ENRICA VILLARI

BETWEEN HISTORY AND THEORY

The Novel Form in the Work of Franco Moretti

If there is a quality that distinguishes Franco Moretti as a literary theorist, it is his systematically undogmatic method. Throughout his critical sociology of forms, Moretti has adopted a range of models, approaches and perspectives, guided by the conviction that, as Novalis wrote, 'theories are nets; and only those who cast will catch fish.'[1] For Moretti, heterogeneity is in 'the nature of literature itself'—'Literature is perhaps the most omnivorous of social institutions, the most ductile in satisfying disparate social demands, the most ambitious in not recognizing limits to its own sphere of representation'—and its examination must reflect this.[2] What unifies such eclecticism is an aptitude for connecting the very small to the very big, the local textual detail to the large-scale transformations of culture and history. The result has been a rich and multi-faceted account of literary forms and their evolution, foremost among them the novel.

What follows attempts to reconstruct his account of the development of the novel-form across several of his major works, in all their methodological diversity—*Signs Taken for Wonders, The Way of the World, The Modern Epic, Atlas of the European Novel, The Bourgeois*—as well as the concomitant evolution of his theory of the novel; for what Moretti has produced is simultaneously theory and history, or rather a theory that unfolds through a history of the novel's evolution. In reconstructing it, we will single out some central features: the novel's relation to its great rival, tragedy; its problem-solving function; the determinations of geography, whether of the nation-state or the world-system; the interplay

between style and character; and finally, some considerations on the theory's political implications.

An unstable compromise

Given that 'a form becomes more comprehensible and more interesting the more one grasps the conflict, or at least the difference, connecting it to the forms around it', Moretti's starting point is the fundamental opposition between the novel and tragedy.[3] In 'The Great Eclipse', collected in *Signs Taken for Wonders* (1983), he argues that the historical 'task' of Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedy was 'the destruction of the fundamental paradigm of the dominant culture'—absolute monarchy—and that in fulfilling this desecrating function it paved the way for the English Revolution.[4] Moretti portrays this age of absolutism as separated from the age of capitalism by a fundamental historical fracture: 'tragedy belongs to a world that does not yet recognize the inevitability of permanent conflict between opposing and immitigable interests or values, and therefore does not feel any need to confront the problem of reconciling them.'[5] As the offspring of an age marked by the permanent class conflict generated by capital, the novel is instead essentially anti-tragic. Its social function is rather the 'composition of values in conflict', under the sign—always precarious, always unstable—of 'compromise'.

This notion is further elaborated in *The Way of the World* (1987), Moretti's pioneering study of the *Bildungsroman* as a 'symbolic form' of European modernity. Emerging out of the conflict between the old aristocratic and new bourgeois classes, the *Bildungsroman* inaugurated the great season of the nineteenth-century novel. For Moretti, the genre is structured by a negotiation between the self-determination of the individual and the demands of socialization—between autonomy and integration. What emerges from his analysis is that, contrary to the Marxist view—from Lukács to the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*—of a heroic bourgeoisie that only relinquished its revolutionary role after 1848, bourgeois values were marked from the start by opposing tendencies, most centrally in the novels under examination, between embrace of freedom and fear

---

[1] Franco Moretti, *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for Literary History*, London and New York 2005, p. 117.

[2] Franco Moretti, *Signs Taken for Wonders*, London and New York 1983, pp. 26–7.

[3] *Signs Taken for Wonders*, p. 26.

[4] *Signs Taken for Wonders*, p. 42.

[5] *Signs Taken for Wonders*, p. 28.

of it. In the classical *Bildungsroman,* 'we find the very opposite of what occurred in the summer of 1789: not a secession, but rather a convergence'. In short, the genre, with its ethos of compromise, narrates 'how the French Revolution could have been avoided'.[6]

Moretti understands that this non-revolutionary image of the bourgeoisie (and of the novel-form) may be unpopular. But he insists that such concerns be left aside:

> Whether, then, it is preferable to weave patiently the veil of compromise, or to slash through it—that is another matter. My purpose here was only to clarify in what way a specific literary genre has encouraged one possible choice to the detriment of the other. Whether this anti-tragic and anti-epic tendency impressed by the novel on Western culture has been a progress or a loss, this is something we must each decide for ourselves.[7]

In his account, it is with the 1815 Restoration that the novel reveals itself to be such a formidable literary form. After the betrayal of the ideals of the Revolution, the harmony between self-determination and socialization achieved in Austen and Goethe is rendered impossible. Yet the novel's anti-tragic and anti-epic tendencies remain. The notion that the biography of a young individual entering adulthood is 'the most meaningful viewpoint for the understanding and the evaluation of history' was sustained for nearly a century.[8] The youthful protagonists of Stendhal, Pushkin and Lermontov, of Balzac and Flaubert, also come to accept the way of the world; yet, voided of symbolic legitimacy, this now comes at the cost of the integrity of the self.

