Roland Greene

Literary scholar of poetry, comparative worlds and critical interpretation

[External image / 外部圖片] Roland Greene in a dark jacket and blue shirt, seated beside books and plants.
Roland Greene in the photograph accompanying Stanford’s 2019 announcement of his appointment to lead the Humanities Center. Photograph: L.A. Cicero / Stanford University · Rights retained by the photographer and source; no open license stated. · Image source

Poetry as an instrument of thought

Intellectual formation, critical practice, and the making of a comparative world. Research completed 19 September 2026.

1. An object that returns after thirty years

In 1992, a Harvard exhibition edited by Roland Greene included Juan Caramuel’s Metametrica of 1663. The particular exhibit was “Maria Stella,” a poem arranged to permit permutations by its reader. Thirty years later, Greene announced a lecture at Irvine on how Caramuel makes and unmakes meaning, explicitly reconsidering the method of Five Words through the seventeenth-century compilation.[1, 2]

This small archival conjunction offers an unusually good entrance into his intellectual life. The Caramuel of 2022 did not arrive simply as a new object for a recently devised method. He was already present in an earlier environment of inquiry, before Unrequited Conquests, Five Words, the Princeton encyclopedia, or Arcade. The record establishes a return, although it cannot tell us how continuously Greene thought about the object in between.

The distinction matters. A career described through successive books can appear to consist of successive intellectual identities: theorist of lyric, scholar of colonialism, semantic critic, institutional advocate. An old exhibition catalogue suggests another arrangement. Certain problems remain available for decades, acquiring new force when a later project supplies a different question. A poem whose reader can rearrange it is simultaneously an object of literary history, an experiment in form, and a model of how knowledge depends on operations performed upon materials.

The interpretation pursued here is that Greene’s most durable preoccupation is with those operations. He studies arrangements that make thought possible: sequences, inherited conventions, words, compilations, and institutions. His work is particularly interesting where an arrangement both enables understanding and exposes its limits. That recurring

tension explains more than either “Renaissance scholar” or “advocate for the humanities,” although both descriptions are accurate.

2. The biographical break

The public autobiographical record is sparse, but one account is consequential. In a 2013 interview, Greene recalled growing up near West Hollywood, losing his father at five, and being raised by his mother. Tap dancing was among the possibilities she encouraged; reading and reflection increasingly became his own. As a first-generation prospective college student, he hesitantly asked a school literature teacher about UCLA before eventually attending Brown. His arrival there disrupted the identity supplied by Los Angeles: the entertainment world that had seemed central at home mattered little to his new acquaintances. Intellectual work furnished another basis for a life.[3]

It would be easy to turn this into a retrospective parable of self-invention. The evidence supports something narrower and more interesting: an early experience of discovering that the world through which one understands oneself is not everyone’s world. Whether that experience contributed to his later comparative habits is conjectural; it nevertheless prevents us from imagining his academic vocation as a smoothly inherited family profession.

The basic chronology is Brown, A.B. 1979; Princeton, Ph.D. 1985; appointments at Harvard and Oregon before Stanford in 2001. At Oregon he chaired comparative literature for six years.[4] These dates locate the formative work in a particular American academic generation: trained while literary theory was transforming established fields, professionally established while the geography and institutional identity of comparative literature were being contested. His later arguments belong to both histories.

3. Lewalski: the intellectual biography inside a memorial

Greene’s 2018 essay on Barbara Kiefer Lewalski is more revealing than an institutional biography. He recalls her as his Brown teacher and adviser, including the force of her spoken Donne in a seminar around 1977. But the essay’s real subject is how a critical intelligence develops. He begins with her first publication, a 1953 attribution study of the Puritan tract Ancient Bounds, and finds in its treatment of a biblical figure the beginnings of her later method.[5]

This is also a clue to how Greene thinks a vocation should be reconstructed. The beginning is an operation, not an ambition. A scholar recognizes that a particular figurative usage can disclose more than its immediate occasion. Later work enlarges the consequences of that recognition.

His account places Lewalski among critics who made formal distinctions historically consequential. Genre, in her work, becomes a means of moving among poetry, Scripture,

and religious argument. Greene ends with another remembered scene: Lewalski, already in her eighties, attending an early-morning MLA panel of doctoral students and asking constructive questions.[6]

These two details should be read together. The first concerns the scale of intellectual attention; the second concerns its distribution. A small scholarly problem can contain a substantial method, and an inexperienced scholar can merit an eminent critic's concentrated attention. The essay makes discernment and investment in others parts of the same vocation.

This does not prove that every feature of Greene's teaching derives from Lewalski. It shows what he chose to preserve when describing a teacher's intellectual authority. The authority resides in making further work possible. It is neither exhausted by the books nor independent of their standards.

4. Princeton: comparison with resistance built in

The acknowledgments to Post-Petrarchism identify Earl Miner and Thomas P. Roche Jr. as advisers and credit them with supporting procedures that could differ from their own. They also name a wider early intellectual company, including Lewalski, William Arrowsmith, James Irby, Dorrit Cohn, Elizabeth Fowler, and Julio Ortega.[7] An acknowledgment is not a map of influence in any exact sense. It is evidence against treating the first book as the product of a single theoretical apprenticeship.

Miner's career joined English and Japanese literary study with comparative poetics. The significance of this example lies in the possibility that a different literary archive might require different theoretical starting points. A comparative project could test the categories of criticism rather than merely enlarge their territory.[8] Roche's scholarship, including Petrarch and the English Sonnet Sequences, supplied a different demand: extensive comparative claims remain answerable to detailed knowledge of particular poetic traditions.[9]

One should resist smoothing these educational possibilities into a harmonious synthesis. Their productive relationship lies in the pressure each can exert on the other. Comparative reach threatens to outrun competence; specialist competence can make inherited boundaries look inevitable. An intellectual formation that keeps both demands alive will produce different accommodations in successive projects.

This is a useful way to understand Greene's later differences with reviewers. The objections are often about scale: what has been gained by expanding the relation, and what has been lost by abbreviating the local account? The problem is constitutive of his work, rather than an occasional lapse that can simply be edited away.

5. Portuguese before professional justification

The most concrete account of an elective intellectual education appears in “The Post-English English,” a short 2002 essay. Greene recalls an English dissertation incorporating Spanish and Latin American writing, followed by two summers, as an assistant professor, devoted to Portuguese and contemporary Brazilian poetry. Senior colleagues considered this an ill-advised use of time before tenure.[10]

The decision changed the people and works able to intervene in his thinking. Reading a new language makes one dependent again: on teachers, dictionaries, interlocutors, and distinctions that one’s established expertise cannot settle. An additional literature does not just enlarge a store of examples; it redistributes intellectual authority.

The same essay questions the expansion of English departments into other literatures when their greater resources permit them to absorb territory without adequately reconsidering the discipline’s identity. His own multilingual work does not lead him to endorse every form of expansion. He distinguishes the transformation of an intellectual practice from the extension of a powerful department’s jurisdiction.[11]

Here formation and the politics of the profession meet. The younger scholar’s supposedly inefficient summers become the basis for recognizing a difference between acquiring another language and institutionalizing other people’s literatures under the sign of English. The distinction is especially pertinent to a career eventually located in an exceptionally well-resourced American university.

