

# **A** *n Orientalist Reading of Kipling’s “The Return of Imray” and “The Mark of The Beast”*

**Nilay Erdem Ayyıldız**

*School of Foreign Languages, Fırat University*

## **Abstract**

The aim of this study is to analyse Rudyard Kipling’s two stories entitled “The Return of Imray” and “The Mark of The Beast”. The study asserts that Kipling takes a colonialist side and seeks to justify colonialism through his selected stories. Kipling is one of the most significant authors representative of the Victorian period when colonialism reached its peak in Britain. In the two stories considered, the author creates a detective who solves the mystery concerning the colonisers, Imray and Fleete, who have been sent to the colonial land; it is this detective who finds out that the murderer is a native. From the chosen setting, the depicted atmosphere and the portrayal of characters to the actions in the stories, every detail draws attention to the writer’s colonialist discourse. The writer intends to prove the superiority of the coloniser to the colonised within a strict framework of such binary oppositions as “us” versus “the other” or “the Orient” versus “the Occident”. Therefore, regarding Orientalism as an effective instrument to legitimise Western dominance as a force over the colonised, Said’s Orientalist theory has been taken as a guide throughout the study.

## **Keywords**

The Victorian period, colonialism, Orientalism, binary oppositions.

This study aims to provide an Orientalist reading of “The Return of Imray” (1888) and “The Mark of The Beast” (1890) by the Indian-born Victorian writer Rudyard Kipling with the purpose of critically analysing these two short stories from the perspective of the ‘Orientalist’ theory of Edward Said. The Orientalist approach reveals how the relationship between the British colonizer and the Indian colonial subject was fictionalized.

Having colonized most parts of the world by the end of the nineteenth century, Britain became “the empire on which the sun never sets” until the early twentieth century. The period in which the nation spread like wildfire all over ‘exotic’ places is called the ‘Victorian Era’. Dividing the exotic places into two categories, Piya Pal-Lipinski states that “...the *near exotic* could be mapped as Italy, Spain, Greece, and parts of eastern Europe. The *remote exotic* initially designated Turkey and India, and then gradually North Africa and the Far East” (2005, 2). Britain extended her imperial borders especially on the remote exotic places. Within the process of colonisation, Britain invaded a nation, occupied and governed it by exploiting its resources and labourers.

India was one of the most significant and profitable colonised exotic territories of the British Empire. When the first English vessel arrived in India in 1583, it was a large territory with a giant and growing population. Having been ruled by a changing group of Hindu and Muslim dynasties, India was then under the control of the Mughals who welcomed the English vessel (Milburn 1813, iii). By starting with mutual commercial affairs, the connection between English and Indians turned to be more useful for the British rather than for the Indians, the reason being that having been interested in the raw materials and the population in India, Britain increased its authority over it by benefitting from internal conflicts within the country itself. The weakening power of the Mughals led to strengthened British authority over India in the eighteenth century. In 1781, Lord Cornwallis was appointed governor by the British East India Company to accelerate imperialistic activities in India. In addition to the exploitation of Indian

natural sources, Britain began to train native people for the army and thus made these 'half citizens' serve British colonial benefits. Offended by the brutal British military practices, the Indian soldiers rebelled and started The Sepor Mutiny in 1857 that became a turning point for all Indians. The rebellion was crushed; nevertheless it created a division between Hindus and Muslims, both of whom were under the British rule. Thus, in 1858, there was a post-Mutiny state of India: British India known as 'British Raj', a term used for British rule in the Indian subcontinent usually for the period between 1858 and 1947. In 1858, the rule of the British East India Company was turned over to the Crown in the person of Queen Victoria, who was proclaimed Empress of India in 1876. Thus, Britain managed to get the authority of India officially. This situation lasted until 1947 when the British Indian Empire was divided into two sovereign domain states: the Union of India (later the Republic of India) and the Dominion of Pakistan (later the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, the eastern half of which later became the People's Republic of Pakistan). That is to say, The British Raj extended over almost all present-day India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, with exceptions such as Goa and Pandicherry (Milburn 1813, iv-ixv).