It is thanks to this formal reconfiguration, Moretti proposes, that modern interiority now makes its novelistic debut—an imaginary life that no longer integrates with reality but pursues its own independent path, free of any constraint, like 'the "strange men" discussed by contemporary Russian culture', who are no longer legible in the manner of Wilhelm Meister or Elizabeth Bennet.[9] With this comes bad faith and all its ambiguities: 'Imaginary life is not—is not only—a storehouse of gratifying lies about oneself; it is also that very same interiority . . . that provides refuge for those values that have been repressed in public behaviour.' So, too, the 'symbolic contradictions' of success, but also the freedom

[6] Franco Moretti, *The Way of the World,* London and New York 2000 [1987], p. 64.
[7] *Way of the World,* pp. 54–5.
[8] *Way of the World,* p. 227.
[9] *Way of the World,* p. 86.

from every constraint that constitutes Onegin's curse, or the confusion between dreaming and mass-cultural consumption that is Bovary's.[10] As their personalities rise above the prose of reality (or aspire to do so), these protagonists inaugurate the modern paradigm of indecision. Yet action is necessary—in life as much as narrative—and so we have the parallel motif of 'arbitrary decisions', gratuitous acts such as Julien Sorel's pistol shot at Madame de Rênal, or Onegin's sudden, belated love for Tatiana.

This phenomenology of modern character enables Moretti to elucidate the epochal meaning of these novels. A new attitude towards life: the 'narrative' attitude which 'has severed all links with comment and judgement as ways of assigning meaning'.[11] The splitting of character also corresponds to an equivalent splitting of the reader: 'the level of discourse treats him as an adaptable, critical and intelligent being—too intelligent perhaps; but the story level speaks to him as a helpless, bewildered and irrational creature.'[12] And yet when we shift to British soil, the coming-of-age novel tells a completely different story. There, the identity of its protagonists—Edward Waverley, David Copperfield, before them Tom Jones—is not threatened, because youth is not the laboratory of maturity. Rather, it is a parenthesis that temporarily distances the protagonist from his true self, which is rooted in childhood, and to which the character returns in the novel's denouement. Paraphrasing Virginia Woolf's famous comment, Moretti claims that—with the sole exception of George Eliot—these are not novels written for grown-ups. They are regressive, conservative, beholden to the binary structure of good and evil that one finds in fairy tales.

If we were to stop here, this would certainly represent the most problematic aspect of Moretti's account, and not only for the negative value judgements concerning specific novels that are not always easy to share. But *The Way of the World* offers a further interpretation of the English variant. Having had its revolution in the mid-seventeenth century, mid-nineteenth-century English society was not characterized by the same need for legitimation (or, conversely, criticism) as post-revolutionary France, where the betrayal of the Revolution fractured the novelistic unity of the real and symbolic. It is not that class conflict did not exist in England, but that, just as the Glorious Revolution had effected a compromise between the two factions of the civil war, so too—this is my

[10] *Way of the World*, p. 90.
[11] *Way of the World*, p. 124.
[12] *Way of the World*, p. 125.

own elaboration—the plots of the two masterpieces of the English novel which deal directly with industrial conflict (*Hard Times* and *North and South*) show how the class struggle could have been avoided. As Moretti illustrates, the English variant rests on a judicial framework, one that makes the exercise of critical judgement—those distinctions between good and evil—necessary, and which the narrative attitude of the French novel had expunged.

Two great nineteenth-century narrative traditions are thereby distinguished, representative of one of 'the great symbolic contrasts of the modern world'—'On the one hand, the French Revolution . . . On the other, the English Revolution'.[13] Under the sign of politics and the legacy of the Revolution, 'narrative' dominates in the first. In the second, where the culture of the law holds sway, the 'commenting' element survives. Moretti makes no secret of which he regards as the more significant. Yet when, in *Atlas of the European Novel* (1997), he returns to these two branches, he reaches different conclusions. A shift in methodology renders his account of the evolution of the novel at once richer and more problematic.