6. A translator’s trace in the permissions page

An easily missed line in Post-Petrarchism records Greene’s translation of Martín Adán’s La mano desasida, published as “The Hand Let Go” in Extramares 1 in 1989, with permission acknowledged to Cecilia Bustamante. This establishes a translation publication; the evidence consulted does not establish that it was a translation of the entire long poem.[12]

The bibliographical detail gives the book’s comparative reach a practical underside. At least one poet in its archive had been approached through the work of producing English, not only through interpretation of Spanish. Translation forces decisions that a general account of cross-cultural relation can postpone: what a syntactic hesitation does, how much a repeated word must remain the same word, and which obscurities belong to the poem rather than the translator’s incompetence.

The first book’s range—from Petrarch and Sidney through Taylor, Whitman, and Yeats to Neruda and Adán—can therefore be understood as more than a geographical extension of an English dissertation.[13] It emerges from overlapping activities: comparative theorizing, intensive reading, and at least some literary translation. The obscure journal credit witnesses the mechanics of that formation.

It also marks a limit on biographical confidence. The publication trail identifies an act of mediation; it does not license an invented story about friendship, editorial patronage, or the

circumstances of the commission.

7. Augusto de Campos answers back

Greene's 1992 conversation with Augusto de Campos, conducted in Portuguese and translated by Greene, is among the richest sources for the encounter behind the professional category "Brazilian poetry." His questions bring Petrarch, John Freccero, Sharon Cameron, and video artist Peter Rose into an inquiry about lyric time and space. He proposes that concrete poetry makes explicit operations already present in lyric more generally. Campos accepts part of the proposition but insists that the poem acts upon space and changes the reader's apprehension; its work exceeds illustration of a critical theory.[14]

That qualification is worth preserving. Greene is attracted to the experiment as a disclosure of something general about poetry. Campos protects the experiment's intervention in perception and practice. The difference concerns what each participant wants a theory of poetry to account for.

The interview also moves through the auditory dimension of concrete work and its capacity for social criticism. Greene resists interpretations that would reduce its public presence to a harmless visual emblem.[15] His interest in material form already includes a question about critical agency.

This exchange gives a more exact account of Brazilian formation than a list of admired names. The Brazilian poet helps determine what counts as an adequate question. Yet the conversation does not abolish the critic's tendency to generalize. Its value lies in allowing that tendency to meet a knowledgeable resistance.

8. The material-poetry laboratory

The Harvard project brought old books into relation with contemporary experimental work. Its catalogue includes Johanna Drucker and preserves a signed contribution by Kevin Young; the Caramuel entry is later recalled in a comparison with a modern poem by Ilse and Pierre Garnier. These are traces of a collaborative interpretive setting, not evidence that every catalogue judgment was Greene's own.[16]

The companion essay "The Concrete Historical" supplies an argument for the arrangement. Greene treats material poetry as a longer history than the modern concrete movement. Particularly suggestive is his engagement with Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton's account of Renaissance reading directed toward practical ends. Against an image of the book as a resource from which usable knowledge is extracted, the material poem can interrupt the movement of reading and make its own operations an object of attention.[17]

This is an early version of a question important to his later work: does literature supply information, or does it alter the conditions under which something can count as

knowledge? The alternatives need not be exclusive, but confusing them makes it difficult to explain what an apparently impractical formal experiment accomplishes.

The exhibition was itself an experiment in arrangement. Putting objects in proximity makes certain comparisons possible before those comparisons have been fully argued. An exhibition has a distinctive strength and weakness: it lets the eye discover a relation, while potentially allowing visual persuasiveness to outrun historical explanation. Greene's later critical practice often works along that same productive, vulnerable edge.

9. A working library: Pozzi, Cavell, Fried

The project's selective bibliography, credited to Greene and Harvard students, includes Giovanni Pozzi's La parola dipinta, published by Adelphi in 1981. Alongside it appear Stanley Cavell's "Music Discomposed," Michael Fried's "Art and Objecthood," Veronica Forrest-Thomson, Julia Kristeva, Walter Ong, Roger Chartier, and Elizabeth Eisenstein.[18]

This is a striking constellation, provided we do not mistake a collective bibliography for a list of privately decisive influences. Its interest is organizational. Philosophy of art, the history of printing, sound, visual form, and the conventions of poetic interpretation have been assembled around a problem they can illuminate differently.

Pozzi is particularly telling. An archive of figured writing can make a Renaissance scholar's inquiry continuous with modern formal experiment without turning the Renaissance into a mere prehistory of modernism. The old object has its own technical and devotional density. The new object changes what one notices in it. That reciprocity is more demanding than finding anticipations.

Cavell and Fried suggest another pressure within this environment: when and how does an artistic object require a beholder, performance, or situation? Their presence does not establish Greene's allegiance to either philosopher's answers. It shows that the materiality of poetry was being considered in company with arguments about the status of art itself.

This working library is one available answer to the question of Greene's philosophical formation. The evidence points toward an education assembled through problems in poetics, with philosophical texts functioning as interlocutors. It does not justify assigning him a philosophical school on the basis of names in a bibliography.

10. The afterlife of a supposedly marginal project

By June 1997, an announcement of UbuWeb's sound-poetry archive listed Greene's essay, the Campos interview, and the collaborative bibliography among its available materials. The Harvard project had entered a different circulation system: a developing online archive of experimental art.[19] Decades later, Patricia Lino's winter 2026 seminar on

expanded poetry still lists the exhibition catalogue among its opening readings.[20]

These are modest but concrete indicators of an intellectual afterlife. They do not demonstrate large-scale influence or justify calling Greene a founder of UbuWeb. They show that an early project remained usable outside the publication sequence by which a literary scholar is normally summarized.

They also complicate the idea of a subsequent "digital turn." Long before Arcade, Greene's work was circulating in an online environment suited to its crossings among media and periods. The distinction is between the digitization of a completed argument and a medium that supplies the argument with a new neighborhood. On UbuWeb, a Renaissance literary historian's essay is encountered beside experimental practice rather than only beside other Renaissance scholarship.

The history of reception is partly a history of such neighborhoods. A text can acquire a new use without being rewritten, and a contribution can remain active where a search confined to books and major journals would scarcely notice it.

11. Lyric theory and the risk within ritual

The most durable conceptual reception of Post-Petrarchism concerns lyric's ritual and fictional dimensions. Jonathan Culler takes up Greene's distinction to resist treating every lyric as a represented speaker's fictional utterance. He also revises the balance: ritual can be fundamental to lyric while fiction is optional.[21]

What survives here is not necessarily the first book's entire historical architecture. A tool can become more influential than the account that originally housed it, and reuse may shift the emphasis considerably.