Imperialism was not only a British practice of colonizing other lands and people but also a kind of philosophy making the colonized people believe in the superiority of the white race and their moral responsibility of bringing civilisation to the 'uncivilised' people of the world. This attitude was taken especially towards nonwhite, non-Christian cultures in India, Asia, Australia and Africa. Significantly in the Victorian Era when imperialism was on the peak, the Queen Victoria said: "The important thing is not what they think of me, but what I think of them" (Pritchard 2014, 122). It can be claimed that the general idea is that the powerful one represents, while the weak one is represented. Stuart Hall states that: "representation means using language to say something meaningful about, or to represent, the world meaningfully to other people" (1997, 15). Hence, the right to define meaning is granted to the coloniser, and texts were used as a vehicle of

presenting representation of India and Indians to the British who did not have the opportunity to visit India. Enjoying the affluence from the resources and labor from the colonised countries, the British readers who could not travel to distant places were supposed to be told about colonials and their strange and ‘exotic’ colonised lands (Pal-Lipinski 2005, 15). Thus, the fundamental idea behind it, as stated by Filion, was that: “the reader’s understanding of these places and indigenous peoples is constructed entirely through what the media and British government claim they are” (2008, 71)

Fiction has been the most suitable way of conveying the Orientalist discourse, as Edward Said (1935-2003) highlights the power of fiction by mentioning it as “important in the formation of imperial attitudes, references, and experiences” (xii). The influence of colonialism might be traced in many Victorian fictions such as Haggard’s *She* (1889), Conrad’s *Heart of Darkness* (1899) and Kipling’s *Kim* (1901), which are set in ‘exotic’ Oriental lands colonised by Britain.

It can be claimed that the British interest in India could be observed in the Oriental themes of travelogues and diaries. Other Victorian fictitious works of the period portrayed the uneasy relationship between British coloniser and the colonial subject as well. And these works fitted so well with the civilising mission of the British rulers. Almost all these writings convey a kind of uneasiness that resulted from the anxiety experienced by the colonised. The fundamental reason for this anxiety derived from the idea that the more one suppresses the other, the more rebellious s/he (the suppressed one) becomes. This situation resulted in an essential need for making all colonised subjects believe in and internalise the civilising mission of the British colonisation.

At this point, the most practical and cunning tool for justifying colonisation was none other than Orientalism. Defined by Said, in his work *Orientalism*, as “a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (2013, 4), Orientalism appeared to be a cunning way of rationalising colonisation

by rendering the Occident superior to the Orient; in Said's words, "dealing with questions, objects, qualities, and regions deemed Oriental" (2013, 73). He defined the 'Orient' as an exact opposite of the West. The Orient is projected as exotic, mysterious, and the Orientals as primitive, uncivilised and animal-like. Therefore, Orientalism seems to be a kind of Western strategy to construct a negative image for the rest of the world outside the West. Said also states that: "[t]he Orient is not an inert fact of nature. It is merely *there*, just as the Occident itself is not just *there* either..." (2013, 5). Therefore, the concepts of the 'Orient' and the 'Occident' are consciously constructed and employed to justify dominance of Western imperial powers. This construction results in other conceptual contrasts such as 'here' versus 'there', and 'us' versus 'them' that facilitate justification of the colonisation. Said explains this by claiming: "In essence, such a category is not so much a way of receiving new information as it is a method of controlling what seems to be a threat to some established view of things" (2013, 60). The critic calls orientalism "an accepted grid for filtering through the Orient into Western consciousness" (2013, 7). Thus, in fact, the Orient was Orientalised by Westerners, "not only because it was found to be Oriental but also because it could be made Oriental" (Jouhki 2006, 5). For Said, the key element of making Oriental is 'classification', because he regards classification as one of the circumstances of eighteenth century culture that facilitated Orientalism. Hereby he elaborates upon the issue that the Western world used categories such as "race, color, origin" as a means to make a distinction between their Christian selves and "everyone else" (2013, 121). Bhabha confirms this way of thinking by stating "the objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonised as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin in order to justify conquest" (1986, 154). Thus, the common platform for the usage of colonial discourse is through text for the West. By means of fiction, the Orientalist views are disseminated rapidly all over the world by creating a subverted image of the Orient in Western minds. Therefore, as Keer states, "Through Orientalism, the west authors the east and becomes its authority" (33).

Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936) was one of the most significant writers in the Victorian period. As told by Harold Bloom, born in Bombay, India and spending most of his life both there and in England for education, Kipling had great opportunity to have knowledge of both the East and the West. His close relationship with the Victorian government and art had a great influence on his views. One of his aunts was married to Edward Burne-Jones (1833-1898), who was a brilliant Pre-Raphaelite artist. Therefore, he was in company with the artist circle of the period, especially with Robert Browning (1812-1889), Charles Swinburne (1837-1909), Christina Rossetti (1830-1894), and William Morris (1834-1896). His other aunt was married to Edward Paynter (1836-1919) and another to Alfred Baldwin (1841-1908), who was an ironmaster and owner of railroads. He had a well-to-do, intellectual, middle class family background. Under the circumstances of family background, experiences and social associations, it is not surprising that Kipling drifted in an imperialist direction. He professed the philosophy of imperial life, and which, rough and ready though it was, appealed so strongly to his generation. He interpreted Oriental life and mind according to the Western world (Bloom 2014, 14-18). Kipling appears to be an imperialist, because, for him, it was the Western moral duty to enlighten the non-white world. Therefore, Kipling originated the concept of "The White Man's Burden" which is very similar in its context to Said's "Orientalism" in confirming the superiority of the West over the East. Foregrounding his commitment to the imperialist agenda, Kipling emphasised the superiority of the white race implying that it is the West's mission to civilise other nations. He subtly contributes to the British colonial projects in India the need for British reform with its stress on India's so-called moral degradation. Kipling's specific term is used to refer to the colonial subjects under the British authority such as India and many African nations that are thought to be primitive, savage and brute. Thus, underlying the notion that British colonial conquest was immensely noble, the term 'The White Man's Burden', just like Orientalism, is used to legitimise the Western colonization. Semmler states that: "Kipling told

