

# Comparative Literature: Historical and Critical Study of Its Schools, Approaches and Concepts

Riyad Manqoush\*

## Abstract

This essay is intended to analyse the discipline of comparative literature with the aim of appropriating a methodology that can be used in literary studies. This critical appropriation is of quite significance because it can contribute in the contemporary comparative studies. My discussion of comparative literature is divided into four sections: the French school i.e. the historical and positivist approach; the German and Slavic school i.e. the Marxist approach; the American school i.e. the critical and interdisciplinary approach; and finally the theory of intertextuality i.e. the Semiotic approach. At the end of this paper, I conclude that the previous sections can be utilised as an appropriate methodology for analysing literary texts. This is because literary works echo one another. In addition to that, the American approach particularly the interdisciplinary approach cannot be avoided in literary studies for literary texts reflect other fields of knowledge. However, I have deduced that the studies of intertextuality are ignored in contemporary critical works. Therefore, I claim that comparative studies can be developed when including the studies of intertextuality.

## Introduction:

This essay is intended to analyse the discipline of comparative literature with the aim of appropriating a methodology that can be used in literary studies. To make the discussion clear, I will divide comparative literature into four sections: the French school i.e. the historical and positivist approach; the German and Slavic school i.e. the Marxist approach; the American school i.e. the critical and interdisciplinary approach; and finally the theory of intertextuality i.e. the Semiotic approach.

## Comparative Literature:

The roots of the comparative literature can be seen in some French writings of the early nineteenth century. According to Bijay Kumar Das (2005: 124), “comparative literature owes its origin and title to a series of French anthologies published in 1816 under the title *Cours de Literature Comparée*.” These “series” have succeeded in exposing “comparative literature” as a new field of study and have also assisted identifying its early eminent pioneers. In his study of those pioneers, Ulrich Weissterin (1974: 171) argues that “Jean-Jacques Ampère” (1800-1864) and “Abel Francois Villemain” (1790-1890) are “the true father[s] of systematically conceived comparative literature in France—or anywhere, for the matter”. This is because the two theorists have played a significant role in establishing this form of literary studies.

However, although other critics agree with Weissterin’s claim that Villemain is the “father” of “comparative literature”, they exclude Ampère. For instance, Timothy Brennan (2004: 33) asserts that it was “Abel Francois Villemain” who in “1829” made “the first use of the term *littérature comparée*”. Regardless of this dispute, there is no doubt that the early comparative literature appeared in France. Due to this beginning, the early comparative literature is identified as the French school. In fact, in the subsequent discussions, the emphasis will be on the approach and contribution of each school rather than their national or geographical origin. Therefore, the French school will be referred to as the historical and positivist approach; the German and Slavic school will be the Marxist approach; the American school will be the critical and interdisciplinary approach; and then, I will elaborate the current contributions of the Semiotic approach to show the cohesion between the theory of intertextuality and comparative literature.

## French School: Historical and Positivist Approach:

Although Ampère and Villemain focused on comparative literature, this paradigm was not considered as a discipline until the French Philarète Chasles defines it in “1835” as the study of “the influence of thought upon thought” (Chasles 1973, cited in Bassnett 1993: 12). Based on Chasles’ statement, the parameter “influence” is the centre of the French traditional comparative studies. However, Chasles did not explain how the study of “influence” can be

---

\* Assistant Professor of English literature Department of English – College of Education Hadhramout University

performed. Therefore, filling in this theoretical gap, Ferdinand Brunetière (1974: 181) adds that: “we are defined only by comparing ourselves to others; and we do not know ourselves when we know only ourselves.” In other words, Brunetière illustrates that the study of “influence”, which has been mentioned by Chasles previously, must be between different national literatures. He claims that nations cannot “know” their impact on other nations except by “comparing” themselves with the “others”.

