Scapegoat Archetype in *the Island of Doctor Moreau* by H.G. Wells

Aazam Jahangiri

Humanities Department, Shoushtar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Shoushtar, Iran.

ABSTRACT

This article intends to study *The Island of Dr.Moreau* written by H.G. Wells in the light of scapegoat archetype. In this process, Carl Jung's theory of the archetypes or pre-existence forms and collective unconscious as their storehouse is benefitted to offer a sound understanding of the nature of archetype. In addition, Sir James Frazer's exposition of the probable reasons and relevant rituals to the sacrificial scapegoat are presented. In this study, the attempt is made to examine the unconscious belief in the significance of scapegoating in reviving peace.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved

Introduction

An important matter reflected in some literary works, is removing disaster in the form of reflecting it on an animal or a person. This animal or person must be killed or discarded to atone for the people's sins and restore welfare, peace and fruitfulness. This sacrificial act has a root in human beings' collective unconscious and can be subcategorized under the broad category of archetypes. Similar to all archetypes, sacrificial archetype is stored in the collective unconscious. In *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious,* Carl Jung proposes that human cultures share a collective and impersonal psychic system, consisting of pre-existence forms. Jung defines these pre-existence forms as archetypes. He argues that the subject can be aware of such forms only when they are given specific personal psychic forms. This means that these archetypes can find a channel of expression in art, myth, dream, religion and even the eventual facing of death (1981, 27-41).

Although sacrificial ceremonies may be slightly different from one another, they mostly are similar in their origin and original experience. This original experience intends to remove tension and calamity from human life and for regained peace, prosperity and fertility. From ancient samples, one can mention an offering in the form of an animal or a human being in order to appease the wrath of gods. Throughout different times and in different communities, the sacrificial victim was a distinguished man or animal, somebody who is different in some characteristics from the rest.

The Island of Doctor Moreau is an 1896 science fiction novel written by H. G. Wells. The text of the novel is the narration of Edward Prendick, a shipwrecked man rescued by a passing boat who is left on the island home of Doctor Moreau, who creates human-like beings from animals via vivisection. The novel deals with a number of themes, including pain and cruelty, moral responsibility, human identity, and human interference in nature. On the other hand, this novel deals with human fears and weaknesses. In certain situations, people put their problematic burden on a person or an animal and banish or kill him or it to relieve their tension. This kind of displacement can be considered as a kind of sacrificial archetype that is a

subcategory of the general category of archetypes residing in a collective unconscious. This article tries to consider this novel in the light of scapegoat archetype.

The study of scapegoat archetype in this novel can be useful for several reasons. It can be a pattern for analyzing other works of this novelist and its conclusion can guide for more completed work on this novel. Other myths, rites and images from biblical, cultural and literary sources can be regarded in this novel, too. Moreover, the study verifies the importance of archetypes to intensify the literary influence on the readers and audience.

Methodology

This research tends to argue the influence of the scapegoat archetype in *The Island of Doctor Moreau* by H.G. Wells. The researchers try to use the Jungian theory of collective unconscious and theory of archetype. For Jung, the human psyche consists of three parts: the personal consciousness, personal unconscious and collective unconscious. Archetypes are patterns or images of repeated human experiences such as birth, death, rebirth, the four seasons, and so forth. These archetypes express themselves in our stories, dreams, religion and fantasies.

Mythological and archetypal school of criticism that plays a prominent role in practical criticism, developed in the twentieth century to indicate the importance of some collective aspects of people's lives that bind together the community of people through believing in certain forms of faith and shared practices, like myths, legends and certain ritualistic patterns. The fundamental belief in myth criticism is that these practices continue over a long period of time and are deeply rooted in the mental and emotional lives of the people. They are projected in artistic and literary works as recurring symbols, motifs and images.

No doubt, mythological and archetypal criticism takes us beyond the social and historical considerations, deep into the remotest past of humanity when men's collective thought and behavioral patterns are formed. As Anthony Stevens states "all cultures, whatever their geographical location or historical era, display a large number of social traits which are in themselves diagnostic of a specifically human culture"(2002, 25).

Tele:
E-mail addresses: a.jahangiri2003@gmail.com

One special trend in mythology according to *Larouss World Mythology* is the comparative mythology that extends from the middle of the nineteenth century with especial focus on the similarities among myths of people from different periods (1989, 14). In this method, certain mythological schemes are fundamental and consequently occur in regions far apart like mythology of royalty, immortality and cycle of vegetation, etc. Sir James Frazer's *The Golden Bough* has risen from such method (Guerin, et al., 165).

