

# Tracking Tigers: Recovering the Embodied Practices of Taxidermy

*Merle Patchett*

Scotland's interior walls are a final resting place for many thousands of dead animals. On a visit to almost any castle or stately home in Scotland visitors can expect to be met by the glass-eyed stare of at least one mounted stag head. So synonymous is the stag's head wall mount with certain versions of Scottish, particularly Highland, culture that little thought would likely be given as to its provenance, let alone the people, practices and processes involved in its production. On a visit to Hopetoun House, it was not a stag, but the glass-eyed stare of a tiger mount that invited such speculation and led me on a recovery project of sorts (see Figure 1). While no obvious narrative accompanied the mount, or the seven other tiger heads adorning the walls of the "tiger room," their looming material—yet also unmistakably spectral—presence worked on my imagination. Precisely how did the heads—or at least the skins once part of heads—of a species entirely alien to Scotland come to be mounted on the wall of a stately home in South Queensferry, Edinburgh? As there was no accompanying interpretive framework (the tiger heads being displayed without any information and going without mention in the guide book) it was the mounts' exoticism and ambiguous im/materiality that led me to speculate about their journey and transformation from lively, embodied tigers to domesticated taxidermy wall mounts. Following the evidential conventions of historical geographic enquiry my initial impulse was to locate a textual-documentary record for the tiger mounts in order to build up the necessary contextual information to tell of the people, practices and places involved in such a transformation. Yet the lack of an interpretive framework or any historical-curatorial record left me unsure as to whether it would be possible to recover the people, practices and places involved in their making. The challenge of recovery demanded a different sort of approach.

I should acknowledge at this point that my interest in taxidermy is part of a larger research project which seeks to reconsider the way we choose to understand the representation and display of taxidermy animals by giving credence to the practices that are folded into the historical geographies of their making.<sup>1</sup> Considerable academic attention has been paid to the "finished"

---

Merle Patchett is in the Department of Geographical and Earth Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK. *Historical Geography* Volume 36 (2008): 17-39. ©2008, Historical Geography Specialty Group, Association of American Geographers.

form and display of taxidermy specimens inside cabinets, behind glass—in other words, to their representation.<sup>2</sup> By way of contrast, my research seeks to recover the practices and relationships that brought specimens to their state of enclosure, inertness and seeming fixity.<sup>3</sup> Through a combination of studying technical manuals, spending time observing and documenting practising taxidermists and researching the biographies and work-places of past practitioners, I have been able to build up a picture of the material cultures of life and death that constituted animal collection, preservation, and display in Victorian-Edwardian Scotland. While my initial focus has been on how the craft of taxidermy was practiced in Scotland, I am keenly aware that taxidermy skills were also crucial to the colonial trafficking that made dead animals mobile and ensured their long-term preservation in entirely alien environments. The Hopetoun tigers, being trophies of colonial enterprise, therefore present themselves as a possible “case-study” for recovering the tangle of beings, practices and places involved in the making and mobilising of colonial taxidermy specimens.<sup>4</sup> Yet, as is the case with many taxidermy specimens and displays, the tigers had little in the way of conventional documentary material which led me to initially question the possibility of recovering the “lived” histories of their making.<sup>5</sup> A recent vein of creative historical research has however reconsidered “the limits and location of any set of materials determined as ‘archive.’”<sup>6</sup> Within this body of work, researchers have highlighted that material encounters and material entities can be rich resources for historical recovery.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, when revisiting the Hopetoun tigers, the absence of conventional documentary evidence became less of an obstacle to progress than was first imagined. The historical geographies of their making were, on closer inspection, bound into the mounts’ representational and solid forms.

Studied up close the tigers’ facial features began to expose the secrets of their assembly. The gloss black paint around the eyes, on the gums and in the nostrils stood out against the dulled and dusty fur. Papier maché was exposed by balding patches of skin on the dried and cracking ears. A seam of stitching that ran from the middle of the lower lip down the centre of the neck could be made out on most and the painted pink tongues inside their gaping mouths may have been glossy but were certainly not moist. Viewed collectively, I noticed the heads were all mounted on the same dark wooden “heraldic” shields and that the faces were fixed with the same doleful open-mouthed expression. This led to further speculations: had they been made by the same craftsman, or if not that, then at least by the same method of manufacture? Thus as the tigers’ physical fabric started to unravel, the story of their making began to suggest itself. I realised that through close scrutiny (and my knowledge of the craft of taxidermy) I could use the mounts and the materials they were made up of as evidence or, rather, non-textual resources, for recovering the embodied practices and places of their making.

This paper therefore uses the Hopetoun tiger mounts’ seeming inar-

Figure 1. One of the eight Hopetoun tigers. (© Author's own)



ticulacy as an opportunity to explore the possibilities and problematics of using material objects as resources for evidential recovery in historical geography research, particularly when that recovery is concerned with getting at the embodied past practices and places that were involved in the making of such material entities. To begin, I draw on recent work that argues we must see beyond the representational surface of things, and outline how the tiger mounts can be understood as active assemblages of the movements, materials and practices that brought them into existence. This understanding offers a way of circumventing an assessment of the tigers as “dead or redundant” as it opens up the possibility of using the materials the tiger mounts are derived from as sources for recovering the lived histories of their making. Following this, I draw on the work of Caitlin DeSilvey and Hayden Lorimer to explore strategies that make the recovery of the lived acts and inhabited places of the Hopetoun tigers’ creation practically possible. To close, I demonstrate how the Hopetoun mounts are themselves an embodied record of the lived acts and inhabited places of their making, and that through their excavation an attempt can be made at “fleshing out” the geographies that brought them into being. As such this paper adds to an increasing body of work in historical geography that attempts to develop “an engagement with the past that draws part of its force from absence and incompleteness.”<sup>8</sup>

### Things out of Place and in Disorder

Much has been written on the hollowness of souvenirs, their intrinsic sadness and the ultimate futility of collecting things in an effort to remember places and events. Perhaps none is more poignant than that which is plucked from ‘nature’, that thing that once was living and is now dead or redundant—a shadow of what it once was in life....<sup>9</sup>

On first encounter, the eight tiger heads that line the walls of the “tiger room” of Hopetoun House could easily be dismissed as merely the hollow souvenirs of an imperial adventurer. The tigers, mounted in typical big-game trophy style (i.e. the taxidermised head is mantled to a wooden heraldic shield), are arranged in a classic tableau (the heads, grouped in fours and evenly spaced, mirror each other on adjacent walls). As such, they embody “an archetype of British aristocratic adventuring.”<sup>10</sup> Visitors to the “tiger room” are led to interpret them as the relics and trophies of colonial enterprise, a practice and past with which many are now uncomfortable, and so little contemplative time seems to be spent in their company.