Just like Chasles and Brunetière, other French scholars, such as Fernand Baldensperger, Ferdinand Brunetière, Paul Hazard and Paul Van Tieghem, have also stressed on “influence”. Given a discussion of those scholars, Kristof Kozak (2003: 112) illustrates that the “early French comparative literature ... concentrates on relations (*rappports*) studied in rather strict historical-positivist manner. In this approach to comparative literature, the utmost significance is attributed to facts, factual evidences, and documents.” Thus, the traditional comparatists insist that the study of the mutual influences between the different national literatures must be proved with “factual evidence”, not with critical and artistic analysis. By this insistence, one can claim the French school shifts comparative literature into a “historical” and “positivist” approach. In fact, this is the reason for renaming the French school the historical and positivist approach.

Benedetto Croce (1973: 222) argues that “the comparative history of literature is history understood in its true sense as a complete explanation of the literary work, encompassed in all its relationships, disposed in the composite whole of the universal literary history.” In this excerpt, Croce avoids categorising “comparative literature” as a separate discipline, claiming that it is just a part of “literary history”. In fact, categorising comparative literature as a part of “literary history” and separating it from literary criticism is indisputable at that time. This is because, as I have explained earlier, the traditional comparatists merely focus on the historical and positivist aspects of different national literatures.

The early comparative literature has been used to show the hierarchy of national literature in comparison with other foreign literatures. Bassnett (1993: 21) explicates that “people used the phrase ‘comparative literature’ without having clear ideas about what it was. With the advantages of retrospection, we can see that

‘comparative’ was set against ‘national’.” Based on this argument, one can realise that “comparative literature” has been employed to assist the movements of nationalism that dominated France and Europe at the “eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries”. Elucidating this argument, Bassnett (1993: 14) argues that:

[I]t is impossible to see the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as a time of immense literary turmoil throughout Europe, as issues of nationality increasingly appeared linked to cultural developments. Nations engaged in a struggle for independence were also engaged in a struggle for cultural roots, for a national culture and for a past. The need to establish antecedents became vital; emergent nations had to establish a tradition and a canon.

Thus, according to the French school, comparative literature is intended to prove that the French national literature is superior to other European—and non-European—literatures. In fact, this perception is problematic and it transmits colonial ideologies because it shows the other “nations” and cultures as embryonic. The parameter “influence” is supposed to indicate that the French culture is influential and the other cultures are merely receivers of that influential French culture.

While the traditional French comparatists employ comparative literature to expose the hierarchy of their culture, they insist on the linguistic element in any comparison. In other words, according to their approach, the comparison must be “between two [different] languages” as explicated below:

Comparative literary study could take place between two languages, so a study involving French and German authors would be acceptable. What would be unacceptable, however, would be a study of between two writers working in English, regardless of whether one was Canadian and the other Kenyan. Nor would a study of Beowulf and Paradise Lost be acceptable, because although the former is in Anglo-Saxon, technically Anglo-Saxon is an early variation of Modern English (Bassnett 1993: 28).

Their resolve that the “two” compared texts must come from two different countries and must be written in “two” different “languages” seems to be illogical because some languages like “English” can be used in many countries. For instance, as Bassnett explicates above, most of the “Canadian” and “Kenyan” literatures are written in English, although they express

different cultures and nations. Therefore, such restriction has been attacked by the American comparatists as will be discussed in the next section.

Although the French school is Eurocentric, it has influenced other cultures and nations. For instance, Mohammad Ghanimi Hilal (1987: 8)—an Arab scholar influenced by the French school—illustrates that comparative literature “does not only expose the facts, but it historically explains them with evidence and excerpts from the literatures that it studies.” Hilal’s notion of comparative literature is similar to the French comparatists discussed earlier. In addition to that, the domination of the ideas of the French school, which is represented by Hilal in the Arab World, made most of the Arabic comparative studies deal with the concept of “influence”. Abdoh Obud (1999: 16) gives some examples of these studies such as: “The influence of Abu al-Ala al-Ma’ari on Dante, the influence of *One Thousand and One Nights* on European literatures, the influence of the Andalusian poetic *muashah* on the European Troubadour poetry, and the influence of European literatures on the modern Arabic literature.” Most of these topics are intended to show the Arab contribution to Western literatures. In other words, they stress on the Arab national literature and its impact on the European ones. This confirms my early argument that the French school is not only restricted to France, but it also exists everywhere. Therefore, changing its name into the historical and positivist approach or the traditional school of comparative literature, without restricting it to France, might be a wise decision.