Like Jung, Frazer does not consider himself a professional philosopher but he too, via anthropology, arrived at the fundamental insight that myths across different cultures, though distinct in content, share a universal structure. In fact, both Jung and Frazer accept the universal structure in their structural analysis of myth. But, while Frazer's work deals with mythology and archetypes in material terms, the work of Jung in contrast, is immaterial in its focus. Jung's work theorizes myths and archetypes in relation to the unconscious, an inaccessible part of the mind (Walker 1995, 3-15). Frazer's *The Golden Bough* attempts to define the shared elements of religious belief to scientific thought, discussing fertility rites, human sacrifice, the dying god, the scapegoat and many other symbols and practices whose influence has extended into twentieth-century culture(Leach 2011, 279-290). Its thesis is that old religions were fertility cults that revolved around the worship and sacrificing a sacred king. Frazer proposed that mankind progresses from magic through religious belief to scientific thought (ibid, 298).

The origins of the archetypal hypothesis date back to Plato. Jung himself compared archetypes to platonic ideas. Plato's ideas were pure mental forms that were imprinted in the soul before it was born into the world. They were collective because they embodied the fundamental characteristics of a thing. Although every people has its own distinctive mythology that is reflected in its legend, folklore, and so forth, in other words, although myths take their specific shapes from the cultural environments in which they grow, they are in the general sense universal. More over, similar motifs and themes may be found among different mythologies and certain images recur in the myths of people widely separated in time and place that tend to have a common meaning or tend to arouse certain psychological responses with similar cultural functions. Such motifs and images are called archetypes. Archetypes can be stated as universal symbols. Philip Wheelwright in his *Metaphor and Reality* characterizes such symbols as;

Those which carry the same or very similar meanings for a large portion, if not all, of mankind. It is a discoverable fact that certain symbols, such as the sky father and earth mother, light blood, up-down, the axis of a wheel, and others, recur again and again in cultures so remote from one another in space and tie that there is no likelihood of any historical influence and casual connection among them.(1962, 111)

So, all of us inherit the same archetypes, the same invisible patterns or motifs, like emotions, into the structure of the human psyche and they manifest in personal and cultural experiences. Moreover, Jung proposes the duality in the nature of archetypes. He believes that archetypes exist in the psyche as well as in the outer world. He calls this non-psychic aspect of the archetype the Psychoid archetype. In this regard, he considers a visible part for the conscious aspects of the archetype and an invisible part to correspond to the unconscious aspect of the archetype. The archetypes are not merely psychic entities, he asserts, but a bridge to matter and material world. Jung uses the ancient term of unus mundus to describe the unitary reality which he believed underlay all manifested phenomena. He believes that archetypes

are as the mediators between the psyche and the fundamental principles of matter and energy in the physical world (Stevens 2002, 87). Actualization of archetypes occurs with the context of an individual's environment. For instance, the mother archetype is actualized in the mind of a child when the child is in the vicinity of a maternal figure that corresponds to its maternal archetype. This mother archetype that is a unit of collective unconscious transforms, in the form of the mother complex, into the personal unconscious of the child. Thus, while archetypes themselves may be conceived as few innate forms, from these may arouse innumerable images, symbols and patterns of behavior. Furthermore, while the archetypes as elementary structures are unconscious and difficult for perceiving, their emerging images and forms can be apprehended consciously. So, by examining behavior, images, art, myth, etc, the existence of archetypes can be deduced indirectly. As inherited potential, archetypes can be actualized in the outside world through their entrance in consciousness in the form of images or manifested in behavior.

Archetypes also associate with the symbolic meanings. Generally, they can be put in three main classifications each of which can be divided into subcategories. Three major classifications of archetypes are: archetypal images (water, sun or fire, colors, Circle, snake numbers, the archetypal woman, the wise old man, garden, tree and desert), archetypal motifs or patterns (creation, immortality, hero archetypes), and archetypes as genres (mythos of spring, summer, fall, and winter). The scapegoat archetype is a subcategory of hero archetype. It is the act of killing the hero or a representative that with his or its death or discarding, the welfare of returns since he or it is identified to atone for the people's sins or calamities. In this way, the community can restore the land's prosperity (Guerin, et al. 157-164).