In recent work exploring nineteenth-century spaces of consumption, Kevin Hetherington observes that all acts of arrangement and ordering reflect an attempt “to take possession of things” in order to give them “stable and ordered significance.”<sup>11</sup> In this sense, following Hetherington’s thesis, the dis-

play of collected artefacts can be understood as a form of disposal, as it creates a “stop or pause in the biography of an artefact” whereby the meanings of things are displaced to tell stories about the collector or owner and the social relations they inhabit.<sup>12</sup> As such, the places where such things are displayed become dead spaces according to Hetherington, as they promote a “static or ossified sense of history” by “mummifying” the subjectivity of things.<sup>13</sup> Here Hetherington echoes Benjamin’s and Maleuvre’s arguments before him by comparing display spaces, like the museum, arcade or interior,<sup>14</sup> to mausoleums concluding that that “lived history” disappears in such spaces because artefacts are removed from “the uncertain flow of time.”<sup>15</sup> The Hopetoun tigers’ representation as trophies could therefore be understood as an attempt at taking possession, to singularise their meaning and significance, and to put them “in place” historically. Similarly, the “tiger room” could be understood as a tomb which embalms the subjectivity of the heads, making them appear as “dead or redundant.”<sup>16</sup> However, as Hetherington himself admits, this sense of order and stillness “is rarely achieved in practice.”<sup>17</sup> Consequently he argues that disposal should be understood as an active process rather than as an ossifying one, as what is disposed of through processes of ordering and “singularisation” (i.e. an artefact’s polysemy) remains as an absent-presence.<sup>18</sup> Hetherington therefore concludes that in this sense disposal is about “the mobilisation of absence.”<sup>19</sup>

Following Hetherington, it is my intention to mobilise the “absent-presences” of the tiger heads in order to expose the clever artifice and ambiguity of the tigers’ representation as trophy souvenirs. While the “shock[ing] physicality” of encountering such exotic creatures in a Scottish stately home is certainly tamed somewhat by their careful arrangement and style of mounting, the materials and craft of their making ensures that the heads’ subjectivity resists full “containment.”<sup>20</sup> The craft of taxidermy, a practice defined by James Ryan as “the representation of residues of animals to produce an illusion of live presence,” ensures that taxidermy specimens, whether presented as natural history objects in the museum setting or as sporting trophies in domestic settings, retain excessive sensual and semiotic effects.<sup>21</sup> Artists Brydis Snaebjörnsdóttir and Mark Wilson have commented that a taxidermy specimen challenges easy definition, classification and therefore representational clarity because it “is simultaneously representative of itself as an object but also of itself as a former living animal.”<sup>22</sup> Crucially, the use of actual animal skin (and often other matter originating with the animal) combined with the taxidermic crafts of mimetic reproduction ensure that a taxidermy specimen’s transformation from live embodied animal to static representational prop is always indexed and, as such, taxidermy objects will always appear as “something other than an object enframed by human desires.”<sup>23</sup> Therefore, although attempts can be made to direct our understandings of and responses to taxidermy, specimen animals retain both aesthetic and ontological ambiguity. The

art historian Steve Baker has similarly argued, for example, that taxidermy specimens are necessarily provocative objects in that they are “trace-bearing objects and those traces are the remnants of a prior life, a ‘real’ life.”<sup>24</sup> This “real” life therefore remains as a shadowy presence that haunts and disrupts any attempts to contain or stabilise representations of taxidermy.<sup>25</sup> Yet it is not my intention to recover a sense of the Hopetoun tigers’ prior “real” lives since the majority of taxidermy specimens, to quote Garry Marvin, “do not begin to have a recoverable history until their final fatal encounter with humans.”<sup>26</sup> Rather, it is my concern to attempt a recovery of their “after-lives.”<sup>27</sup> This is conceivable as the tiger mounts’ physical forms also bear the traces, and contain evidence, of the lived acts of their making. However, in order to expose the secrets of the tigers’ assembly and thus begin to unravel the story of their making it requires, to follow Jessica Dubow, “challenging the priority given to the representational surface”; the notion that the tigers are “hollow” must therefore be rejected as such a recovery requires “getting under their skins.”<sup>28</sup>

In order to attempt a recovery of the Hopetoun tigers’ after-lives and “flesh-out” the geographies of their making, it is apposite to engage with recent work on material culture that does not construe artefacts as stable entities with durable physical forms and therefore as “fixed in value and potential.”<sup>29</sup> The social anthropologist Tim Ingold observes that “despite the best efforts of curators and conservationists, no object lasts forever”—a rudimentary fact which he argues much of the commentary on studies of material culture has tidily dismissed.<sup>30</sup> While a growing multidisciplinary literature has begun to challenge the presumption of object durability, Ingold’s recent appeal “to take materials seriously” is worthy of closer inspection, since his ontological arguments hold considerable appeal for an historical geographer attempting to use material entities as sources of historical recovery.<sup>31</sup> In *Archaeological Dialogues* he asserts there is a pressing need to redirect attention away from “the world of solid objects envisaged by material culture theorists” and to instead refocus on the materials and processes out of which objects, artefacts and organisms are made.<sup>32</sup> Ingold argues that the overwhelming focus in material culture studies has been on the use and circulation of commodities rather than on their manufacture or, indeed, de-manufacture. Of the two approaches, the former is problematic for Ingold as it overlooks the materials out of which such things are made, which forever threaten the meaning and physicality of such commodities with “dissolution or even ‘dematerialisation.’”<sup>33</sup>

Fellow anthropologist Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld has similarly critiqued how scholars in material culture studies too easily identify social significance with physical permanence, bemoaning how the focus “on the social life of things (and value) has long since squeezed out consideration of their social death.”<sup>34</sup> The axiom “things have social lives,” which sprang out of the work of Appadurai and which underpins a great deal of the literature within material culture studies, is problematic for Ingold too.<sup>35</sup> Its “fetishist logic”

infers that material things are only important in terms of the roles they play in the constitution of social relations.<sup>36</sup> Ingold asserts that the inverted fetishist logic of material culture studies can be reversed. Bringing things to life, argues Ingold, is not a matter of sprinkling them with “magical agency dust,” but is rather to view things and artefacts as “in life.”<sup>37</sup> Here Ingold makes a case for restoring material entities within his conception of the “life world” whereby animacy “is not a property of persons imaginatively projected onto things.” Instead, it should be understood as “the dynamic, transformative potential of the entire field of relations within which beings of all kinds, more or less person-like or thing-like, continually and reciprocally bring one another into existence.”<sup>38</sup> Ingold’s form of relational ontology, where materials are viewed as active constituents in a “world-in-formation,” therefore offers an understanding of the artefact as “process” whereby material entities can be understood as active assemblages of the movements, materials and/or practices which brought them into existence.<sup>39</sup>