To summarise the discussions of this section, I will attempt to give a definition of comparative literature according to this historical and positive approach i.e. the French school. Comparative literature is a branch of literary history that studies two different national literatures, which are written in two different languages, with the aim of identifying the influence of one on the other. Analysing these influences must historically be proved with “factual evidence” from both texts. This historical and factual treatment makes the comparative studies of the French school positivistic rather than artistic.

#### **Slavic and German School: Marxist Approach:**

The emphasis on the “influence”, which has dominated the traditional studies of comparative

literature, runs contrary to the thoughts of the Marxist theorists like the Russian Viktor Zhirmunsky and the Slovak Dionyz Durisin. Since the two scholars have adopted the notions of the German philosophers Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), they stress on the “social evolution” and the “typological analogies” in their studies of comparative literature. Petar Petrov (2007: 13) explicates that:

Zhirmunsky’s main concern was to distinguish the so called “analogies” or “historical-typological similarities” that always correspond to similar situations in social evolution, whose presence may be verified in Literatures with no contacts among themselves. On the other hand, the similarity between literary facts may come from the presence of direct contacts from a cultural point of view. It is therefore crucial to distinguish, in each Literature, the “typological analogies” from the actual “influences”. Generally speaking, both are connected: an influence only becomes possible if there is an inner need of the receiving Literature to absorb foreign elements during its evolution. In other words, each influence is a historically conditioned fact determined by the internal development of a certain national literature.

Zhirmunsky above explains that the French school’s use of term “influence” is general. They even relate the “typological similarities” between the different “national literatures” to the process of “influence”, though there are “no contacts among” these different cultures. In fact, Zhirmunsky does not deny the impact of national literatures on one another, but he insists that there must be an “actual” and direct “contact” between them as well as “an inner need of the receiving [of] foreign elements”. Hence, this approach distinguishes between two types of similarities that can be seen between the different national literatures. The first is related to the impact of one national literature on the other. And the second is attributed to the similar “social evolutions” which the two cultures may have undergone.

I have discussed previously that the Marxists expose two types of similarities. However, the similarities that have been related to the concept “influence” are avoided by the Marxists for two main reasons. First, this type of study has already been covered by the traditional French comparatists. Second, it is not relevant to the ideas of the Marxist theory that centre on the human societies. Therefore, the Marxists have

mainly focused on the similarities that are attributed to “social evolutions”. According to Obud (1999: 41), the Marxists argue that “The study of literature should not be separated from the study of society. The artistic and intellectual evolutions in literature should not also be taught in isolation from the study of the social evolutions. Literary evolution does not merely occur by internal factors, but also by the interaction of literature with the society”. Given such elaboration, the Marxist approach attempts to deconstruct the theory of “influence” in order to shed light on a new school of comparative literature that deals with the “typological analogies” or the “social similarities”.

In addition to that, Obud (1999: 42-43) alleges that “among the factors that led to a severe conflict between the traditional comparative literature and the Marxist literary theory is the fact that the latter has international or world trends. Therefore, it is difficult to reconcile with an approach of literary studies that stems from the national literature.” This is because the Marxist theory focuses on the economic and social evolution of all nations. Therefore, these “world trends” make the Marxists resist the term “national literatures”. Instead, they stress on the term “world literature”, which was coined by Johann Wolfgang Von Goethe (1749-1832) as David Damrosch (2003a: 327) explains below: Comparative literature arose in a kind of competitive symbiosis with the nationalisms dominant in nineteenth-century Europe. While some comparatists studied the interactions of national traditions, others saw the nation-state as destined, like capitalism, to wither away in a few decades. This is the perspective that Marx and Engels endorsed in the Communist Manifesto of 1847, where they followed Goethe in proclaiming the rise of world literature as the cultural mirror of a postnational world.

However, the term “world literature” is ambiguous, unlike the “national literature” which can simply mean the literary production that is written by local people of certain nation and in the formal language of their country. In his attempt to define “world literature”, Damrosch (2003b: 281) argues that “world literature is an elliptical refraction of national literatures ... World literature is writing that gains in translation ... World literature is not a set canon of texts but a mode of reading: a form of detached engagement with worlds beyond our own place and time.” Thus, these characteristics can make any national literary work a “world

literature”, despite it originating from Europe, America, Asia or Africa.