Paterson that he felt the White Man's burden was laid on him to advocate in every way the bringing of the British peoples under an Empire Council" (1967, 74). Therefore, it can be claimed that Kipling writes his stories from the dominating viewpoint of the white man in a colonial possession. Instead of questioning the white Westerners' right to rule the colonials, he intends to convey the message that the native people in the Orient are in an urgent need of a civilising agent, that is, a British coloniser who would bring them civilisation. It is clear that Kipling who is referred to as 'The Unofficial Laureate of the Imperialists' was a strong defender of Imperialism. His notion of the White Man's Burden moved even the silent British to the action for the benefit of the British Empire. Aptly called by George Orwell as the 'Prophet of 'British Imperialism' (2006, 100), Kipling confirms this title with his stories "The Return of Imray" (1888) and "The Mark of the Beast" (1890).

First of all, the choice of India, as the setting of the stories is not surprising. As stated above, Kipling who was a journalist, technician, poet, and a short story writer was born in India and spent most of his life in India where he had many good and bad experiences. More importantly, due to his English education, he could see India with an Englishman's eyes and due to his Indian childhood and his newspaper experiences; he could sympathise with the native Indians. Thus, as claimed by Hart, "[h]e dealt with the Here and the Now. He dealt with his Own People, whose bread and salt he had eaten, whose wine he had drunk, whose vigils and toil and ease he had shared, with whose lives he passionately identified his own" (1918, 6). His experience of the traditional Indian life led him to concern himself with the top and bottom of the Indian social structure. Kipling's individual experiences in India and England enabled the author to decipher the hidden meanings behind the seemingly commonplace.

From the Orientalist perspective, the choice of India as the setting of an imperialist text is unerring. India was one of the exotic places on which the West turned its

eyes, and it was a mysterious place that the British colonisers desired to discover. It was full of valuable materials and sources that made the Western colonisers' mouths water. However, for them, this richness belonged to the uncivilised, savage and brutal Indians who could not even govern themselves. As Mary Douglas writes, India is "a mirror image" of Europe and thus a totally opposite world to the West (1972, 12). This 'mirror image' fits well with Said's definition of the Orient as an exact opposite of the West, which considers itself on the top of the world. In an Orientalist eye, India is seen as "the spiritual, degenerated, caste-centered, collectivist, holistically religious locus that has no coevalness with the West" (Jouhki 2006, 14). India has always been a land of mysterious and supernatural elements for the Westerners. In many Victorian works, this feature of India was drawn attention to sharpen the contrast between the Orient and the Occident. Space is created by imaginative contrast between the reader's current space and the location itself. In Said's terms "[i]maginative geography and history help the mind to intensify its own sense of itself by dramatizing the distance and difference between what is close to it and what is far away" (2013, 55). That is to say, for instance, the Victorian writer created an imaginative Orient by drawing contrasts with Britain by means of stereotypes. The reason is that it is known that stereotypes in Orientalism facilitate the Western imperialistic goal of restructuring and dominating Oriental culture: "[so] that geographically and historically, Orientalism is to encompass the ancient world, the period of colonisation in the nineteenth century and the current relationship between the West and the Orient; further it is to cover all disciplines concerned with the Orient" (Dalmia-Luderitz 1993, 98).

As a significant part of the Indian life, supernaturalism and mysticism evoked a kind of shocking effect on white readers through the horror and detective short stories set in India. From the Orientalist way of thinking, it was ridiculous that the illiterate Indian relied on superstitious beliefs. For instance, Weber associates

India with the magico-religious, while he bases Western Europe on rationality. The fundamental reason of these associations is because of science. Science did not progress in India, so the natives focused on religious and superstitious beliefs in their lives so that they were seen as ‘other-worldly’ (Weber 1958, 12). On the other hand, in the nineteenth century, the Victorian Era witnessed a great age of positivism based on scientific developments. The British viewed Indian culture and religion as backward and profane. To them the strength of European culture was its Christian foundation. Their goal was to obliterate as much as possible the superstitious, traditional culture established during the Mughal rule and to replace it with Christian values, English education, and Western ideas by founding libraries and schools (Bhaktivinoda 2002). Hence, the untrustworthy attitude of Christians towards Indians was primarily not only because of the religious motives but also because of political and ethnic designs. Weber states that the “image of ‘other-worldly’ and holistically religious Indian society has still strong hold of Western discourse in India” (1958, 12), because the advancement of British science over the superstitious beliefs of the Indians serves as justification for the rule of the ‘more advanced’, ‘more civilised’, ‘more capable’ Britain over the Indians.