Ingold’s corrective offers specific advantages to my research efforts with the Hopetoun tigers. It is Ingold’s contention that the overt focus of material culture studies on processes of consumption has meant that much work has also tended to focus on the present to the exclusion of the past or future. Such presentism, according to Ingold, means that the materials out of which such things are made—which also come to threaten their composition and meaning—are masked by the focus on the solid form of the objects they make up. However, by viewing the tiger mounts as active assemblages of the materials, practices and movements that brought them into existence it is possible to circumvent a focus solely on their representation as finished objects in the present day. This realisation opens up the possibility of using the materials out of which the tiger mounts are made as sources for recovering the lived histories of their making. However, while Ingold’s pronouncements conceptually open up the possibility of such a recovery, the question of how anyone might practically recover the tangle of beings, practices and places which brought the mounts into being, whilst also capturing something of their “lively” character, still remains. In the following section, I shall therefore engage with work by historical-cultural geographers that offers practical strategies for reclaiming embodied aspects of the past through the assemblage and rehabilitation of historical fragments.

### Interacting Otherwise with Matters of the Past

Hayden Lorimer has observed that “trust in empirics is habituated among historical-cultural geographers.”<sup>40</sup> This fidelity to empirical and archival evidence, as noted in my introductory remarks, left me initially hesitant as to whether I could use the Hopetoun tiger mounts as a possible case study for exploring the making and movement of colonial taxidermy speci-

mens as the tigers had little in the way of conventional curatorial/archival documentation. Such absences have encouraged some historical geographers to develop creative and “expressive modes of researching” which draw force from absence and incompleteness.<sup>41</sup> Recent work which reconsiders the nature of the “archive” and archival practice does so by recognising that “archives can exceed the darkened catacomb and civically-administered collection, and [can] be sought out in physical landscapes, or still less likely sorts of locale.”<sup>42</sup> Where postcolonial researchers have shown it is possible to read civil or imperial archives “against the grain” to uncover “counter-histories,” others have sought to extend, disaggregate or distribute the once centred version of the archive. Such researchers have thereby found greater licence to salvage, assemble and rehabilitate diverse forms of historical fragments in an effort to recover pasts and aspects of pasts that may be veiled or suppressed by dominant and conventional forms of historical record.<sup>43</sup> The purposeful accumulation of fragments to compose archives, which are unconventional and unorthodox in form, has been most clearly articulated as a research strategy in the work of DeSilvey and Lorimer. Both have assembled makeshift forms of archive in an effort to “make do” with what exists when conventional textual sources have been left wanting. It is worth examining their separate craftings of a “make-do” method as they offer possible strategies for getting under the skin of the Hopetoun tigers, to recover and retell the lived acts and inhabited places of their making.

DeSilvey’s salvage project centres on a Montana homestead.<sup>44</sup> Describing her role as curator-*cum*-caretaker and the site as an experiment in the “recuperation of residual historical materials in processes of cultural remembrance,” DeSilvey resists extracting stable examples of material order from the homestead. Instead, she has sought to craft an approach that does not temper the entropic nature of the leftover matter on the homestead.<sup>45</sup> After the transient material remains of the site forced her “to accept that the artefact is not a discrete entity but a material form bound into continual cycles of articulation and disarticulation,” DeSilvey realised that the disarticulation of the “cultural” artefacts left on the site had the potential to reveal other histories.<sup>46</sup> While she did not want to use the remainder materials at the site to “speak of a singular human past,” she still wanted to use the deteriorating materials of the homestead to recover something of the former modes of existence and inhabitation at the site.<sup>47</sup> Drawing on Walter Benjamin’s theory of historical constellations DeSilvey assembled and juxtaposed redundant objects and discarded materials in a bid to recuperate “obsolete networks of use and affinity” whilst at the same time acknowledging these temporary arrangements of deteriorating materials offered only fleeting glimpses of the homestead’s pasts.<sup>48</sup> In attempting to salvage meaning from waste things the histories and connections offered by DeSilvey’s constellations are therefore as indirect and incomplete as her sources: “intertwined histories of colonialism, racism, resource



exploitation and gender politics are glimpsed only in shards of evidence.”<sup>49</sup> Yet, by making do with the materials she had to hand she was able to uncover fragmentary histories which might have been obscured through more direct historical recovery methods and thus present the complexity of the “entangled material memories” of the homestead.<sup>50</sup>

Before showing how DeSilvey’s constellation method can be applied to the Hopetoun tigers to work past “an entirely negative reading of [their] material dislocation and dissociation,” I want to review how Lorimer considers the assemblage of diverse historical fragments a means to encounter something of the “lived” character of past events and places.<sup>51</sup> Lorimer has attempted to rehabilitate historical fragments in a bid to reanimate local landscapes.<sup>52</sup> Cross-cutting the theoretical agenda set by non-representational theory, he has attempted to craft an approach to recovering the pasts of places which is attentive to their performative and embodied aspects. However as Lorimer has observed there are inherent difficulties in attempting to recover the embodied and lively nature of practices, techniques and places when they have already happened and are no longer “happening,” because their traces are not likely to exist in their original “haptic, sonic (or) kinaesthetic form.”<sup>53</sup> Much is contingent, therefore, on “the availability of ‘sources’ which capture (or at least take us closer to) the smells, sounds, sights and feelings of (past) embodied experience.”<sup>54</sup> This does not mean conventional archival and representational sources should be abandoned since “creative engagement with, and imaginative interpretation of” such sources hold much potential for excavating forms of the non-representational.<sup>55</sup> Different tactics are thereby suggested, for example, developing an immersive ethology/ethnography, drawing creatively on both conventional and less-conventional sources, to enliven historical narration. Attempting to reanimate the “lived culture” of a herd of reindeer, he “made-do” with what existed on the ground in a restorative ethnography of lived acts and inhabited places.<sup>56</sup> This “restorative ethnography” saw him “keeping company” with the present reindeer herd and herders to find means to retell the relics and artefacts left behind by those who lived in the past.<sup>57</sup>

While it is not possible to literally “keep company” with the Hopetoun tigers on their transformation from wild embodied animals to taxidermy wall mounts, reanimating their journey is not an impossibility as “crafting a closeness to the style and tone in which [such] events are remembered, located, and organised” is of greatest moment according to Lorimer.<sup>58</sup> In the paper’s closing section, I want to explore the possibility of a restorative ethnography of the lived acts and inhabited places of the Hopetoun tiger’s manufacture. Here I do not want to offer a finished thesis—an impossibility in any case—but rather offer some examples of how this might be begun and what might result.