In short, although both the Marxist and French schools present a historical and positivist version of comparative literature, the Marxists refuse to relate any similarities between the different national literatures to the process of influence. They assert that influence can only occur if there is a real connection between two nations and when one nation has a desire to borrow some elements from the other. To them, most of these similarities appear due to the “typological analogies” which indicate that the social evolution in any nation leads to literary evolution, without being influenced by other literatures. Hence, since people have similar social circumstances, the Marxists pay more attention to the world literature rather than national literatures.

#### **Critical and Interdisciplinary Approach:**

The most obvious contribution, which has changed comparative literature from a historical approach into a critical approach, is of the American critic Rene Wellek who has showed in 1958 a fierce opposition to the French school. Influenced by the New Criticism, Wellek rejects the French comparatists’ “historical and positivist trends” and their emphasis on the “actual evidences” (Obud 1999: 48). This is because he believes that the internal literary structures should be given more emphasis rather than the external facts. In other words, Wellek, who seems to be the founder of the American school, refuses to deal with comparative literature as a literary history and he conversely stresses on the critical and artistic aspects of any comparison. Since my emphasis is on the approach, not on the school, I will use the phrase “critical approach” when referring to the American school. In fact, this modification can be reasonable for two reasons. First, this approach is not merely restricted to America; it is used by many critics all over the world. Second, its early roots emerged outside the USA as will be discussed in the following paragraph.

Wellek’s opposition is a reflection of some French comparatists. Obud (1999: 51) argues that at the early twentieth century the critical writings of Rene Etiemble, Pierre Brunel, Claude Pichois and A. M. Rousseau attempted “to balance between the historical and critical approaches”. In other words, those French theorists rejected the notion, of their contemporary comparatists in France, which

indicates that comparative literature is closer to literary history rather than literary criticism. This discussion reinforces my earlier argument that the critical approach or the so-called "American school" has its roots outside the USA, especially in its emphasis on the critical aspect of comparative literature.

Furthermore, in his repudiation of the historical and positivist approach, the German Henry Remak (1971: 1-2) argues that "the French are inclined to favour questions which can be solved on the basis of factual evidence (often involving personal documents). They tend to exclude literary criticism from the domain of comparative literature." Hence, just like the French theorists that have been discussed previously, Remak claims that "literary criticism" is essential in literary studies and it must not be evaded in any comparative study. Remak (1971: 1) also attempts to give a new definition of "comparative literature" as quoted below:

Comparative Literature is the study of literature beyond the confines of one particular country, and the study of the relationships between literature on the one hand, and other areas of knowledge and belief, such as the arts (e.g. painting, sculpture, architecture, music), philosophy, history, the social sciences (e.g. politics, economics, sociology), the sciences, religion, etc., on the other. In brief, it is the comparison of one literature with another or others, and the comparison of one literature with other spheres of human expressions.

Thus, Remak highlights a new concept of comparative studies that is "interdisciplinary approach" which indicates that literature can also be compared with other disciplines and "areas of knowledge" such as "history", psychology, anthropology and "religion". In fact, Remak is not the first scholar who called for interdisciplinary comparative studies. According to Bassnett (1993: 33), an "early version of American school" can be seen in Charles Mills Gayley who stressed "on the importance of psychology, anthology, linguistics, social sciences, religion and art in the study of literature." From this excerpt, one can realise that the interdisciplinary approach is American in origin, but the critical approach is not. Nevertheless, both approaches shape a new school of comparative literature known as the American school.

Since the interdisciplinary approach might be ambiguous, I will attempt to discuss some its

examples in which literature echoes other fields of knowledge as can be seen below:

#### Impact of history on literature

History is intrinsic in many literary texts. According to Kristeva (1980: 65), "history ... [is] written and read within the infrastructure of [literary] texts." This is because the presence of history in literature gives it authenticity. In general, "any chain of language is invested with a sending-focus that links the body to its biological and social history" (Kristeva 1980: 99). For instance, Habiby's *The Secret Life of Saeed, the Pessoptimist* (1974) and Yehoshua's *The Lover* (1977) have been built on the ruins of history. Both Arab and Israeli novelists use the Arab-Israeli conflict, although they diverge in their employment of that conflict.