More importantly, as a colony of the British Empire, India became a threat to the British government after the Indian Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, even though the rebellion of a large part of the Indian army was quelled (Bentley 2005, 1-5). As Bentley mentions “tensions [that] emerged between the governments of India and Great Britain from the 1880s” were also enough to evoke fear and anxiety about India (2005, 5). As an imperialist zealot, Kipling evaluated Indians’ rebellion as ‘madness’, because, for him, they did not have the capacity of realising that Britain intended to protect them from themselves by bringing civilisation to them. This notion is also related with the Orient’s being associated with a “feminine figure which is weak, and inferior for male-dominated Western world” (Jouhki

2006, 4). In a way, the Orient – like a woman to a man – has been seen as the weak and inferior partner. The Oriental has needed the Orientalist to be animated. The feminine Orient has waited for European penetration and insemination by colonisation (Said 2013, 207-219). Welby claims, as parallel to Said’s theory of Orientalism, “...Kipling’s Anglo-Indians and Indians struggle to assimilate a paternal law, but their desire for the life-affirming maternal realm constantly threatens the autocratic word of the (colonising) father” (2010, 4). On the other hand, from a Freudian perspective “Anglo-Saxon Orientalist depictions of India and the Orient in general reflected to some extent their sexual power-fantasies” (Jouhki 2006, 4). In accordance with this point, Fanon also likens the self-justifying ideological operation of colonialism to the mother: “...who unceasingly restrains her fundamentally perverse offspring from managing to commit suicide and from giving free rein to its evil instincts. The colonial mother protects her child from itself, from its ego, and from its physiology, its biology and its own unhappiness which is its very essence” (Bhatnagar 5; quoted in Fanon 43).

Thus, Kipling reflected these Orientalist notions and imperialistic anxieties related to natives in his short stories. Both “The Return of Imray” (1888) and “The Mark of The Beast” (1890) are set in India and both revolve around a coloniser who seeks to pacify the native Indians by solving mysterious events involved in India. Hence, both of them fall into the category of colonial texts as they try to justify colonising, the so-called civilising of the Orientalised Indians.

The exotic setting is portrayed with its nature and weather. The season is summer in the stories, and the narrator mentions the hot weather, even if it rains in India. He depicts the exotic atmosphere of India in “The Return of Imray”:

The heat of the summer had broken up and turned to the warm damp of the rains. There was no motion in the heated air, but the rain fell like ramrods on the earth...The bamboos, and the custard-apples, the

poinsettias, and the mango-trees in the garden stood still while the warm water lashed through them, and frogs began to sing among the aloe hedges... (141)

The characters of the story seem to have exotic air of the setting as long as daylight. However, when it gets dark, the narrator begins to draw an uneasy atmosphere. The narrator of “The Return of Imray” tells about his feelings and his dog in the dark: “As long as the full light lasted I was comfortable, and so was Tietjens; but in the twilight, she and I moved into a back verandah and cuddled each other for company” (142). The depiction of exotic fruit trees in the morning is replaced with the depiction of the setting of “a nest for owls and serpents” and fearful essence and motion of something the narrator cannot see (143). It is felt that something goes wrong by means of an uncanny atmosphere. Accordingly, an evil air is depicted in both stories. In “The Return of Imray”, for example, this is felt by the narrator’s such statements as “I heard a wild hammering and clamouring above my head or on the door” (141), “a dim figure stood by the windows” (141), “there was a sound of footsteps at night” (141), “the curtains between the rooms quivered as if someone had just passed through” (146), and “the chairs creaked as the bamboos sprung under a weight that had just quitted them” (142).

As for the depiction in “The Mark of The Beast”, the opening statement of the story hints at a the setting full of mysteries and horrible elements: “Your Gods and my Gods-do you or I know which are the stronger? Native Proverb” (132). The setting is said to be “EAST of Suez” whose inhabitants are “[m]an being there handed over to the power of the Gods and Devils of Asia” (132). The evil air in the setting is full of the sounds of leopard-like victim and leper who are shivering and mewing, “unmanageable-mad and fear”, horses that are rearing and screaming in evenings (135).