In the oldest human records the practice of sacrifice is found. The archeological records contain human and animal corpses with sacrificial marks long before any written records. Sacrifice is a common theme in ancient cultures like Greek, Roman and in most religions. Commonly, the most valuable sacrifices have been that of lives, human or animal. According to Rene Girard in his *Violence and the Sacred*, sacrifice is essential if community order and harmony are to be restored. He also adds that, "Violence is the heart and the secret soul of the sacred" (1977, 31). Girard suggests that sacred violence in the form of a ritual sacrifice ultimately cleanses the community of violence. Sacrifice is one of the dominant themes in Frazer's *The Golden Bough*. He considers its causes, categories and functions in human societies

According to Frazer, in scapegoating practices done in ancient Greece, mostly a cripple or a beggar who was called the Pharmakos being stoned, battened and cast out of community for their ritual purification. Pharmakos as a sacrificial vehicle was blamed for occurring a natural disaster such as a plague, famine and so on, or for calenderical crisis like the end of the year. (Frazer, 578)

In Abrahamic religions like Judaism, Christian and Islam, sacrifice is either bloody or unbloody. Bloody sacrifice is practiced by killing some determined animals like a lamb, a goat, etc. and unbloody sacrifice is done by offering grain, wine and so on to the priests or the poor. The prophets of these religions pointed out that the sacrifice is only a part of their serving of their duty as God's slaves and should be accompanied by their sincere piety and inner morality and goodness to enjoy from God's providential power. The prototype of such religious sacrifice in which a human being is used as the victim of

sacrifice is represented in Abraham's willingness to sacrifice his son at Mount Morriah. Another type of ritual that is common among these Abrahamic religions and shows the importance of sacrificial act in all of them is called Korbani or Qorbani. Korban is derived from the Hebrew root Karov and means close or to come close to God. In some villages in Greece, Christians sacrifice in a practice called Kourbania for Orthodox saints. This act provides benefits for the church and brings a sense of community as well. An animal sacrifice in Arabic is called Qurban, probably rooted in the Jewish term Korban. In the Islamic context, atonement by blood sacrifice is done in a feast that is called Feast of Sacrifice once a year in Mecca in pilgrimage and at the same time in every Moslem country all over the world. An animal sacrifice is also called Dabiha that means sacrifice as a ritual. The sacrificed animal may be a sheep, a lamb, a goat, a camel or a cow (Zwemer 1946, 187-192).

But the term scapegoat derives from a Hebrew ritual in which scapegoat sacrifice is practiced in a riddance-of-evil ceremony described in the *Bible* (Leviticus, 16) as a central part of the Yom Kippur ritual. By such rituals, people try to excise the evils like death, disease, violence, physical and psychic sufferings or the sense of sin and guilt from themselves. It was believed that such afflictions bring darkness and disorder both to man's inside and outside life. Kipper is related to Kippurim which is a Hebrew word for atonement and elimination. As Theodore Gaster mentions, "There are etymological parallels in both Babylonian and Arabic. A Babylonian rite on the fifth day of the ten- day New Year Festival was called Kuppuru and involved purgation, purification and confession of sins and a human sacrifice"(ibid. 138).

In the original Hebrew, two goats were selected. One of them was dedicated and killed as a sin-offering to Yahweh that he might forgive Israel. The remains of this goat were considered as unclean and were burned. The other goat that was treated as expelled or escaped goat was dedicated to Azazel who was the supposed fallen angel by Hebrews. The goat appeared as an ambiguous figure. But, to understand the significance of a goat in the formation of sacrificial scapegoat, it is important to reveal the hidden meanings of Azazel or the God Goat. Sylvia Brinton Perera in her *the Scapegoat Complex* (1985) believes that in pagan and folk tradition Azazel was a hairy god to whom sacrifice must be done. As a horned god, Azazel cooperated with the farmer god. But, in Judeo-Christian culture, all these aspects of the goat god changed in meaning drastically. Here, Perera explains the goat is identified with Satan and the demonic energies of the accusing Azazel. In this case, the goat transformed to a figure that was encountered by the collective rejection. Azazel is also interpreted as the place where a fallen angle that changes to an evil demon descends. In this regard, it refers to a harsh cliff or mountainous land where the goat is driven on (89-90).

