

Michael J. Bell

POLICING LOUISE POUND

INTRODUCTION

Though Louise Pound (1872–1958) is not truly a forgotten American ballad scholar, she is not a well-remembered one either. Most of her great work in ballad and folk song studies was conducted over a hundred years ago. And despite the occasional modern nod to the scholarly brilliance of her scourging of Francis Barton Gummere, her own theory of balladry in *Poetic Origins of the Ballad* (1921b), and her publication of the first book length scholarly collection of American folksongs—*American Ballads and Songs* (1922)—she was not well liked by the coterie that dominated academic ballad studies in the first quarter of the twentieth century. D. K. Wilgus, trying to be polite, noted that their reception of her major theoretical work, *Poetic Origins*, “was, to say the least, mixed.” The truth is that it was vicious. Those who liked the book, Wilgus continued, “regretted the overlappings, repetitions, and polemical tone...[and] the weaknesses of what constructive argument she offered.” Those who did not, suggested that, like Gummere, she buttressed her argument by “quot[ing] out of context” (Wilgus 1959, 98; for his full discussion of Pound’s ballad work, see 1959, 89–99). The harshest of Pound’s critics was Gordon Hall Gerould (1877–1953), who in the very public pages of *The Literary Review* of *The New York Evening Post* chided her lack of Child and Gummere’s “exquisite literary tact,” declared that she was “obviously incapable of orderly thought,” and ended by pronouncing her anathema: “Wherefore, I submit, she should not be writing about ballads at all” (Gerould, G. H. 1921, 14).

Gerould’s 1921 review so traumatized Pound that, offered the opportunity to review his new book *The Ballad of Tradition* in 1933, she spent most of her review pointing out how it had only taken him twelve years to come around to her way of thinking and then cataloguing in detail the terrible things he had said about her. Her summary of what she called his “brickbats” spoke volumes:

The author is obviously incapable of orderly thought...the results are practically worthless and deserve no praise...a dull, confused and unconvincing book...Some very good minds have gone over the same material before and come to very different conclusions...and [Child] had exquisite literary tact which Miss Pound seems not to possess...she has never learned...how to deal fairly with evidence...so led away by her theories as to argue the impossibility of ballad composition by European peasants because the cowboys haven't really done it...a quite abysmal lack of understanding of the psychological and social differences between the conditions in which popular ballads have been made and those in which they cannot be made...her habit of distorting evidence...She seems to have no inkling that people in different states of society think and behave quite differently; and she has apparently never even surmised the real nature of folk-ballads. (Pound 1933, 125; for a discussion of the use of the claim of "disordered minds" as an attack on women, see Busfield 2003, 36–47)¹

Gerould's scorning of Pound as a disordered mind would be easy to dismiss as just another example of the appallingly sexist things that male intellectuals say/said when confronted with a women scholar engaged in serious work that challenged both the prevailing wisdom—in this case the definition and theory of the traditional popular ballad—and the critical edifice that it supported. But to call her tactless is damning. Tact is the highbrow version of politeness. Whereas politeness is the ordinary display of sensitivity towards others, tact is that sensitivity plus delicacy. It presents itself as a knowing intimacy. To be tactful is not only to wish to be kind, but also to know how to choose the right words and actions to ensure that one is graceful and elegant in their relationships. As David Russell notes, tact is "an aesthetic of handling over more abstract conceptualization or observation—whether of people or objects" (2017, 1).

To be accused of lacking exquisite literary tact is doubly damning. Literary tact is the aesthetic perfection of ordinary tact. In the right hands, it imbues a writer's choice of words and manner of outreach with what T. S. Eliot described as "the direct sensuous apprehension of thought" (Eliot 1921, 285; see also Cottom 1985, 1–34; Cox 1994, 212–233).² In Gerould's version of this concept, the unity

of thought and feeling was embodied to near perfection by Child as a scholar and realized perfectly in his collection in which everything included was genuine and everything excluded was not. Gerould said as much in 1908, writing that the recently discovered ballad "The Bitter Withy" was the only claimant to have passed the three accepted tests of ballad genuineness required to be considered a genuine Child ballad: the first and most important of which was the "purely personal, the critical sense of the scholar who has learned by long-continued and careful study to distinguish the false from the true, to separate the chaff from the wheat" (Gerould, G. H. 1908, 142). This embodiment of mind and manners, what George Santayana described ironically as "the genteel tradition"—and Lionel Trilling called less politely, "Anglo-Saxon Toryism"—turns Gerould's desire for exquisite tact into an academic policing of Pound's thoughts and words (Santayana 1911 [1967]; Trilling as cited in Sedgwick III 1984, 50; see also Dawidoff 1992; Foucault 1995, 135–141).

Pound's misfortune was that the ballad fraternity found in Gerould someone who was temperamentally inclined to be a vehement defender of the Harvard communalist approach. Born in New Hampshire into modest middle-class prosperity, Gerould attended Dartmouth College where he received his B. A. in English in 1898. After college, at the encouragement of a favorite professor, he continued his education at Oxford where he completed a B.Litt. in philology and language with two leading philologists: Arthur S. Napier and Joseph Wright. Upon returning home in 1900, he joined the English Department at Bryn Mawr College as an Associate in English Philology. He taught at Bryn Mawr until he was recruited by Woodrow Wilson to join the faculty at Princeton. While at Bryn Mawr, he met his future wife Katharine Fullerton, who had begun teaching English Composition at the College after graduating from Radcliffe College in 1901. Though there is no direct evidence, it is most likely that Gerould's interest in balladry was magnified by his relationship with Francis Barton Gummere, who was just a mile down Montgomery Avenue at Haverford College, another Quaker institution. The two men shared common ground; both published editions of *Beowulf*, for example, and Gummere would have appreciated Gerould's extensive work in Medieval Studies.³

Across the first three decades of the twentieth century, the Ger-

oulds were the power couple of Trilling's Anglo-Saxon Toryism. She was out in the world more than he—she published 114 stories, poems, and essays in magazines like *The Century*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's*, and *Scribner's*. He only had thirty or so publications, but he did have two novels and his scholarship and teaching at Princeton to fill in the gap. Despite their disparity in output, both Geroulds were regarded in the world of letters as two of the leading voices for the “plight of the genteel” (Gerould, K. F. 1922, 446). They wrote on a variety of subjects and opposed so much—bad books, bad taste, bad culture, circus trips with children, the end of high culture, movies to which they seldom went and at which Katharine was seldom entertained. She did not get Chaplin, for example (Gerould, K. F. 1912b; Gerould, K. F. 1915; Gerould, K. F. 1921a, 29; Gerould, K. F. 1926, 446). Together they despaired of American provincialism, held no hope for the assimilation of the working class or immigrants, and preferred to model themselves on their English and New England forefathers. It may be unfair to saddle each with the other's words, but it is probably fair to say that these sentiments were constantly present at their dinner table. Certainly, the critics noticed their similarities: “He writes,” one anonymous reviewer noted, “with none of the disdainful tension, lapsing into grisliness, of his wife, Mrs. Katherine Fullerton Gerould. His style is amorphous within and fuzzy without. But he, too, is by implication a violent anti-modernist and intent on showing the strength, serenity, and comeliness of an older order of American life” (Anonymous 1920, 454).