Greene's early account is less innocently communal than "ritual" might suggest. Its theoretical company includes Stanley Tambiah, Roman Jakobson, Barbara Johnson, and Paul de Man; participation does not eliminate questions of constraint and rhetorical force.[22] The reader's capacity to inhabit an utterance is not a guarantee that inhabiting it is emancipatory.

That distinction provides a connection to the colonial work. A literary form can make a position available to its user without making the position adequate to the world. The critical question is double: what experience does the form enable, and what does that experience allow its participant to overlook?

Read this way, the move from lyric sequences to imperial desire is not simply a shift from formalism to politics. The possibility that a form organizes participation while limiting recognition was already available inside the earlier problem. Colonial history makes the consequences more difficult to evade.

12. Prose and the damage done by later classifications

The Project of Prose in Early Modern Europe and the New World, edited with Elizabeth Fowler in 1997, is easy to subordinate to the better-known poetry books. Its introduction identifies a problem central to Greene's intellectual history: later disciplinary divisions have scattered early modern prose among categories that obscure some of its contemporary relations. The contributors bring together travel writing, historiography, language reform, political discourse, and other practices. Greene's own chapter is "Fictions of immanence, fictions of embassy." [23]

The collection adjusts the account of his formation. His investment concerns how forms become available for acts of thought and representation. Prose supplies another case in which criticism's inherited classifications can conceal the work being done.

There is a difference between asking how earlier prose led toward the novel and asking what it was used to accomplish before that outcome organized the story. The second question makes unfinished or subsequently separated possibilities visible. It also calls for collaboration: no individual specialist can be presumed to command every archive necessary to reconstruct them.

Editing consequently becomes an intellectual technique. The editor identifies a problem that existing specializations distribute among different people, then creates a form in which their knowledge can interact. That procedure will recur at much greater scale in the encyclopedia, but the prose collection already makes its rationale legible.

13. Desire as a historical instrument

Unrequited Conquests appeared in 1999. Its archive connects Renaissance love discourse with colonial experience through Columbus, Portuguese writing about Brazil, Wyatt, Sidney, and the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega.[24] The ambitious move is to treat poetic conventions as active resources for historical actors. Literature participates in the organization of desire and possession; it is not merely a record left after political action.

The Garcilaso material is especially revealing for an account of intellectual formation. As Jo Labanyi observes in her review, the book relates his translation of Leone Ebreo's Dialoghi d'amore to his historical writing.[25] Philosophical translation and historiography belong to a connected practice. A vocabulary of relation and desire can enter the construction of historical knowledge without announcing itself as a detachable "influence."

There is a corresponding danger for the critic. If a convention provides a compelling account of colonial desire, it may become too successful an explanatory device. The colonized can recede into the role of that which frustrates the colonizer's knowledge. Incompleteness is not justice, and the recognition that possession fails is not itself an adequate encounter with another person's agency.

This is where Greene’s comparative method becomes most consequential and contestable. It reveals a discourse operating where conventional disciplinary divisions would not lead one to look. But discovering that discourse cannot by itself establish its explanatory priority over every other part of the historical situation.

14. Two reviews that should remain in disagreement

Labanyi finds the book illuminating in its account of the limits of imperial desire and the possibilities those limits leave open. Elizabeth DeLoughrey, reviewing it in Jouvert, is more troubled by the way Petrarchism functions as an origin. She asks what happens to earlier Mediterranean exchanges and to other historical agents when a European poetic tradition supplies the governing terms. She also challenges the treatment of the unavailable second voice within colonial representation and identifies insufficient attention to gender and class.[26, 27]

These objections concern the location of intelligibility. Does the historical other become intelligible in terms that alter the account, or principally as the limit encountered by a European subject?

The disagreement cannot be resolved by declaring the book either politically subtle or Eurocentric. It identifies two achievements that must be distinguished: explaining the workings of a colonial discourse, and recovering the histories that discourse obscures. A study may accomplish the first while leaving important work undone in the second.

For Greene’s vocation, the larger implication is that comparison needs more than increasing range. An enlarged archive can leave the center of authority intact. The harder achievement is allowing new material to change the question and the terms in which an answer would count. The Campos exchange supplies a small-scale instance of that pressure; the colonial books encounter it under greater historical stakes.

15. A period can contain an argument against itself

“Colonial Becomes Postcolonial,” published in 2004, examines whether thinking beyond colonial relations can arise within colonial circumstances, rather than beginning only after political independence. Its opening engages Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui through Walter Mignolo, alongside other debates about colonial and postcolonial history.[28]

The philosophical issue is the relation between a historical condition and the thoughts available inside it. A period designation can become circular: everything within “the colonial” is made evidence of colonial logic, and whatever contradicts that logic is assigned to a later age. The category then prevents the critic from recognizing a conflict that historical actors were already living.

Greene’s intervention locates intellectual possibility within compromised circumstances. An inherited discourse may supply means for contesting some of the relations that sustain

it. That does not render the inheritance innocent, nor make every contradiction a latent liberation. It requires more discriminating descriptions than a clean succession of epochs can provide.

The question returns in the Baroque work and in the later defense of the humanities. How much can an intellectual practice alter the institutions and assumptions that make it possible? When does working within an inheritance become renovation, and when does renovation preserve its authority? These are connections across Greene's projects, not claims that a single answer governs them all.

16. A comparatist who distrusts the rhetoric of a new beginning

Greene's interventions in the profession's self-description form another, less conspicuous body of work. "Their Generation" appeared in the 1995 volume Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism. Its definition of comparative literature as a place where literatures are studied together with their languages, histories, theories, and practices remains quoted on Princeton's departmental website.[29] "American Comparative Literature: Reticence and Articulation," published the same year, considered the discipline's account of itself; Earl Fitz subsequently invoked its argument that continuing reconstruction belongs to the field's inheritance.[30, 31]

The relevant disposition is a reluctance to equate change with rupture. If a discipline has always been made through disputed boundaries, announcing its unprecedented crisis can conceal older resources for responding to a present difficulty. But continuity can be claimed too easily, especially by someone whose own formation has made an institution's flexibility visible.

A sharp contemporary response makes this problem concrete. Reviewing advance material for the 2006 ACLA volume Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization, Didier Coste described Greene's "Not Works but Networks" as the intervention of a moderator and coalition builder. He thought Greene's continuity with earlier disciplinary debates diminished his recognition of a changed political situation after September 11. He also found the opposition between works and networks insufficiently elaborated.[32]

Coste's judgment is an argument, not a neutral diagnosis of Greene's temperament. Yet it supplies a useful counterweight to the picture of an adventurous comparatist: intellectual experimentation may coexist with institutional gradualism. The scholar can want to change the relations among objects while remaining wary of claims that the practice containing them must begin anew.