The Hebrew ritual, then, took the Biblical form and its adaptation was in the form of sacrificing the son of God, Jesus Christ, as a Lamb of God to atone all humanity's sins. Christ endured the agonies of conflict between his wish for personal survival and his acceptance of the mission he felt. But, at last, he accepted the sacrificial role (Hubert 1981, 74). And Alfred Cave in his *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement* says: "Not only portions but the whole New Testament-not only the New Testament teaching but any type of that teaching must be cast aside unless the work of Christ be in some sense or other regarded as a sacrifice"(2009, 289). Sacrificial act can be traced in many different historical situations like what Rene Girard has

described as the process of blaming Jews in many medieval cities for the presence of bubonic plague that subsequently resulted in massacring this Jewish population (Girard 1987, 1-5). He also describes, again in the medieval era, the common witch trials in which the women were blamed for the ills of the community and executed. (Girard 1987, 7-9).

But, there should be some reasons sacrificing. It was possible for primitive man to shift a load of wood, stones and so on, from his back to the back of another. Similarly, he thought on the possibility of shifting the burden of his pains and sorrows to the other instead of himself. As a result, he used different ways for casting the supposed burden on some one else. He gradually found out that for ridding himself from the threatening evils, he could transfer them onto other people, animals or thing as vehicles. In fact, the primitive man used some typical devices for his ease at the expense of putting a burden on his neighbor's shoulders (Frazer, 557). The other probable reason that unconsciously provokes the savage mind to practice sacrifice is to convince a god or gods to change the course of nature and life. Although there are differences among ancient religions and cultures, they unconsciously recognize that gods' anger should be appeased when they are offended by men's actions. They thought that the most fundamental practice that could help their redemption was done by offering sacrifice. Since men are social creatures who prefer to live in a community to survive instead of being alone, they expelled the evils publicly. In general, there are two kinds of the public expulsion of evils: the occasional expulsion of evils and the periodic expulsion of evils (ibid. 567). The occasional expulsion of evil occurs whenever a group, a community or a people see the symptom of damage and misfortune. So, there is no exact or annual date for performing the act of expulsion. In his *The Golden Bough*, Frazer has given examples of such kinds of rituals with the same characteristics but slightly different in the form of performance (Frazer, 567).

However, Some primitive people tend to rid the evils at fixed times to make a fresh start of life. So, they tend to have periodic expulsion ceremonies instead of having occasional expulsion ceremonies. Here, some points should be mentioned. First, in periodic expulsions of evils, mostly, ceremonies are held once a year. Second, the suitable time of the year coincides with change of season. It should be noticed that certain seasons possess some marks which show their appropriateness for a general expulsion of evils. For example, in some special seasons, mortalities increased for climactic changes. Sometimes the date of the annual expulsion is fixed with reference to the agricultural seasons. Often, the expulsion of evils coincides with the beginning of the New Year because at the beginning of the New Year, people tend to remove their troubles. Third, it is observed that before and after a periodic expulsion, a general license is applicable by which the ordinary social rules and restraints are put aside for a while. So, men can free their passions. A great supply of food and joy is added to their release of passions. The traces of the expelling the powers of evil have survived in Christian Europe up to the modern times (ibid. 570).

In this way, a vehicle has been chosen; somebody or something on which the act of expelling casts on him or it. In fact, the vehicle is the embodiment of the devil and bears the sorrowful burden of others to clear ills, disaster and misfortune from infested people through the process of projective identification. So, for restoring fruitfulness, mostly, the members of community project the specter of evil into the least blameworthy of creatures. The vehicle or the scapegoat-identified individuals have learned to fear assertion. They should deny their self-protective instinct in order to accept the role

chosen for them better. The vehicle may be in two general forms, i.e. immaterial or invisible vehicle, and material vehicle or scapegoat.

Immaterial or invisible vehicle is also called immediate expulsion of evils. In this class, evils are invisible to the common eyes. In this way, mostly, for ridding the group, community or village from disease and disaster, they abandon the supposed devils or demons and drive them out of their residence in some ritualistic ceremonies associated with making noise, beating the air and so on, to frighten the spirits and force them to flight (ibid. 567).

The material vehicle or scapegoat is also called mediate expulsion of evils. In this class, evils are embodied in a visible form. As a matter of fact, the evil is supposed to be loaded on a material medium. This material medium acts as a medium to draw the evil off from the village or community. One should notice that both the occasional and periodic expulsion of evils can be cast on a material vehicle. The only difference is that in the periodic expulsion of evils, selecting the scapegoat occurs in the regular and annual intervals.

