**The French School**

The founding fathers of this school define

'comparative literature' as a branch of literary study which traces the mutual relations between two or more internationally and linguistically different literatures or texts. (5) Insofar as relations between nations have some historical roots, literary comparative studies are linked to history. It is on this basis that Jean Marie Carré comes to propose in his foreword to Marius Francois Guyard's book *La Litterature Comparée* that "comparative literature is a branch of literary history, for it tackles the international spiritual affinities." (6) As these perspectives place a strong emphasis on geographical and linguistic boundaries in the comparison, they (elusively, however, by the use of 'international' as a keyword) show a national propensity.

Inasmuch as it is colored by the *'études binaires*' (binary studies), this approach complicates matters by stating that comparative literary study should take place between specific 'individuals.' (7) It means that 'anonymous', 'folkloric' and 'collective' works, even if well-known and accepted, are excluded from the province of comparative literature, for no other reason than their being oral and 'impersonal.' (8)

If the French approach lacks in determination of method, the French theorists themselves are to blame for not being able to reach an idealistic methodology of comparative literature. It is Tieghem who makes a rigid sharp distinction between so-called 'general literature' (to him, all research underlying the common properties of a number of literatures, be it reciprocal relation or congruency) and 'comparative literature' (the study of two entities: two books or writers, two groups of books or writers, or two complete literatures). (9) His attempt to have this concept of 'general literature' circulated in Europe came to naught. Not to mention its illegitimacy and erroneousness, the concept, as seen by H. Remak, makes the already indistinct definition of 'comparative literature' much more blurred. Remak maintains that 'general' and 'comparative' literature are inseparable, for the two (as defined by Tieghem) rely on one method. Even Guyard, a notable founder of the French School, comes to agree with the American critic Remak that Tieghem's 'general' and 'comparative' literature fall into the same category of meaning. Remak agrees that

Tieghem's concept gives wider scope to 'general literature' than 'national' and 'comparative' literature: instead of confining themselves to two European literatures (French and English or German), the devotees of the French School are invited to bring more literatures from inside and outside Europe into the zone of their comparative studies. (10)

Despite its post-war popularity in most parts of the world, the French School, to borrow M. Shafiq's phrase, "has come to an impasse" for many reasons. (11) First of all, the French theorists have failed clearly to define the terminology and methodology of 'comparative literature.' These theorists have busied themselves with outside impacts on the literary work such as the 'causality' of relations between literary works, while ignoring the internal aspects of the texts in question. Hence, 'comparative literature' (defined by M. Wahba and several others as a 'branch of literary study') (12) is tied to nineteenth-century 'positivism' ("A system of philosophy elaborated by Auguste Comte [1798-1857], holding that man can have no knowledge of anything but actual phenomena and facts and their interrelations, rejecting all speculations concerning ultimate origins or causes"). (13) This makes 'comparative literature' lose touch with other critical or aesthetic approaches. Another good reason is that no credit can be given to a comparative study based upon linguistic differences only, leaving out the factor of culture, though language and culture are intermingled. (14) It is more accurate, therefore, that a comparison should take place between literatures in a single language, inasmuch as they are products of different cultural contexts – a hypothesis which the American scholars have adopted as one of the bases of their so-called 'American School of comparative literature,' which will be discussed below, after an examination of the French School's most common fields of study.

**The Concept of Influence:**

There is general agreement that the 'influence' study (basic for the French School of comparative literature) is a very knotty question, for it takes various forms which comparatists sometimes misuse due to a failure to distinguish between one form and another. There are many arguments surrounding the term

'influence', but one can define it simply as the movement (in a conscious or unconscious way) of an idea, a theme, an image, a literary tradition or even a tone from a literary text into another. But scholars do not stop here; rather, they classify influence into distinct types as follows.