In another essay, I have dealt with Gerould's “handling” of Pound as part of a larger discussion on the debate over American balladry at the beginning of the twentieth century (Bell 2022). At this moment, however, my narrower intention is to analyze three of her writings for evidence of the validity of Gerould's accusations. I will begin with her 1896 essay in *Modern Language Notes (MLN)* on Chaucer's *Romaunt of the Rose* (c. 1320), which marked the formal beginning of her professional career as a literary historian; proceed to her first folklore publication, an 1899 pedagogical essay designed to promote the teaching of the ballad, simply entitled “The Ballads” and published in the *North-West Monthly*; and conclude with her first definition of folksong offered in a footnote within the “Introduction” of *Folk-song of Nebraska and the Central Middle West: A Syllabus*,

published in 1915.

I have chosen these three texts from Pound's career because they offer the chance to observe Pound's academic style in development, and thus to discover what in the attacks from Gummere might have brought forth such rancor. My hypothesis is simple. If she is the person Gerould describes, then the evidence should be most visible in those moments before she brought her training as a philologist and literary historian to bear on Gummere's hypotheses. All publications are inherently acts of apprenticeship. Subjects, theories, and methods are impermanent. But repeated demonstrations of solid technique coupled with attention to writing for the audience and not for oneself are signals that allow readers to identify the tone and passion of any scholar. In Pound's case, these criteria allow for an exploration of the moments before she became a target of Gerould's sharpened axe, when she still had choices about how she wished to transform her subjectivity into her scholarly persona, and thus when she might have been most likely to display Gerould's list of flaws.

I will not, however, use this essay to defend Pound's *Poetic Origins*. By any standard except received history, the book rivals in substance anything published by her contemporaries H. M. Belden, John A. Lomax, Phillips Barry, Gordan Hall Gerould, and George Lyman Kittredge. But, as Wilgus's tepid description makes clear (1959, 89–99), even a strong counterargument to Gerould's review would not work at this point. The truth is that Pound does not have a folklore scholarship problem. She has a folklorist problem, and until that problem is resolved, even the best reading of *Poetic Origins* is unlikely to prevent her from being marked down as a disorderly woman as opposed to a dedicated scholar in action. Such a claim may seem hyperbolic. But there is no doubt that Gerould's review colonized her memory, slipping, as Emmanuel Levinas suggests all trauma does, through "the tight weave of [her] consciousness" before she was ready for it, trapping her into repeating "a past that was never present" (Levinas 1987, 75).⁴ For the remainder of her career, Pound would return to Gerould's attack to challenge its credibility, to revel as her arguments became part of the new wisdom of ballad studies, and to complain that her ideas had been absorbed without appropriate credit.

Louise Pound was trained for greatness. Her father Stephen

Pound was a prominent jurist in Lincoln, Nebraska and her mother Laura a civic activist most noted for her work with the Lincoln Public Library. Along with her two siblings—her older brother Roscoe who would become a celebrated legal professor and dean of Harvard Law School and her younger sister Olivia who would become the family classist—Pound was taught by her mother from an early age about the natural sciences, ancient and modern languages, and literature. Pound was then sent to a local preparatory school, at sixteen to the Latin School in the School of Fine Arts, and finally at eighteen to the University of Nebraska (for a complete biography, see Cochran 2009; see also Botkin 1959a; Botkin 1959b; Krohn 2008; Lowenthal 1999).

Pound was an active student throughout her university years. She participated in the full range of college activities, including joining the Drama Club and Literary Society alongside her close friend Willa Cather, with whom she performed in several plays.⁵ She also produced her first academic publication, a translations exercise from *Beowulf* she had written for L. A. Sherman—Chair of the department and her mentor—in her required sophomore class on Anglo-Saxon literature, which he used as an example in his *Analytics of Literature* (Sherman 1892, 407). Always among her class's leading students, she was an orator for senior Class Day Exercises, presenting a speech entitled "The Apotheosis of the Common," which drew high praise within and outside of the University.

Upon graduation in 1892 with an A. B. in English, she became a reader for the Department of English and then Assistant Instructor until she received her A. M. in 1896. She also published her first professional paper in *Modern Language Notes (MLN)*, "*The Romaunt of the Rose*: Additional Evidence that it is Chaucer's," in 1896, most likely prepared as a part of her graduate work. According to Sherman, during this time Pound "carried all Anglo-Saxon work" in the English Department. She continued to work in the department for the next two years while taking full summer schedules at the University of Chicago, including advanced language courses in Phonology and Morphology. In addition to being an outstanding summer student and a nationally recognized tennis champion while at the University of Chicago, she published in 1898 an educational pamphlet titled "A List of Strong Verbs and Preterite Present Verbs in Anglo-Saxon" through the University of Chicago Press for use in her courses at the

University of Nebraska (Pound 1898).

In the summer of 1899, Pound left her instructor position at Nebraska to pursue her Ph.D. at the University of Heidelberg, where Ph.D.'s could still be obtained through examination and presentation of a dissertation without first taking a prescribed course of study. Pound attended a good number of lectures while in Germany, but with remarkable diligence she completed the required exams, had her dissertation accepted, and graduated *magna cum laude* in the unheard-of time of one year. Her dissertation, *The Comparison of Adjectives in English in the XV and XVI Century*, was supervised by the noted German philologist Johannes Hoops. Dr. Pound returned to Lincoln, Nebraska where she taught until her death in 1958 at the age of 86.

POUND'S "THE ROMAUNT OF THE ROSE: ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE THAT IT IS CHAUCER'S"

As was common in academic publications in philology at the time, Pound's essay in *MLN* applies a focused scientific method to a narrow literary question. Pound invokes W. W. Skeat (1835–1912), the noted philologist⁶ who had "proved to his satisfaction" that the English translation of the thirteenth century French poem *The Romaunt de la Rose* "could not be Chaucer's." "Professor Skeat," Pound explains, had then reasserted "this opinion, with some modifications, in his recent edition of Chaucer's complete works." According to Pound, Skeat's proof was based on "internal, philological grounds, relating to the vocabulary, to the dialect, to the grammar, and to the rime." Specifically, Skeat had proposed seven tests through which he could prove his point, and even though the work of "certain German scholars" and Thomas A. Lounsbury of the Sheffield Scientific School at Yale had demonstrated that several of Skeat's tests failed on merit, Lounsbury still claimed "that as concerns the remainder, the main body of the translation, his tests hold good" (Pound 1896, 97; all quotes hereafter indicated by *MLN* and page number). Pound informs her readers further that she does not think it was necessary to provide a detailed analysis of either Skeat's or Lounsbury's work, noting simply that Lounsbury had demonstrated that "the dialect test" which Skeat claimed would "alone prove decisive," points, "if to anything,

to a Chaucerian authorship” (MLN 97). Pound concludes her summary of previous research by asserting “though there may seem to be difficulties in the way of the translation’s being Chaucer’s, there are much greater difficulties in the way of its not being Chaucer’s” (MLN 97–98).