The vehicle which conveys away the collected demons or illnesses may be of various kinds. In some tribes a boat or a ship was launched to depart famine, sickness and so forth. Most of the times, people shouted after it. Sometimes the vehicle is an animal, mostly domestic animals like goats, dogs, and bulls. In addition to the animal scapegoat, in some sacrificial ceremonies, the scapegoat was a human being, mostly one with a defected body who was driven out of the communities' boarders or is bothered and left to die. The thought is that in such cases the plague is transferred to the victim. In classical antiquity, i.e. Ancient Rome and Greece using a human as a scapegoat was frequent. For example, on the fourteen of March, Romans drew a man clothed with skins out of the city. Since for Romans, Mars was the symbol of vegetation no war, they called him the old Mars. He should be sacrificed at the beginning of the New Year or for the growth of the crops. Sometimes the sacrificial scapegoat is a divine animal. In some tribes and communities, some especial animals were holy like cows for Brahmans or bull for Egyptians. They did not kill such animals unless they had certain token that seemed to be ominous. On the other hand, the scapegoat may be a divine man, for instance, the king of the community. There is an ambiguity about using a divine man or animal as scapegoat. The question is that how a holy one can be sacrificed for the atonement for the sins and calamities of the others who are in the socially lower ranks? In fact, in such cases, there are two presuppositions: first, we have the custom of killing a divinity to save his divine life from being weakened by the decline of the age and second, we have the expulsion of evils by casting on a divine man or animal. By the combination of these two customs, one can conclude that while he is going to be killed as a scapegoat, the divine life would be saved from the degeneracy of the old age. On the other hand, because he should be killed eventually, people used the opportunity of putting the burden of their misfortunes, disease, famine and so forth, on him to carry with him to the afterworld. Another point is that such a distinguished and difficult burden should be carried away by a distinguished person. Therefore, the aim is not to punish the divinity, but to purify him from the harmful influences (ibid. 587-590).

Discussion: Scapegoat Archetype in *The Island of Doctor Moreau* This part tries to argue the existence of the scapegoat archetype in *The Island of Doctor Moreau*. According to what has been discussed in the previous parts, there are some common features like occurring a calamity in the community, choosing a vehicle, the public expulsion of evil, the occasional expulsion of evil, material vehicles in this novel that is to be discussed.

There is great tension in the normal life of the animals on the island that is reflected through the narrative of the visitor, Prendick. It was foreshadowed at the early parts of the novel when the narrator, Prendick, was on the ship. The thing he noticed on the ship was a grotesque bestial native M'ling and also the fact that the ship was transporting a number of animals that seems to be belonged to Montgomery. The first unusual thing for him, on the island, was to be housed in an enclosed compound that symbolizes how all the nearly all the creatures on the island are controlled through some brutally strict regulations established for them by a mighty scientist, Dr. Moreau. As the ruler of the island, Moreau has experiment in vivisection that manipulates the ordinary and natural existence and life of the animals. Such painful manipulation creates disorder and anxiety for the residents of the island, i.e. its native animals. Their commonly animalistic way of life like drinking water bent down, running on all fours and so on were forbidden for them. In fact, the puma that rips free of its restraints and kills Moreau is the representative of the humanoids under anguish. The burden of their misery casts on him as someone whose existence is the source of problems. As mentioned in the prior parts, Scapegoat ritualistically can be either an animal or a deformed and an insane person or a king or princes. Here, in the case of *The Island of Doctor Moreau*, Moreau himself as the ruler of the island is the scapegoat.

As it is narrated, Moreau was discarded from London eleven years before as someone who manipulated helpless animals physiologically. Londoners recognized the danger and immorality of his vivisections and cast him out as their scapegoat to regain the community's peace. On the Island, he was scapegoated again as a double-scapegoat, this time to the extent of losing his life. Puma is the one that eventually escaped from his laboratory and led him to chase and eventually to kill him. So, Puma's action objected to Moreau's destructive pattern of the animals' subjugation. It unconsciously appease the wrath of all beast Men by eliminating the root of their tortures that was Moreau's crudity in changing their instinctual and animalistic life and endowing them with what they were not originally made for, i.e. to have humanoid body, to be trained them in order to act as if they were fundamentally human beings. In fact, Moreau was preoccupied with such illusion and it was not in balance with the reality of these animals' life. In fact, this disturbance was felt by all those were under vivisection, but few dare to object, as their controller, Moreau was too strong to be overcomed over. However, Puma escaped from his laboratory and this time the fortune changed for Moreau's loss as a helplessly creature captured in its hand far from his supporters and assistance with the hope of no aid.

