

Ulrikab Abroad: ‘Authentic’ Inuit-German Encounters in Labrador and Germany

BY MAGDALENE KLASSEN, McGill University

On September 24, 1880, Abraham Ulrikab arrived in Hamburg, having traveled 29 seasick days from Labrador.¹ He was accompanied by his wife Ulrike, their two young daughters Maria and Sara, his wife’s nephew Tobias, and another Inuit family. Organized by Johan A. Jacobsen, the voyage of the two families to Europe conveyed them to a *Völkerschau*, or human exhibition, put on by Hamburg zookeeper Carl Hagenbeck. They traveled through Germany, stopped in Prague, and ended their journey in Paris. All the while, Ulrikab kept a diary.

Although these families were not the first Indigenous people, or the first Inuit, to be put on display in Europe, they were some of the earliest people to be exhibited in the context of a zoo.² In Germany, Carl Hagenbeck was the main purveyor of what he called “anthropozoological exhibitions,” and these families were the fourth group of “savage aboriginals from exotic lands” that he displayed.³ Though Hagenbeck’s zoo had begun as an exclusively animal affair, he soon realized that the exhibitions could be more successful

if the unfamiliar animals were accompanied by people from the same regions. In 1874 he exhibited reindeer and a group of six Sami.⁴ Exhibitions of Nubians and Kalaallit (Greenland Inuit) followed in 1876 and 1877. Hagenbeck’s *Völkerschau* did not have precise itineraries, but they did follow predictable schedules. Every afternoon, Ulrikab and the others would demonstrate their traditional skills: they kayaked, butchered seals and “made [themselves] look fierce,” in an enclosure that was meant to replicate their homeland.⁵ But Ulrikab and his family were not necessarily the “savages” that audiences came to see: they were devout Christians, and active members of the Moravian mission at Hebron. In addition to staging his “otherness,” Ulrikab also signed autographs, played violin, and sang Moravian hymns renowned for their musical complexity. Many newspapers remarked on Ulrikab’s intelligence and musical abilities.⁶

Ulrikab does not describe what the other family—Terraniak, his wife Paingu, and their daughter Nuggasak—did while his family sang hymns, but they were the “heathen Eskimoes” that Jacobsen had hoped to find.⁷ They practiced “magic,” refused to be mea-

1 Abraham’s last name is variously recorded as Ulrikab (derived from his wife’s name) or Paulus (of unknown origin). I have chosen to refer to him by the former name, since he signs off as such in his letters to Brüder Elsner.

2 Hilke Thode-Arora, “Hagenbeck’s European Tours: The Development of the Human Zoo,” in *Human Zoos: Science and Spectacle in the Age of Colonial Empires*, eds. Pascal Blanchard et al. (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), 169.

3 Carl Hagenbeck, *Von Tieren Und Menschen: Erlebnisse und Erfahrungen von Carl Hagenbeck* (Berlin: Vita Deutsches Vlg., 1909), 83; “Trapped in a Human Zoo: Based on Abraham’s Diary,” *The Nature of Things* (CBC Television, February 2016).

4 Hagenbeck, *Von Tieren Und Menschen*, 83.

5 Hermann Lutz and Abraham Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 2005), 41.

6 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 36.

7 M. Hoffmann, *Beiträge über Leben und Treiben der Eskimos in Labrador und Grönland: Aus dem Tagebuche des Herrn Carl Hagenbecks in Hamburg mit dem Schiffe, Eisbär’ nach Grönland Entsandten Herrn J.A. Jacobsen* (Berlin: M. Hoffmann, 1880), 13.

sured for “scientific” purposes, and were “distracted” by steam trains.⁸ One newspaper explained that they were “more interesting” than the Ulrikab family, “in so far as culture [had] not smudged too much of their naturalness.”⁹ Although Ulrikab wrote little about this non-Christian family, their presence complicated his own European experience. As Ulrikab explained in a letter to a Moravian missionary, his family did not “like their habits [because] they practice magic,” and were pleased when each family had a different house to live in.¹⁰ Nevertheless, as the trip continued, Ulrikab and Terrianiak came to depend increasingly on one another in this strange land. These two families were eight of the estimated 35,000 Indigenous people from across the world who were exhibited in Europe, where “by far the most sustained use of performers was to be found in Germany,” thanks to Hagenbeck, who prided himself on providing such an entertaining and educational experience for the German public.¹¹

Jacobsen, a Norwegian, had been sent to the Labrador Sea by Hagenbeck in order to replicate the success of an earlier exhibition of Kalaallit, or Greenland Inuit.¹² When he arrived in Labrador, he faced strong opposition to his attempt: the Moravians were firmly against the exhibition of their converts “like wild beasts,” but eventually acknowledged that they were “free people and [the Moravians could not] hold them” if they wanted to go.¹³ Still, Jacobsen complained in

his diary that the Inuit were “suppressed so slavishly” by the Moravians, and despaired until Ulrikab finally agreed to go. Ulrikab justified his participation twofold: as a means to repay his debts to the Moravian mission store, and as a chance to fulfill his longstanding desire to see Europe.¹⁴ The missionaries admitted that they could not deny him this chance, and Jacobsen promised a visit to Herrnhut, the core of the Moravian Brethren.¹⁵

The Moravian Brethren (also the *Unitas Fratrum* or *Herrnhuter Brüdergemeinde*), which emphasized ecumenism and pietism, had its origins in the early fifteenth-century Moravian Reformation and the Hussite movement. Its heart, however, lay in Saxony, on the former estate of Count Nikolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf, who in 1722 offered a section of his estate as sanctuary for Bohemian and Moravian members of the *Unitas Fratrum* fleeing Catholic persecution.¹⁶ Inspired by their devotion, he joined the denomination and came to have a significant influence on the Brethren’s theology. Yet to call the Brethren a denomination may be a misnomer, given their vision of a universal church, in which the various Protestant churches were only parts in the larger body of Christ: Brethren were encouraged to associate with and even participate in other congregations.¹⁷ This desire to form a worldwide community also found them at the forefront of missionary work, which they began in 1732, only twenty years after the congregation was established.¹⁸

Over the next century, the Brethren would de-

8 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 35.