Having laid out her problem, Pound explains her intention to apply the “tests of sentence-length and sentence-structure” to determine if they shed a different light on the issue of authorship. She does not imagine that these tests would be conclusive. Rather, stating her hypothesis formally, she writes:

it is obvious that comparisons of the sets of figures here presented, calculated from Chaucer’s genuine writings, from those unquestionably spurious, from the English version of *The Romaunt of the Rose* and from the French original, should throw some light upon the question, either on one side or on the other. It is also obvious that such testimony should have equal weight with that resting on vague theorizing or speculations, or on the uncertain foundations of personal opinion. (MLN 98)

Pound’s open questioning of the value of personal authority is a stark reminder that she saw Philology as an experimental science. It was no accident that Lounsbury taught in the Scientific School at Yale, or that Francis James Child’s earliest teaching of Anglo-Saxon literature was in the Scientific School at Harvard (Bell 2022). Language study and philology were highly technical subjects whose primary methods were grounded not only in direct evidence but also in the accurate measurement of that evidence. “Vague theorizing or speculations” about style or potentially damning “uncertain foundations of personal opinion” had no place in the process. Pound was interested in how one manipulated and controlled variables in cause-and-effect relationships to *measure* style. Her method led her to provisional conclusions, and her chosen verbs were should, might, and could.

Accordingly, Pound takes special care to explain her methodology. At one level her experiment is simple. She makes word and sentence counts of the three types of ‘Chaucerian’ poetry: genuine, spurious, and questionable. To make her calculations possible and to make her tests uniform with Skeat’s, she “adopt[s] and carr[ies] out

consistently his system of punctuation as shown in his 1891 edition of the 'Prologue'" (MLN 98). Pound indicates that following Skeat in this fashion was a choice and not a necessity, since he did not always follow his own principles as an editor. Despite this caveat, she was determined to play fair and as such makes clear that she "repunctuated to render the whole uniform...[with] the 858 lines of the 'Prologue'" and then does the same with the other test poems and *The Romaunt* so that they too are "made uniform with the 'Prologue'" (MLN 98).

The resulting fourteen tables are staggering. Each is broken down by the number of sentences, indicated by the number of periods and words, and then further broken down by predication, simple sentences, initial contractions, and internal contractions. Each table displays in units of one hundred sentences the exact number for each column, which are then totaled and averaged. For example, Pound calculates that in Chaucer's "Knights Tale" there are 763 periods (sentences) which contain 17,044 words, within which there are 2,018 predications, 219 simple sentences, 246 initial contractions, and 1,148 internal contractions. These produce sentences that average 22.31 words, 2.69 predications, 0.028 simple sentences, 0.30 initial contractions, and 0.30 internal contractions. This procedure is conducted on the five genuine Chaucerian poems, five recognized spurious Chaucerian poems, and all 2,205 lines of the *Romaunt of the Rose*, all of which are then compared to the averages on the genuine Chaucerian poems and with those of the *Romaunt*. Pound's conclusions are meticulous: "Not only does the *Romaunt of the Rose* fail to show any of the variation from Chaucer's manner, demonstrated in the poems long attributed to him but now rejected, but it seems to stand on the same literary footing as those which are Chaucer's beyond dispute" (MLN 99).

Pound was not done upsetting apple carts. As she notes, Skeat had admitted that some of the English *Romaunt* might possibly be Chaucer's. Pound proceeds to subject this new claim to the same experimental process and once more demonstrates that the variation was within the sentence limits found in Chaucer's recognized works and thus lent "no color" whatsoever to Skeat's theory (MLN 100). Continuing her sweep through Skeat's claims, Pound reports that he had also suggested that John Lydgate (c. 1370–c. 1451) and John Gower (c. 1330–1408) were potential authors for pieces of the Chaucerian oeuvre. Once more applying her sentence test to Lydgate's

"The Complaint of the Lover's Life" and Gower's "Confessio Amantis" (a 33,000-line Middle English poem), she demonstrates that "the sentence test verifies and would point, even if there were no other proofs at hand, to the conclusion that the five works classed as spurious could not be Chaucer's." Moreover, she declares the "same test seems to point just as plainly to *The Romaunt of the Rose* as Chaucer's. Add the correspondence in the number of predications, simple sentences, and conjunctions, and the matter gains increased conclusiveness" (MLN 101 and 102).

Pound's final paragraph leaves no doubt about the scientific status of Professor Skeat's claims. Her mentor L. A. Sherman had previously shown that Chaucer wrote shorter prose sentences than any of his contemporaries. Now, she compared his facts to her data. "Not only," she states, "does the *Romaunt of the Rose* fail to show any of the variation from Chaucer's manner, demonstrated in the other poems long attributed to him but now rejected, but it seems to stand on the same literary footing as those which are Chaucer's beyond dispute" (MLN 102). She had begun with two goals: to investigate the validity of Skeat's claims and to establish the principle that scientifically acquired evidence should matter as much as personal insight. Now, she applied that second principle dauntlessly. It is possible, she writes, that another unknown writer might have the same sentence averages as Chaucer, but, until they appeared, her results "should seem decisive." After all, she continues, one writer who stood "ahead of his contemporaries as far as Chaucer" was quite enough for any nation. "That there should have been two, and that the name of the second should not have survived, seems more than we should be asked to believe," Pound concludes (MLN 102).

POUND'S "THE BALLADS"

Pound's 1899 ballad essay was a very different document for its era. It was one of several pedagogical pieces she wrote for Professor Sherman's larger project to provide college and normal schoolteachers with precise outlines of potential topics in English literature. Sherman's series was one of several produced monthly by Nebraska's University Extension program for teachers of English, Economics,

and European and American History. They were designed first to answer a need identified by John Dewey that normal schools, “where the bulk of teacher training took place, rarely prepared students in the rigors of subject knowledge while those who graduated from universities and decided to teach were well versed in subject knowledge but had no skills in or knowledge of the craft of teaching” (Dewey 1896, 363). The second objective was more political. Sherman was the primary advocate of what was known as “The Nebraska method” of English Studies, an attempt to shift attention away from the traditional heavy focus on renowned authors and towards the literary historical study of periods, genres, styles, and authors that we know today.