Novel and nation-state

Moretti's concern in *The Way of the World* is the relationship between the novel and capitalism—or, the novel and the bourgeoisie. *Atlas of the European Novel* represents a notable change of perspective:

> Literary sociology has long insisted, as we know, on the relationship between the novel and capitalism. But Austen's space suggests an equally strong affinity (first pointed out by Benedict Anderson in *Imagined Communities*) between the novel and the geopolitical reality of the nation-state. A modern reality, the nation-state—and a curiously elusive one. Because human beings can directly grasp most of their habitats: they can embrace their village, or valley, with a single glance; the same with the court, or the city (especially early on, when cities are small and have walls); or even their universe—a starry sky, after all, is not a bad image of it. But the nation-state? 'Where' is it? What does it look like? How can one *see* it? And again: village, court, city, valley, university can all be visually represented—in paintings, for instance: but the nation-state? Well, the nation-state . . . found the novel. And vice versa: the novel found the nation-state. And being the only symbolic form that could represent it, it became an essential component of our modern culture.[14]

---

[13] Moretti, *Way of the World*, p. 206.

[14] Franco Moretti, *Atlas of the European Novel*, London and New York 1998, pp. 16–17.

The novel as symbolic form of the nation-state. And with this reformulation, the English branch suddenly appears the most fertile. While previously the British overwhelmingly represented a conservative rearguard—suffused with nostalgia for childhood rather than the ardour of youth that characterizes the coming-of-age novel in its most achieved form—now it is Scott and Dickens (and Conan Doyle) who dominate the novel's history. How to account for this? The explanation that emerges from Moretti's analysis is as follows: the British nation is a more composite and differentiated space, and therefore more generative for the novel form's 'problem-solving' vocation. 'It's a form that (unlike an anthem, or a monument) not only does not conceal the nation's internal divisions, *but manages to turn them into a story.*'[15] Goethe grasped this British specificity when he identified the blossoming of the historical novel with the richness of a nation composed of three kingdoms—England, Scotland and Ireland—each with their own histories and traditions. If this prompted Scott to become a historical novelist, Goethe concluded that it was the comparative poverty of German history that had led him back to private themes after the experiment of *Götz von Berlichingen* (1773).[16]

Moretti's analysis begins anew with Austen, and the way in which two Englands—the 'local gentry' and the 'national aristocratic elite'—give rise to the drama of *Pride and Prejudice*. But it is Scott's *Waverley*, with its protagonist's journey across a landscape of uneven development, from the Hanoverian England in which Austen's novels are set, to feudal Scotland and the Jacobite Highlands, which instantiates the centrality of geography, and in particular the dialectic of centre and periphery. In *Waverley* it is the Scottish periphery that generates the plot, but as Moretti demonstrates, in the tales of two cities—the novels of Balzac and Dickens set in Paris and London—it is provoked by the centre.

Here another divergence arises. While in the *Comédie humaine*, Paris possesses a 'centripetal pull from which no one escapes', in Dickens, London 'has almost no gravitational force: everybody runs away (except scoundrels)'.[17] In Paris the centre prevails—and within it the linear movement from the Latin Quarter (youth in search of success) to the

---

[15] *Atlas of the European Novel*, p. 20.

[16] Johann-Peter Eckermann, *Gespräch mit Goethe, in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens, 1823–1832*, vol. 2, Leipzig 1937, pp. 304–8.

[17] *Atlas of the European Novel*, p. 120.

Faubourg Saint-Germain—while in London, we witness a retreat: the characters 'withdraw to the counter-world of the suburb, to protect their moral illusions'. Yet, ingeniously, for Moretti precisely this lack of gravitational pull renders Dickens's portrait of the modern metropolis the more radical one. In *The Atlas*, the linearity of desire imposed on the complexity of Paris is counterposed—and illustrated with maps of *Our Mutual Friend*, *Little Dorrit* and *Bleak House*—to an enigmatic and quasi-illegible London, a 'mosaic of worlds' without a centre, in which, despite the organizing conceit of Dickens's 'notorious family romances', the various narrative threads remain largely unrelated.[18]