17. The "in Shakespeare" problem

"Misplaced Horizons in Literary Studies," an informal 2010 Arcade essay, is unusually

direct about the professional incentives that shape interpretation. Greene objects to scholarship that installs a canonical writer as the horizon within which a historical problem must be understood. A study of political thought in Shakespeare can quietly replace a study in which Shakespeare participates in a larger history of political thought. Publishing conventions reward the more recognizable author-centered formulation.[33]

The objection is especially interesting beside the subtitle of Five Words: Critical Semantics in the Age of Shakespeare and Cervantes. The canonical names remain as coordinates for readers, but the advertised unit of investigation is the word. One can read that conjunction as a practical accommodation between a recognizable literary world and a method intended to redistribute attention within it. The title alone cannot establish a publisher's role in that accommodation.

More fundamentally, the essay insists that literature's importance cannot be secured by making everything else a subsidiary of literature. A critic has to risk discovering that a poem or play is a relatively minor participant in a particular historical question. Otherwise the conclusion has been guaranteed by the construction of the inquiry.

This is a demanding version of humanistic advocacy. The value of literary study is to be demonstrated through the knowledge it produces, including knowledge that changes its estimate of literature's significance. Its institutional defense cannot depend on granting its objects automatic supremacy.

18. Criticism and the awkwardness of judgment

In "The Social Role of the Critic" (2011), Greene explicitly identifies with criticism even while observing that many literary scholars find the designation obsolete. His positive examples include Kenneth Burke, Lionel Trilling, and Leo Spitzer. He wants renewed evaluation, connections between works and the world, and statements about art that art cannot make about itself. He is also sharply critical of the pursuit of notoriety under the label of the public intellectual.[34]

This is not a neutral program of access. It requires someone to judge what matters and explain why. A university platform can make more voices audible while its editor continues to insist that not all statements have the same critical value.

The position produces a real tension. The restoration of judgment could become the restoration of a gatekeeper's authority. Conversely, refusing judgment does not remove power; it can leave existing publicity, institutional prestige, and market visibility to perform the selection. Greene's program is strongest when evaluation is understood as an argued and revisable act whose grounds must be exposed.

There is also an unresolved severity in his opposition between criticism and journalism. The boundary is less secure in practice than the polemic suggests: serious criticism has long depended on periodical forms, editorial occasions, and general readers. The essay is

most illuminating as a statement of what he fears losing—the capacity to say something consequential that a work or institution cannot say about itself—rather than as a settled taxonomy of legitimate intellectual occupations.

19. Five Words: a change in the grain of literary history

Five Words appeared in 2013. Its terms are invention, language, resistance, blood, and world, considered across the long sixteenth century, approximately 1525–1675, and across English and other European languages. The choice shifts attention away from an author's oeuvre or a self-evidently prestigious philosophical concept toward ordinary terms moving among different activities and kinds of writing.[35]

A word can connect a literary passage with technical, political, medical, or religious discourse without making any one domain the natural center. But such mobility introduces a demanding problem of evidence. A term can persist while its uses change; a related concept can circulate through different terms; apparent equivalence across languages can conceal consequential differences.

The method therefore asks the critic to operate between levels of continuity. Too much continuity makes history a procession of examples illustrating a stable concept. Too little leaves disconnected occurrences. The intellectually interesting work occurs in proposing relations precise enough to be contested.

From the perspective of formation, the project also alters the relation between reading and erudition. A command of many works is no longer displayed principally through an extended series of interpretations. It is made to support a trajectory whose object passes among them. That compression can yield a new account of a historical problem; it can also leave a reader wanting to reopen the individual contexts on which the trajectory depends.

20. Burke, Spitzer, Empson: the critic's mixed ancestry

Greene's later account of semantic criticism makes his intellectual allegiances unusually explicit. He distinguishes intensive interpretation associated with Empson, wide searches enabled by databases, philological contextualization exemplified by C. S. Lewis and Spitzer, and historicist approaches associated with Williams, Koselleck, and Martin Jay. His own method seeks resources from each. Kenneth Burke supplies the idea of a representative anecdote: an intelligible, deliberately provisional account of a complicated field.[36]

The combination is revealing. The claim of criticism is neither that it can replace the archive with a brilliant reading nor that the archive can spare it the responsibility of interpretation. Evidence can multiply while the obligation to decide what it means becomes more difficult.

This helps distinguish Greene's philosophical disposition from a simple embrace of either linguistic skepticism or empirical recovery. The account must be persuasive, but it must

also make its selectivity visible. A narrative is a proposal about the evidence, rather than a transparent container into which the evidence naturally falls.

There is an aesthetic dimension to that obligation. The critic needs an apt shape for an explanation. Aptness is not an ornamental bonus supplied after the historical work; it affects whether the relation being claimed can be grasped and tested. Greene's literary formation remains active within his methodological prose. The critic is a maker of intellectual forms, even when those forms must submit to kinds of correction different from a poem's.

21. Why the explanatory objects matter

One of the more distinctive features of Five Words is its second vocabulary: palimpsest for invention, pendent for language, cartone for resistance, envelope for blood, engine for world. Vin Nardizzi's response draws attention to the tactile and spatial force of these conceits. They make relations among meanings imaginable through the properties of objects. Nardizzi also presses the tension between Greene's use of material properties and his distance from an inquiry into the things themselves.[37]

The distinction between a material object and a material conceit is crucial. The critic is not necessarily reconstructing the production, circulation, ownership, or labor embodied in an engine. He is borrowing an intelligible relation from it. The resulting explanation can be illuminating without being a history of that object.

This makes the connection to the material-poetry work both suggestive and qualified. Earlier, the arrangement of a poem makes operations available to a reader. Here an explanatory figure makes semantic relationships available to an interpreter. In both cases form can do intellectual work. Yet the historical object and the critic's model of meaning have different evidentiary obligations.

The method's attraction is its resistance to purely abstract classification. Its risk is the persuasiveness of a well-chosen figure. Once one sees a palimpsest, later evidence may be too readily interpreted as another layer. A successful conceit has to remain a tool that can be set aside, not become an image that silently decides the argument.

22. A reviewer reopens the local evidence

William A. Oram's review of Five Words praises its ambition while identifying the costs of compression. He questions a reading of George Buchanan on which a larger claim depends. He also argues that the account of blood makes historical change too clean: medieval blood can already be literal and physiological, while early modern blood remains symbolically charged. More broadly, he finds religion underweighted and detects continuities with a familiar account of Renaissance secularization.[38]

The criticism is especially pointed given Greene's apprenticeship with Lewalski. The

relation should not be turned into a story of repudiation; there is no evidence for that. It poses a better question about what happens when the unit of inquiry changes. A method trained to observe meanings crossing religious and secular domains can nevertheless produce a compressed story in which one domain seems to recede too neatly.

The problem is not solved by demanding exhaustive context for every occurrence. Such a demand could make the comparative experiment impossible. Rather, the larger narrative must remain vulnerable to a sufficiently consequential local objection. If a counterexample cannot modify the narrative, the method's announced provisionality has become merely rhetorical.

Oram's review is valuable precisely because it does not dismiss the experiment. It asks whether the scale at which the book sees something new also obscures continuities a closer historical view would retain. That question belongs beside the earlier debate over Unrequited Conquests: comparative power and selective compression are joined.