The stories function successfully in embedding the Orientalist views in colonial discourse by applying the Orientalist principles. The characterisation in the stories is a kind of ‘we’ versus ‘they’ resulting from a rigid classification. Said mentions

this concept as “classification”, which he regards as one of the requirements facilitating Orientalism. The distinction between ‘We’ and ‘the Other’, and ‘us’ and ‘them’ is made understandable and adoptable by all readers. It is clear that the purpose is to create superiority over all other nations outside West.

The colonial subject or the exotic figure is used as the criminal. Filion expands on this point as follows: “stories about the rising of the mummy and the appearance of the vampire in England are examples of anxiety the British subject feels about the ramifications of colonisation and the subsequent crimes of imperialism” (2008, 70). No matter in which role the criminal, that is to say, the colonial subject is, he is identified with the animalistic or the sinister. Therefore, in the story, it is felt that the ‘other’ is in an urgent need of a civilising agent. The criminal needs to be the other – someone that can be distinguished from those who are non-criminals. Therefore, the notion of othering is associated with the villain or the civilising agent in the stories.

In “The Return of Imray”, the criminal is Bahadur Khan, an Indian servant who murders the British officer, Imray. As a colonial subject, he rebels against the coloniser that represents British authority and is punished by the detective, another British officer. Although he is not alone at home as servant, among the questioned Indian servants, he is depicted with his extraordinary appearance. He is mentioned as “great, green turbaned, six-foot Mahomedian” (144). With every mention of Khan, the narrator also tells of the snakes swinging from the ceiling-between cloth and a thatch (142). Thus, the narrator makes the reader suspicious about Khan. Khan confesses his crime with equanimity. Imray’s body falls down revealing that Khan has killed him by cutting his throat “from ear to ear” (143). This exemplifies the point noted by Rowbotham: “Uncivilised behavior such as violence was associated with foreign people and places, and civilised or non-violent behavior was associated with British values and practices” (2005, 94-95). Although the Indian servant referring to Strickland as “His Honour” (144), “The Presence” (145) and “The Heaven-born” (145) seems to devote himself to

the authority of the coloniser, he turns out to be Imray's murderer. Therefore, Kipling uses symbolism in his detective story; the mention of snakes haunting the household are used to represent sneaky and dangerous Indian colonial subjects waiting for an opportunity for assaulting the authority of the British Empire. Also, when the narrator enters his room, he says that he saw his servant "waiting, impassive as the copper head on a penny, to pull of my boots" (146). The "copper penny" phrase, used to describe Filion, his servant, "is both a belittling comment about the man's skin color and an allusion to the poisonous serpent" (2008, 84). This observation implies that the narrator sees his seemingly placid servant the same way as he sees a poisonous animal. Degrading the Other with animalism is contrasted with praising the loyalty of Strickland's dog, Tietjens to her owner. Caring for Strickland even in his illness, the dog is implied to be more humane than Indian servants, especially Bahadur Khan, formerly serving Imray for many years and then killing him violently. Obviously, in Kipling's eyes, the dog is more loyal than the colonised Indians.

The criminal figure in the story "The Mark of The Beast" is a Silver Man, an Indian leper who punishes a British man, Fleete who comes to India to have control over the land left to him by his uncle. The Silver Man transforms Fleete into a leopard-like creature. As he is a colonial subject using his supernatural and mystical power to attack British man, he has the colonial subject role, that is, the criminal. He enters the setting "from a recess behind the image of the god." He is said to be "naked in that bitter, bitter cold, and his body shone like frosted silver, for he was what the Bible calls 'a leper as white as snow.' Also he had no face, because he was a leper of some years' standing and his disease was heavy upon him" (133). He takes his revenge by leaving with his sharp teeth a mark on Fleet's left breast for disrespecting the Monkey god, Hanuman by polluting his figure. One of the priests in the story says: "He has done with Hanuman, but Hanuman has not done with him" (133). The reason of these happenings is that

Fleete pollutes the image of the god of Monkey, Hanuman by grinding the ashes of his cigar into its forehead. Furthermore, he mocks it by pointing it: “Shee that! ‘Mark of the B-beasht! I made it. Ishn’t it fine?’ ” (133). His insult is answered by Silver Man’s leaving a mark of the beast on his left breast where his heart lies. This curse turns him into a beast that is devoid of civility, rationality, identity and ultimately his soul. He devours, chops and begins to mew and then rears like a leopard. Therefore, what happens to Fleete is a kind of supernatural revenge, a native revolt.