9 “The Eskimos in the ‘Zoologischer Garten,’” *Frankfurter Nachrichten*, Dec. 3, 1880, quoted in Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 51.

10 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 7.

11 Sadiyah Qureshi, *Peoples on Parade: Exhibitions, Empire, and Anthropology in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2011), 261.

12 Hoffmann, *Beiträge über Leben und Treiben der Eskimos*, 12. Initially Jacobsen was sent to Greenland but the Danish inspector refused to allow him to take any Inuit to Europe, so he continued on to Labrador.

13 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 9.

14 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 5.

15 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 5.

16 Robert L. Gallagher, “The Integration of Mission Theology and Practice: Zinzendorf and the Early Moravians,” *Mission Studies* 25, no. 2 (2008): 185.

17 Robert Beachy, “Manuscript Missions in the Age of Print: Moravian Community in the Atlantic World,” in *Pious Pursuits: German Moravians in the Atlantic World*, eds. Michele Gillespie and Robert Beachy (New York: Berghahn Books, 2007), 37.

18 David A Schattschneider, “Pioneers in Mission: Zinzendorf and the Moravians,” *International Bulletin of Missionary Research* 8, no. 2 (1984): 64.

velop a vast global network of missions, spanning the Danish, Dutch, Spanish, French, and British empires.¹⁹ In doing so, they did not organize a distinct mission society within the church, instead “conceiving of the mission enterprise as an obligation for the Church as such,” and had one of the highest ratios of missionaries to parishioners.²⁰ Across the continents, Moravians sought to preach the Gospel and “civilize” Indigenous social structures while placing a strong, if conflicted, emphasis on preserving their traditional modes of life. Their ecumenism and the “Christian diaspora” they cultivated allowed for a degree of cultural difference within the Church, yet questions of how to accommodate or repudiate the utterly foreign cultures they encountered in the mission field proved difficult to resolve.²¹ In Labrador, the Moravian missions were, from their founding in 1771, virtually the only European presence in the area. Though missionaries attempted to exert a great deal of control over the lives of their congregants, the particularities of Labrador’s environment, inhospitable to a sedentary European lifestyle, meant that even Christianized Inuit continued to practice long-established lifeways.

Still, to European visitors, it was particularly exciting that the other Inuit family, found further north at Nachvak, were still “wild”: Terrianiak was an *Angkok* or spiritual leader, and neither he nor his wife Paingu (spiritually powerful herself) or daughter Nuggasak had any relationship with the missions. No ob-

jection to their participation, by Moravians or their own community, has been preserved. Satisfied with the group, Jacobsen arranged to pay the Inuit a daily wage of three shillings per man, two per woman, and one per child, and together they set sail for Hamburg.²² However, Jacobsen neglected one crucial—in fact, legally required—element of the journey: inoculation.²³ In Darmstadt, the fifth stop on the tour, Nuggasak contracted smallpox and died on December 14.²⁴ Her mother and Ulrikab’s daughter Sara followed soon after. In his grief, Ulrikab abandoned his diary. Although Jacobsen and Hagenbeck tried to protect the remaining Inuit by having them inoculated twice over the next month, Ulrikab and the rest of the group died as well.

Ulrikab’s story is undeniably tragic, and the wider practice of human zoos a horrifying stain on Europe’s history. Yet as one scholar has suggested, the goal of studying Ulrikab’s story ought to be to “interpret as much as indict.”²⁵ Although Hagenbeck and Jacobsen expressed shock and grief over the death of these families—Hagenbeck even swore to give up the *Völkerschauen*—both continued to exhibit many more people from around the world, until after the First World War when it ceased to be profitable.²⁶ In his memoir *Of Beasts and Men*, Hagenbeck skipped neatly over the events of 1880–1881.

The Moravian Brethren’s response to the deaths was also ambiguous: although they were sorrowful

19 Felicity Jensz, “Colonial Agents: German Moravian Missionaries in the English-Speaking World,” in *Missionaries, Indigenous Peoples, and Cultural Exchange*, eds. Patricia Grimshaw and Andrew May (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press, 2010), 139.

20 Anne Folke Henningsen, “On Difference, Sameness and Double Binds. Ambiguous Discourses, Failed Aspirations,” in *Protestant Missions and Local Encounters in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries: Unto the Ends of the World*, edited by Hilde Nielsen et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 133.

21 Beachy, “Manuscript Missions,” 37.

22 Georg Kretschmer, “Letter to Brother Connor,” August 20, 1880, quoted in Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 6–7. Given that Ulrikab’s debts were only 100 shillings, he would have been able to pay them off after about two weeks in Europe.

23 “Trapped in a Human Zoo.”

24 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, xxiii.

25 Corey Coates, “The First Inuit Autobiography: Text and Context(s) (Extended Review),” *The Northern Review* 28 (2008): 267.

26 Nigel Rothfels, *Savages and Beasts: The Birth of the Modern Zoo* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 143–144; France Rivet, *In the Footsteps of Abraham Ulrikab: The Events of 1880-1881* (Gatineau: Polar Horizons, 2014), 195.

(even two years later, one missionary mentioned in a letter how much they all missed Ulrikab's violin playing), they also suggested the deaths were the result of divine will, punishing the Inuit for not following the advice of their missionaries.²⁷ In 1882, the Hebron missionaries ended a letter published in the *Missionsblatt* (the main German-language Moravian periodical) by saying that they had been "vindicated: The Lord has punished Abraham for his disobedience, and providence has shown that 'the outside' was indeed full of lurking dangers."²⁸ Though Ulrikab had gone to Europe out of Moravian devotion, his was not a religiously sanctioned voyage.

In January of 1881, Ulrikab was inclined to agree with missionaries' judgment of the voyage: in his final letter to former missionary Augustus Elsner, written five days before his death, Ulrikab described how he and the remaining others prayed daily, asking Jesus to "forgive our aberration...all day we cry together... that our sins will be taken away by Jesus Christ."²⁹ Yet the significance of this diary does not lie only in the emotion invoked by the text; Ulrikab's reflections on the exhibition and on his Christian faith that was being tested by the experience reveal a careful evaluation of his self-conception and of the new setting he was encountering.