Pound’s interest in ballads was a result of her working with H. M. Belden, the great Missouri folklorist, whom she met in 1893 when he was her colleague for a year. He encouraged her to become involved in gathering Nebraska ballads soon after his arrival in the department, sparking her lifelong interest in folklore and folklife. Pound’s essay was modelled formally on Child’s 1874 essay on ballad poetry, though in actual content it was closer to Wellesley Professor Katharine Lee Bates’ “Introduction” to her high school/undergraduate textbook *Ballad Book*, published in 1890, which Pound knew and recommended,⁷ and, to a lesser degree, on Gummere’s short 1896 “Ballads” and “Folk-songs” entries for the Warner Library’s sections on both subjects (Bates 1890; Gummere 1896a; Gummere 1896b; see also Bell 2021). The essay itself broke no new ground. Pound’s objective was to present a short, accurate, neutral description of ballad facts with little or no editorializing or prescription. Her points, she writes, were only “suggested” and “introductory,” and her injunction that they should be “followed out by the student as far as his interests will carry him” indicates that she saw as her responsibility promoting understanding and not rote learning (Pound 1899, 880; all quotes hereafter TB and page number).

She begins by listing the four essentials of ballad teaching: “(1) Nature and definition of the ballad as a lyric type. (2) Characteristics of ballad poetry; leading kinds of distinguished. (3) Brief historical sketch of the ballad in English. (4) The ballad revival in the eighteenth century, and its part in the English Romantic Movement” (TB 880). Taking up the first, she explains:

Ballads are generally classed as lyrics, not pure lyrics, but merging into the latter in musical origin, stanzaic form, and the frequent appearance of the lyric note. In their origin ballads seem to have been sung as an accompaniment to a dance, as suggested by the name, from the Old French *baller*, to dance, and were rather the product of improvisation than strictly of individual authorship. In this latter respect, their “communal” authorship and in that their nature is primarily narrative, they resemble epic poetry, are epic rather than lyric. Briefly, then, the type ballad is a miniature epic, a short narrative told lyrically. (TB 880)

What is immediately apparent is how hard Pound is working to maintain a scholarly voice. Ballads are “generally classified” as a form of lyric poetry, but she swiftly clarifies that they are “not pure lyrics,” and only become lyrics by being of “musical origin,” having “stanzaic form,” and possessing “the frequent appearance of the lyric note,” a phrase she assumes her audience of English teachers will understand. The ambiguity is intentional. Pound intentionally does not lay out any ballad laws. Her adverbs and verbs throughout the piece are as conditional as her conclusions. Nouns that might be solid are softened by terms like “generally,” “seem,” and “resemble,” or modified curiously, like the phrase ballads “were *rather* the product of improvisation than *strictly* of individual authorship,” for example (emphasis added). Moreover, her placement of “communal” in quotes renders the central tenet of contemporary scholarship—Gummere’s communal theory—as a possibility and not a fact. Likewise, she consciously remains neutral on the hot button topic of whether epics were stitched together from ballads or ballads were remaining fragments of epics. This neutrality results in a wonderful hodgepodge of a subsequent sentence in which ballads first “resemble” epic poetry, then “are epic rather than lyric,” until, in their ideal form, their “type,” as she calls it, as a ballad becomes a “miniature epic, a short narrative told lyrically” (TB 880).

Pound’s struggle with language only grows. Concentrating on the “types” ballads form, she writes:

The first of these is the pure, or so-called “communal” ballad, the traditional ballad, orally transmitted, characterized by *fluctuating text*, and “popular” in that it has come down anonymously, without

individuality of authorship behind it, as if arising from the people. The pure ballad is necessarily antecedent in time, is a "distinct species" both historically and theoretically. (TB 880)

This initial sentence is a compressed listing of too many conventional markers of ballad forms and features in too little space. The result is a tumbledown of equivalence without explanation. Indeed, according to Pound, ballads are "pure," "so-called communal," "traditional," "orally transmitted," "anonymous," have a "fluctuating text," and lack "individuality," all of which coalesce to create the "as if" illusion that they "arise from the people." There is no question that there is confusion here, but it is not until her final sentence in this discussion when she borrows from Child's unattributed claim that the popular ballad is a "distinct species," and "necessarily" antecedent in history and theory to other forms of poetry that she almost takes a stand on something. Unfortunately, that stand, with its reliance on Child, does not reduce the flow of definitional ambiguity.

Pound resolves this confusion by directing her readers to Child's collection. Its "monumental" ten volumes, she tells the reader, contain "almost exclusively ballads of this type, which he has followed to their sources and accompanied by information as to their history and shifting texts." Pound's reliance on Child as arbiter and on the idea that ballad texts by their very nature will make plain sense of her wealth of information was the common solution for almost all ballad scholars during this era. Scholars could not explain or replicate Child's method, so they relied on the supposedly self-evident ballads to do the work for them. To this end, Pound recommends some examples that might be profitably read: the "Robin Hood ballads, the Battle of Otterburn, Sir Patrick Spens," and two—Waly Waly and Helen of Kirconnal—which demonstrate how pure ballads can almost be "carried out of balladry proper by the predominance of the lyrical" (TB 881).

Pound then proceeds to repeat this definitional work with the "so-called Broad-sides," which she suggests are better defined as "vulgar" literary ballads. The first she describes as "a degeneration of the pure ballad, a cross between it and the literary ballad," brought about by the introduction of print. This foregrounding of the textual intersection between oral and print picks up on her earlier discussion

of the relationship between the epic and lyric impulses in the pure (type) ballad and anticipates her similar description of the literary ballad, which she makes clear are a modern form resulting from “the disappearance of the ballad stage in society, sequent upon the growth of civilization and the coming of letters.” Literary ballads are imperfect, “polished and regularized” attempts by modern, civilized poets to “imitate” the “pure ballad in diction and simplicity,” Pound asserts (TB 881).

In both cases, though Pound does not explicitly say so, the textual history of the ballad is written as a degeneration from an initial purity to a hybrid mixture of the worst of orality and print to an imitation in print of the initial state of purity. The result is a hierarchy of value and a melancholy discourse that details the descent from pure, oral, traditional ballads to ill-mixed story song and finally to civilized pale copies. Pound does take some space to connect the historical context of the broadsides to cultural advancement, concluding that they flourished “in large numbers in the sixteenth century and later, emerged as the street ballads and popular songs in concert halls today.” This extension to the concert hall was uncommon. The prevailing consensus drew a hard and fast line between the street life of the broadside ballad and musical hall performance. Again, on this topic Pound does not comment. Instead, she supplies potential texts of both types for her readers to use, though she cautions against using Kipling’s *Barrack Room Ballads* too freely to exemplify the literary ballad, since they “in their suggestion of musical origin, pseudo-tradition, and seeming impersonality of authorship [seem to] approximate the strict ballad type, [but] are scarcely in the ballad spirit” (TB 881).