In addition to that, history can be seen in Naguib Mahfouz' *The Day the Leader was Killed* (1983). While the novel centres on two coworkers—Egyptian young man and woman—who fall in love, the narrator employs the plot to reflect Egypt at the time of the ex-president Anwar Sadat. For instance, the lives of the two lovers expose the difficulties that the Egyptians faced when their country joined the international free-market.

#### Impact of religion on literature:

There is also another type of relation in which literary texts reflect issues of religion. Kristeva (1980: 65) has dealt with this type but under the name of "morality" which, as she claims, does exist in some literary works. In fact, literature may refer to religious sources such as the Quran and Bible in order to make the plot realistic. However, these issues can sometimes be appropriated in a particular way such as the use of *al-Isra wa al-Mi'raj* in Updike's *Terrorist* (2006: 3-4) below:

[T]he Messenger, riding the winged white horse Buraq, was guided through the seven heavens by the angel Gabriel to a certain place, where he prayed with Jesus, Moses, and Abraham before returning to Earth, to become the last of the prophets, the ultimate one. His adventures that day are proved by the hoofprint, sharp and clear, that Buraq left on the Rock beneath the sacred Dome in the center of Al-Quds, called Jerusalem, by the infidels and Zionists.

In fact, the excerpt above echoes the journey of Prophet Mohammad to al-Aqsa and also to heaven i.e. *al-Isra wa al-Mi'raj*. Allah (s.w.t) says in the Quran that:

سُبْحَانَ الَّذِي أَسْرَى بِعَبْدِهِ لَيْلًا مِّنَ الْمَسْجِدِ الْحَرَامِ إِلَى الْمَسْجِدِ الْأَقْصَى الَّذِي بَارَكْنَا حَوْلَهُ لِنُرِيَهُ مِنْ آيَاتِنَا إِنَّهُ هُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْبَصِيرُ

[Glorified be He (Allah) Who carried His slave (Muhammad) for a journey by night from *al-Masjid al-Haram* (at Makkah) to *al-Masjid al-Aqsa* (in Jerusalem), the neighbourhood whereof We have blessed, that We might show him (Muhammad) of Our Ayat (proofs, evidences, lessons, signs etc.). Verily, He is the All-Hearer, the All-Seer]" (al-Quran, al-Isra 17:1, brackets and italics in the translation are original).

While the narrator of the story uses this Islamic event as an intertext, his description of that trip is intended to expose the way in which some imams, such as Shaikh Rashid in the novel, attracts young Muslims. In general, although religion can be utilised as an intertext in literature, readers have to be careful of the hidden operating ideologies. This is because some writers consciously or unconsciously distort religious ideas.

#### **Impact of psychology on literature:**

Literary works sometimes appropriate scientific knowledge. Kristeva (1980: 99) alleges that "knowledge or science becomes the *objective formulation of the desire to write*." This indicates that authors can make use of some "knowledge" in their narratives. She also elaborates that the "interrelationship" between the literary text and science can make the "literary person[s]" or authors of literature "scientific specialist." For instance, the relationship between literature and Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis has resulted in the creation of a new literary theory that is the "psychoanalytic criticism" which, according to Peter Barry (2002: 96), "uses some of the techniques of psychoanalysis in the interpretation of literature." In psychoanalysis, Freud divides the psyche into three parts: the "ego", the "superego", and the "id". In fact, these parts or levels of the psyche refer to the conscience, the consciousness, and the unconscious. However, each one of these levels has a certain goal. In his explanation of these three levels, Keith Booker (1996: 29) explains that:

The id is for Freud the site of natural drives; it is a dark area of seething passion that knows only desire and has no sense of moderation or limitation. The superego is an internalized representation of the authority of the father and of society, authority that establishes strict limitations on the fulfilment of the unrestrained desires residing in the id. The ego moderates between the authoritarian demands of the

superego and the unmitigated desires of the id. Essentially equivalent to the conscious, thinking mind, the ego is also the principal interface between the psyche and the outside world.