In tracing Ulrikab's journey, several intersecting lines of questioning emerge. His experiences in German zoos and Moravian churches invite reflection on the nature of authentic experience and feeling. As Raibmon has argued in her work on authenticity in the lives of Indigenous people of the North West Coast, "authenticity was a structure of power that enabled, even as it

constrained, [Indigenous peoples'] interaction with the colonial world."³⁰ Ulrikab's experiences were similarly enabled and constrained by European expectations, but in light of his personal Moravian faith, we might also consider the conflicting ways that this journey was at once an exploitative spectacle and a religious pilgrimage. Furthermore, that Ulrikab kept a diary encourages us to think about how different modes of writing may complicate our expectations of what constitutes authenticity.

This diary seems to be lost. We do not know whether he wrote in a notebook or on scraps of paper, with what implement he wrote, or how many people knew about the diary. But we do know that it returned to Labrador—along with Ulrikab and his family's pay and the last of their belongings—on August 17, 1881, seven months after all the Inuit who had traveled to Europe had died.³¹ Today, all that remains is a German translation of the Inuttit original by missionary Georg Kretschmer, which was discovered in the Moravian Archives in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, by J. Garth Taylor in 1980.³² In recent years, Ulrikab's story has been taken up by German Canadianist Helmut Lutz, who published *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab: Text and Context*, an English translation of the diary and of German newspaper articles related to the Inuit visit; and by France Rivet, who compiled further documents about the conditions that led to their visit and the aftermath of their deaths in her book *In the Footsteps of Abraham Ulrikab*. Rivet is also working with the Nunatsiavut government to repatriate the bodies from the Muséum national d'histoire naturelle in Paris, where they have been held since 1886.³³

27 Marie Kretschmer, Letter, August 23, 1882, quoted in Rivet, *In the Footsteps of Abraham Ulrikab*, 227.

28 "Hebron," *Missionsblatt aus der Brüdergemeinde*, no. 1 (1882): 10.

29 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 64.

30 Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 11.

31 A. Dewitz, "Bei Den Eskimo Im Zoologischen Garten," *Missionsblatt aus der Brüdergemeinde* 12 (1880): 224–6.

32 J. Garth Taylor, "An Eskimo Abroad, 1880: His Diary and Death," *Canadian Geographic* October–November (1981): 38–43.

33 Rivet, *In the Footsteps of Abraham Ulrikab*, 251. They were

Ulrikab seems to have begun writing the diary on October 22, 1880, five days after the group arrived in Berlin, and nearly a month after they had arrived in Europe. Ulrikab gives no clear indication as to his motivations for keeping a diary, but his first entry offers some possibilities: he begins by explaining that “in Berlin it is not very nice...the air is constantly buzzing from the sound of the walking and driving.”³⁴ Indigenous visitors were often overwhelmed by the European metropolis, a reaction that often filled their hosts with pride as they watched civilization awe their primitive guests.³⁵ However, October 22 was also the day that two members of the Moravian Brethren came to visit their enclosure, “and they were so happy when they saw us that they knew us immediately and called our names, told us to sing...and invited us to their house and their church. We really want to...but are not able to, as there are too many people [visiting the zoo].”³⁶ The relief of seeing someone, if not familiar, at least sympathetic, must have greatly comforted Ulrikab, who would soon write to Brüder Elsner (whom he had known in Labrador): “I remember to have wished to see Europe and some of the [Moravian] communities over there for a long time. But here I wait in vain for someone to talk about Jesus.”³⁷ As much as Ulrikab had come to Europe to pay off his debts, he had also come on a kind of pilgrimage.

Whether he was writing out of homesickness or spiritual hunger, we might understand the diary as a kind of comfort: for the most part, he wrote about his regret for leaving his homeland, and the joy he felt when

encountering fellow Moravians. Yet the Moravians had also furnished him with this specific medium for expressing regret: though we know little of how he learned to write, we know that he wrote in Inuttitut, which the Moravians had rendered in a Latin script. Of course, since a missionary’s translation of the diary is all we have, there is no way of knowing exactly what Ulrikab wrote. Even if he had reflected deeply on the nature of the ethnographic exhibit, Kretschmer may have omitted some of the original content from his translation. Though there is no way to verify these speculations, the translation’s unusual syntax and vocabulary, which are grounded in the Labrador environment, suggest that something of Ulrikab’s voice remains in the text. As such, it would seem that the details of the exhibit, including his family’s living conditions, and his interactions with Europeans such as Jacobsen, Hagenbeck, the anthropologist Rudolf Virchow, or the general public, did not, to Ulrikab, merit much reflection.

In the Exhibit: the European Gaze

Ulrikab did, however, describe some of their daily activities in the exhibition. In each new enclosure, the families kayaked in ponds, and Tobias would dress up as the seal, “wrapped in furs,” while Terrianiak and Ulrikab pretended to hunt him.³⁸ Ulrikab looked forward to the occasions when a real seal would be brought in from Holland, and the Inuit would eat it after the mock hunt, a welcome respite from the European food that was “not very good”: fish, potatoes, dry bread, and beer.³⁹ The crowds were enormous: on the exhibit’s first day in Berlin, the *Norddeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* reported an audience of almost 7,000.⁴⁰ The intensity of these crowds—in size and excitement—made Terrianiak’s family increasingly cheerless, but Ulrikab ex-

initially buried in the St-Ouen cemetery, and exhumed on the request of the museum.

34 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 12.

35 Coll Thrush, *Indigenous London: Native Travelers at the Heart of Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 115.

36 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 12–13.

37 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 5.

38 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 14.

39 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 30.