1. **'Literary' and 'Non-literary' Influence:**

The concept of 'literary influence' originated in the type of comparative study that seeks to trace the mutual relation between two or more literary works. This sort of study is the touchstone of the French comparative literature. Hence, a comparative study between B. Shaw's *Pygmalion* and that of Tawfiq Al-Hakeem, or between Arabic and Persian poetry, for example, is a good example of 'literary influence'; while a comparative study between Rifa'at Al-Tahtawi and French culture is based on the principle of 'non-literary influence,' even though culture is related at some level to literature. The latter is ignored by the French School on the ground that the influenced writer ('receiver') does not absorb certain constituents of a literary work into his or her own work but rather some primary material which he or she

dexterously reshapes into a literary work. (15)

1. **'Direct' and 'Indirect' Influence:**

A 'direct influence' between two literatures, beyond the boundaries of place and language, is marked when there is an actual contact between writers. More specifically, a literary text can have no existence before its writer's reading of another writer's 'original' text or having direct contact with him or her. It is difficult, not to say impossible, however, to prove this relation, resting basically on a clear-cut causality, between nationally different writers; (16) especially, when some writers do not mention (deliberately or unconsciously) their debt, if such exists, to certain foreign writers or texts. Shakespeare's plays, for example, are derived from a number of older texts (history, biographies of notable persons or folkloric tales), but it would be inaccurate to suggest that such materials are behind his peculiar genius, because they were only the raw material that he reshaped into new forms with his genius. Shakespeare's drawing upon any preceding sources is thus irrelevant to the concept of 'direct influence,' but closely pertains to the concept of 'creativity' in the Middle Ages in Europe, which was gauged by a writer's utilization of certain literary devices (rhetorical or stylistical modes) to create out of an overworked subject a new literary source that appeals to the reading public. (17)

The comparatists interested in emphasizing the direct influence between different writers are in this way obliged to obtain documentary information verifying an actual relation between them, such as personal contacts or letters. Though their job is difficult, these comparatists do not enrich their national literatures with new literary models (patterns of thought, technique or types of personae... etc.) as much as they accelerate a tendency towards a blind chauvinistic 'national-ism,' where each critic makes a statistical list of the works manifesting the superiority of his national literatures to foreign ones.

In many cases influence can exist between two different writers, without there being any direct relation between them because of the language barrier, but rather through specific intermediaries such as individuals, journals or periodicals of literary criticism, saloons or societies of literature, and translations. If there is any influence of this sort, the French comparatists take it to be 'indirect.' Some individuals happen to visit and stay temporarily in foreign countries and become conversant with some of their literary works, which they propagate at home after coming back. An example is Mme de Stael's *De L'Allemagne* (1810, and was published in Britain in 1813), a book about Germany she wrote while staying there, which acquainted the French people with the German literature of the time. (18) Translation plays a no less effective role in importing information to peoples of the world about each other's literature.

It is noteworthy, however, that translation is often referred to as a complicated and deceptive process: inasmuch as it may provide national literatures with fresh themes or techniques, it may also distort the original texts. Owing to the deep influence of national matrices of language, culture and politics, many scholars fail to give, consciously or unconsciously, accurate translations of foreign texts. This results in the danger of the appearance of entirely different texts from the originals, which consequently leads to what critics describe as 'a false influence,' as the writer influenced by such translated works is misguided. (19) In many cases the translated texts can put people off the originals. Charles Pierre Baudelaire's translation of Poe's stories into French and several other English translations are clear examples. (20) A 'false influence' can be uncovered when a writer is influenced by another from his own country, whom he believes to be influenced by foreign texts; whereas if this writer went to the source he might find quite different elements. An example to examine is the influence on Mikhail Yurievich Lermontov of Alexander Pushkin's Byronic poetic narratives, but as he came to consult Lord Byron's original texts he could absorb from them many valuable artistic aspects, which Pushkin could not, into his own works – aspects which contributed to the

development of Russian literature. (21)

'Influence study' now seems a difficult task, as it requires comparatists to be well versed in different languages, cultures and literary histories in order to come up with sound conclusions. It is rendered more complex by the insistence of the French comparatists on processes such as 'borrowing', 'imitation' and 'reception.' Both Tieghem and Guyard concur that the study of a writer's impact on a foreign country cannot be divorced from studying the 'reception' of this writer's works in that country to a degree at which it becomes impossible to distinguish between 'reception' and 'influence.' (22) J. M. Carré also maintains that 'influence' study stresses the need to examine the reception of foreign works in a national country. Hence, he takes 'reception' to be a synonym for 'influence.' (23) And as the reception of a work in a foreign country subjects certain parts of it to 'borrowing' and 'imitation' on the part of some national writers, which are clear signs that 'influence' takes place, it seems that the three processes are bound together. But many critics see that the 'influence' process must not be mixed with the other processes, as is shown below.