This division of human psyche "has been directly applied to literature by critics who have sought analogies to the relationship among id, ego, and superego in workings of various aspects of the literary text" (Booker 1996: 29). This can be applied to literature, for example in William Shakespeare's *Hamlet* (1601), where Hamlet's abnormal love towards his mother which he cannot declare out of fear of his father. Thus, this desire and love can be referred to as the id or the unconscious. In addition to that, the authority of the father, the morals, culture, and religion which forbid this kind of love can be identified as the superego or the consciousness. When Hamlet's uncle, Claudius, murders the father and marries the mother, Hamlet is supposed to revenge and kill his uncle. However, he delays fulfilling this mission until he is forced to do it. This gives another impression that Hamlet's delay of killing his uncle can be explained as a reluctance to kill himself because Claudius is carrying out Hamlet's secret desires. Hence, analysing the psyche of the characters can provide illuminating interpretations of literary texts.

#### **Impact of culture on literature:**

Cultures are inherent in literary texts. According to Kristeva (1980: 65), "the poetic word, polyvalent and multi-determined, adheres to a logic exceeding that of codified discourse and fully comes into being only in the margins of recognized culture." Moreover, Roland Barthes (1977: 148) argues that "a text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialogue, parody, contestation." Furthermore, Allen (2000: 36) indicates that both "individual text and the cultural text are made from the same textual material and cannot be separated from each other." He also adds that any particular "text is not an individual, isolated object but, rather, a compilation of cultural textuality" (Allen 2000: 36). Thus, the three discussed scholars reinforce my argument that there is always a connection between literature and culture. The language, themes, style, and views of many literary texts are influenced by the cultures of the writers. Since literature and culture are mutually constitutive, literary texts cannot completely be understood without analysing the cultural elements used in them.

Reinforcing the previous argument, the Moroccan Bin Salim Hamish's *Zahrat al-Jahiliyah* (2006) is an example of the use of culture in literature. This novel makes an obvious portrait of the Arab culture before and after the advent of Islam. Although the novel centres on a female protagonist, Zahra, and her life at that time, the narrator surrounds his heroine with many cultural elements. For instance, the story presents the positive and negative traditions that prevailed Arabia at the time of *Jahiliyah* as well as at the beginning of Islam. These components make the novel a mixture of cultural and literary texts. Hence, an excellent understanding of that novel requires a sufficient knowledge of the Arab culture at that time.

#### **Semiotic Approach and Intertextuality:**

Unlike the traditional French comparatists who focus on the concept "influence" and the Marxists who concentrate on the "typological analogies", Kristeva relate the similarities between the different texts to the process of "intertextuality". The word "intertextuality" is an English synonym of the French "intertextualité" that denotes the interrelationship among the different textual elements inside and outside the text. According to Allen (2000: 3), the real beginning of this kind of study is attributed to the "Saussurean and Bakhtinian theories of language and literature." However, Saussure and Bakhtin did not make a direct use of word

"intertextuality". Saussure merely emphasised on the signs that exist in the articulated language while Bakhtin "stress[ed] on [the] polyphony" of literary works (Allen 2000: 27). Therefore, "since neither Saussure nor Bakhtin actually employs the term, most people would wish to credit Julia Kristeva with being the inventor of 'intertextuality'" (Allen 2000: 11). This is because Kristeva is believed to be the first theorist who has named that textual interrelationship as intertextuality which has afterwards been developed as a theory.

#### **Conclusion:**

Based on my discussion in this essay, I can conclude that the present research is of quite significance because it provides a critical appropriation that can contribute in the contemporary comparative studies. For instance, the sections, which have been discussed earlier, can be utilised as an appropriate methodology for analysing literary texts. This is because literary works echo one another. In addition to that, the American approach particularly the interdisciplinary approach cannot be avoided in literary studies for literary texts reflect other fields of knowledge. However, I have deduced that the studies of intertextuality are ignored in contemporary critical works. Therefore, I claim that comparative studies can be developed when including the studies of intertextuality.