Pound then sums up her presentation thus far:

Roughly speaking, the characteristics of the ballad are simplicity, objectivity, the absence of the personal note and of self-consciousness, imperfect presentation of the narrative, which often shows violent omissions, iteration, and rude and unornamented diction, marked by the recurrence of stereotyped epithets and lines. As regards sources and motives, the ballads deal variously with themes of popular history, love, chivalry, feud, fighting, outlawry, adventure, romance domestic calamity, and the superstitious and supernatural. The dominant note is pathos, often tragic. In meter the ballads show,

conventionally, the resolved seven-stress line, or the four-stress line with refrain. (TB 881)

Finished defining, Pound begins her explanation of the literary history of the ballad by declaring that if “the test of stanzaic form is disregarded,” then pure ballads now named the “English ballads...may be said” to be ancient, and further that “some episodes of *Beowulf*” and perhaps also the “rhythmical narratives of the battles of Brunanburh and Malden” might have been ballads as well. If, she continues, the “conventional ballad form” is the test, then the first English ballads—those in the Child collection—strictly “date from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries,” and only continue to be popular “down to about the middle of the eighteenth century.” Again, this dichotomy is an uncomfortable compromise between the prevailing communalist interpretations and more historical study of ballads. Pound uses this dichotomy, however, to shift her attention to the history of ballad study. She begins with Bishop Percy, his folio “rescued from its use to kindle fires,” and comments on his inappropriate “treatment of his materials.” Pound aims to start her history off on the right foot. She acknowledges that the *Reliques* were “epoch-making,” but pointedly indicates that they were “as much the result as the cause of the Romantic movement,” and that the good Bishop “simply did more adequately what had been attempted by his predecessors, and in a way that won and held popular attention, reaching men’s hearts at a critical time” (TB 882).

Pound follows her stringent framing of Percy’s role within the study of ballads with an equally stringent survey of German influence, Sir Walter Scott, Wordsworth, and Child. She provides appropriate quotes for pedagogical use to note the impact of ballads on these scholars, and more importantly “a partial list of ballads collections accessible to the student,” citing all the relevant possibilities: Percy, Scott, Gummere, Bates, Allingham, Hales and Furnivall, and, of course, Child, as well as her recommendations of Bates’ *Ballad Book* and Walford’s edition of Percy’s *Reliques* as being “best suited for popular beginning study.” Finally, Pound supplies references to the pertinent scholarly discussions by Lang, Child, and Gummere on ballads and Phelps on English Romanticism, ending with Child’s bibliography at the end of his tenth volume for the more serious student

(TB 883).

Pound concludes her syllabus by printing a Scot's version of Edward in full dialect as a teaching aid, a technique Kittredge would later adopt in his "Introduction" to his and Helen Child Sargent's one volume ballad collection (Kittredge 1904, xxv–xxvii). She provides no direct comment on the text, but, following Bates' teaching discussion, gives instead a short list of representative questions that might be asked of students:

(1) Note the verse form, rime, stress, and the use of refrains. Note also characteristic points of diction, stereotyped expressions, repetitions, vocabulary. (2) What is the theme, the situation? How is the story told, and emotional appreciation of it secured at the same time? How much is said by the speakers? How much suppressed? (3) Why the questions in stanzas 2 and 3? Why the questions in stanzas 4, 5, and 6? What new light on the story and new characterization in the last stanza? (4) Whence has the ballad derived its power? (5) How far is the ballad lyrical? (TB 883)

POUND'S *FOLK-SONG OF NEBRASKA AND THE CENTRAL WEST*

My final example of Pound's emerging scholarly voice is a paragraph and a lengthy footnote taken from her *Folk-song of Nebraska and the Central West: A Syllabus* (1915). This collection was the outcome of the work she had begun at Belden's suggestion twenty years earlier. It was presented as "syllabus only"—that is, as a temporary publication displaying only the content's initial stanza or most familiar lines, with the goal of making available evidence of Nebraska folksong until a more complete collection of music could be published (Pound 1915 2; hereafter FN and page number).⁸ Pound was forty-four, had been a full professor for four years, and was on the cusp of laying waste to Gummere's theory. The syllabus, however, makes no mention of Gummere's work. It is, as she writes, an attempt to chart "the themes and motives of the popular song of recent times" to determine the narrative forms, sentiments, and humor that were "strong enough to secure preservation." Specifically, her question is: "What is the general character of the material commending itself to the Ameri-

can folk-consciousness in the period just passing? Of the thousands of songs having currency, which types have the people liked well enough to remember and to hand on?" She does not preview her answer, but notes that her materials are sufficient to allow for comparative analysis with other American versions and, as always, she it makes it clear that her conclusion would be based on "widespread collection, followed by analysis and comparison of the materials secured" (FN 4).

Pound follows her initial remarks on her purposes and sources by dropping a bombshell. "A collection of folk-song" she states, "should be what its name implies. It should register what the people have cared to preserve, regardless of questions of origin, or quality, or technique" (FN 4). To make her point, as she had in her *MLN* article, Pound lists her formal "tests for inclusion." The "chief requisite, she writes, for "belonging to folk song...was recovery from oral tradition." She includes the songs in her syllabus because they "were learned by their singers not from the printed page but from the singing of others, and have by this time an existence not dependent on a written original" (FN 5). This two-fold test is important. Most folklorists agreed on the necessity of oral transmission, but the idea that ballad authenticity could no longer be diminished by learning "dependent on a written original" suggests openly the novel and uncomfortable possibilities that "pure" ballads are neither the exclusive product of a pre-print environment nor a distinct, pre-writing communal product. But she does not stop there. "The main essential" of a folksong, she continues, is:

that the people sing it; that it has "lived in the folk-mouth," and that it has persisted for a fair number of years. Entries have not been limited to song-narratives, i.e. to ballads proper but popular lyrics of many classes have been admitted, provided, in the sense noted, that they have existence in folksong. As already indicated, for some of the pieces entered no printed original has ever been found; on the other hand, a ballad or song was not omitted because it happens to have been or to be still well known in print. Scrapbook collections of clippings from "Old Favorites" columns of newspapers have often afforded variant texts and have helped in identifications; but pieces found in such form only have not been included. An attempt was also made to include children's songs and singing games and

rhymes of various kinds. Here again the fact that many of these are accessible in books was not allowed to stand in the way of their admission, provided those reporting them had not learned them there. (FN 5)

For Pound, ballads and folksong are not inherited survivals from a lost age. They are a process of transmission. A ballad or folksong is folk poetry for no other reason than “the people sing it”—that it persisted “in the folk mouth...for a number of years.” This was not business as usual. Though the ballad consensus depended on Child’s collection to carry the weight of tradition, Pound allows data to dictate relationships between “American folk-consciousness in the period just passing,” and the “thousands” of songs which Americans have liked “well enough to remember and to hand on.” Furthermore, she had found that “popular lyrics of many classes...provided, in the sense noted, that have existence in folksong” (FN 5). In Pound’s work, there are remnants of Child’s ballads, no doubt the best parts of the collection; on the other hand, Pound does not omit other types just because they happen “to have been or to be still well known in print. Songs from any source are acceptable, just as long as it could be proven that the bearer reporting [songs] had not learned them solely from print” (FN 5). Folksongs are made folk by oral transmission. They last because of oral tradition.