## Getting under the Skin: Tracking Tiger

After being encouraged to make-do with what exists, an attempt at recounting the lived acts and inhabited places that went into the making of the Hopetoun tiger heads becomes conceivable. First though, this requires imaginatively speeding up the material disarticulation of the mounts to expose the hidden architecture of their making. As DeSilvey has observed, “the disarticulation of a cultural artefact [can] lead to the articulation of other histories” in the present.<sup>59</sup> As such, the absence of a conventional textual record for the mounts becomes less of an obstacle to historical inquiry into their histories as the mounts offer themselves as sources for historical recovery and reconstruction.<sup>60</sup> As I disclosed at the paper’s outset, my close inspection of the mounts offered some clues as to how they came into being. For example, the fact that the heads were all mounted on the same large black shields and wore similar opened-mouthed expressions, suggested that they had either been made by the same taxidermist or had at least gone through the same workshop. While I could not physically disassemble the mounts to expose their underlying artifice, from experience I knew that there were other ways of “getting under the skin.” Looking into the mouths of the tigers, for example, I made out they all had similarly designed artificial tongues. Unlike many other taxidermy mounts I had encountered, these tongues were particularly distinctive as they were shaped in an arc and had prominent papillae (a feature characteristic of wild big cats but unusual in taxidermy big-cat mounts) and this convinced me they must have gone through the same taxidermy firm. The mounts also bore the traces of recent restoration, so after consulting their restorator I was told that the black shields, open-mouthed expressions and unusually detailed tongues were signature styles of the van Ingen taxidermy firm in Mysore, India, and that the order numbers on the back of the shields confirmed they had been mounted there. This, taken together with the knowledge that the second Marquis of Linlithgow (owner of Hopetoun house at the time) served as the Viceroy and Governor General of India from 1936 to 43 and definitely “dispatched” at least two of the tigers—they bear his initials—meant that the story of their making began to emerge.

From this starting point, knowing who shot the tigers and the factory in which they were assembled, the task turned to uncovering other sources which could take me closer to the lived experience of these events. This highlights my efforts to assemble a make-shift archive of sorts. Here I follow DeSilvey’s constellatory method of assembling whatever there is to hand “in the hope that their sum will add up to more than the parts.”<sup>61</sup> Obviously bringing what may seem, at first, to be unconnected materials into correspondence requires processes of “manipulation, description, displacement” and thus highlights my presence as a researcher in the recovery of the Hopetoun tigers’

after-lives.<sup>62</sup> However, as DeSilvey and Lorimer have shown, the purposeful assemblage and rehabilitation of diffuse historical remains to form unorthodox archives can hold both serious creative and political potential. Not only do such assemblages insist upon “more imaginative styles of composition and expression,” they also can assist in “the recovery and construction of an opposing view to challenge, and sometimes undermine, received wisdom about the events surrounding past geographies and histories.”<sup>63</sup> In what remains, therefore, I wish to be granted a little creative licence to bring together a variety of sources which might capture something of the embodied experience and practices of “the field” and “the factory,” that the Hopetoun tigers would have once inhabited, albeit in different states of liveliness. I have chosen to focus on the loosely defined sites of “the field” and “the factory” rather than attempt to chart the journey of a particular tiger from wild embodied creature to static wall mount. Such an inherently linear approach could overlook the complex tangle of beings and matter that make up the events that took place within these sites and could also overlook the fact that the sites where these events took place were themselves “in life.”<sup>64</sup> Here I follow Ingold’s relational ontology where the earth, or “lifeworld,” is not conceived as an “inert substratum over which living things propel themselves about like counters on a board or actors on a stage,” but rather is understood to be in perpetual flux, “coming-into-being” through its continual generation.<sup>65</sup> This type of thinking has certain parallels with Sally Marston et al.’s recent plea for a “site ontology” where sites are conceptualised “as immanent (self-organising) event-spaces dynamically composed of bodies, doings and sayings” which are “differentiated and differentiating, unfolding singularities that are not only dynamic, but also ‘hang together’ through the congealments and blockages of force relations.”<sup>66</sup> While I do not have the space available to engage properly with their conceptualisation (or the criticisms levelled at it<sup>67</sup>), I do think that understanding “sites” or spaces as *emergent* is important. Indeed, I believe that it holds a particular appeal for historical geographers interested in the embodied character of past places as it aids in resisting predetermining or, after analysis, overdetermining the contents that made up those sites and therefore the sites themselves. Also, by building up a sense of the embodied sites of “the field” and “the factory” before attempting to reconstruct the more intimate details of the Hopetoun tigers journey within, between and beyond them, I hope to avoid both “flattening” or “deadening” the historical context in which the transformation of the tigers took place. In what remains I will therefore sketch rather than set the scenes.

## The Field

It is no longer possible to witness the embodied acts that went into the killing of a tiger for a trophy mount. This ought to come as some relief; however, absence means that other sources need to be recovered which might take us closer to the complexities of such killing practices and the places where they took place.<sup>68</sup> While the Hopetoun tigers have little other than their skins to index that they were once embodied tigers that became enrolled in such practices by their killing, I would like to suggest here that it is possible to use photographs which, although not documenting the Hopetoun tigers' ensnarement, at least capture something of that "event." A collection of photographs from another Scottish aristocratic family are instructive. Aside from predictable staged commemorative photos of victorious hunter and "bagged" prey, the series includes photographs depicting some of the less well documented aspects of "shikar" hunting.<sup>69</sup> To illustrate, Figure 2 depicts a complex scene. The dead-weight of a freshly shot tiger is being hoisted onto the back of a kneeling elephant by a member of the British shooting party who stands in his *houdah* (also on the back of a kneeling elephant) operating a makeshift pulley system (which makes use of an elephant's tail). Two other party members stand on the back of the kneeling elephant and receive the tiger from the party attendants who have obviously pushed the tiger up from below using a ladder to support the body. The tiger is presumably being hoisted onto the back of an elephant so it can be carried back to camp to be skinned. While acknowledging that photography is by its nature "tendentious" and that photographs are taken to serve particular interests and present particular "ways-of-seeing," I would argue that a photograph like this one which does not seem to be staged (all subjects seem unaware the shot is being taken) can still give vital insights into the lived experience of the event which it depicts.<sup>70</sup> The photograph has presumably been taken by one of the members of the British hunting party from their elevated position in the *houdah*. Perhaps it was their first hunting expedition and they were in awe of how much effort was required to lift the dead-weight of an tiger. Alternatively, perhaps they were wanting to document that their party had "bagged" a tiger of a such considerable size it required more effort than usual or perhaps they merely wanted to get their "shot" of the tiger.<sup>71</sup> Yet regardless of motivation, photographs like this one can help to "re-frame the colonial figure in its space-based experience."<sup>72</sup> Jessica Dubow has recently argued that many postcolonial critics have failed to highlight the "lived and affective" aspects of experience under colonial conditions as the colonial scopic regime is understood to be a "view on the world" as opposed to a "point of view in it."<sup>73</sup> For Dubow it is important to consider the "lived reciprocity of subject and space" in colonial contexts so that the colonial figure is understood as an "embedded and embodied being" rather than disengaged and displaced.<sup>74</sup>