40 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 14.

plained that his family had “been very patient, although we have also been greatly tired. Constantly in the evenings we pray, wanting to be helped. [Praying] seems to achieve something within us.”⁴¹ Being exhibited clearly overwhelmed and took a toll on all of the Inuit. Ulrikab wrote, somewhat puzzled, of how he was “constantly told to write my name...there were many voices, one always took it away from the other, to please them all was impossible, there were too many.”⁴² Yet those who visited seem to have been pleased with the show, and besides obtaining Ulrikab’s autograph, many bought souvenir cards printed with portraits of the individual Inuit, or the 28-page “Report on the Lives and Undertakings of the Eskimos in Labrador and Greenland,” an illustrated brochure based on Jacobsen’s diary of his trip to the Labrador Sea.⁴³

The scale of Hagenbeck’s promotional efforts and the German public’s interest in the exhibit were not without precedent. Historians of the “red Atlantic” have extensively documented the intensity of the European gaze on indigenous visitors, “the maelstrom of publicity, [the] hungry, pressing public,” as have Indigenous visitors themselves.⁴⁴ Peter Jones, an Ojibwa Methodist minister who undertook several fundraising and diplomatic trips to England, noted that in London his presence “created no little excitement.”⁴⁵ He resented the British fascination with his “odious [and inaccurate] Indian costume,” which he was regularly asked

to wear while he spoke.⁴⁶ Jones’ cousin Maungwudaus, who toured with George Catlin’s show in the 1840s, compared London crowds to “musketoos in America in the summer season, in their number and in biting one another to get a living.”⁴⁷ Although Jones and Maungwudaus both originated from territory that England claimed to control, and had specifically English experiences of Europe, it is likely that they would have been similarly unimpressed by Germans.

Perhaps because Germany had no formal colonies in the Americas (though individual Germans were certainly involved), Germans have long understood their fascination with the Indigenous peoples of North America as one of “mutual recognition.”⁴⁸ Some have argued that this formulation is a manifestation of the Romantic obsession with the wild.⁴⁹ Others have pointed to German self-conceptions as “the Indians of the Romans,” and the importance of the “Volk” in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German nationalism.⁵⁰ In both cosmologies, a “self-delusive concept of a ‘special affinity’” between Germans and Indigenous people is active, by which *Indianer* are supposedly able to distinguish Germans from other Europeans, and have a special respect for them.⁵¹ While this German fascination with *Indianer*, which persists to this day, is widely known, their constructions of the “Eskimo” are less well-documented.

41 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 26.

42 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 31.

43 Hilke Thode-Arora, “Abraham’s Diary - A European Ethnic Show from an Inuk Participant’s Viewpoint,” *Journal of the Society for the Anthropology of Europe* 2, no. 2 (2002): 5. (Jacobsen’s diary was published in French and English by Rivet and Lutz in 2014.)

44 Thrush, *Indigenous London*, 163; Jace Weaver, *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenous and the Making of the Modern World, 1000-1927* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).

45 Peter Jones, *Life and Journals of Kah-Ke-Wa-Quo-Na-By: Rev. Peter Jones, Wesleyan Missionary* (Toronto: Anson Green, 1860), 300.

46 Jones quoted in Kyle Carsten Wyatt, “Rejoicing in This Unpronounceable Name’: Peter Jones’s Authorial Identity,” *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of Canada* 47, no. 2: 170.

47 Maungwudaus quoted in Kate Flint, *The Transatlantic Indian, 1776-1930* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 82.

48 Susanne Zantop, “Close Encounters: Deutsche and Indianer,” in *Germans and Indians: Fantasies, Encounters, and Projections*, eds. Colin Calloway et al. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2002), 4.

49 Zantop, “Close Encounters: Deutsche and Indianer,” 10.

50 Christian F. Feest, “Germany’s Indians in a European Perspective,” in *Germans and Indians*, 28.

51 Hartmut Lutz, “German Indianthusiasm: A Socially Constructed German National(ist) Myth,” in *Germans and Indians*, 168, 172.

Germans often described the Inuit in admiring terms, even as “First among the Savages.”⁵² The earliest European depictions of Inuit people are German woodcuts from 1567, and, as several scholars have noted, many Inuit have traveled across the Atlantic since European ships first arrived.⁵³ The first Inuit known to have visited the states that would become Germany were a man and woman who traveled with Capt. Samuel Hadlock in 1824.⁵⁴ Many Kalaallit and Sami, a people indigenous to Sápmi, or the arctic regions of Fennoscandia, also toured Germany, especially in the 1870s.⁵⁵

Germans also learned a great deal about the Inuit through Moravian missionaries, who sent home accounts of the “peculiarly childlike and childish” disposition of the Inuit in Greenland and Labrador.⁵⁶ These reports circulated in general Protestant missionary periodicals in addition to specifically Moravian networks. During Ulrikab’s visit, one newspaper wrote that “the Eskimos present here do in general live up to the expectations we are used to having of them. . . . a picture bringing together ugliness, good nature, and comic aspects in the most pleasant way.”⁵⁷ The “Eskimo” was construed

as kind-hearted and simple-minded: rather than a noble savage, we might call this trope the “comical savage.” However, the Inuit’s actions were not always as benign as this trope would suggest: on the Moravians’ first attempt to establish a mission in Labrador in 1752, some Inuit killed the missionaries. This hint of danger heightened the allure of “Eskimo” stereotypes.

Ulrikab in this gaze

Philip J. Deloria has argued that, “in the smothering omnipresence of a white racial gaze, show Indians were, in fact, *always* performing Indianness, whether they wanted to or not, twenty-four hours a day.”⁵⁸ Though Deloria was writing specifically about the American context of Wild West shows, his observations resonate with the expectations of authenticity that Ulrikab described in his diary. Although Ulrikab did not explicitly reflect on his role in the exhibit, he continually presented the dissonance between the act in the German zoo and his daily life in Labrador. For Deloria, “playing Indian, as always, [had] a tendency to lead one into, rather than out of, contradiction and irony.”⁵⁹ Whether Ulrikab reflected on this irony or not, his performance in the exhibition suggests a subtle and sophisticated method of engaging with the contradictions. Ulrikab performed more than a clichéd “Eskimeness,” instead choosing to demonstrate his dual Inuit and Moravian *Bildung*. His skill with the harpoon and the violin displayed these two educations separately, but he also demonstrated their harmony, which was best exemplified by the maps of Labrador and Nain that he drew for spectators.⁶⁰ Although none of these maps survive, modern scholars and bygone explorers alike

52 David Thomas Murphy, “‘First among the Savages’: The German Romance of the Eskimo from the Enlightenment to National Socialism,” *German Studies Review* 25, no. 3 (2002): 533.