In “The Return of Imray”, Khan’s reason for killing Imray seems to confirm the sharp distinction between Western rationality and Oriental spirituality by branding Oriental as superstitious and orthodox. Khan says: “Walking among us, his servants, he cast his eyes upon my child, who was four years old. Him he bewitched, and in ten days he died of the fever my child” (145). Concerning this point, Clarke claims: “For many, the Orient has been a dominion of hordes and despots or spiritual mystics and exotic sensuality. Exaggeration and imagination together with a range of both positive and negative stereotypes connected to popular prejudices have been essential to these views” (1997, 3-4). Bahadur Khan, confessing his crime to Strickland, justifies his murder of Imray by relating it to a popular Indian belief: the Evil Eye. For Strickland, such a superstition is strange and lame excuse for the crime. It is suggested in the story that the nonsense Indian belief in the Evil Eye results in a kind of tragedy: the tragedy of a British officer, innocent Imray who had simply patted the head of an Indian child by appreciating his eyes. Expressing his amazement upon Khan’s explanation Strickland says to the narrator: “This [...] is called the nineteenth century. Did you hear what that man said?” (145). Khan’s defense is obviously found ridiculous and the popular Indian belief of Evil Eye is despised. Thus focusing on spiritual and religious traditions, Indians are implied to be very backward to the Westerners who had taken many steps in science; as Filion claims: “the Western point of view, which supposedly privileges science, medicine, and empirical knowledge, is more progressive and

advanced than the mystical interpretations of events that Khan offers” (2008, 83).

On the other hand, in “The Mark of The Beast”, Kipling creates ambiguity by treating the events unrealistically and leaving gaps that lead to doubt and confusion for the reader. The superiority of Western rationality and positivism collapses with the failure of Doctor Dumoise who has diagnosed the case of Fleete in scientific terms as ‘hydrophobia’ (136). The medicine he gives Fleete appears to be ineffective. Furthermore, the Doctor is reported by the narrator to be “dead now; he died, in a rather curious manner, which has been elsewhere described” (132). Not giving details about the mysterious death of the doctor, the narrator suggests that he is also cursed by this mysterious case. Even the idealized British coloniser, Strickland admits it by saying: “It’s no good. This isn’t any doctor’s work” (136). The narrator also confirms it by saying: “I, also, knew that he spoke the truth” (137). Strickland seems to acknowledge the spiritual power and mysticism in his words: “Even if the Silver Man had bewitched Fleete for polluting the image of Hanuman, the punishment could not have fallen so quickly” (137). Therefore, he finds the solution in getting rid of the magic by means of magic. Fleete’s life is saved by means of the same leper’s touch on his breast by force. When they find the leper wandering around, the narrator’s comment about him indicates an othering and degrading manner towards the Indian leper: “It was an unattractive sight, and thinking of poor Fleete, brought to such degradation by so foul a creature” (138). Thus, the criminal is again defeated, even if by brutal force, by the power of the British coloniser, the detective Strickland.

The victim of the Victorian stories is usually the British coloniser who comes to the colonised land and then is murdered by the criminal, that is to say, the colonial subject as a result of his ignorance. “The Return of Imray” revolves around the mysterious disappearance of Imray from his position in colonial India. The victim in this story is Imray, an officer of the British army, who seems to have come to India in order to supply the control over the administration of the Indian Empire. The narrator implies Imray is courageous for going to this dangerous,

mysterious land, India that is mentioned as the land outside the West; thus for colonizers, outside the world: “Imray achieved the impossible. Without warning, for no conceivable motive, in his youth, at the threshold of his career he chose to disappear from the world-which is to say, the little Indian station where he lived” (140). He has a bungalow in India, and stays with a few Indian servants. Referring to him as ‘His Honour’ (144), ‘Heaven-born’ (145), and ‘The Presence’ (145) Bahadur Khan says: “I am clay in the white man’s hands” (145). Furthermore, the Indian servant of the narrator is said to be waiting to pull of his boots. Therefore, it can be claimed that a master and slave relationship exists between the Indian servants and the British colonisers in the story. Seemingly passive and loyal to their master, the Indian servants are implied to be insidious, sneaky and ungrateful people against whom the British colonisers have to be careful. Imray’s fault of ignoring their true nature results in his cruel death. Patting the head of Khan’s child and looking at his eyes and then the child’s subsequent death prepared his own murder because of Khan believing in a common Indian belief: the Evil Eye.

“The Mark of The Beast” revolves around the victim character, Fleete. He is identified as “a big, heavy, genial, and an inoffensive man” (132). It is said that when “Fleete came to India he owned a little money and some land in the Himalayas, near a place called Dharmsala. Both properties had been left him by an uncle, and he came to finance them” (132). It is suggested that Fleete intends to use a Hindu religious centre for commercial purposes. That is to say, he is a British coloniser, but not an idealized one, because just like, Imray, “his knowledge of natives was, of course, limited, [...]” (132). He insults the Monkey god, Hanuman by “grinding the ashes of his cigar-butt into the forehead of the red stone image of Hanuman” (133). His fault is revenged by a leper priest who bites his breast and hence transforming him into a beast-like creature, devoid of civility, humanity and his soul. Thus, the story hinges on profanity towards a local divine figure that results in tragic consequences.