Pound knew she was on dangerous ground and thus clarifies her approach in a lengthy footnote. First, she addresses a long-standing worry: the use of style and taste, especially as derived from personal authority, as acceptable criteria:

To the present writer it seems a mistake to make style standard-giving in a collection of folk-song. There are many who seem to hold as standard-giving the style prevailing in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; all forms of whatever times conforming to these in tone and diction are “genuine”; all other are spurious. (FN 5)

Her targets are hard to miss. For Gummere, Kittredge, and especially Gerould, Child’s sensibility was the final arbiter of all ballad matters. Consider again Gerould’s full rationale for accepting “The Bitter Withy” into the Child canon:

Yet the very rarity of the treasure makes the question of its genuineness an important one, and every such find should be submitted to all possible tests before it is accepted as belonging to the family of traditional ballads. The tests by which it must be judged, I take it, are three. The first is purely personal, the critical sense of the scholar who has learned by long-continued and careful study to distinguish the false from the true, to separate the chaff from the wheat. The second is the external evidence with reference to the circumstances of discovery, whether the collector or collectors can be trusted. The third is the source of the material, whether the narrative is the product of tradition, or of some clever inventor. (Gerould, G. H. 1908, 142)

Pound's rejection of Harvard's test of genuineness leads her to question their remaining central axioms. "Usually, too," she writes about their thesis on the origin of traditional ballads, they "are assumed to have some romantic-mystic 'communal' origin as opposed to the individuality of modern 'art' poetry." But, she asks, "Is there such a thing as a permanent or eternal style in folk-song?" and answers "Not unless reference is had to the circumstance that folk-song is addressed to the ear only; that on its appeal to the ear depends its vitality. There is a 'history of taste' for folk-poetry as there is for book-poetry. There are as great differences between the folk-poetry of the sixteenth and twentieth centuries as between the book-poetry of the sixteenth and twentieth centuries" (FN 6).

Two things are happening here. First, following up on her emphasis on transmission, she lays out the contrast between ear and eye music to distinguish folk from written. As she puts it, folk artists "composed for the ear; otherwise [their] work was in vain. The newer writes for the eye, both words and music." The result, she continues, is that older folksong and ballads are better and more long lasting because the need to preserve them through memorization requires their creators to use memorable forms and phrases. New composers of broadsides and popular songs could rely on print to fix their songs as they move between the worlds of ear and eye, but, as she continues, the consequence is that "Much in modern song is unsingable and unrememberable; no one can expect to make a deep impression on

the popular mind” (FN 8). Moreover, she writes, oral musical eras, in which “connection and delivery were very close,” make the evidence even stronger:

In the sixteenth century song was as nearly universalized as it is likely to be for a long time. Some musical proficiency was demanded of nearly everybody, whether belonging to the upper classes or to the lower. The Renaissance lyric, words and music, seems to have had its origin in the higher culture of the times, but it attained unparalleled popularity. (FN 6)

Pound had quietly made clear her belief that the existing examples of the ballad of tradition contained in Child’s collection were best understood as a Renaissance lyrical form. Now she stated it loudly:

Acknowledgement that the period of the English Renaissance had the most memorable style in folk-song is not the same thing however as acknowledging that only such folk-songs as conform to this style are “genuine.” The making of popular ballads—that variety of folk-song having special interest is not a “closed account,” though the making of ballads and songs in the older and more memorable style might be; nor is some hypothetical communal-mystic manner of origin, based on this older style, a valid test for determining what folk poetry is and what it is not. (FN 8)

Since all of Child’s choices were enshrined in the Gummere-Kittredge theory—the formal distinction between art and popular poetry, the necessity of a formal ballad age, the closed nature of his collection, un-self-conscious artistry—communal creation fell to the wayside. Pound, on the other hand, believed that ballads were not a closed account, and thus any group could pass down genuine ballads representing the imaginations of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. Such ballads would be as different from each other as were their centuries of origin. Early texts, in Pound’s opinion, were more aesthetically pleasing because oral worlds relied on the rhetorical tropes of memory, but the social differences between Renaissance England and twentieth-century America did not make the latter’s ballads and folksongs impossible, or inferior in the present or in the future.

American scholars did not need to posit mystical campfire singing, as John A. Lomax had done in 1911, or to deny that America could ever have ballads as he did in 1915 (Lomax 1911; Lomax 1915; see also Bell 2004; Bell 2006). So long as Americans kept songs alive by singing them from memory and passing them on in song, there would be a living American folksong tradition.

CONCLUSION

It is obvious that Louise Pound's scholarship was neither disorderly nor tactless. If anything, her writing was the model of a modern scientist's. Her response to W. W. Skeat's opinion of Chaucer's authorship works because her careful application of sentence-length and other tests show that *The Romaunt of the Rose* is more like Chaucer's other writing and less like the list of other potential claimants. It does not, however, prove Chaucer's authorship, and Pound does not try to make it do so. Her attempt to parse the ballad for teachers is hampered by a lack of scientific precision in the romantic, mystical language she uses to explain it. But, she tries to present the facts so that interested teachers could decide for themselves how to prepare their own lessons. Likewise, her explanation of folksong is no screed. She did not decide what the outcome of her collecting should be and then go searching for examples to prove her point. She was not tied by birth and background to the New England Brahmin world, of which George Santayana wrote its "'heredity' philosophy...had grown stale, and [its] academic philosophy...[had] caught the stale odor from it" (Santayana 1911 [1967], 39; see also Brooks 1915, 5–15 and 165–183). Her process is modern and inductive. She collected the songs people knew and sang and then asked where they had gotten them, how they had preserved them, and how they had passed them on. Those songs and singers determined what a folksong is and shaped the argument she would make.

It is equally obvious that Pound did not defer to age, reputation, or received wisdom. No one who made a career by taking on Child, Skeat, and Gummere could have done so. As much as anyone in her generation, she exemplified the idea and practice of the New Woman: that first generation of women intellectuals who came of age be-

tween 1890 and 1920 and upended the male status quo through their presence in the academy. As Einav Rabinovitch-Fox describes them, “New Women” rejected the stereotype of the Victorian “True Woman,” with its emphasis on domesticity and submissiveness (Rabinovitch-Fox 2017; for further discussion of the concept of the “True Woman,” see Cogan 1989; Patterson 2005, 1–2 and 25; Strange and Brown 2002, 615–616; Warner 2006, 177–195; Welter 1966, 151–174). They were the Gibson Girls in their shirtwaists, rode 100 bicycle trips—as Pound was famous for in Lincoln, were written about in the *New York Times* for their tennis skill, and were fearlessly unconcerned as they built and staffed settlement houses, social service agencies, and public health clinics, all while collecting folksongs. In doing so, they trampled the man’s supposed God-given authority to explain everything.