23. A method undergoing further education

The Arcade colloquy Critical Semantics: New Transnational Keywords, developed from a 2018 MLA panel organized by Anston Bosman, is a useful place to see a method becoming something other than its author's possession.[39]

Crystal Bartolovich's "Common" takes the inquiry toward struggles over common land, capitalist enclosure, and the lives of nonhuman creatures. She also refuses to read Greene's opening assertion of words' priority as a literal claim about the universe: stones and other things existed before human language. She treats it instead as a polemical intervention within contemporary criticism.[40] In his response, Greene acknowledges that her example led him to develop a dimension he had not adequately elaborated: meanings articulated through competing class positions.[41]

John Casey's "Color" presses a different limit. What happens when a word leads into disputed relations between sensation and external reality? The history cannot be supplied by verbal usage alone; theories of vision and material experience bear on what the term can mean.[42]

These interventions should not be reduced to "applications" demonstrating a finished method's reach. They alter its requirements. Material relations and perceptual experience exert pressures that semantic elegance cannot simply absorb.

They also complicate the biography of formation. Greene's education is not restricted to Brown, Princeton, or the years before the first book. A public response in which a senior scholar identifies something another reader has made him see is stronger evidence of continuing formation than the generic claim that he remains intellectually curious.

24. The Baroque: when the object precedes its name

Greene's 2009 essay "Baroque and Neobaroque: Making Thistory" treats the Baroque through its difficult conjunctions with power and knowledge. Its bibliography brings Latin American discussions into contact with European theorization, including Deleuze.[43] This supplies documented philosophical engagement at a particular stage of the career; it is not evidence that Deleuze governed Greene's original formation.

The later statement of his project begins from a difficulty for critical semantics: seventeenth-century practitioners did not possess "Baroque" as the general historical category later applied to their work. The inquiry therefore begins from a missing organizing term.[44]

This reverses the apparent procedure of Five Words. Instead of following a word through heterogeneous uses, one asks how heterogeneous practices became thinkable before a later word gathered them together. It is a subtle but consequential change. If criticism begins with the retrospective category, it risks finding only the features that made the category persuasive to later historians.

The question also returns to the prose collection's concern with subsequent classifications. A literary history must use categories, yet some of its most valuable work consists in loosening their hold long enough to recover alternatives. Greene's recurring interest is not simply in categories that travel. It is in the work concealed by their eventual stability.

25. Caramuel again: meaning as something made and unmade

The 2022 Irvine lecture description gives this inquiry a particularly concrete form. Caramuel's compilation contains permutational poetry in multiple languages and makes the instability of poems and semantic meaning part of its announced problem. Greene presents it as an occasion to reconsider critical semantics itself.[45]

The 1992–2022 connection can now be stated more precisely. The earlier exhibition made Caramuel available within a long history of poetic materiality. The later question concerns what such procedures do to a method organized around meaning. The object returns with the power to complicate the method, rather than merely certify its usefulness.

There is a further possibility here, although it remains an interpretation rather than a report of a fully published argument. If a poem can be generated, varied, and dismantled, then understanding it involves more than finding the meaning of an achieved verbal object. One may have to understand the space of alternatives and the procedures by which one arrangement is selected. Literary knowledge can include knowledge of making.

Greene's recent lecture record points in that direction: a 2025 Princeton talk linked Bernini, Caramuel, and Sor Juana, while another lecture addressed poetry and artificial intelligence under the title "When Artifice Is Knowledge."[46] Titles establish a research

direction, not the conclusions of talks whose full texts have not been consulted. They nevertheless make the long return to the material-poetry problem visible.

26. Perloff, Veloso, and the direction of cultural transmission

Marjorie Perloff recalled in a 2019 interview that Greene introduced her to Brazilian poetry. She also described his invitation of Caetano Veloso to the 2016 MLA convention, where she interviewed him. Her account includes an audience extending beyond the expected academic participants, with hotel employees attending.[47]

The first detail is easy to miss if Greene is classified as an early modernist standing at the edge of a contemporary poetry world represented by Perloff. In this instance the direction of transmission ran the other way. The second detail places that mediation in an institution whose public identity is usually professional and scholarly.

Greene's convention theme, "Literature and Its Publics: Past, Present, and Future," and the title of his presidential address give the episode its declared framework.[48] "Publics" becomes more concrete when a writer or musician brings constituencies that a learned society does not ordinarily assemble.

The intellectual significance is not celebrity proximity. It is the capacity to change who is present and what kinds of knowledge can be exercised in the room. That capacity depends on arrangements as practical as invitations, scheduling, introductions, and the allocation of institutional attention. Cultural mediation is partly a craft of occasions.

The episode also returns us to Portuguese. An early investment whose professional value had been questioned later supports a form of public convening unavailable to a narrower specialization. The relation is visible without requiring the claim that the original decision was made with this eventual use in mind.

27. The encyclopedia as an argument about the world

The fourth Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics appeared in 2012, with Greene as editor in chief, Stephen Cushman as general editor, and Clare Cavanagh, Jahan Ramazani, and Paul Rouzer as associate editors. Its credits also identify assistant editors Harris Feinsod, David Marno, and Alexandra Slessarev.[49] Attribution matters: the scale is part of the intellectual accomplishment, and that scale was collective.

Contemporary reporting describes six years of work involving roughly five hundred contributors. One consequential change was the replacement of broad geographical treatments with more differentiated coverage: Spanish American poetry received separate national entries, while the treatment of India was substantially expanded into multiple entries.[50]

The same report preserves a more vivid editorial detail: one contributor submitted an entry entirely in handwriting, while others were explaining poetry made with algorithms and digital displays. Greene imagined these contributors encountering one another through the encyclopedia.[51] The juxtaposition gives "world poetry" a material meaning. Its participants do not occupy a single technological present, and the editor's task includes making their knowledge coexist without requiring identical means of production.

An encyclopedia's theory is partly located in such decisions. What receives its own heading? What is treated as a subdivision? Which distinctions are explained as normal, and which require an introductory justification? A reader can absorb an answer to those questions before encountering any explicit argument about literary value.

This is a form of authorship through the organization of other people's expertise. The editor makes a structure in which judgments are delegated, coordinated, and made available for use. The resulting book may exert influence most effectively when its design becomes unobtrusive—when a reader treats its distinctions as a natural map of the field.

There is a risk in that success. An expanded reference system can make a more plural world accessible while continuing to stabilize categories that scholars elsewhere dispute. No encyclopedia escapes the tension between usable organization and the complexity it abbreviates. Greene's work makes that tension part of the vocation rather than a reason to avoid collective reference altogether.

28. From a catalogue to an ongoing conversation

Arcade, launched in 2009, provided another form for connecting scholarly work and readers. Early reporting identified Greene's role alongside the work of web editor Zach Chandler and a community of contributors. [52] Its significance lies less in putting scholarship online than in allowing an argument to acquire responses, adjacent materials, and further occasions of use.

The critical-semantics colloquy is an instance of that structure. A book becomes a panel; the panel becomes a collection; the collection includes challenges and a response. Intellectual formation is partly distributed among the participants, while an editor provides continuity across the stages.