53 William C. Sturtevant and David Beers Quinn, “This New Prey: Eskimos in Europe in 1567, 1576, and 1577,” *Indians and Europe*, ed. Christian F. Feest (Aachen: Rader Vlg., 1987), 62.

54 Robin K. Wright, “The Traveling Exhibition of Captain Samuel Hadlock, Jr: Eskimos in Europe, 1822-1826,” in *Indians and Europe*, ed. Christian F. Feest (Aachen: Rader Vlg., 1987), 220. Although Hadlock had brought the couple from Baffin Island, by the time they visited Germany, he had substituted a Roma woman for the Inuit woman, who had died in England.

55 Rainer Baehre, “Early Anthropological Discourse on the Inuit and the Influence of Virchow on Boas,” *Études/Inuit/Studies* 32, no. 2 (2008): 19.

56 Br. Hieronim, “Letter from New Herrnhut, June 20th, 1867,” *Periodical Accounts Relating to the Missions of the Church of the United Brethren, Established Among the Heathen* 25 (1868): 376.

57 “The Eskimos in the ‘Zoologischer Garten,’” quoted in Lutz

and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 46.

58 Philip Joseph Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004), 67.

59 Philip Joseph Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 180.

60 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 27.

have remarked upon the “phenomenal amount of accurate spatial representation and locational awareness” of Inuit maps.⁶¹ Ulrikab’s skill with a pen, whether signing autographs or writing in his diary, but especially in drawing maps, was a clear representation of his talent, which combined Inuit cartographic knowledge and European methods of representing land on paper.

Deloria’s irony thus reflects back onto the crowd: they came to gape at “savages,” yet they left carrying proof of Ulrikab’s intelligence and ability. As Sami scholar Velli-Pekka Lehtola argues in his work on exhibitions of Sami in Germany, human exhibitions could be spaces of agency and even dissent for those who participated.⁶² Of course, rather than ending with tales told back at home, Ulrikab’s trip—like many others—ended in death, and he and his family were deeply homesick throughout their trip. Still, Ulrikab was able to resist aspects of the savage persona imposed on him, for his “wild” and “civilized” skills blurred and complemented each other, challenging the European presumption that these were mutually exclusive categories. In light of his map-making, singing, and violin-playing, Ulrikab’s performance in Hagenbeck’s zoo can be understood as an attempt to authentically articulate his Moravian-inflected Inuit identity, an effort in direct opposition to the reductive demands of the *Völkerschau*.

Moravian contexts

Labrador’s relative isolation meant that Ulrikab was likely very unfamiliar with European constructions of savagery and with the more violent aspects of European colonialism. While the late nineteenth century was perhaps “the most traumatic and turbulent period in the history of western North American Aboriginal

people,” in Labrador the long missionary presence and otherwise sparse European settlement meant that Ulrikab and his family were not very well acquainted with the horrors visited upon groups like the Mi’kmaq of New Brunswick or the Beothuk in Newfoundland.⁶³ Although the Moravian mission was often a site of tension between Inuit and missionaries, these conditions afforded the Inuit relative freedom compared with Indigenous nations further south.

In general, the Moravian missionaries permitted outward signs of traditional Indigenous culture: language, some clothing (such as Inuit parkas), and those customs that they felt did not interfere with Christian duty or belief.⁶⁴ They did, however, take great pains to unite this religious diaspora, and many converts traveled to the Brethren’s capital, Herrnhut, where “it was not an uncommon sight to find former Negro slaves, Eskimos, and representatives of other heathen congregations sitting among the German brothers and sisters.”⁶⁵ However, such travel was difficult, and the Moravians primarily communicated through their such journals as the quarterly *Periodical Accounts* and *Missionsblatt aus der Brüdergemeinde*, which featured yearly reports from around the globe.⁶⁶ These journals, distributed to all Moravian communities, contributed to their strong sense that the Brethren were part of a universal church, and cultivated a “tremendous community solidarity” at both local and global levels.⁶⁷

In keeping with their efforts to be a ecumenical force, Moravians cooperated closely with colonial

61 John Spink, *Eskimo Maps from the Canadian Eastern Arctic* (Toronto: B.V. Gutsell, 1972), 22.

62 Veli-Pekka Lehtola, “Sami on the Stages and in the Zoos of Europe,” in *L’Image Du Sápmi II. Études Comparées*, ed. Kasja Andersson (Örebro: Örebro University Press, 2013), 326.

63 Paige Raibmon, *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late-Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005), 5.

64 Henningsen, “On Difference, Sameness, and Double Binds,” 135.

65 Bayreuther quoted in Rudolf Conrad, “Mutual Fascination: Indians in Dresden and Leipzig,” in *Indians and Europe*, ed. Christian F. Feest (Aachen: Rader Vlg., 1987), 460.

66 Beachy, “Manuscript Missions,” 41.

67 Beachy, “Manuscript Missions,” 41.

governments. Yet, in their status as a minority denomination within Germany, which held no colonies until after its unification in 1871, Moravian missions often had a particularly tenuous relationship with imperial states.⁶⁸ Colonial governments such as the Danish or British were often suspicious of the Moravians' motives. When, in 1765, they petitioned the British House of Lords for a land grant in Labrador, the Brethren emphasized the ways in which their mission would be "so useful to the English Nation" in its imperial and economic interests.⁶⁹ The year before, the Brethren had approached the governor of Newfoundland, Hugh Palliser, at an auspicious time: France had recently ceded the Labrador coast to the British in the Treaty of 1763, and Inuit raids were threatening the fledgling English fishing industry.⁷⁰

Palliser agreed to allow Moravian evangelism so long as the Brethren stopped the Inuit from visiting the southern coast of Labrador, where the English fisheries were located. In 1771, Jens Haven and two other missionaries established the mission Nain. Hebron, where Ulrikab and his family lived, was established in 1818.⁷¹ Because of Haven's knowledge of Greenlandic Inuktitut, which overlaps significantly with the Labrador dialect Inuktitut, communication between the missionaries and the Inuit was swifter and easier than in many other missionary contexts.⁷²