**The Concept of Reception:**

There is a sharp line of demarcation between the process of 'influence' and 'reception', though the two are not unrelated: no influence can take place between foreign writers without the reception of a literary work outside its national borders. That is, 'reception' can be taken as a step on the road to 'influence.' But the reception of a foreign work in a nation does not necessarily mean that it is a good sign of 'positive influence': this would require proof that the foreign work helped develop in another country a foreign work within its national literature. In some cases a country's reception of foreign works helps only in letting its people know more about other cultures, as reflected in such works. This is why Zhirmunsky, along with other Russian scholars, sees that the process of 'reception' is not coincidental or mechanical but rather systematic, as it takes place only when the foreign works bring in cultural and ideological modes that accord with or help evolve those of a nation. (24) To give but one example, Fitzgerald's English translation of Omar Khayyam's *Rubaiyat* would not be given so much attention in the west unless it fulfilled a need for Khayyam's new trends of pessimism and mysticism. (25) On the contrary, the Arabic translations of certain Greek works during the Renaissance were not celebrated much in the Oriental world, containing as they did social and religious concepts that were inconsistent with its Islamic and Christian culture.

**The Concept of 'Imitation' and 'Borrowing':**

Ulrich Veisstein recognizes that though 'influence' and 'imitation' or 'borrowing' are related, they are drastically divergent in meaning. 'Influence' goes beyond the process of adopting certain aspects of a foreign literary work, and can manifest itself in a writer's imitation of this work in a way which suits the taste of his countrymen and proves his creative ability. The latter, Veisstein maintains, should not necessarily be seen as a refurbishing of specific foreign forms or themes, but as a creation of new concepts and contents originating from the foreign ones. (26) It seems then that aspects of foreign influence are embedded within the text, and to analyze them one must analyze carefully the whole text and consider the process of influence (starting with the literal translation of the foreign text through the imitation and borrowing processes). But pure 'imitation' in itself is a conscious process of adopting certain parts of a foreign work through which the imitator gives no room for the presentation of his creative ability in his text.

The 'borrowing' process is a ramification of 'imitation', in its broad sense, which ranges from the refashioning of the best parts of a foreign work in a way that fits well the national public taste to the adoption of a particular foreign style or technique. Pushkin's adaptation of Byron's elegy to the Russian style, and Pound's reshaping of the Russian old models of poetry are good illustrative examples. (27) There is a marked difference, however, between 'imitation' and 'borrowing': in the case of borrowing (especially from a work written in a foreign language) the writer, like the translator, is bound by the original text, whereas in the case of imitation he is not.

Still, there is a thin line of demarcation that should not be broken between imitation and borrowing as forms of artistic creativity (which adds new literary and technical modes to the influenced literature) and as 'plagiarism' (which is the borrowing from foreign works without referring to the sources or areas of citation). This last process, of course, has always been disapproved of

(28).

**'Positive' and 'Passive' Influence:**

A national writer's use of specific foreign literary sources in creating successful works of his own simply means that these sources have a 'positive' influence upon him. In other words, according to Aldridge, the existence of something in a writer's work is contingent upon his reading of another writer's work. (29) Examples of this sort of influence have been mentioned so far in discussing the complex process of reception. Some foreign works may have a 'passive' influence upon a national writer, in that he may feel compelled to write in a reaction to an affront to highly revered national figures in foreign literature. For example, S. Daniel's *Cleopatra* (1594), Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra* (1606-7), La Chapelle's *La Mort de Cléopâtre* (1680, A. Sommet's *Cleopatra* (1824), Mme de Gérardin's *Cléopâtre* (1847), Shaw's *Caesar and Cleopatra* (1912) and other plays, all belittled the Oriental mentality through portraying Cleopatra, an ancient Egyptian queen, as a two-faced siren who won victory for her country by seducing Anthony and other western military leaders. Conversely, Ahmed Shawqi's portrayal of Cleopatra manifested her as a striking example of loyalty and self-sacrifice for the sake of her country's welfare and dignity. (30)