At Stanford, Greene also founded the Renaissances workshop in 2004 and the Poetics workshop in 2006. His record of dissertation advising includes work on attention, Amerindian orality, and early modern aesthetic comparison across Europe and Kashmir, among many other subjects.[53] The range does not establish that every dissertation exemplifies his own method. Indeed, a successful adviser makes possible work that need not resemble his own.

The connection to the Harvard catalogue is structural. A setting is created in which a relatively inexperienced participant can produce a public, attributable piece of knowledge

in company with others. The medium changes; the problem of arranging intellectual participation persists.

This also helps explain why the books alone provide an incomplete account of output. Some of the work takes the form of other people's projects becoming feasible, better defined, or more widely encountered. That influence is real but difficult to quantify, and a responsible profile should not convert every later accomplishment of an advisee into evidence of the adviser's authorship.

29. The material conditions of intellectual range

Greene became director of the Stanford Humanities Center in September 2019. The appointment announcement described an institution already supporting fellowships, workshops, and events, with programs developed under his predecessor Caroline Winterer.[54] It would be inaccurate to attribute the entire setting to his direction. Institutional work usually involves inheriting capacities, preserving some, redirecting others, and making new connections possible.

The 2025 incorporation of Stanford's Center for Spatial and Textual Analysis into the Humanities Center, with Mark Algee-Hewitt as CESTA's director, is a more recent instance of that work.[55] It belongs in the profile as an institutional development, without implying that Greene personally performs all the computational research it supports.

The economics of this vocation are consequently different from those of an independent writer living primarily by sales. The documented supports include academic appointments, university libraries, endowed positions, research communities, publishers, and the paid labor of staff and collaborators. The sources consulted do not establish his private finances or personal allocation of time, and those should not be invented.

What can be said is that long comparative projects depend on protected time and accumulated infrastructure. Their apparent intellectual freedom has institutional preconditions. Greene's early criticism of English departments' acquisitive expansion is therefore pertinent to his later position: a well-funded institution can create conditions for exchange, but its power can also make the exchange asymmetrical.

The task is not resolved by a declaration of openness. It is resolved, to the extent that it can be, through particular choices about whose questions receive resources, who retains authority over their materials, and whether participation changes the institution's understanding of itself.

30. India and the question of the intended addressee

A 2025 Arcade interview with D. Venkat Rao was conducted jointly by Greene and Digital Public Fellows Utsavi Singh and Mahishan Gnanaseharan. Rao asks what it means to inherit Western intellectual forms when one senses that one's own culture was not their intended

addressee. He also questions the assumed universality of such categories as writing, narrative, and identity. The interviewers ask how radical reconsideration can proceed without further weakening humanities institutions already under pressure.[56]

The distinction of voices matters. Rao's claims are his own; they should not be absorbed into Greene's intellectual biography as though conducting an interview established agreement. The evidence is that Greene helps stage and participate in a conversation capable of putting the institution's inherited concepts under pressure.

There is a revealing affinity with the earlier Campos interview. In both cases an interlocutor makes it difficult to retain a general category unchanged. The poet insists that a critical account attend to what experimental practice does; Rao asks whether the forms of reflection assumed by an intellectual institution are everyone's forms of reflection.

The later conversation raises the stakes. A framework that enables international exchange may already decide how the participants have to become intelligible. Openness must therefore include the possibility that the host's questions require revision.

For a comparatist, this is a demanding continuation of formation: expertise consists partly in recognizing when one's expertise has structured the encounter too completely. Nothing in the public record proves that this difficulty has been overcome. Its explicit presence in the conversation is the more credible evidence of an ongoing intellectual task.

31. After universalism

In March 2026, Greene gave the inaugural lecture associated with his International Francqui Professorship at Ghent. The announced subject was "Literary Studies After Universalism: A History and a Manifesto."[57] The abstract describes the weakening of universalist assumptions as enabling new literary objects and critical approaches while contributing to a crisis of public authority. It proposes an argument about renewed grounds for criticism involving ethics and justice.[58]

An abstract does not establish how successfully the lecture made that argument. It does identify a question toward which the earlier work plausibly converges. What can authorize judgment after the critic relinquishes the assumption that inherited criteria speak for humanity as such?

Greene's career offers several partial responses rather than a finished solution. Comparison can expose the limits of a local theory. Historical semantics can reveal that apparently stable terms carry incompatible uses. Editorial work can distribute authority across more participants. Yet none of these procedures automatically produces just judgment. Each can enlarge the institution while preserving the institution's privilege to define the terms.

The challenge is therefore sharper than recovering confidence in the humanities. It is to explain how criticism can claim consequential knowledge without pretending to occupy a

position outside the histories it studies. That question brings together the education in form, the multilingual extensions, the colonial arguments, the disputes over judgment, and the practical work of convening others.

32. The continuity that matters

Greene’s formation cannot be adequately represented as a succession of prestigious teachers followed by increasingly prominent offices. The more revealing record consists of decisions and encounters: learning Portuguese before its professional value was evident; translating Adán; allowing a Brazilian poet to qualify a general account of lyric; bringing a seventeenth-century combinatorial book into an exhibition with modern experimental work; accepting that a colleague’s example requires a method to account more explicitly for social position.

Across these episodes, literary form remains a source of thought. The poem, word, catalogue, or institution is valuable partly because its arrangement permits something to be seen. But an arrangement also excludes, abbreviates, and distributes authority. Greene’s most interesting work keeps producing versions of that double fact.

His characteristic strength is to recognize that an apparently restricted object can reorganize a much larger question. His characteristic vulnerability is the persuasive economy of that reorganization: a relation can become compelling before all its historical costs have been registered. The most useful criticisms of his work do not ask him to abandon comparison. They ask what else must change when a comparison succeeds.

The Caramuel return gives this vocation a fitting temporal shape. An object encountered early remains capable of revising a later method. Intellectual maturity need not mean possessing an increasingly complete system. It can mean having assembled an archive that still contains things able to surprise the system—and having created settings in which other readers can point them out.

Research note and sources

This profile reconstructs a public intellectual practice; it is not an authorized biography or an account based on personal interviews. It distinguishes remembered influence, documented collaboration, and an affinity inferred from the work. The analysis draws on complete accessible essays and interviews, an exhibition catalogue, authorized book previews, scholarly reviews, and institutional records. The three major monographs were not all available for complete reading: their treatment here combines the materials specified below, rather than claiming a fresh, exhaustive close reading of each book. Recent lecture abstracts establish announced questions, not the contents of unconsulted lectures. Current institutional information was checked in September 2026.

For further reading beyond the familiar books, the richest starting points are the 1992

catalogue and Campos interview; the 2002 autobiographical passage about Portuguese; the Lewalski memorial as an account of intellectual apprenticeship; and the semantic-criticism colloquy, where a method is revised in public. Coste's French review is particularly useful as an external, unsympathetic reading of Greene's disciplinary position.