The national space that gave rise to the plot of *Waverley* thus finds its equivalent in Dickens's centre-less metropolis. The periphery's capacity to provoke drama—recall Betsey Trotwood's role in *David Copperfield*—shapes the British novel, from Trollope to the Brontë sisters, Eliot and Hardy. And from Scott onwards, the dialectic can be credited with an important 'side-effect' of uneven development: the continuing rethinking of 'modernity' in light of social formations and cultures of the past. The British lineage therefore provides richer examples of how geography shapes the novel's formal properties. But Moretti's argument has implications beyond the borders of Britain—just think of Verga's *The House by the Medlar-Tree* or Lampedusa's *The Leopard*; or the Europe–Russia dialectic in *War and Peace*, or more generally in the Russian novel—and well beyond the nineteenth century.

In *The Modern Epic* (1996), Moretti concludes his investigation of a super-canonical lineage of 'sacred texts'—*Faust*, the *Ring* cycle, Pound's *Cantos* among them—with the periphery of the post-war world-system, and the extraordinary global success of Gabriel García Márquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. 'For the first time in modern history, the centre of gravity of formal creation leaves Europe, and a truly worldwide literary system—the *Weltliteratur* dreamed of by the aged Goethe—replaces the narrower European circuit.'[19] Register the homology in Moretti's analysis, as the possibilities of the novel-form are regenerated not at the centre but the periphery, but this time no longer of the nation-state. And there's more: for the young Waverley, bored by his prosaic youth at

[18] *Atlas of the European Novel*, p. 129.

[19] Franco Moretti, *The Modern Epic*, London and New York 1996, p. 233.

Waverley-Honour, Scotland exposes him to an unfamiliar reality that is not the fruit of a poetic invention, but a fact of life:

> Here was a girl scarce seventeen, the gentlest of her sex, both in temper and appearance, who had witnessed with her own eyes such a scene as he had used to conjure up in his imagination, as only occurring in ancient times, and spoke of it coolly, as one very likely to recur. He felt at once the impulse of curiosity, and that slight sense of danger which only serves to heighten its interest . . . It seemed like a dream to Waverley that these deeds of violence should be familiar to men's minds, and currently talked of as falling within the common order of things, and happening daily in the immediate vicinity, without his having crossed the seas, and while he was yet in the otherwise well-ordered island of Great Britain.[20]

The potential for the marvellous that he discovers 'naturalizes' the romance of the Gothic novel. As Scott's lapidary postscript observes: 'Indeed, the most romantic parts of this narrative are precisely those which have a foundation in fact'[21]—as if to say, the reality of uneven development produces reserves of the marvellous which no poetics can equal. Likewise, here Moretti illuminates how *lo real maravilloso* puts 'modernism's feet back on the ground'. The term first appeared in Alejo Carpentier's preface to *The Kingdom of This World* (1943), in which he contrasted the European avant-garde characterized by the 'exhausting attempt to invoke the marvellous. . . The marvellous pursued in old prints . . . pathetically evoked in the skills and deformities of fairground characters . . . produced by means of conjuring tricks' to the 'marvellous reality' of everyday life he discovered in Haiti.[22] As Moretti explains:

> *Lo real maravilloso*. Not magical *realism*, as it has unfortunately been translated (and as it will inevitably continue to be called), but marvellous *reality*. Not a poetics—a state of affairs. In Haiti, Carpentier writes, surrealism is in the things themselves. It is an everyday, collective fact, which restores reality to modernist techniques: which takes the avant-garde, and sets its feet back on the ground. Does *Ulysses* separate polyphony from any concretely recognizable 'voice' whatsoever? Well, in *Midnight's Children* the opposite happens, and polyphony is re-motivated: there are many languages in the novel, because India is divided into many cultures, and Saleem, with his extraordinary hearing, managed to hear them all. The technical complexity remains, but it is *naturalized* (and also, if the truth be told, somewhat attenuated).[23]

---

[20] Walter Scott, *Waverley*, London 2011, pp. 77–8

[21] Scott, *Waverley*, p. 363.

[22] Quoted in *Modern Epic*, p. 234.