No literature can stand alone on its own nation's cultural and literary heritage; rather, it must transcend geographical and linguistic borders to give and take (a technique, a theme, an idea or a human model) from different literatures of the world. This inevitable mutual sharing between international literatures is another essential area of study in French 'comparative literature.' Its fields of study are the following:

1. **Literary Schools and Genres:**

From the 18th century until now, the world has witnessed the emergence of various literary schools or movements (Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, Naturalism, Symbolism, Expressionism, Surrealism, Modernism, Post-modernism) and genres (epic, novel and drama). It is hardly a coincidence that such literary forms and schools are found, in one way or another, in the literatures of different parts of the world: there must have been a connection between them. Romanticism, for example, was brought to Germany through Schiller, to England through Shelley, to France through Hugo, and to Russia through Pushkin within the 19th century; but it appeared in the Arab world through a group of poets in the first half of the twentieth century. (31) Like animal geneses, these schools and genres (as shown by Brunetiére's *L'évolution des Genres*, based on Darwin's theory) have undergone basic changes and evolutions; and some of them have decayed. There is no place in today's literature for classicism, with its rigid artistic formulae, as is the case with the historical novel (which inundated Europe till the middle of the late century); when they first appeared, epic and drama were confined to using verse, but in time they tended to use both verse and prose, and then prose only.

Accordingly, comparatists interested in this field of study should base their studies on raising and answering a number of questions such as: what are the similitudes and dissimilitudes between two international literatures in using a specific school or genre? Where and when did this school or genre first appear? And how did it find its way into other literatures? What was behind its change or evolution? Did the boundaries of language, place and time have to do with this? Besides, many other questions can be put forth and answered.

Despite its large scope, this area of study in comparative study has not been scrutinized. J. W. Goethe's *West Östlicher Divan* (1819); L.R. Furst's *Romanticism in Perspective*: *A* *Comparative Study of the Romantic Movements in England, France and Germany* (1960); and *Islamic and Arab Contribution to the European Renaissance* (1977) by the National Commission For UNESCO in Egypt, are among the most significant studies on the history and development of various literary schools and genres in Western and Oriental countries.

1. **Ideological Echoes:**

According to Tieghem, the ideological history of a nation is generally formed by the history of philosophy, religion, ethics, culture and politics. This ideological history cannot be divorced from literary history, as the spread of any ideology outside national borders depends upon the artistic method of expressing it, as represented in the works of such French philosophical writers as Montesquieu (1689-1778), Voltaire (1694-78) and Rousseau (1712-78). These philosophical writers and many others are proper candidates for comparative literature studies.

Literature harbors all kinds of ideas, which are viewed differently by different writers. Religious ideas in, for example, French literature are treated in various ways: some writers defend religion or certain doctrines, while others question them. Cálvin, Pascal, Rousseau, Montaigne, Fénelon and Chateaubriand are among the theological writers whose distinguished works have found their wide echoes outside the frontiers of France.

As for philosophical ideas, not all of them are reflected in literature, but the ones that can be taken as seeds for ethical, social or literary concepts. A great deal of the philosophy of Hegel and Locke have found their way into many of the European literary works. Still, philosophical ideas are not the same in various literary forms, but are modified in a way that serves the writer's literary goal. German Existentialism, for instance, would not have gained popularity in France, if Sartre had not prepared the French public's taste with his novels and plays. Similarly, Al-Gähiz and Ibn El-Muqaffa must have exerted a strenuous effort in assimilating some of the foreign philosophical ideas (as of India, Persia and Greece) and introducing them into Arab culture in some works. (32)

Much more attention has been directed by comparatists towards ethical ideas in literature than to theological or philosophical ideas, in that they are closely related to literature (with all its forms, substance and essence). Ethical ideas embrace the writer's view of man (his nature and destiny in this world or the other) and the critical views which evaluate his actions and dictate how he should behave within definite social and ethical norms. These theoretical and practical rules of the writer are bound together in their literary expression.