Moravian missions chose to preach and educate

in Indigenous languages. In Labrador, missionaries underwent intensive language learning, and held all sermons, hymns, and classes in Inuktitut. The Brethren further translated a vast array of texts into Inuktitut: from bibles and hymnals to booklets of German folk songs and children's stories about masquerades. These translations taught the Inuit as much about European culture (albeit through a Pietist lens) as they did about Christian theology. Given that Ulrikab could write fluently in Inuktitut, we can surmise that he had also learned about German mores and Moravian missions around the globe. Jacobsen wrote that Ulrikab "has as much talent for music as he does for drawing, and has an impressive knowledge of geography and natural science."⁷³ Yet he would have known little of the dispossession, massacre, and forced assimilation of other Indigenous groups: for the most part, Inuit Moravians continued to lead traditional lives. From October to April, they lived in traditional multi-family *iyлуqsuaq* around the mission, but remained nomadic in the summer months.⁷⁴ Although Moravians encouraged converts to help with fur trading, basket weaving, or collecting eider feathers (the Labrador mission was almost self-sufficient), much of their livelihood depended on seasonal hunting.⁷⁵

It is not clear when Abraham and Ulrike became affiliated with the Moravian Church. In a letter to Brother Elsner, Ulrikab mentioned a time when he "did not believe in my Lord and Saviour yet."⁷⁶ He began to appear in the Hebron mission store's records in

68 Jenz, "Colonial Agents," 140.

69 "Extract from the Petition of the Society of the Unitas Fratrum to the Lords of Trade, 23 February 1765," in *In the Matter of the Boundary between the Dominion of Canada and the Colony of Newfoundland in the Labrador Peninsula, between the Dominion of Canada of the One Part and the Colony of Newfoundland of the Other Part*, vol. 3 (London: W. Clowes and Sons, 1927), 1313.

70 W. H. Whiteley, "The Establishment of the Moravian Mission in Labrador and British Policy, 1763–83." *The Canadian Historical Review* 45, no. 1 (1964): 30.

71 A. C. Thompson, *Moravian Missions: Twelve Lectures* (New York: Charles Scribner & Sons, 1882), 225. Today Nain is the northernmost permanent settlement in Labrador.

72 Thompson, *Moravian Missions*, 225.

73 Hoffmann, *Beiträge über Leben und Treiben der Eskimos in Labrador*, 18.

74 J. Garth Taylor, "Historical Ethnography of the Labrador Coast," in *Handbook of the North American Indians*, ed. David Damas, vol. 5 (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1984), 512.

75 J. F. W. Kuehn, W. F. Bechler, and T. Eug. Reichel, "Our Financial Position," *Periodical Accounts Relating to the Missions of the Church of the United Brethren, Established Among the Heathen* 31, no. 326 (1880): 271–74.

76 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 4.

1875, when he would have been about thirty.⁷⁷ Given that he knew enough of the Nain area to map it, he may have lived there earlier. However, there were also some elusive mentions of Ulrikab's parents and other relatives living in the Hebron area. By the time they left Labrador, both he and Ulrike were tightly woven into the Hebron mission: he as a musician, she as a helper around the mission house. Both were considered model converts.

Abraham and Ulrike's longstanding connection to their mission suggests that they would not have been well acquainted with the practice of playing Indian, or "Eskimo." As Deloria has observed, "some Native people may well have been duped or bribed into some performances...but not for very long."⁷⁸ Ulrikab and his family quickly learned how to manage what was expected of them in the German zoos. In one instance, Ulrikab described how "Our enclosure was often broken by the throng...They all came into our enclosure to see the kayak but immediately everything was filled with people and it was impossible to move anymore."⁷⁹ Upon realizing that Jacobsen and the zoo manager were unable to keep the crowd under control, Ulrikab stepped in. Of the incident, he wrote: "so I did what I could. Taking my whip and the Greenland seal harpoon, I made myself terrible. One of the gentlemen was like a crier. Others quickly shook hands with me when I chased them out. Others went and jumped over the fence because there were so many."⁸⁰ That Ulrikab could induce such a reaction from so large a crowd speaks volumes about Europeans' expectations of these Inuit visitors, and Ulrikab's awareness thereof. Ulrikab stepped into a role that the spectators imposed upon

him: he noted that "some of them were even horrified by our Northlanders often," and in his quick thinking he exploited this fear.⁸¹ In specifying that he used a harpoon from Greenland (Jacobsen had picked up some artifacts there before arriving in Labrador), Ulrikab noted the dissonance between this scene—using an unfamiliar tool to frighten humans—and his real life, where he would have used a familiar harpoon, perhaps one that he had made himself, with great care, sneaking up on a seal to strike at exactly the right moment. However, in the context of the zoo, it did not really matter whether he tried to demonstrate his education or frighten people away; both delighted the spectators, who reached out to shake his hand as he chased them away.

Hagenbeck's Exhibitions

Although they did not deny the exhibitions' entertainment value, Hagenbeck and his contemporaries also understood them as scientific endeavors, and these *Völkerschau* were among the most significant contributors to German knowledge of Indigenous peoples. By professionalizing the display of Indigenous peoples, Hagenbeck transformed the industry from one that exhibited exoticness with little concern for accuracy into one that intended to demonstrate, with scientific rigour, the "underlying ethnic difference" between Europeans and the rest of the world.⁸² Scholars such as Jace Weaver and Kate Flint have carefully documented the extent to which Indigenous people travelled to Europe, and have noted that many, like Peter Jones, came with diplomatic intentions to represent their people, only to find themselves put on display.⁸³ Most of these diplo-

77 "Einkauf von Pelzwaaren bis zur Schiffszeit," 1863–1903, Labrador Inuit through Moravian Eyes, Memorial University of Newfoundland Library Archives, 68.

78 Deloria, *Indians in Unexpected Places*, 54.

79 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 41.

80 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 41.