[23] *Modern Epic*, p. 234

While Joyce's *Ulysses* detached polyphony—the coexistence of different styles and discourses that Bakhtin termed heteroglossia—from any recognizable voice, in García Márquez's Macondo polyphony is produced by the coexistence of five generations. 'And it is not just a question of biological coexistence: through individuals, whole cultures overlap'.[24] Recall the famous trial scene in *Waverley* in which the culture of feudally faithful, chivalric Jacobites clashes with the Hanoverian legality of the nation-state. The story of Macondo, too, is one of accelerated modernity. By placing a character's search for the marvellous in his own time, Scott retained what the Russian formalists termed the 'realistic illusion'. This arrested the tendency, already present in Sterne and Diderot, toward a liberation from anthropocentrism that would triumph in the twentieth-century polyphony of global works. And thereafter, 'magical realism restores the link that Joyce's generation had severed: technique—and anthropocentrism'.[25]

The self and the world

While character is fundamental to Moretti's early conceptualization of the novel and its evolution, this emphasis lessens as his framework shifts to the nation-state and the world-system. *The Bourgeois* (2013) represents an intermediary point. As its introduction explains, the analysis is bifurcated: 'two chapters on bourgeois characters—and two on bourgeois language.'[26] In the central chapter on style, Moretti makes this shift in attention explicit: when 'capitalist structures solidify, narrative and stylistic mechanisms replace individuals as the centre of the text'. According to his analysis, the precise language of *Robinson Crusoe* represented a hallmark of the bourgeois cultural revolution: 'It's a first glimpse of bourgeois "mentality", and of Defoe's great contribution to it: prose, as the style of the useful.'[27] Yet in the Victorian era, this clarity is overcome by 'fog', by a prose charged with adjectives and metaphors. Precision is abandoned for the imposing mobilization of Victorian values—religious, moral, social—with which the British bourgeoisie cloaked the naked, autonomous dynamics of capitalism. Here, then, is a paradox. Or, to use Moretti's term, a 'dissonance': the greatest capitalist power of the nineteenth century produced the culture most saturated with values. It was in this way, he explains, that it secured its hegemony.

[24] *Modern Epic*, p. 239.
[25] *Modern Epic*, p. 235.
[26] Franco Moretti, *The Bourgeois*, London and New York 2013, p. 17.
[27] *The Bourgeois*, p. 39.

Elsewhere in the introduction, Moretti confesses that he was tempted to make the contemporary implications of this analysis explicit: 'The "American way of life" as the Victorianism of today: tempting as the idea was, I was too aware of my ignorance of contemporary matters, and decided against it.'[28] *The Bourgeois* was published in the same year as Fredric Jameson's *The Antinomies of Realism*, and as Jonathan Arac has observed, these concurrent works by leading Marxist critics on the realist novel imply opposing political evaluations: 'Jameson writes as if some great revolution had been won, Moretti as if it has been lost.'[29] Arac traces this through their contrasting evaluation of Eliot, in particular a celebrated passage in *Middlemarch*, where the blackmailer, Raffles, dies at the home of his victim, the local banker, Bulstrode. The ambiguity of Bulstrode is one of the peaks of Eliot's characterization: 'He was simply a man whose desires had been stronger than his theoretic beliefs, and who had gradually explained the gratification of his desires into satisfactory agreement with those beliefs. If this be hypocrisy, it is a process which shows itself occasionally in us all, to whatever confession we belong.'[30]

Jameson commends the episode as indicative of the overcoming of traditional distinctions between good and evil; for him, Eliot is a leading figure in 'the last stage in the secular struggle against religion and superstition as well as the most fundamental political drive towards democratization'.[31] Moretti, on the other hand, critically counterposes Eliot's approach to Ibsen's radicalism. While Ibsen refuses to resolve the conflict of legality and injustice, Eliot chooses resolution:

> The idea of injustice protected by the cloak of legality—Bulstrode, guilty, wealthy, and unscathed by his early actions—was for Eliot too bleak a view of her society. Mind you, this *is* how capitalism works: expropriation and conquest, rewritten as 'improvement' and 'civilization' ('who would use money and position better . . .') . . . But Victorian culture—even at its best . . . cannot accept the idea of a world dominated by *perfectly lawful injustice*.[32]

Yet, as we have seen, Moretti has elsewhere praised *Middlemarch* in much the same way as Jameson, as the exception to the fairy-tale

[28] *The Bourgeois*, p. 23.
[29] Jonathan Arac, 'Why Should Marxist Critics Fight over George Eliot?', *Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. 77, no. 4, December 2016, p. 585.
[30] George Eliot, *Middlemarch*, Edinburgh and London 1876, p. 459.
[31] Quoted in Arac, 'Why Should Marxist Critics Fight over George Eliot?', p. 583.
[32] *The Bourgeois*, p. 178.