It is hardly difficult to notice that ethical ideas have been the raw material for the masterpieces of world writers such as Addison, Shakespeare, Marlowe, Pope, Voltaire, Pushkin, Petrarch and Byron. The mutual influence between these writers, and many others, has been considered by a number of comparatists, like J. Texte (1865-1900) and Paul Hazard (1878-1944). Still, the works of Texte and Hazard are not regarded as 'comparative literature' but 'general literature' studies, inasmuch as they pursue the literary and ideological history of all European countries within a century or two, whereas the French School is characterized by binary study. Hence, Voltaire's imitation of Pope's view of man's dual nature, or mysticism in Arabic and Persian literature, or 'existentialism' in German and French literature, for example, all are proper provinces for comparative literature studies. (33)

Any treatise on 'comparative literature' may come to effective conclusions if it examines the role of other ideas (say, political, scientific or aesthetic) in the growth of literature – ideas which, of course, are echoed in most world literatures. Many of the theories of natural and social sciences are reflected in certain works by Zola; the 19th century literary decadents (a group of French and English writers who adopted the theory of 'art for art's sake) can be traced back to the multifarious analyses of psychotherapy; and even the most recent scientific discoveries are represented at length in modern literature. The political ideas in the masterpieces of Plato, Bacon, Vico, Hegel and Marx have been imitated by countless European writers, who must have affected many writers outside Europe. As for aesthetic ideas, they have been already referred to in discussing literary schools and genres, whose use in modern literature is attributed to Aristotle. (34) It seems now that the comparatist's job of studying the history of ideas and their participation in laying the bases of many literary texts is very complicated - a job which should shed some light on the history of two different cultures and the reasons behind their mutual literary contact.

**(3) Image Echoes:**

The treatise on 'image' in comparative literature has two main points of departure. First, a country's image in a foreign writer's work (e.g., Twain's portrayal of Egypt, along with some other Arab countries, in *The Innocents Abroad* or Voltaire's image of the English people) or literature (Spain in Arabic literature or Germany in French literature). Second, the image of a certain type of common character or of an object (woman in Arabic and Persian literature, or nature in English and French literature).

The image of a country in foreign literatures, in travel books or literary texts through using 'foreign' personae or local colour, is widespread in both national and comparative literature. Pierre Reboul's *Le Mythe Anglais dans la Litterature Francaise sous la Restauration* (The English Myth in French Literature: The Restoration Period) outlines English characters in French literature between 1815 and 1830, who seem to be characterized by independent thinking, duality, love of freedom and a commanding temperament. But this image underwent basic changes in later writings. In 1813 Mme de Stael introduced the French people to a picture of a deteriorating Germany (displaying a dull romantic spirit and a sharp division into principalities, kingdoms and Duchies). Owing to the social evolution of Germany in the late 19th century, Wagner depicted it as a united republic and a luminous center of knowledge and culture. On the contrary, Bismark saw it as martial and dictatorial. These inconsistent views, however, could not sweep from the French mind the picture of Germany as a home of the erudite physician, the romantic poet and the favored musician. The *Mercure de* *France* (a French journal published in 1924) presented an ideal picture of the Roman citizen (known for his generosity, love of nature and deep reverence for the past). The accounts of some French travellers and translated Roman works into French were primary sources for this view. However, this idealistic picture later underwent a change: some French writers looked upon the Roman ideal as foolhardy, opulent and showy. Inasmuch as this last view contradicted the Roman identity as shown throughout Roman history, it was regarded as inaccurate.

With an equal degree of interest, several scholars pursued the depiction of France in other European literatures (of England, Germany, Italy, Spain, etc.), as appeared in *Revue de Psychologie des Peuples*. Some

Munich University professors also drew an analogy between the image of France in German literature and that of Germany in French literature.(35)

It is obvious now that a country's image in a foreign literature rests upon different, often contradictory, points of view. Depending on sources irrelevant to literature (journals, periodicals or newspapers) and viewing a people through stereotypes may lie behind such contradictory views. In order to ensure accurate and authentic images of countries, the comparatist is required to examine all the literary works portraying a country and the writers' biographies, so as to make sure whether or not they visited this country. It is preferable, though difficult, that the comparatist himself visit the country and get acquainted with its people and culture to be able to compare its literary image with its reality. Good judgment is an essential prerequisite, to detect truth or falsification of literary images of a place. This sort of study, after all, becomes most difficult when the lines of distinction between mythical and real are broken and when it becomes impossible to trace the sources of a country's image printed in the minds of a foreign people. (36)

As for the second dimension of 'image' (which is the representation of a type of character or an object in more than one literature), it demands of the comparatist to base his study on two things. In the first place, he or she needs to look for the cultural, social or political communication between two different nations some of whose literary works focus on a certain type of character or an object. In the second place, the role of geographical, linguistic and cultural boundaries in modeling the same type of character or object in a similar or different manner should not be ignored.