On the other hand, Strickland, the colonizer both in “The Return of Imray” and

“The Mark of The Beast” draws attention to the direct relationship between power and knowledge by claiming that: “Imray made a mistake ... [s]imply and solely through not knowing the nature of the Oriental” (146), and Fleete’s “knowledge of natives was, of course, limited [...]” (132). However, Strickland is Kipling’s idealised, open-minded British coloniser who hates “being mystified by natives, because his business in life is to over-match them with their own weapons” (133). He fits well with Pepper’s definition of the ideal colonizer: “[he] is constructed by silently demonising all those things which he is not... not a woman, not gay, not black, not working class” (2000, 40). In “The Return of Imray”, by means of his clever questioning, he makes Khan confess his crime, and leads to Khan’s death with the bite of a snake, because he knows the nature of the Orientals. In “The Mark of The Beast”, he knows that only magic can solve the magic and corresponds to the revenge of the leper priest by forcing him to touch Fleete’s breast to save his soul, because, as the narrator concludes in the end of the story, Strickland is aware of the fact that “the gods of the heathen are stone and brass, and any attempt he deals with them otherwise justly condemned” (139). Thus, he achieves overmatching them with their weapons. The reason is that knowledge is certainly power in British India as many instances in Kipling’s fiction can attest (Bayly 1996, 165-67). Thus, Kipling draws attention to another essential principle of Orientalism: direct proportion between power and knowledge. It is stated by Said as follows: “...knowledge of subject races or Orientals is what makes their management easy and profitable; knowledge gives power, more power requires more knowledge, and so on in an increasing profitable dialectic of information and control” (2013, 37), because “[c]reating the Orient as a place of residence for the Other requires the privileging of European culture, knowledge and law” (Filion 2008, 73). Said concludes his thoughts as follows: “[t]o be a European in the Orient, and to be one knowledgeably, one must see and know the Orient as a domain ruled over by Europe” (2013, 198). Simply, the more knowledge one has about something, the more power s/he has over it. This is the situation of Strickland who comes to India and becomes a part of it, and is able

to solve the mystery behind Imray's sudden disappearance and the magic done to Fleete. Therefore, as Kerr says " 'Knowing the Oriental' was essential in order to control the Orient" (2003, 45). His statement derives from Said's notion: "[p]ower enables knowledge, knowledge legitimizes power" (2013, 34). Otherwise, the fate of the coloniser can be just like Imray's, since "there are hundreds of less institutional instances in Kipling's fiction where information is crucial for control of a situation, and correspondingly where ignorance exposes its possessor to impotence, failure and ridicule" (Kerr 2003, 40). It is obvious that Kipling warns the Victorian readers against the Orientals and he intends not only to teach Britain of his knowledge, but to provide such a wealth of information that the Empire might better understand and control India.

To conclude, both in "The Return of Imray" and "The Mark of The Beast", the plot revolves around a British outsider who is unfamiliar with the customs and beliefs of the colonial subjects and Strickland, an idealized British officer who knows well the nature of the natives and therefore, can solve the mystery at the end of the stories. In both stories, ignorance of the colonisers is punished by the native through revenge. Having made to feel the anxiety resulting from the Indian Sepor Mutiny of 1857, the Victorian reader is warned against the colonial Indians' potential rebellion. Therefore, it can be claimed that Kipling's short stories "The Return of Imray" and "The Mark of The Beast" clearly confirm Said's statement that: "The fact of the Empire was present in nearly every British 19<sup>th</sup> century writer's work concentrating on India" (2013, 14). Thus Kipling's notion of the 'White Man's Burden' reflected in these stories displays how the Orient is Orientalised in the hands of the colonisers.