Killing Moreau on the island and expelling him from London demonstrate that, in fact, he was scapegoated twice and scapegoating in both cases were done publicly. Furthermore, such public expulsion is accomplished not annually as a ritual, but, on this especial occasion when both communities' peace was infested by Moreau's notorious scientific vivisection and the community members noticed the symptoms of such damage.

The act of expelling casts on Moreau as the vehicle, and as the embodiment of devil and cruelty. He bears the sorrowful burden of the community members that were tortured in his hands to clear their anguish through the process of projective identification. He even did not find time for any assertion and self-protection. In fact, he is a material vehicle or scapegoat. In

the act of expulsion of evil, it is evident that Moreau has a visible form, since it is visible to the common eyes. So, the evil is supposed to be loaded on him as a material medium or material vehicle. Out casting him from London and killing him on the island by the puma represent his role as a medium to draw the evil off from the city and the island. The vehicle is a scientist with a voracious appetite for vivisection. Such distinguished and difficult burden is carried away by him as a distinguished person with extraordinary ability.

Conclusion

The analysis of *The Island of Doctor Moreau* by H.G. Wells based on potential elements of sacrificial archetype is the basis of the conclusion. *The Island of Dr. Moreau* captures some selected public issues as those issues that are anxieties of the individuals. There is a nervous energy and a passion in Moreau's scientific actions. Recognizing the reasons of the turmoil and tension is relevant to understanding what bothers the community and how its members try to get rid of it; one needs special recognition that connects us to the world of unconscious.

Community suffered from a problem, which probably started from a biological interference to its members' physiological and mental dimensions of their existence. They try to resist gradually and expel the source of evil in an act of unconscious scapegoating to regain their previous calmness. Of course, since the act of scapegoating has rooted in men's collective unconscious, in order to study and analyze such novel, one must delve into the deeper layers of this literary work. Because of existing elements that are relevant to the sacrificial archetype in this novel, analyzing the sacrificial archetype can be helpful in its better understanding. Dr. Moreau, according to the results achieved in the discussions above, is a material vehicle or a scapegoat that is occasionally eliminated publicly. His role as the scapegoat is twice represented, first occurred 11 years before the story started in London where he was out casted by the Londoners and second, on the island where he was killed. In both cases, he was scapegoated by the both communities to restore their former peace and calmness.

Acknowledgement

Bibliography

Abrams, M. H. (1971). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. New York: Harcourt Bruce College. 267.

Ackerman, Robert. *(2003). J. G. Frazer: His Life and work*. Encyclopedia Britannica Inc.

Bressler, Charles. (2007). 4th ed. *Literary Criticism*: *an Introduction to Theory and Practice*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Brome, Vincent. *(1951). H.G. Wells: A Biography*. London. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green. 99.

Campbell, Joseph. (1986). *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

(1991). The Mask of God: Vol.1. Primitive Mythology. New York: Penguin Group Inc.

Canadas, Ivan. (2010). *Going Wilde: Prendick, Montgomery and Late-Victorian Homosexuality in The Island of Doctor Moreau*. JELL: Journal of the English Language and Literature Association of Korea. 56.3: 461-485.

Cave, Alfred. (2009). *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement*. Edinburgh: General Books LLC. 289.

Castle, Gregory (2007). *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*. Oxford: The Blackwell Publishing.

Cudden, J.A. (1982). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. New York: Penguin Books.

Davies, Nigel. (1981). *Human Sacrifice: In History and Today*. Dorset: Dorset Press.

Dobson, Darrell (2005). *Archetypal Criticism. The literary Encyclopedia*. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Edinger, Edward F (1987). *The Christian Archetype: A Jungian Comentary on the Life of Christ Studies in Jungian Psychology by Jungian Analysts*. Toronto, Inner City Books.

The Columbia Encyclopedia, Sixth Edition (2004). Columbia. Columbia University Press.

Frazer, Sir James George (1998). *The Golden bough: A Study of Magic and Religion*. ed. Robert Frazer. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics.

Frye, Northrop(2001). "The Archetypes of Literature." *The Norton Anthology: Theory And Criticism*. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch. New York: Norton.

Gaster, Theodor H (1952). *Festivals of the Jewish New Year.* New York: William Sloane.