As a figure of speech (like the symbol of nature as divine power or as a kind mother who gives solace to her children during sorrow and distress times), 'image' has crept into all poetry, drama and novel (as is the case with the French and English romantic poets). It is most significant if the comparatist can determine the origin of an image or a group of images in the works of a writer and their imitation by others. Since foreign images are assimilated by writers into their national languages and cultures, the comparatist is bound to refer to this process. The transmission of Arabic poetry, with all its images, through 'intricate historical circumstances' to Spain, Sicily and south-west France during the Renaissance period may be a prolific province for comparative literature studies.

(37)

**(4) Verbal Echoes:**

Subsequent comparative studies have been fastened on the 'give' and 'take' between languages, with regard to the various channels of connection between nations. These studies reached contradictory conclusions as to the words and idioms which crept from the borders of one language into the other's. But what matters most is the discovery that foreign words go beyond being mere sources of enrichment for the legacy of the receiving language that has received them; they become indicative of definite social and cultural values with many connotations. It is reasonable to suggest that languages, despite their variation, are the cornerstones of cultural and social reciprocity between nations.

Mackenzie, an English researcher, has thoroughly examined the relations between England and France in the light of the words each one borrowed from the other's linguistic legacy. Most fruitful is the role of the Orientalists in revealing the impact of foreign languages on Arabic, and vice-versa - an impact which throws light upon various ancient relations (historical, political, commercial, scientific, literary, etc.). Some examples of the many comparative studies made in this field: Siegmond Fidenkel, *Die Aramaischen Fremdworder im*

*Arabischen*, Leiden, 1886 (Aramaic Words in the Arabic Language); Lyde, *Glossaire des mots Espagnols*, *Portugais Dérivés de l' Arabie*, 1869 (A Glossary of Spanish and Portuguese Words Derived from the Arabic Language); Heinrich Leroy, *Die Semitischen Fremdworder im Griech-ichen*, Berlin, 1895 (Semitic Words in the Greek Language).(38)

Much more light has been thrown on the role of the Arabic words borrowed by other languages in widening international relations in the fields of mathematics, natural sciences, history, geography, oceanology, botany and medicine. For instance, *The Canon of Avicena*, a literary medical book ("ranking with the works of Aristotle, Euclid and Ptolemy") has always been a primary source for 'practitioners' of medicine in different parts of the world, and of which many of the terms have been adopted by various foreign languages. Countless Arabic astronomical terms have also found their way, with just a little change, in Western navigation books, such as: 'Achenar' (Akhir El-Nahr), 'Alkaid' (Al-Qa'id), 'Altair' (Al-Ta'ir), 'betelguese' (Bit Al-Gawza'), 'Centaurus' (centaurs), 'Mirfak' (Mirfaq), 'Famalhut' (Fam ElHoot), 'Regal' (Regal)... etc. (39) In music, too, some of the names of musical instruments (such as *ud* for the English word 'lute') are still in common use all over the world.

Such studies may open new horizons for other ones which may come up with fresh ideas or concepts, so as to add to our knowledge of international relations across time and history. Still, it is not easy to achieve this, for verbal echoes study demands, besides vast knowledge of different international cultures, traditions, politics and histories, a great ability of testing these within certain linguistic contexts in two or more international literary texts, with a view to deciding the kind of historical relations between them. Such study can be easily drawn towards the orbit of both sociology and anthropology; the comparatist should not let the outside sources of the linguistic contexts seduce him away from the examination of the literary work itself.