Figure 2. "Dead Weight." (© Dunrobin Castle Estates)



Heidi Scott has similarly argued to reconnect colonial visions with embodied experience.<sup>75</sup> By focusing on the intricacies of everyday experience in colonial Peru, Scott has been able to provide an insight into how landscapes there were not only “lived-in” but “woven and contested.”<sup>76</sup> More importantly, in terms of my recovery of the Hopetoun tigers’ after-lives, Scott contends that in refocusing attention on embodied aspects of colonial experience space is opened up to consider not only the corporeal and non-representational but non-human agency as well. Therefore, when combined with other sources such as field guides and *shikari* diaries, photographs like the one highlighted can help to take us closer to the complex tangle of beings and embodied practices which made-up the make-shift dwellings of the shikari field the tigers would have once inhabited.

### The Factory

Once the hunt was over and the tigers had been skinned and salted, their preserved pelts would be sent from the *shikari* camps to, in the case the Hopetoun tigers at least, the van Ingen taxidermy firm in Mysore. The purpose built factory which was in business from 1912 to 1995 was, according to Pat Morris, a historian of taxidermy, very likely the largest and most sophisticated taxidermy operation in existence. Curious to see what, if anything, of the famous factory remained, Morris visited the site in 2003. The trip alerted him to the factory’s imminent demolition, along with most of the documentary and

material evidence of its existence. Salvaging what he could from the abandoned and derelict factory, and from the recollections of the last remaining members of the van Ingen family to have worked there, he presented, in a published volume, a record of the van Ingen taxidermy operation. Morris's book details the factory's layout, the methods of work and arrangement of workers, a sample of promotional materials and product range, and an estimation of the number of animals "processed" by the firm.<sup>77</sup> His record also presents a series of photographs of the factory both when it was in operation and in its derelict state. Used imaginatively, his publication can therefore be deployed as a resource to build up a sense of the lived practices and embodied spaces of the factory that the Hopetoun tigers would have moved through.

One example will be illustrative: that of the tiger head moulds recovered during the 2003 trip (see Figure 3). According to Morris, the innovation of the van Ingen mould system meant that the factory could process the vast number of tiger head mounts demanded by the excessive "output" of the *shikari* hunters. In its heyday, the firm regularly handled four to five hundred tigers annually. To make the mould, first a head shape was moulded in clay using the skinned head of a shot tiger as a referent, then a mould was formed around it using fine-grained concrete. After the concrete had set the clay would be removed and the mould was then ready to make multiple manikins in papier maché, "each one an exact replica of the clay model."<sup>78</sup> This meant that large numbers of head mounts could be produced to a consistent quality with little actual skill required which meant they could take advantage of the relatively unskilled and therefore cheap labour of the indigenous population living in Mysore. The system was so successful that more complex moulds were developed. These were made out of several pieces, meaning that modelled heads could be given different expressions.

The firm were even able to accommodate anatomical variation, for tiger heads came in a range of thirteen sizes. It was the dedicated task of one worker to match up the skulls sent in with the skins of the tigers with the nearest size of mould. Furthermore, note would be taken as to which expression the customer or patron favoured. The head mould therefore embodies colonial principles and techniques of control on which the factory was founded. The mould carries suggestions not only of the dull repetitive work employees endured but also the sheer quantity of animals the factory was able to process; tens of thousands of animals went through the factory in its eighty years of production. A creative engagement with relics, like a salvaged taxidermy mould, that suggest something of the factory's past practices could therefore help to differently figure the working of bodies and bodies at work at the site.<sup>79</sup>

Figure 3. van Ingen “snarling” tiger mould with moulded head. (© Pat Morris)



---

## Conclusion

Two brief sketches of “the field” and “the factory” are intended to demonstrate how far it is possible, with an inventive use of source materials, to disclose something of the lived acts and inhabited places of the Hopetoun tigers’ making. My aim here has not been to “piece the fragments of space and time back together” but rather to “trace out the threads and follow their convolutions.”<sup>80</sup> Through the tentative beginnings of an on-going attempt to understand the existence of the Hopetoun tigers I hope to have shown that their inarticulacy is not an obstacle to recovering something of their after-lives. Ingold’s critique of material culture studies assisted in moving beyond any initial fixation with the representational form and presentation of the tiger heads by encouraging a view that the mounts are active assemblages of the materials, practices and movements which brought them into existence. This understanding, once combined with an awareness of practical strategies for rehabilitating historical fragments, convinced me that the mounts’ physical form and underlying fabric could be used as a resource for recovering the lived history of their making. Moreover, by making do with what remains and by developing expressive modes of researching, historical narratives can actually draw force from absence and incompleteness as they resist the notion that the past is wholly recoverable or can be fully represented. The use of a partial and distributed archive to build up a picture of the lived acts and inhabited places of the tigers’ making marks an attempt on my part to acknowledge and work with the elusive character of the past. By the same measure, it is necessary to recognise responsibilities on the part of the researcher to carefully and faithfully rehabilitate the historical remains left. This commitment to piecing together evidence (in whatever form it takes) of past events means that histories like the Hopetoun tigers, which may be obscured by conventional biographical and textual resources, remain to be told. While at first glance the mounts could be dismissed as obsolete relics of practices we no longer comfortably associate ourselves with, my short exploration of the geographies of the Hopetoun tigers’ making exposes them as evidence of much larger forces and practices that brought them into being. Returning to the tiger room of Hopetoun House and re-examining the eight tiger head mounts with knowledge that their similar expressions result from standardised industrial moulds, heightens an awareness that their replicate expressions are an embodied record of the colonial forces, practices and journeys that brought them into being. Simon Naylor has recently expressed a concern that in expressing the texture of “places inhabited and lives lived” we can lose a sense of “the more-than-local” nature of the world and has thus called for a greater emphasis on “travel, connection, movement and circulation.”<sup>81</sup> While the focus of this paper has been the recovery of the embodied practices and places of the Hopetoun tigers’ making, my approach is of potential use in tracking the wider



historical events and processes associated with the movement of colonial taxidermy specimens. Tracking the cartographies of particular taxidermy mounts like the Hopetoun tigers from their “collection” and preservation through to their shipment and eventual presentation as imperial prizes in Scotland offers a possible way of folding together detailed sketches of the specific spaces they may have moved through with broader narratives about the colonial forces and practices which enabled and drove such movements.<sup>82</sup> Thus the—as yet—unfinished tale of the Hopetoun tigers’ making and mobilisation promises to further enliven these dead geographies.