And herewith is the crux of Pound’s folklorist problem. She would not chant the breviary with the ballad boys’ choir.⁶ She was a member of the cadre of twentieth century collectors of ballads and folksongs who listened to what twentieth century people sang, and memorized, and sang again—a scholar who allowed that singing to dictate the borders of American folk musical traditions and who used that new land to describe an American folk and their folksongs which were neither frozen in time nor trapped in amber. Undoubtedly, her portrait of these American circumstances was more radical than those of many of her colleagues. But, like all members of the new generation of folklorists who started collecting folksongs from actual singers—like W. W. Newell in his groundbreaking essays in the *Journal of American Folklore* at the turn of the century, Belden in Missouri, Barry in New England, Shearin and Combs in Kentucky, Reed Smith in South Carolina, Lomax in the Southwest, and the rest—she sought out the folk alive in the American here and now. Unfortunately, as Pound made clear, the very singing of those people threatened the edifice which Child’s progeny had built.

In Gerould, then, the ballad clerisy found the perfect person to put Pound in her place. I do not think he thought long or hard about his locutions. Why should he have? The stakes demanded harsh words and a stern rebuke. American ballad studies had placed its faith in a nineteenth-century literary theory dressed up in the finery of eighteenth-century aesthetics, which, at its most extreme, denied

that America could have ballads (Bell 2006; Lomax 1915, 1; see also Kirschenblatt-Gimblett 1998). In the mind of the ballad boys, Louise Pound just did not understand that better minds than hers understood America's need for the ballad's ability to model true community, to demonstrate the union of innocence and reflection, or to resist contemporary mendacity and mediocrity. What better way to chastise her than to announce to the world that better minds had come to better conclusions than she because, unlike her, they were Eastern, elite, old-schooled, mannered, had finer sensibilities, and, importantly, were men.

NOTES

¹ Pound responds to Gerould in the March 26th issue of *The Literary Review*, accusing Gerould of "creating views, label[ing] them as mine, then bludgeon[ing] his straw-men." She goes on to discuss several of his errors in fact and opinion, but, unfortunately, like in all such attempts to set the record straight, correcting the impression that she has "the habit of distorting evidence" or "starts from an absurd chronology" of ballad creation was a no-win situation. Facts seldom win arguments; it is difficult not to appear defensive no matter how offensive critical comments are, and, like with all loaded comments, any answer contains the presumption of guilt (Pound 1921a, 14).

² For Eliot, such fusion of thought and feeling was last evident in the work of the metaphysical poets of the seventeenth century who were the last to feel "their thought as immediately as the odour of a rose. A thought to Donne was an experience; it modified his sensibility" (Eliot 1921, 287). Interestingly, of their number, George Herbert was actually described by the critic Joan Bennett thusly: "His most characteristic gift is the power of controlling the movement of feeling in his poems. The emotional pattern is managed with exquisite tact" (Bennett 1934, 65). The concept stuck to the point that an "A-Level" Revision Question asked to "Examine 'exquisite tact' in the poetry of George Herbert" (Bennett 1934, 92).

³ Despite the importance of his *The Ballad of Tradition* (1932) and *The Grateful Dead: The History of a Folk Story* (1908) to folk studies, the bulk of Gerould's scholarly work was in medieval and Arthurian Studies. He was a founding and leading member of the Medieval Society of America. His most important works include his *The North-English Homily Collection* (1902), his first academic essay in 1904, "Forerunners, Congeners, and Derivatives of the Eustace Legend" (1904, 335–448), his *Sir Guy of Warwick* (1905), a modern literary reading of the medieval story, his translations of *Beowulf* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, his *Saint's Legends* (1916), and his "The Making of Ballads" (1932).

⁴ Another perspective on Pound's trauma would see it as an example of the experience of those subjected to subaltern positions (for further discussion, see Caruth 1996, 3–6; Gilligan 1982 [1993], 128–151; Spivak 2010, 82–82).

⁵ There is now an extensive literature on their relationship, especially since the emergence of the assertion that Cather “viewed herself as a lesbian” (O’Brian 1987, 6). As Robert Cochran notes, whatever Cather’s sexual orientation might have been, there is no evidence that it was reciprocated by Pound. For a discussion of Pound’s relationship with Cather, see Cochran 2009, 60–65.

⁶ Walter William Skeat was a preeminent English philologist. He was the Eirington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon studies at Cambridge University and the founder of the English Dialect Society. He is most known for his work on Old and Middle English, including his seven-volume edition of *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* (1899) as well as his edition of William Langland’s *Piers the Plowman* (1886).

⁷ Bates may have returned the favor of Pound’s suggestion by copying Pound’s scientific approach in her 1904 revision. For a discussion of Bates’ revisions, see Bell 2021, 329–332).

⁸ For an example of another syllabus from the era, see Shearin and Combs 1911.