---

1. Roland Greene, ed., "Material Poetry of the Renaissance / The Renaissance of Material Poetry: An Annotated Record of the Exhibition", Harvard Library Bulletin, n.s. 3.2 (Summer 1992), 66–93. Especially entries 21 (Caramuel), 29 (Garnier), and 36, 42–43 (Drucker). The catalogue preserves individual contributors' signatures. Harvard's repository supplies the complete text; the repository's recent upload date is not the publication date.↩

2. University of California, Irvine, "Critical Semantics Continued: How Juan Caramuel Makes and Unmakes Meaning", lecture announcement and abstract, 6 May 2022. This source documents the proposed argument, not a transcript.↩

3. Helin Gao, "From LA to MLA: Roland Greene's Academic Journey", The Stanford Daily, 14 January 2013. The principal source for the autobiographical recollections used here.↩

4. Stanford Department of English, "Roland Greene", faculty biography and education record; see also the Stanford Humanities Center biography for the 2001 Stanford arrival and subsequent directorship.↩

5. Roland Greene, "The Critical Horizon of Barbara K. Lewalski", Arcade, 20 August 2018. Complete essay consulted. The account of her earliest article is Greene's retrospective interpretation of her formation.↩

6. Roland Greene, "The Critical Horizon of Barbara K. Lewalski", Arcade, 20 August 2018. Complete essay consulted. The account of her earliest article is Greene's retrospective interpretation of her formation.↩

7. Roland Greene, Post-Petrarchism: Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence (Princeton University Press, 1991), authorized preview including acknowledgments, permissions, contents, and opening argument. The Extramares credit is in the permissions material. The original journal issue was not independently examined; no claim about the translation's full extent is made.↩

8. Princeton University, "Earl Miner, Specialist in English and Japanese Literature, Dies", 20 April 2004. Used to establish Miner's intellectual range, not to attribute all his positions to Greene.↩

9. Princeton University, "Thomas Roche Jr., Scholar of Renaissance Poetry and 'Force of Nature,' Dies at 89", 8 May 2020. For the 1989 book and its bibliographical significance, see also the Folger Shakespeare Library's entry on Anne Locke's A Meditation of a Penitent Sinner.↩

10. Roland Greene, "The Post-English English", PMLA 117.5 (October 2002), 1241–44. Complete essay consulted. The first page of the supplied PDF also contains the end of a preceding contribution; the autobiographical passage belongs to Greene's essay.↩

11. Roland Greene, “The Post-English English”, PMLA 117.5 (October 2002), 1241–44. Complete essay consulted. The first page of the supplied PDF also contains the end of a preceding contribution; the autobiographical passage belongs to Greene’s essay.↩

12. Roland Greene, Post-Petrarchism: Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence (Princeton University Press, 1991), authorized preview including acknowledgments, permissions, contents, and opening argument. The Extramares credit is in the permissions material. The original journal issue was not independently examined; no claim about the translation’s full extent is made.↩

13. Roland Greene, Post-Petrarchism: Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence (Princeton University Press, 1991), authorized preview including acknowledgments, permissions, contents, and opening argument. The Extramares credit is in the permissions material. The original journal issue was not independently examined; no claim about the translation’s full extent is made.↩

14. Roland Greene, “From Dante to the Post-Concrete: An Interview with Augusto de Campos”, Harvard Library Bulletin 3.2 (Summer 1992), reproduced by UbuWeb. Complete interview consulted. The introduction identifies the Portuguese conversation, correspondence, and translation. Speaker attribution is essential: the profile distinguishes Greene’s propositions from Campos’s replies.↩

15. Roland Greene, “From Dante to the Post-Concrete: An Interview with Augusto de Campos”, Harvard Library Bulletin 3.2 (Summer 1992), reproduced by UbuWeb. Complete interview consulted. The introduction identifies the Portuguese conversation, correspondence, and translation. Speaker attribution is essential: the profile distinguishes Greene’s propositions from Campos’s replies.↩

16. Roland Greene, ed., “Material Poetry of the Renaissance / The Renaissance of Material Poetry: An Annotated Record of the Exhibition”, Harvard Library Bulletin, n.s. 3.2 (Summer 1992), 66–93. Especially entries 21 (Caramuel), 29 (Garnier), and 36, 42–43 (Drucker). The catalogue preserves individual contributors’ signatures. Harvard’s repository supplies the complete text; the repository’s recent upload date is not the publication date.↩

17. Roland Greene, “The Concrete Historical”, Harvard Library Bulletin 3.2 (Summer 1992), reproduced by UbuWeb. Complete essay consulted, including its engagement with Jardine and Grafton and its distinction between historical material poetry and the concrete movement.↩

18. Roland Greene and Harvard students, “Material Poetry of the Renaissance / The Renaissance of Material Poetry: A Selective Bibliography”, UbuWeb reproduction of material associated with the 1992 project. A collective research bibliography, not an autobiographical list of influences.↩

19. “Real Audio Sound Poetry Archive Open”, announcement dated 17 June 1997, preserved in Google Groups. Its contents list documents the availability of the three Greene items on UbuWeb by that date; it does not establish an editorial role for him in the archive.↩

20. Patricia Lino, PORT 290, Winter 2026, syllabus, opening class on expanded poetry.

The 1992 catalogue appears among the recommended texts. This is evidence of a specific later pedagogical use, not a measure of general influence.↩

21. Jonathan Culler, "Poetics, Fictionality, and the Lyric", Dibur 2 (Spring 2016). The full article PDF is also available. Used for the reception and revision of Greene's ritual/fiction distinction.↩

22. Roland Greene, Post-Petrarchism: Origins and Innovations of the Western Lyric Sequence (Princeton University Press, 1991), authorized preview including acknowledgments, permissions, contents, and opening argument. The Extramares credit is in the permissions material. The original journal issue was not independently examined; no claim about the translation's full extent is made.↩

23. Elizabeth Fowler and Roland Greene, eds., The Project of Prose in Early Modern Europe and the New World (Cambridge University Press, 1997): publisher's introduction excerpt and contents. The account concerns the editorial argument and arrangement; Greene's chapter is identified bibliographically, not represented as having been read in full.↩

24. University of Chicago Press, Unrequited Conquests: Love and Empire in the Colonial Americas, book description and contents, read alongside the reviews below. Greene's Stanford bibliography dates the original book to 1999; publisher and review records also describe the 2000 edition.↩

25. Jo Labanyi, review of Unrequited Conquests, Journal of Latin American Studies 37.2 (May 2005), 380–82, DOI 10.1017/S0022216X05229358. The review text is also present in Cambridge's collected reviews PDF.↩

26. Jo Labanyi, review of Unrequited Conquests, Journal of Latin American Studies 37.2 (May 2005), 380–82, DOI 10.1017/S0022216X05229358. The review text is also present in Cambridge's collected reviews PDF.↩

27. Elizabeth DeLoughrey, "Petrarchism in the New World", Jouvert 6.3 (2002), review of Unrequited Conquests. Used as a substantive critical disagreement, not as a consensus judgment on the book.↩