**(5) Human Models and Heroes:**

That certain characters and heroes are used in eastern and western literatures (especially epic arts) is commonplace. There are characters attributed to ancient myths such as: Pygmalion (as in Shaw's *Pygmalion*, Ovid's *Les Metamorphosis* and John Marston's *The Metamorphoses of Pygmalion's Image*) and Prometheus (as in Geothe's unfinished play *Prometheus*, Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* and A. Gide's *Promethée Mal*

*Enchaine*). Religion has provided all literatures with such figures as: Noah, Youssif (or Joseph), Moses, Solomon, the prophet Mohammed, Christ, Cain, Abel and the devil. The latter is depicted, for just one example, in "Paradise Lost", Hugo's *Fall of the Devil*, M. Lermontov's dramatic poem "The Devil," Byron's Cain and in some works of Baudelaire and Arab writers. (40) Some of the characters, are, it is suggested, taken from popular myths, namely: Ala Edin and Shahrazad in *The Arabian Nights*; Faust in Marlowe's *Dr. Faustus* and several dramatic and poetic works of the Middle-Ages in Europe; and Don Juan in Tirso de Molina's play *El-Bortador de Sevilla y Convidada de Piedra*, Otto Renk's *Don Juan* and in some works of Baudelaire, Moliere, Byron, Goldoni, Mozart and Hoffmann. Other characters (like Alexander, Cleopatra, Arthur, Julius Caesar, etc.) are adopted by western and eastern writers from history. However, certain common types (say, the miser or the gambler) are ascribed to no definite originals but to daily life in general, therefore they are not focused upon in comparative literature. Instead, the focus has been on the worker, the inventor, the doctor, the naive girl, the harlot and many other common characters.

It is noteworthy that all the aforementioned types of characters vary from one literary text to the other. The imitators may have an excuse in Aristotle's definition of tragedy, which is the imitation of men in a way which makes them look better than we do; this is the method of painters, whose drawing of an original model results in producing a much more beautiful one, though the two may look identical. Like the painter, the poet creates out of bad or vicious people very idealistic human models. (41) For example, Moliere's Don Juan is made to be a social satirist and a benevolent man altogether; Byron assigns Don Juan to convey his own philosophy: namely, detesting the haughtiness of society, its rigid and arbitrary traditions and calling for free love - a sacred love. In this Don Juan appears as a social victim and rebel. Some of the characters, however, do not deviate from their original outlines. Shahrazad, for example, figures in Arabic and western literatures as a symbol of the heart's triumph over mind.

The comparatists who want to work on this field of study in comparative literature are bound to trace how certain characters are sketched by two different literatures and the reasons beyond their consistency with, or deviation from, the original models. Still, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to come to clear-cut and accurate conclusions, when it is argued at length that the sources of specific characters are found in myth or folklore, or even created out of imagination and are made by writers to look real.

To conclude, the French comparatists have not restricted comparative literature study to the above fields: it has been of paramount importance for them to work on the popularity and influence of a writer or group of writers on the writings of foreign countries - a sort of study which Tieghem calls 'dexologia' (a Greek word for 'fame'). (42) Countless positive studies have been centered on the contribution of the French writers (Rabelais, Ronsard, Montaigne, Moliere, Boileau, Fénelon, Flaubert, Baudelaire, Rousseau, Maupassant, Zola, etc.) in developing other European literatures, and the impact of the latter (like Richardson, Ossian, Byron, Shaw, Valery, Goethe, Herder, Schiller, Dante, Le Tasso, Pirandello, Goldoni, Lope de Vega, Dostoievski and Tolstoi) on French literature. Outside Europe, comparative studies have focused on the mutual influences between Arabic literature and European literatures. (43)

Despite its circulation inside and outside Europe within the early years of the twentieth century, the French School of comparative literature could not avoid criticism because of certain drawbacks. Tieghem, along with his followers, is impeached for drawing comparative literature away from its primary focus by involving it with problematic, though irrelevant, issues. To inquire thoroughly into 'rapports de fait' or outside circumstances affecting two or more literary texts makes the comparatist concentrate not on the texts but on extraneous factors. (44) In this way the subject remains bound by the old historical and 'positivistic methods of investigation. Another serious mistake is the confinement of comparison to the boundary of language and place between the texts, which draws us into Eurocentric view. Tieghem's differentiation between 'comparative' and 'general' literat-ure has caused the comparatists to differ often over, for example, "whether a study on the impact of Ibsen on modernist drama can be properly traced to 'comparative' or 'general' literature." (45)

Inasmuch as these principles separate the external and internal constituents of a literary work, they come to contrast sharply with the new theories of literary criticism which flourished in the second half of the twentieth century and which are known for their consideration of the work of art as one integral whole. All these drawbacks must have given birth to the so-called American School of comparative literature.