### Acknowledgments

Thanks go to Dr. Carl Griffin and Dr. Adrian Evans for organising the 2007 Association of American Geographers conference session Historical Geographies of Embodied Practice where a version of this essay was first presented. Audience members at this session offered me particularly useful critique. Thanks must also go to my supervisors Dr. Hayden Lorimer and Dr. Chris Philo for their feedback and advice on earlier drafts of this essay. Finally Pat Morris, Sandra Olm (Hopetoun House) and Keith Jones (Dunrobin Castle Estates) are all due special thanks for their assistance at various stages of my research for this paper.

### Notes

1. Chris Philo and Chris Wilbert, *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations* (London: Routledge 2000): 5.
2. For example see James Griesemer, “Modelling in the Museum; On the Role of Remnant Models in the Work of Joseph Grinnell,” *Biology and Philosophy* 5 (1990): 3-36; James Desmond, “Displaying Death, Animating Life: Changing Fictions of ‘Liveness’ from Taxidermy to Animatronics,” in Nigel Rothfels, ed., *Representing Animals* (Indiana: University of Indiana Press, 2002); Lynn Nyhart, “Science, Art and Authenticity in Natural History Displays,” in Soraya Chadarevian and Nick Hopwood, eds., *Models: The Third Dimension of Science* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004); Harriett Ritvo, *The Animal Estate* (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1987); James Ryan, “‘Hunting with Camera’: Photography, Wildlife and Colonialism in Africa,” in Chris Philo and Chris Wilbert, *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places*; Chris Wilbert, “What Is Doing the Killing? Animal Attacks, Man-eaters, and Shifting Boundaries and Flows of Human-Animal Relations,” in The Animal Studies Group, eds., *Killing Animals* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006); Karen Wonders, *Habitat Dioramas: Illusions of Wilderness in Museums of Natural History* (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wicksell, 1993); Karen Wonders, “Habitat Dioramas and the Issue of Nativeness,” *Landscape Research* 28:1 (2003), 89-100.
3. Some attempts have been made to get at “the-behind-the-scenes” of taxidermy display; for example see Paul Farber, “The Development of Taxidermy and the

- History of Ornithology,” *Isis* 6:4 (1977): 550-66; Donna Haraway, “Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden New York City, 1908-1936,” in Donna Haraway, ed., *Primate Visions* (London: Verso 1989); Hannah Shell, “Skin Deep: Taxidermy, Embodiment and Extinction in W. T. Hornaday’s Buffalo Group,” *Proceedings of the Californian Academy of Sciences* 55:5 (2004): 83-108; Bryndis Snaebjörnsdóttir and Mark Wilson, *Nanoq: Flatout and Bluesome* (Spike Island: Blackdog Publishing, 2006). Susan Star, “Craft vs. Commodity, Mess vs. Transcendence: How the Right Tool Became the Wrong One in the Case of Taxidermy and Natural History,” in Adele Clark and Joan Fujimura, eds., *The Right Tools for the Job: At Work in Twentieth Century Life Sciences* (California: University of California Press, 1992).
4. For work that has tracked movement of material objects to explore colonial relations see Tim Barringer and Tom Flynn, *Colonialism and the Object: Empire, Material Culture and the Museum* (London: Routledge 1998); and Chris Gosden and Chantal Knowles, *Collecting Colonialism: Material Culture and Colonial Change* (Oxford: Berg, 2001). However the objects used by these authors were usually part of large museum collections which had detailed records about their provenance and collection and so their work is less instructive on what can be done in terms of historical recovery if such records are lacking.
  5. Very few examples of taxidermy come with a provenance record as highlighted in a conference paper given by Pat Morris: “Lost, Found and Still Looking: Tracing Some Examples of Ancient Taxidermy,” paper presented at Lost, Stolen or Strayed conference, Naturalis, Leiden, May 2001.
  6. Hayden Lorimer, “Caught in the Nick of Time: Archives and Fieldwork,” in Mike Crang, Dydia Delyser, Steve Herbet and Linda McDowell, eds., *Handbook of Qualitative Methods in Human Geography* (London: Sage, forthcoming).
  7. For examples see Matthew Kurtz, “Situating Practices: The Archive and the File Cabinet,” *Historical Geography* 29 (2001): 26-37; Caitlin DeSilvey, “Observed Decay: Telling Stories with Mutable Things,” *Journal of Material Culture* 11:3 (2006): 318-38; Caitlin DeSilvey, “Salvage Memory: Constellating Material Histories on a Hardscrabble Homestead,” *Cultural Geographies* 14:3 (2007): 401-24; David Featherstone, “Spatial Relations and the Materialities of Political Conflict: The Construction of Political Identities in the London and Newcastle Port Strikes of 1768,” *Geoforum* 35:6 (2004): 701-11; Jude Hill, “Travelling Objects: The Welcome Collection in Los Angeles, London and Beyond,” *Cultural Geographies* 13 (2006): 340-66; Jude Hill, “Globe-trotting Medicine Chests: Tracing Geographies of Collecting and Pharmaceuticals,” *Social and Cultural Geography* 7:3 (2006): 365-84; Jude Hill, “The Story of the Amulet: Locating Enchantment in Collections,” *Journal of Material Culture* 12 (2007): 65-87; Karen Till, “Fragments, Ruins, Artefacts and Torsos,” *Historical Geography* 29 (2001):70-3.
  8. DeSilvey, “Observed Decay,” 330.
  9. Bryndi Snaebjörnsdóttir and Mark Wilson, “Introduction,” in Snaebjörnsdóttir and Wilson, *Nanoq: Flatout and Bluesome*, 14. For a similar account, see Susan Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniature, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (London: Duke University Press, 1993).
  10. *Ibid.*, 16.
  11. Kevin Hetherington, *Capitalism’s Eye: Cultural Spaces of the Commodity* (London, Routledge, 2007): 148.