28. Roland Greene, "Colonial Becomes Postcolonial", Modern Language Quarterly 65.3 (September 2004), 423–41. Complete article available at the linked scholarly teaching site; the discussion here concentrates on the opening conceptual argument.↩

29. Roland Greene, "Their Generation," in Charles Bernheimer, ed., Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), 143–54. The definition discussed is reproduced on Princeton's "What Is Comparative Literature?" page. The complete chapter was not available for this research. This is Roland Greene's contribution, distinct from the earlier disciplinary report associated with Thomas M. Greene.↩

30. Roland Greene, "American Comparative Literature: Reticence and Articulation", World Literature Today 69.2 (Spring 1995), 293–98. Bibliographical record and subsequent discussion consulted; the profile does not claim a complete reading of this essay.↩

31. Earl E. Fitz, “Brazilian and Spanish American Literature in an Inter-American Perspective: The Comparative Approach”, CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 4.2 (2002), preserved by Library and Archives Canada. Fitz cites Greene’s account of the field’s continuing construction, referring to “Reticence and Articulation,” p. 297.↩

32. Didier Coste, “Le Mondial de littérature”, Acta fabula 6.3 (Autumn 2005), especially paragraphs 64–68. Coste explicitly worked from advance online material and texts supplied for the forthcoming Saussy collection; his review’s pagination and title wording should not be substituted uncritically for the published chapter’s bibliographical record.↩

33. Roland Greene, “Misplaced Horizons in Literary Studies”, Arcade, 12 March 2010. Complete essay consulted.↩

34. Roland Greene, “The Social Role of the Critic”, Arcade, 18 March 2011. Complete essay consulted. The assessment of its criticism/journalism distinction is this profile’s interpretation.↩

35. University of Chicago Press, Five Words: Critical Semantics in the Age of Shakespeare and Cervantes (2013); see also the Bibliovault book record and chapter descriptions. Used alongside Greene’s retrospective methodological essay, Oram’s review, and the Arcade colloquy. The profile does not imply that publisher summaries substitute for a complete reading of the book.↩

36. Roland Greene, “What Is Semantic Criticism? A Taxonomy Past and Present”, Arcade, in the critical-semantics colloquy developed from the 2018 MLA panel. Complete essay consulted, including the response to Bartolovich and the description of the Baroque project.↩

37. Vin Nardizzi, “Graft(ing)”, Arcade, critical-semantics colloquy. Especially the opening discussion of the five explanatory conceits and their haptic properties.↩

38. William A. Oram, review of Five Words, Spenser Review 45.2.39 (Fall 2015). The review is distinct from unrelated comments appended to the archived webpage. The profile attributes the disputed readings and secularization objection to Oram.↩

39. Anston Bosman, introduction to Critical Semantics: New Transnational Keywords, Arcade. Establishes the colloquy’s relation to the 2018 MLA panel and its participating arguments.↩

40. Crystal Bartolovich, “Common”, Arcade, critical-semantics colloquy. Her materialist and ecological argument is distinguished from Greene’s acknowledgment in his response.↩

41. Roland Greene, “What Is Semantic Criticism? A Taxonomy Past and Present”, Arcade, in the critical-semantics colloquy developed from the 2018 MLA panel. Complete essay consulted, including the response to Bartolovich and the description of the Baroque project.↩

42. John Casey, “Color”, Arcade, critical-semantics colloquy. Especially the opening account of blood, color, sensation, and competing theories of external reality.↩

43. Roland Greene, “Baroque and Neobaroque: Making Thistory”, PMLA 124.1 (January 2009), 150–55. Public extract and bibliography consulted; Cambridge’s 2020 online date is not the original publication date.↩

44. Roland Greene, “What Is Semantic Criticism? A Taxonomy Past and Present”, Arcade, in the critical-semantics colloquy developed from the 2018 MLA panel. Complete essay consulted, including the response to Bartolovich and the description of the Baroque project.↩

45. University of California, Irvine, “Critical Semantics Continued: How Juan Caramuel Makes and Unmakes Meaning”, lecture announcement and abstract, 6 May 2022. This source documents the proposed argument, not a transcript.↩

46. Stanford Division of Literatures, Cultures, and Languages, “Roland Greene”, extended faculty record, accessed September 2026. Used for workshop foundation dates, dissertation subjects, and the 2025 lecture titles. The record also lists future events; those have not been treated as completed appearances.↩

47. Jeremy Sigler, “A Conversation with Marjorie Perloff”, Tablet, 1 April 2019. Perloff’s recollection supplies the account of Greene’s introduction to Brazilian poetry and the Veloso event’s audience; it is not independent attendance data.↩

48. Roland Greene, “Presidential Address 2016: Literature and Its Publics: Past, Present, and Future”, PMLA 131.3 (May 2016), 594–602. Title, publication record, and public extract consulted. The convention theme is also recorded in Greene’s Stanford biography.↩

49. New York Public Library catalogue record for The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics, fourth edition (2012), including the differentiated editorial credits.↩

50. Corrie Goldman, “Stanford Scholar Holds Poetry as a Cultural Mirror”, Stanford News Service report reproduced by Patch, 13 January 2013. Source for the duration, contributor scale, and changes in geographical coverage.↩

51. Corrie Goldman, “Stanford Scholar Holds Poetry as a Cultural Mirror”, Stanford News Service report reproduced by Patch, 13 January 2013. Source for the duration, contributor scale, and changes in geographical coverage.↩

52. Cynthia Haven, “From Blog to Book…”, The Book Haven, 27 March 2010. Contemporary account of Arcade, its November 2009 launch, and Zach Chandler’s work. The dated report is evidence about the platform’s beginnings, not its present staffing or traffic.↩

53. Stanford Division of Literatures, Cultures, and Languages, “Roland Greene”, extended faculty record, accessed September 2026. Used for workshop foundation dates, dissertation subjects, and the 2025 lecture titles. The record also lists future events; those have not been treated as completed appearances.↩

54. Stanford Report, “Literature Professor Roland Greene Named Director of Stanford Humanities Center”, 29 July 2019. Appointment effective September 2019; the report also identifies predecessor Caroline Winterer’s contributions.↩

55. CESTA, “Mark Algee-Hewitt to Lead Stanford’s Center for Spatial and Textual Analysis”, 22 August 2025. Used for the organizational relationship with the Humanities Center and the appointment of CESTA’s director.↩

56. “Thinking Together, Thinking Differently: An Interview with D. Venkat Rao”, Arcade, 21 February 2025. Conducted in January by Greene, Utsavi Singh, and Mahishan Gnanaseharan. The profile preserves the distinction between collectively posed questions and Rao’s answers.↩

57. Ghent University, “Ghent University Welcomes International Francqui Professor Roland Greene”, 5 March 2026. Confirms the inaugural lecture on 4 March 2026.↩

58. Ghent University, Belvedere Lecture 2025–2026: “Literary Studies After Universalism: A History and a Manifesto”, event abstract. Used for the announced argument, not as a transcript or an assessment of its delivery.↩