WORKS CITED

- Anonymous. 1920. "Review: *Youth in Harley* by Gordon Hall Gerould." *The Nation* 111 (2885): 454–455.
- Bates, Katharine Lee, ed. 1890. *Ballad Book*. Boston: Leach, Shewell, & Sanborn.
- Bell, Michael J. 2004. "'The Anglo-Saxon Ballad Spirit in America': John A. Lomax and the Politics of the Body Politic." In *BASIS 2: Ballad Mediations: Folksongs Recovered, Represented, and Reimagined*, edited by Roger deV. Renwick and Sigrid Rieuwerts, 78–87. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.
- . 2006. "'We Have None at All': Lomax, Gummere, Kittridge and the Crisis of American Balladry." Kommission für Volksdichtung (SIEF) Annual Meeting. Riga, Latvia.
- . 2021. "Katherine Lee Bates and the Pedagogy of the Ballad." *Journal of American Folklore* 134 (533): 319–342.
- . 2022. "'She Should Not Be Writing About Ballads at All': Louise Pound's American Ballad Revolution." Unpublished manuscript.
- Bennett, Joan. 1934. *Five Metaphysical Poets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Botkin, Benjamin A. 1959a. "Pound Sterling: Letters from a 'Lady Professor.'" *Prairie Schooner* 33 (1): 20–31.
- . 1959b. "Louise Pound (1872–1958)." *Western Folklore* 18 (3): 201–202.
- Brooks, Van Wyck. 1915. *America's Coming-of-Age*. New York: B. W. Huebsch.
- Busfield, Joan. 2003. "Disordered Minds: Women, Men, and Unreason in Thought, Emotion and Behavior." In *Women's Minds, Women's Bodies: Interdisciplinary Approaches to Women's Health*, edited by G. Boswell and F. Poland, 36–47. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Caruth, Cathy. 1996. "Introduction." In *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*, edited by Cathy Caruth, 1–10. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Cochran, Robert. 2009. *Louise Pound: Scholar, Athlete, Feminist Pioneer*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Cogan, Frances B. 1989. *All American Girl: The Ideal of Real Womanhood*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- anhood in Mid Nineteenth Century*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Cottom, Daniel. 1985. "Introduction: Of Taste and the Civilized Imagination." In *The Civilized Imagination: A Study of Ann Radcliffe, Jane Austen, and Sir Walter Scott*, 1–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, F. Brett. 1994. "What Need, Then, for Poetry?: The Genteel Tradition and the Continuity of American Literature." *NEQ* 67 (2): 212–233.
- Dawidoff, Robert. 1992. *The Genteel Tradition and the Sacred Rage: High Culture vs. Democracy in Adams, James, and Santayana*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Dewey, John. 1896. "Pedagogy as a university discipline." *University Record* 1: 353–355 and 361–363.
- Eliot, T. S. 1921. "Review of *Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century: Donne to Butler*, Selected and edited, with an Essay, by Herbert J. C. Grierson." Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gerould, Gordon Hall. 1902. *The North-English Homily Collection: A Study of the Manuscript Relations and of the Sources of the Tales*. Lancaster, PA: Press of the New Era Print Co.
- . 1904. "Forerunners, Congeners, and Derivatives of the Eustace Legend." *PMLA* 19 (3): 335–448.
- . 1905. *Sir Guy of Warwick*. Chicago: Rand, McNally & co.
- . 1908. "The Ballad of The Bitter Withy." *PMLA* 23 (1): 141–67.
- . 1916. *Saints' Legends*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- . 1921. "Review: Poetic Origins of the Ballad." *The Literary Review of The New York Evening Post* (New York, NY), March 5.
- . 1923. "The Making of Ballads." *Modern Philology* 21 (1): 15–28.
- . 1932. *The Ballad of Tradition*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Gerould, Katharine Fullerton. 1915. "The Extirpation of Culture." *The Atlantic Monthly* 121: 445–455.
- . 1921a. "Movies." *The Atlantic Monthly* 127: 22–30.
- . 1921b. "What Constitutes and Educated Person Today?" *The*

- Atlantic Monthly* 127: 744–748.
- . 1922. “The Aesthetics of Conservatism.” *The Atlantic Monthly* 128: 21–25.
- . 1926. “The Plight of the Genteel.” *The Harper’s Monthly* 127: 310–319.
- Gummere, Francis Barton. 1896a. “The Ballad.” In *The World’s Best Literature Ancient and Modern*, edited by Charles Dudley Warner, 445–507. New York: The International Society.
- . 1896b. “Folk-Song.” In *The World’s Best Literature Ancient and Modern*, edited by Charles Dudley Warner, 562–569. New York: The International Society.
- Kirschenblatt-Gimblet, Barbara. 1998. “Folklore’s Crisis.” *Journal of American Folklore* 111 (441): 281–327.
- Kittredge, George Lyman. 1904. “Introduction.” In *English and Scottish Popular Ballads: Edited from the Collection of Francis James Child*, edited by Francis James Child, Helen Child Sargent, and George Lyman Kittredge, xi–xxxi. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.
- Krohn, Marie. 2008. *Louise Pound: The Nineteenth Century Iconoclast Who Forever Changed America’s Views about Women, Academics, and Sports*. Clearfield, UT: American Legacy Historical Press.
- Levinas, Emmanuel. 1987. “God and Philosophy.” In *Collected Philosophical Papers*, edited by Alphonso Lingis, 153–173. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Lomax, John A. 1911. *Cowboy Songs and Other Frontier Ballads*. New York: Sturgis & Walton Company.
- . 1915. “Some Types of American Folk-Song.” *The Journal of American Folklore* 28 (107): 1–17.
- Lowenthal, Kristi. 1999. *Mabel Lee and Louise Pound: The University of Nebraska’s Battle Over Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics*. Master’s thesis, University of Nebraska.
- Patterson, Martha H. 2005. *Beyond the Gibson Girl: Reimagining the American New Woman, 1895–1915*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Pound, Louise. 1896. “*The Romaunt of the Rose*: Additional Evidence that It is Chaucer’s.” *MLN* 11 (4): 97–102.
- . 1898. *A List of Strong Verbs and Preterite Present Verbs in*

- Anglo-Saxon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1899. "The Ballads." *The North-Western Monthly: A Magazine Devoted to University Extension and the Problems of Education* 9 (7): 330–333.
- . 1915. *Folk-song of Nebraska and the Central Middle West: A Syllabus*. Lincoln: Nebraska Academy of Sciences.
- . 1921a. "Letter to the Editor." *The Literary Review of The New York Evening Post* (New York, NY), March 12.
- . 1921b. *Poetic Origins and the Ballad*. New York: Macmillan.
- , ed. 1922. *American Ballads and Songs*. New York: Scribner.
- . 1933. "Review: *The Ballad of Tradition* by Gordon Hall Gerould." *Modern Language Notes* 48 (2): 124–27.
- Rabinovitch-Fox, Einav. 2017. "New Women in Early 20th-Century America." *Oxford American History* <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/97801993291>.
- Russell, David. 2017. "Introduction: An Art of Handling." In *Tact: Aesthetic Liberalism and the Essay Form in Nineteenth-Century Britain*, 1–11. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Santayana, George. 1911 [1967]. "The Genteel Tradition in American Philosophy." In *The Genteel Tradition: Nine Essays by George Santayana*, edited by Douglas L. Wilson. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sedgwick III, Ellery. 1984. "The American Genteel Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century." *American Studies* 25 (1): 49–67.
- Shearin, Hubert G. and Josiah H. Combs. 1911. *A Syllabus of Kentucky Folk-Songs*. Lexington, KY: Transylvania Printing Company.
- Sherman, Lucius Adelno. 1892. *Analytics of Literature: A Manual for the Objective Study of English Prose and Poetry*. Boston: Ginn & Company.
- Skeat, Walter William. 1886. "*The Vision of Piers the Plowman*" by William Langland. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- , ed. 1899. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, edited from numerous manuscripts by the Rev. Walter W. Skeat*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. 2010. "Can the Subaltern Speak?." In *Can the Subaltern Speak?: Reflections on the History of an Idea*, edit-

- ed by Rosalind Morris, 21–78. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Strange, Lisa S. and Robert S. Brown. 2002. “The Bicycle, Women’s Rights, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton.” *Women Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 31 (5): 615–616.
- Warner, Patricia Campbell. 2006. *When the Girls Came Out to Play: The Birth of American Sportswear*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Welter, Barbara. 1966. “The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820–1860.” *American Quarterly* 18 (2): 151–74.
- Wilgus, Donald Knight. 1959. *Anglo-American Folksong Scholarship since 1898*. Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press.