12. *Ibid.*, 177.
13. *Ibid.*, 175.
14. In Hetherington's thesis, "interior" refers to the bourgeois home.
15. *Ibid.*, 177-8. For Benjamin and Maleuvre's arguments see Walter Benjamin, *The Arcades Project* (Cambridge, MA, Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1999); Didier Maleuvre, *Museum Memories, History, Technology, Art* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).
16. Snaebjörnsdóttir and Wilson, "Introduction," 14.
17. Hetherington, *Capitalism's Eye*, 176.
18. *Ibid.*, passim.
19. *Ibid.* Also see Kevin Hetherington, "Secondhandness: Consumption, Disposal and Absent Presence," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 22 (2004): 168.
20. Ron Broglio, "'Living Flesh': Animal-Human Surfaces in Art," (Unpublished manuscript, 2005).
21. James Ryan, *Picturing Empire: Photography and the Visualisation of the British Empire* (London, Reaktion, 1997): 114.
22. The artists are quoted in Steve Baker, "What Can Dead Bodies Do?" in Snaebjörnsdóttir and Wilson, *Nanoq: Flatout and Bluesome*, 152.
23. Broglio, "Living Flesh."
24. Baker, "What Can Dead Bodies Do?" 152-3.
25. Hetherington writes about the ghost as a figure of unfinished disposal: "the ghost's power resides principally in its ability to haunt. To haunt is to remain or return to where one does not belong—unheimlich (uncanny, but literally 'unhomely') and revenant—it calls on people to reflect on their own debt to the life of the unsettled spirit and to their own conduct as possibly a cause of that lack of settlement." *Capitalism's Eye*, 67.
26. Garry Marvin, "Perpetuating Polar Bears: The Cultural Life of Dead Animals" in Snaebjörnsdóttir and Wilson, *Nanoq: Flatout and Bluesome*, 157.
27. Garry Marvin uses the term "afterlife" to describe the "specific, individual, cultural life" a taxidermy specimen has once it has been "despatched" by humans. *Ibid.*, 157-8.
28. Jessica Dubow, "Outside of Place and Other Than Optical: Walter Benjamin and the Geography of Critical Thought," *Journal of Visual Culture* 3 (2004): 268. An increasing number of geographers have highlighted the "more-than-representational" aspects of life. For examples see J-D. Dewsbury, Paul Harrison, Mitch Rose and John Wylie, "Enacting Geographies," *Geoforum* 33 (2002): 437-40; Hayden Lorimer, "Cultural Geography: The Busyness of Being 'More-Than-Representational,'" *Progress in Human Geography* 29 (2005): 83-94. Hayden Lorimer, "Cultural Geography: Wordly Shapes, Differently Arranged," *Progress in Human Geography* 31:1 (2007): 89-100; Nigel Thrift, *Spatial Formations* (London: Sage, 1996). Nigel Thrift, "Still Life in Nearly Present Time: The Object of Nature," *Body and Society* 6 (2000): 34-57; Nigel Thrift, "Summoning life," in Paul Cloke, Phil Crang and Mark Goodwin, eds., *Envisioning Human Geographies* (London: Arnold, 2004): 81-103; Nigel Thrift and J-D. Dewsbury, "Dead Geographies and How to Make Them Live," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 18 (2000): 411-32.

29. Rudi Colloredo-Mansfeld, "Introduction: Matter Unbound," *Journal of Material Culture* 8:3 (2003): 246.
30. Tim Ingold, "Materials against Materiality," *Archaeological Dialogues* 14:1 (2007): 10.
31. *Ibid.*, 14.
32. *Ibid.*, 11.
33. *Ibid.*, 9.
34. Colloredo-Mansfeld, "Introduction: Matter Unbound," 246.
35. Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
36. Ingold cites the following literature as having such a "fetishtic logic": Maurice Godlier, *The Mental and the Material* (London: Verso, 1986); Paul M. Graves-Brown, ed., *Matter, Materiality and Modern Culture* (London: Routledge, 2000); Daniel Miller, ed., *Material Cultures: Why Some Things Matter* (London: Routledge, 1998); Daniel Miller, ed., *Materiality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Peter Pels, "The Spirit of Matter: On Fetish, Rarity, Fact and Fancy," in Patricia Spyer, ed., *Border Fetishisms: Material Objects in Unstable Places* (London: Routledge, 1998); Christopher Tilley, *The Materiality of Stone*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Christina Toren, *Mind, Materiality and History*, (London: Verso, 1999).
37. Tim Ingold, "Rethinking the Animate, Re-animating Thought," *Ethnos* 71:1 (2006): 10.
38. *Ibid.*, 10.
39. *Ibid.*, 12.
40. Hayden Lorimer, "Herding Memories of Humans and Animals," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24 (2006): 515.
41. *Ibid.*, 156. Lorimer cites the following researchers as having developed expressive modes of researching the past: Laura Cameron, "Oral History in the Freud Archives: Incidents, Ethics, Relations," *Historical Geography* 29 (2001): 38-45; Dydia DeLyser, "Ramona Memories: Fiction, Tourist Practices, and Placing the Past in Southern California," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 93(2003): 886-908; Richard Schein, "Replacing the Past?" *Historical Geography* 29(2001): 7-14; David Matless, "Action and Noise over a Hundred Years: The Making of a Nature Region," *Body and Society* 6 (2000): 141-65.
42. Lorimer, "Caught in the Nick of Time." For recent work reconsidering the nature of the archive see Hayden Lorimer, "Telling Small Stories: Spaces of Knowledge and the Practice of Geography," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28 (2003): 197-217; Hayden Lorimer, "The Geographical Field Course as Active Archive," *Cultural Geographies* 10:3 (2003): 278-308; Miles Ogborn, "Archives," in Stephan Harrison, Steve Pile and Nigel Thrift, eds., *Patterned Ground: Entanglements of Nature and Culture* (London: Reaktion, 2004): 240-42; Gillian Rose, "Practising Photography: An Archive, a Study, Some Photographs and a Researcher," *Journal of Historical Geography* 26:4 (2000): 555-71; Gillian Rose, "Working on Women in White, Again," *Cultural Geographies* 9 (2002): 103-09; Charles W. J. Withers, "Constructing the Geographical Archive," *Area* 34:3 (2002): 303-11.
43. For a treatise on the nature of the colonial archive see James Duncan, "Complicity and Resistance in the Colonial Archive: Some Issues of Method and Theory