81 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 27.

82 Pascal Blanchard et al., eds., *Human Zoos: Science and Spectacle in the Age of Colonial Empires* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008), 7; Thode-Arora, "Hagenbeck's European Tours," 167.

83 See Weaver, *The Red Atlantic*; Kate Flint, *The Transatlantic Indian, 1776-1930* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); Emma Anderson, *The Betrayal of Faith: The Tragic*

matic visits, in which Indigenous people insisted that treaties be honored and land rights recognized, occurred in the major colonial powers of England and France, but reports of exotic visitors travelled throughout Europe. When he opened his first *Völkerschau* in Hamburg, Hagenbeck was capitalizing on a hungry market.

By hosting them in the open air rather than on stage, Hagenbeck expanded the accessibility of these shows, which he advertised as the chance to “travel ‘round the world for fifty pfennig.”⁸⁴ Instead of thrilling displays of strange skills or reenactments of sensational historical scenes, Hagenbeck purported to present “primitive” daily life: his exhibitions were widely praised “because the performers were not ‘acting’ but, in a sense, were leading their ordinary lives.”⁸⁵ They were seen as an educational resource for the public and academics alike, and toured Europe extensively.

Hagenbeck’s exhibitions were a boon to the emerging discipline of anthropology, which was developing new ways of putting Indigenous bodies and cultures on display. Dr. Rudolf Virchow, an influential physical anthropologist, is said to have “never missed a *Völkerschau*.”⁸⁶ Virchow and Hagenbeck were acquainted, and Virchow was often given special access to the people on display, so as to take detailed physical measurements. Beyond his visits to the *Völkerschau*, the archetypal armchair anthropologist depended on an “army” of contacts around the world to supply him with skulls and skeletons for analysis.⁸⁷ Although today this project seems to be a quintessentially racist nine-

teenth-century effort, under Virchow’s influence, German anthropology remained committed to a humanist project “centered on efforts to document the plurality and specificity of cultures.”⁸⁸ With his measurements, Virchow sought to prove that environment and culture, rather than innate racial characteristics, shaped people’s bodies.⁸⁹ Virchow was a firm monogenist, believing that all humans were descended from the same couple, though he did subscribe to an evolutionary model of human development in which some peoples were more advanced than others. It was only after his death that German physical anthropology became oriented toward a “narrowly nationalistic and increasingly racist” approach to the discipline.⁹⁰

While Virchow wrote a lengthy article on his meeting with Ulrikab and the other Inuit, and though Jacobsen also remarked on the visit in his diary, Ulrikab did not write about this Berlin visit. But it was quite an event when Paingu, the wife of the Angekok Terrianiak, objected to Virchow’s invasive measuring. As he explained in an article that year,

while I was spreading her arms horizontally, because I wanted to take her fathom length... she suddenly had the fit: she slipped underneath my arm and started “carrying on all over” the room with such a fury and in such a way as I had never seen before.... She jumped from one corner into the other and was screaming with a crying voice, her ugly face looked dark red, her eyes were glowing, and there was a bit of foam at her mouth; to sum it up, it was a highly disgusting sight.... I had the impression that this “psychic cramp” must be ex-

Journey of a Colonial Native Convert (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

84 Hilke Thode-Arora, *Für Fünfzig Pfennig Um Die Welt: Die Hagenbeckschen Völkerschauen* (Frankfurt: Campus Vlg, 1989).

85 Lehtola, “Sami on the Stages and in the Zoos of Europe,” 329.

86 Broberg quoted in Lehtola, “Sami on the Stages and in the zoos of Europe,” 329.

87 Thomas F. Glick, “The Anthropology of Race across the Darwinian Revolution,” in *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), 240.

88 H. Glenn Penny, “Traditions in the German Language,” in *A New History of Anthropology*, ed. Henrika Kuklick (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008), 79.

89 Baehre, “Early Anthropological Discourse,” 22.

90 Penny, “Traditions in the German Language,” 79.

actly the same form of appearance that the shamans perform in their dances.⁹¹

Virchow did not complete the measurements. Whether or not she was practicing some rite, as he suggested, her actions constituted a literal ethnographic refusal, in the words of Audra Simpson, because she refused to “stay in an ethnological grid of apprehension and governance.”⁹² Although we know little else about her behavior on the trip, Paingu here revealed herself as someone possessing power and agency, refusing to submit to Virchow’s pseudoscientific demands. Although Virchow ostensibly worked toward an increased understanding of Indigenous subjects, he clearly had little interest in the culture or comfort of the Inuit. Ulrikab’s decision not to write about Paingu’s actions, whether out of disapproval or respect, resonates with Simpson’s own refusal to “practice the type of ethnography that claims to tell the whole story and have all the answers.”⁹³ In electing not to record the invasive measurement, Ulrikab refused to explain how he may have understood it, and refused to give importance to the data-driven gaze of the anthropologist. As underscored by Virchow’s reliance on the *Völkerschauen*, human zoos functioned at once as a demonstration of European racial and cultural superiority to the general public, and as the basis for scientific claims to the same end. Their entertainment factor can almost be seen as secondary to this exercise of European supremacy.

Ulrikab’s Faith

While they were in Berlin, Ulrikab and his family visited the *Gemeinhaus der Herrnhuter Brüdergemeinde* (the parish hall) twice. For Ulrikab, this seems to have been the highlight of the trip. As he explained

the day after one visit,

yesterday...we went to church, and prayed and sang together. We were all very greatly cheered, also all our Kablunats [non-Inuit], very greatly we have been inspired. We people sang together in the church, “Jesu ging voran” [“Jesus led the way”], we also spoke the Lord’s Prayer. The assembled were greatly inspired by our voices....Then we were at a loss because of all the blessings....When we had finished we were given an enthusiastic welcome, our hands were shaken greatly.⁹⁴

In contrast to the people trying to shake his hand as he chased them out of the enclosure, we can imagine that Ulrikab would have welcomed this attention. Of the same church visit, he wrote to Brother Elsner:

Once we have been to church, in a big community in Berlin. [Because of that] we have been feeling happy until late night, yes indeed, we didn’t want to go to sleep. The Lord seemed to be with us for a long time. Even as we went through the streets we sang praises and were astonished. And it became clear to us how well we were taken care of in our country, yes indeed, long and great are the blessings we receive.⁹⁵

These visits lifted the spirits of Ulrikab and his family immensely. His writing on the convivial church gatherings also clarifies the nature of his faith: his lists of the hymns they sang confirms the oft-noted “Esquimaux delight in singing and music,” as well as its deep connection to Labrador, as he thanked the Lord for the blessings of a place often called “the Land of Cain.”⁹⁶

91 Virchow quoted in Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 60.

92 Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 31.