**References:**

- 1- Allen, G. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- 2- Al-Quran. Undated. (trans.). Al-Hilali, M. T. & Khan, M. M. Madinah: King Fahd Complex for the Printing of the Holy Quran.
- 3- Barry, P. 2002. *Beginning theory: an introduction to literary and cultural theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- 4- Barthes, R. 1977. *Image – Music – Text*. (trans.). Heath, S. London: Fontana Press.
- 5- Bassnett, S. 1993. *Comparative Literature: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 6- Booker, M. K. 1996. *A practical introduction to literary theory and criticism*. USA: Longman Publishers.
- 7- Brennan, T. E. 2004. Said and comparative literature. *Journal of Palestine Studies* 33(3): 23-37.
- 8- Brunetière, F. 1974. European literature. In Schultz, H. J. & Rhein, P. H. *Comparative literature: the early years*, pp. 153-182. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 9- Croce, B. 1973. Comparative literature. In Schultz, H. J. & Rhein, P. H. *Comparative literature: the early years*, pp. 215-223. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- 10- Damrosch, D. 2003a. Comparative literature?. *PMLA* 118(2): 326-330.
- 11- Damrosch, D. 2003b. *What is world literature?* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- 12- Das, B. K. 2005. *A handbook of translation studies*. New Delhi: Atlantic Hilal, M. G. 1987. Unknown. Dar al-Thaqafah.
- 13- Kozak, K. J. 2003. Comparative literature in Slovenia. In De Zepetnek, S. T. (ed.) *Comparative literature and comparative cultural studies*, pp. 111-129. USA: Purdue University Press.
- 14- Kristeva, J. 1980. *Desire in language: a semiotic approach to literature and art*. Gora, T., Jardine, A., & Roudiez, S. (trans.). New York: Colombia University Press.
- 15- Obud, A. 1999. *Al-adab al-muqaran: mushkilat wa afaq* [Comparative literature: problems and horizons]. Damascus: Itihad al-Kuttab al-Arab.
- 16- Petrov, P. 2007. Portuguese and Bulgarian literature from a comparative viewpoint. (trans.) De Carvalho, A. R. In Cieszyńska, B. E. *Iberian and Slavonic cultures: contact and comparison*, pp. 11-26. Lisbon: CompaRes.
- 17- Remak, H. 1971. Comparative literature, its definition and function. In Stalknecht, N. & Frenz, H. (ed.). *Comparative literature: method and perspective*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.
- 18- Updike, J. 2006. *Terrorist*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- 19- Weisstein, U. 1974. *Comparative literature and literary theory: survey and Introduction*. Indiana University Press.



## الأدب المقارن: دراسة تاريخية ونقدية لمدارسه ومناهجه ومفاهيمه

رياض عبدالرحمن منقوش

### ملخص

يستهدف هذا البحث إعادة صياغة علم الأدب المقارن حتى يمكن استخدامه منهجاً تحليلياً في الدراسات الأدبية. إن صياغة هذا العلم من ناحية نقدية تحمل أهمية كبيرة لكونها تسهم في تطوير الدراسات المقارنة المعاصرة. تم تقسيم مناهج الأدب المقارن على: المدرسة الفرنسية أو المنهج التاريخي الموضوعي؛ والمدرسة الأمريكية أو المنهج النقدي المتكامل معرفياً؛ والمدرسة الألمانية والسلوفاكية أو المنهج الماركسي؛ وأخيراً نظرية التناسل أو المنهج السيميوتكي. وفي ختام هذا البحث، يستخلص الباحث منهجاً مناسباً لتحليل النصوص الأدبية لكون هذه النصوص يؤثر بعضها في بعض. كما أنه يؤكد أن النقاد لا يستطيعون تجاوز المنهج الأمريكي وخصوصاً منهج التكامل المعرفي؛ وذلك لأن النصوص الأدبية تعكس العلوم الأخرى. بالمقابل، استنتج الباحث أن الأعمال النقدية المعاصرة تجاهلت دراسات التناسل خصوصاً تلك المرتبطة بالأدب المقارن. لهذا لابد من الإشارة هنا إلى أن ضم دراسات التناسل إلى علم الأدب المقارن سيسهم في تطوير الدراسات المقارنة المعاصرة.