- in Historical Geography," *Historical Geography* 27 (1999).
44. DeSilvey's salvage project at the homestead is well-documented: Caitlin DeSilvey, *Salvage Rites: Making Memory on a Montana Homestead* (Unpublished PhD thesis, Open University, 2005); DeSilvey, "Observed Decay," 318-38; DeSilvey, "Salvage Memory"; Caitlin DeSilvey, "Art and Archive: Memory-work on a Montana Homestead," *Journal of Historical Geography* 33:4 (2007): 878-900.
  45. DeSilvey, "Salvage Memory," 404. DeSilvey notes that her approach has been influenced by similar salvage projects. See for example Victor Buchli and Gavin Lucas, *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past* (London: Routledge, 2001); Hayden Lorimer and Fraser MacDonald, "A Rescue Archaeology, Taransay, Scotland," *Cultural Geographies* 9 (2002): 95-103; Brian Neville and Johanne Villeneuve, *Waste-site Stories: the Recycling of Memory* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002).
  46. DeSilvey, "Observed Decay," 336.
  47. *Ibid.*, *passim*. Tim Edensor has also sought to engage with remainder materials, only in his case those left on industrial ruins. However Edensor's ethic for confronting the past as 'tactile, imaginative and involuntary' resists any recovery of the sites particular pasts and therefore could be read as invitation to fabulate: "The Ghosts of Industrial Ruins: Ordering and Disordering Memory in Excessive Space," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 23 (2005): 826-49. Tim Edensor, "Waste Matter—The Debris of Industrial Ruins and the Disordering of the Material World," *Journal of Material Culture* 10:3 (2005): 311-32.
  48. DeSilvey, "Salvage Memory," 401.
  49. *Ibid.*, 420.
  50. *Ibid.*, *passim*.
  51. DeSilvey, "Observed Decay," 318.
  52. For examples see Lorimer, "Telling Small Stories," 197-217; Lorimer, "The Geographical Field Course as Active Archive," 278-308; Lorimer, "Herding Memories," 497-518; Lorimer, "Caught in the Nick of Time."
  53. Lorimer, "Telling Small Stories," 202.
  54. *Ibid.*, 202.
  55. *Ibid.*, 203
  56. Lorimer, "Herding Memories," 512.
  57. *Ibid.*, 516.
  58. *Ibid.*, 515.
  59. DeSilvey, "Observed Decay," 329.
  60. Jude Hill's research has reconstructed the histories of material entities where complementary documentary and archival evidence has been detailed and as such demonstrates a different engagement with the historical geographies of material entities. For examples: "Travelling Objects," 340-66; "Globe-trotting Medicine Chests," 365-84; "The Story of the Amulet," 65-87.
  61. Lorimer, "Caught in the Nick of Time."
  62. DeSilvey, "Salvage Memory," 416.
  63. Lorimer, "Caught in the Nick of Time."
  64. Ingold, "Rethinking the Animate," 10.
  65. *Ibid.*, 9.
  66. Sallie Marston, John Paul Jones and Keith Woodward, "Reply: Situating Flatness," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32 (2007): 265. See also the

- original Sallie Marston, John Paul Jones and Keith Woodward, "Human Geography without Scale," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30 (2005): 416-32.
67. See Chris Collinge, "Flat Ontology and the Deconstruction of Scale: A Response to Marston, Jones and Woodward," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31 (2006): 244-51; Arturo Escobar, "The 'Ontological Turn' in Social Theory: A Commentary on 'Human Geography without Scale,'" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32 (2007): 106-11.
  68. The Animal Studies Group, *Killing Animals*.
  69. "Shikar" traditionally referred to the form of hunting hospitality offered to visitors in India, yet came to epitomise tiger hunting as the tiger was seen as the ultimate quarry. See Susie Green, *Tiger* (London: Reaktion, 2006).
  70. Rose, "Practising Photography," 555-71.
  71. The shift from hunting with gun to hunting with camera has been documented. See for example Ryan, *Picturing Empire*, 99-139.
  72. Jessica Dubow, "From a View on the World to a Point of View in It': Rethinking Sight, Space and Colonial Subject," *Interventions: International Journal of Post-colonial Studies* 2:1 (2000): 87-102.
  73. *Ibid.*, *passim*.
  74. *Ibid.*, 93.
  75. Heidi Scott, "Rethinking Landscape and Colonialism in the Context of Early Spanish Peru," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24 (2006): 481-96.
  76. *Ibid.*, 487.
  77. Pat Morris, *Van Ingen and Van Ingen: Artists in Taxidermy* (Ascot: MPM Publishing, 2006).
  78. *Ibid.*, 78.
  79. James Duncan's work, presenting a detailed account of the embodied practices of resistance that took place on nineteenth-century Ceylonese coffee plantations, is a comparator for this approach at recovery: "Embodying Colonialism? Domination and Resistance in Nineteenth-century Ceylonese Coffee Plantations," *Journal of Historical Geography* 28:3 (2002): 317-38.
  80. Steve Pile, "Memory and the City," in Jan Campbell and Janet Harbord, eds., *Temporalities, Autobiography and Everyday Life* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002): 116.
  81. Simon Naylor, "Historical Geography: Geographies and Historiographies of Historical Geography," *Progress in Human Geography* 32:1 (2008): 1-10.
  82. Broader narratives on colonialism, collecting and animals are instructive here. See, for example, Steve Baker, *Picturing the Beast: Animals, Identity and Representation* (Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1993); Barringer and Flynn, *Colonialism and the Object*; Mark Barrow, "The Specimen Dealer: Entrepreneurial Natural History in America's Gilded Age," *Journal of the History of Biology* 33 (2000): 493-534; Matthew Brower, "Trophy Shots: Early North American Photographs of Non-human Animals and the Display of Masculine Prowess," in *Society and Animals* 13:1 (2005): 15-3; Philo and Wilbert, *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places*; Elizabeth Edwards, Chris Gosden and Ruth Phillips, eds., *Sensible Objects: Colonialism, Museums and Material Culture* (Oxford: Berg 2006); C. Gosden and C. Knowles, *Collecting Colonialism: Material Culture and Colonial Change*

---

(Oxford: Berg, 2001); Nicholas Jardine, James Secord and Emma Spary, eds., *Cultures of Natural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Nigel Rothfels, *Savages and Beasts: the Birth of the Modern Zoo* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2002); Ritvo, *The Animal Estate*; Ryan, “Hunting with Camera”; The Animal Studies Group, *Killing Animals*.