which goes, “The dear old trees, with their arch of leaves[,] seem to grasp us by the hand.”
the right hand part. Probably because of the small scale of the piece, the complementary hexachord \((D\#/E\# – e\#\) in 4ths) has not been composed out as thoroughly as \(B_\# – a\), but it has made its presence felt earlier, in b.4–5, 10, and 14. Five of the six pitches of the complement \((D\#/E\#, G\#, F\#, B, E; C\# is omitted\) are prominent in the 19-sixteenth-note pattern in the piano that also elaborates the \(V^7\) chord in G; note that \(f^1, b^1, e^2\) are literally in 4ths, and \(E\) and \(E\#\) (the outer tones of the hexachord) are stated as a linear augmented 8ve in the quotes of “The Battle-Cry of Freedom” \((e^3 – e\#^2; g\#^2\) sounds with \(e^3\), and skips a “4th” to the \(E\#\)). The five-note final chord also has three of the six pitches of the complement, \(F\#, G\#, D\#\), and the neighbor motion that prolongs it, two more, \(B, C\#\). From the perspective of the division of the chromatic into the two whole-tone collections, the middleground descent of a four-note segment of \(WT_1\), in the accompaniment of the first half of the song is answered by a four-note segment of \(WT_0\) in the voice part in the second half, \(D–C–A\#–G\#\) \((2\ 0\ T\ 8)\). But that is made possible only by the suppression of \(B\) \((\hat{3}\ in\ G)\), which would otherwise have allowed for a descent from \(\hat{5}\), as in the quoted hymn tune. Four of the six notes of \(WT_0\) are also in the final chord: \(B\#, F\#, G\#, and A\#\) \((068T)\).

The bass \(E\#/D\#\) in b. 21 arrives as a chromatic inflection of \(E\) minor, b.20, which sounds like \(VI\) in \(G\) major. (Ives apparently felt that the deceptive cadence by itself was not sufficient to undercut the resolution to \(G\); rightly, since the feint, by delaying the resolution, tends to confirm \(G\) as the goal). So the unanswered *musical* question is, will the \(E\#\) chord continue on to \(G\) major or back to \(F\) major? Both work beautifully on the surface, but they confer quite different meanings to the song. The \(G\) major seems to me less appropriate because it implies that the experience represented by the song is one of progress or at least of movement from one place to another. More conventional composers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries certainly wrote pieces that start in one key and end in another, and trying to encourage some such progress is thought by some critics to be what Ives had in mind for his music. I prefer the return to \(F\) major, however. Note that although the 3-note chromatic motions (shown in the background graph) can be interpreted as transposed up a step in the \(G\) major section, they also keep the registral positions they had in the \(F\) major part of the song. More to the point, a return to \(F\) suggests to me something closer to what I take Ives’s stance to have been: that ideally it is in the present (metaphorically, the structural tonic) that we must seize upon those elements of the past with which we will create the future.