morality of Victorian novels (and thus 'by far the finest nineteenth-century English novel').[33] In *The Bourgeois*, he commends 'the precision so typical of Eliot's prose style', and her expressed desire 'to escape from all vagueness and inaccuracy into the daylight of distinct, vivid ideas'.[34] Moretti was not so much wavering in his judgement as pointing out a specific missed opportunity: to crystallize the episode into a moment of truth—a manifestation of the cohabitation of lawfulness and injustice. The divergence is less between Jameson and Moretti than between Eliot and Ibsen. And it hinges upon characterization: 'Recognizing the impotence of bourgeois realism in the face of capitalist megalomania: here lies Ibsen's enduring lesson for the world today.'[35]

In this conclusion, we recognize the critical Marxist perspective that Moretti has never abandoned. Is it significant that the final word is given not to a novelist, but a dramatist? What the novel's characters signal through their relationship to the world is that, as long as there are individuals, and extended fictional time to tell their stories, there will be room for small oscillations and small choices: to choose to resist the way of the world, or not. A space—limited, isolated—in which the good *Bürger* might indeed resist the destructive force of capitalism. The self and its relation to the world, so fundamental to the novel, is a cipher for a problematic of modernity writ large: the margins for individual agency and the possibilities for changing the world a little (to echo Eliot). In *Middlemarch*, while Bulstrode's aspiration to be a good Puritan is thwarted by capitalist megalomania, Dorothea's dreams of greatness—which are responsible for her unhappy marriage—are instead defeated by the values of bourgeois seriousness. Eliot knew very well that 'there is no creature whose inward being is so strong that it is not greatly determined by what lies outside it', yet at the novel's end, she grants Dorothea's (unheroic, unhistorical) life political meaning:

> But the effect of her being on those around her was incalculably diffusive: for the growing good of the world is partly dependent on unhistoric acts; and that things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been, is half owing to the number who lived faithfully a hidden life, and rest in unvisited tombs.[36]

[33] *Way of the World*, p. 216.
[34] *The Bourgeois*, p. 84.
[35] *The Bourgeois*, p. 187.
[36] Eliot, *Middlemarch*, p. 621.

This is the slow, prosaic, we might even say dull task of reform, in stark contrast to the historic upheaval of revolution. It is *Middlemarch*'s lesson. But it is also the logic of the novel, in contrast to that of tragedy. In one of his finest essays, 'The Moment of Truth', published in 1986, Moretti writes of modern tragedy—of which he identifies Ibsen as the key figure—that in its progress towards what it calls 'truth', this genre has an antagonist unknown to Ancient and Renaissance tragedy: 'It is neither blindness, nor passion, nor Fate, nor a conflicting value. It is, quite simply, *life*'. And this antagonism, he explains, 'is none other than the tragic rendering of the generic struggle between tragedy itself and the novel'. Ibsen's lucidity and Eliot's fog are already present in these reflections on the difficulties of modern tragedy, primary among them its 'post-novelistic condition'. In this essay, Moretti expressed hope for 'a culture of the Left that would consider the moment of crisis neither as the only moment of truth, nor as the moment of the only truth'. Underscoring that this need not mean 'unending humiliations and compromises', he concludes with a quotation from Max Weber—'from whom there is probably still a lot to learn'—which could also stand as a celebration of novelistic character:

> What is deeply striking and moving, on the other hand, is the view of a *mature* man—it doesn't matter whether young or old in years—who, feeling truly and wholly his own responsibility for consequences, and acting according to the ethic of responsibility, still of a sudden does say: 'I cannot do otherwise: I shall not retreat from here.' Here is a truly human and moving behaviour, and such a situation must be possible at any moment for all of us who have not yet lost our inner life.[37]

---

[37] Franco Moretti, 'The Moment of Truth', NLR I/59, Sept–Oct 1986, pp. 42–4, 47–8.

First published as 'Il Romanzo secondo Franco Moretti', in Francesco de Cristofaro and Stefano Ercolino, eds, *Critica sperimentale: Franco Moretti e la letteratura*, Carocci Editore: Rome 2021, published here with the permission of the editors; an English edition is forthcoming from Verso. Translation: Richard Braude.