Guerin, Wilfred L. et al (1992). *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York: Harper & Row Publisher.

Girard, Rene (1977). *Violence and the Sacred*. trans. Patrick Gregory. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. 1-5-7-9.

Grimal, Pierre (ed.) (1989). *Larousse World Mythology*. London: Hamlyn.

Gwinn, Robert et al (1990). *Encyclopidia Britanica*. Vol. 1. Chicago :Encyclopidia Britanica. Inc.

Hoad, Neville (2004). *Cosmetic Surgeons of the Social: Darwin, Freud, and Wells and the Limits of Sympathy on The Island of Dr. Moreau*, in: Compassion: The Culture and Politics of an Emotion, Ed. Lauren Berlant. London & New York: Routledge. 187-217.

Hubert, Henri et al (1981). *Sacrifice: Its Nature and Function.* Chicago: Chicago Press. 74.

Hughes, Dennis D (2003). *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece*. New York: Routledge.

Jung, Carl G (1953). *The Collected Works.* ed. H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler. London: Routledge & Kegan.

1981). *Archetypes and Collective Unconscious.* ed. 2. New York: Princeton. 27-41.

(1956). *"Symbols of Transformation"*. Collected Works, Vol. 5. London: Routledge & Kegan.

King James (1611). *Bible. Leviticus, Chapter 16*

Kincaid, James R (1922). *Child-Loving: The Erotic Child and Victorian Culture*. New York: Routledge.

Knox, Jean (2003). *Archetype, Attachment, Analysis*. Hove and New York: Brunner- Routledge.

Leach, Edmund R (2011). "Kingship and divinity": The unpublished Frazer Lecture. Oxford. 28 October 1982." HAU: *Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 1.1. 279-298

Leitch, Vincent B (2001). "Carl Gustav Jung." The Norton Anthology: Theory and Criticism. Ed. Vincent B. Leitch.. New York: Norton. 987 - 990

Levi-Strauss, Claude (1963). *Structural Anthropology*. Trans. Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. New York: Basic Books.

Merrian-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary (2003). Springfield: Merrian-Webster. Inc.

Medoff, Richard Brad (2003). "The Goat or Who is Sylvia? (Review)". *Theater Journal*-Volume 55. 1. 164-166. The John Hopkins University Press.

Parrinder, Patrick (2004). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press.

Perera, Sylvia B (1985). *The Scapegoat Complex: Toward a Mythology of Shadow and Guilt (Studies in Jungian Analysis)*. New York. Inner City Books. 74-90.

Philmus, Robert M. and Hughes, David Y. ed. (1975) . *H.G. Wells: Early Writings in Science and Science Fiction* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press. 179.

Quinn, Edward (2004). *Collins Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Glasgow: Harper Collins Publisher.

Rajimwalve, Shara (1998). d. *Dictionary of Literary Terms*. New Delhi. K. S. Paperback.

Schorer, Mark (1946). *William Blake: The Politics of Vision*. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Reed, John R. (1990) *The Vanity of Law in The Island of Doctor Moreau*, in: H. G. Wells under Revision: Proceedings of the International H. G. Wells Symposium: London, July 1986, Ed. Patrick Parrinder & Christopher Rolfe. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna UP / London and Toronto: Associated Ups. 134-144.

Roberts, Adam (2000), *The History of Science Fiction*: in *Science Fiction*. Routledge. 48.

Selden, R (1989). *Practicing Theory and Reading Literature*. London: Billing and Son. Ltd, 1989.

Stevens, A (2002) . *Archetype Revisited*. London: Brunner-Routledge: 65-87.

Walker, Steven F (1995). *Jung and the Jungians on Myth: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing. 3-15.

Wheelwright, P (1962). *Metaphor and Reality.* Bloomington: Indian University Press.

Wells, H. G (1996). *The Island of Dr. Moreau*, Ed. Steven Palmé. Dover Thrift Editions. New York: Dover Publications.

Wells, H. G (1996). *The Island of Doctor Moreau: A Critical Text of the 1896*. London First Edition, with Introduction and Appendices, Ed. Leon Stover. The Annotated H.G. Wells, 2. Jefferson, N.C., and London: McFarland.

Wolfreys, J. et al. *(2002). Key Concepts in Literary Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

 Zwemer, Samuel M (1946). "Atonement by Blood Sacrifice in Islam." *The Moslem World*, Vol. 36. 187.