## References

- Bayly, C. A. 1996. *Empire and Information: Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India 1780-1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bently, Lionel. 2005. *Copyright, Translations and Relations between Britain and India, 1880-1914*. Montreal: ATRIP.
- Bhabha, Homi K. 1986. The other question: *difference, discrimination and the discourse of colonialism. Literature, Politics and Theory*. ed. Frances Barker, et al. London and New York: Methuen.
- Bhaktivinoda, Kedarnath Datta. 2002. "British Orientalism." *Devasthanam: Website of the Sanskrit Religions Institute*. Web. 11 May 2015. <<http://www.sanskrit.org>>.
- Bloom, Harold. ed. 2014. *Bloom's Major Short Story Writers: Rudyard Kipling*. Chealsea: Chealsea House Publishers.
- Clarke, J. J. 1997. *Oriental Enlightenment: The Encounter between Asian and Western Thought*. London: Routledge.
- Dalmia- Luderitz, Vasudha. 1993. Reconsidering the orientalist view. *India International Centre Quarterly*. 20 (1/2), 93-114. Print.
- Douglas, Mary. 1972. "Preface" *Homo Hierarchicus. The Caste System and Its Implications*. ed. Louis Dumont. London: Paladin.
- Filion, Jennifer. 2008. *Poisoners, Larcenists, and the Mad Chambermaid: Villainy in Late Victorian Detective Fiction*. Unpublished Master Thesis and Doctoral Dissertation. Eastern Michigan University. Web. 28 April 2015. <<http://www.commons.emich.edu>>
- Hall, Stuart. 1997. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage.
- Hart, Walter Morris. 1918. *Kipling: The Short Story Writer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jouhki, Jukka. Orientalism and India. *J@rgonia*. August 2006. Web. 13 April 2015. <<https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace>>

- Kerr, Douglass. 2003. Not knowing the oriental. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 5 (2), 33-46.
- Kipling, Rudyard. 2002. "The Mark of The Beast", "The Return of Imray" *Life's Handicap: Being Stories of Mine Own People*. ed. Juliet Sutherland and Charles Franks, 132-147. <<http://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/5777>>
- Milburn, William. 1813. *Oriental Commerce*. London: Black, Parry and Co. Web. 12 April 2015. <<https://books.google.com.tr>>
- Orwell, George. "Essay on Kipling." 30 September 2006. Web. 10 March 2015. <<http://www.george-orwell.org>>
- Pal-Lipinski, Piya. 2005. *The Exotic Woman in Nineteenth-century British Fiction and Culture: A Reconsideration*. Lebanon: University of New Hampshire Press.
- Pepper, Andrew. 2000. *The Contemporary American Crime Novel: Race, Ethnicity, Gender, Class*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Pritchard, Maria. 2014. *Wit & Wisdom of Kings & Queens: I Am Not Amused*. RW Press. Web. 15 April 2015. <<https://books.google.com.tr>>.
- Rowbotham, Judith. 2005. Criminal savages? or "civilizing" the legal process. In *Criminal Conversations: Victorian Crimes, Social Panic, and Moral Outrage*. ed. Judith Rowbotham and Kim Stevenson. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
- Said, Edward. 2013. *Orientalism*. 1977. London: Penguin.
- Semmler, Clement. 1967. Kipling and A. B. Paterson: men of empire and action. *The Australian Quarterly* 39 (2), 71-78.
- Weber, Max. 1958. *The Religion of India*. Glencoe (IL): The Free Press.
- Welby, Elizabeth. 2010. "Out of Eden: Psychic Spaces in Rudyard Kipling's Fiction." Doctoral Dissertation. University of East Anglia. Web. 22 March 2015. <<https://ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk>>.

## Öz

### **Kipling'in “The Return of Imray” ve “The Mark of The Beast” Hikayelerinin Oryantalist Bir Değerlendirmesi**

Bu çalışmanın amacı, Rudyard Kipling'in “The Return of Imray” ve “The Mark of The Beast” başlıklı iki hikayesini incelemektir. Çalışma, Kipling'in kolonyalist bir duruş sergilediği ve seçilen hikayeleriyle kolonyalizmi aklamaya çalıştığını iddia etmektedir. Kipling, Britanya'da kolonyalizmin zirveye ulaştığı Viktoryan döneminin en önemli yazarlarından biridir. Seçilen her iki hikayede de, yazar sömürülen bölgeye gönderilen kolonyalist Imray ve Fleete'in başına gelenlerin arkasındaki sırrı çözüp, katilin sömürülen bir kişi olduğunu ortaya çıkaran bir dedektif karakteri yaratmaktadır. Seçilen yer ve zaman, betimlenen atmosfer ve çizilen karakterlerden hikayelerdeki olaylara kadar her detay, yazarın kolonyalist söylemine dikkat çekmektedir. Yazar, “biz” ve “öteki” ya da “Doğu” ve “Batı” gibi ikili karşıtlıklar çerçevesinde, kolonyalistin sömürülene üstünlüğünü kanıtlama niyetindedir. Bu nedenle Oryantalizmi, sömürülen üzerinde bir güç olarak kullanan Batı baskınlığını haklı çıkarmada etkili bir araç olarak gören Said'in Oryantalist kuramı çalışma boyunca kılavuz edinilmiştir.

### **Anahtar Kelimeler**

Viktoryan dönem, kolonyalizm, Oryantalizm, ikili karşıtlıklar.