93 Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*, 34.

94 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 68-20.

96 Kohlmeister quoted in Tom Gordon, “Found in Translation: The Inuit Voice in Moravian Music,” *Newfoundland and Labrador Studies* 22, no. 1 (2007): 307; Lynne D Fitzhugh, *The Labradorians: Voices from the Land of Cain* (St. John’s, Nfld.: Breakwater, 1999).

Although we know little about Abraham and Ulrike's experience of conversion, this effusive kind of emotional sensibility was central to Moravian theology, which was intensely sensual. Anne Folke Henningsen argues that with "the Blood and Wounds-theology and the emphasis on the suffering Christ", "this emotional Christianity was exactly what paved the way for the successes the Moravians would celebrate in their early global missionary endeavours."⁹⁷ Conversion was not simply a process of learning the catechism, but rather a cultivation of authentic feeling. As Jacqueline Van Gent has detailed, Moravian conversion depended on specific bodily conduct and imagery.⁹⁸ The heart "played a central role" in this theology, as did tears, which were understood to flow from the heart.⁹⁹ Passionate testimony was integral to proving and nourishing one's devotion.

Yet this emotional faith may have also conflicted with Inuit mores. Jean Briggs' ethnography, *Never in Anger*, documents the emotional restraint of Inuit life in the area of Chantrey Inlet. Briggs attributes this to the core Inuit value *ihuma* or *isuma*, which she explains as "all the functions we think of as cerebral: mind, thought, memory, reason, sense, ideas, will...it is the possession of *ihuma* that makes it possible for a person to respond to his surroundings, physical and social, and to conform to social expectations."¹⁰⁰ Coll Thrush, considering *isuma* with regard to Inuit visits to London, describes it as "a studied withholding of affect that allowed for clear-headed apprehension."¹⁰¹ *Isuma* enabled the Inuit to make careful decisions in their of-

ten dangerous homeland, controlling impulses and taming ardor.

Isuma seems at odds with the core tenets of Moravian faith, but Ulrikab's diary demonstrates how they might be reconciled. Though he wrote generously about his visits to the Churches, and described singing hymns well into the night, his descriptions of the exhibition were sparse. Although he acknowledged that all of the Inuit were very homesick and tired of the crowds, he did not dwell on these difficulties. Thrush also argues that "thinking about *isuma*... dislodges racist notions of docility and primitiveness and replaces them with a specifically Inuit rationality."¹⁰² *Isuma* could confuse missionaries, and many reports from Labrador were tinged with the missionaries' uncertainty over the authenticity of their converts' beliefs. As missionaries reported from the Okak station in 1867, "attendance at church and school has been good, and if we were to judge from the language alone, without looking for the fruits of the Spirit, we might easily conclude that most of them were devoted followers of our Saviour."¹⁰³ What missionaries understood as "true feeling" proved elusive, likely because the Inuit looked poorly on the expression of passionate feeling.

Ulrikab's description of his efforts to convert Terrianiak reveals further intricacies of Inuit emotional responses to Moravian theology. After Paingu, Nugasak, and Sara's deaths, Ulrikab wrote to Elsner that "all day we cry mutually, that our sins be taken away by Jesus Christ. Even Terrianiak, who is now alone, when I say to him that he should convert, desires to become a property of Jesus, sincerely, as it seems. He constantly takes part in our prayers."¹⁰⁴ That Ulrikab noted Terrianiak's tears as seemingly sincere suggests

97 Henningsen, "On Difference, Sameness, and Double Binds," 134.

98 Jacqueline Van Gent, "The Burden of Love: Moravian Conversions and Emotions in Eighteenth-Century Labrador," *Journal of Religion History* 30, no. 4 (2005): 567, 563.

99 *Journal of Religion History* 30, no. 4 (2005): 567, 563.

100 Jean L. Briggs, *Never in Anger: Portrait of an Eskimo Family* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970).

101 Coll Thrush, "The Iceberg and the Cathedral: Encounter, Entanglement, and *Isuma* in Inuit London," *Journal of British Studies* 53, no. 1 (2014): 69.

102 Thrush, "The Iceberg and the Cathedral," 69.
103 Thrush, "The Iceberg and the Cathedral," August 10th, 1867, "Periodical Accounts Relating to the Missions of the Church of the United Brethren, Established Among the Heathen 26 (1867): 322.

104 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 64.

an awareness of the difference between Moravian and Inuit valuations of sincerity, especially as contrasted with his assertion that they cried all day. Yet Ulrikab stopped keeping a diary after his daughter's death; expressing his emotions was no longer a comfort. Whether he made this decision due to the emotional restraint of *isuma* or out of plain despair, it is clear that for Ulrikab, a passionate faith and rational observation of his circumstances could often coincide, but writing was only part of this.

Ulrikab as explorer

Despite the myriad ways in which this exhibition was an objectifying experience—the uncontrollable crowds, Virchow's pseudoscientific rigor—we might understand Ulrikab, with his careful observations and his determined spirit in mind, not as an ossifying artifact but as an intrepid explorer. We might see his travels to Europe as a journey that fits into an extensive tradition of Inuit exploration that has spread across Inuit Nunaat, “the entire area of lands and waters that make up the four Inuit homelands across the circum-polar Arctic, stretching from Chukotka to Greenland,” since time immemorial.¹⁰⁵ Several scholars have commented that the impressive accuracy of Inuit maps, the extensive network of trails extending across the Arctic, and the degree of linguistic and folkloric cohesion of the Inuit across the Arctic are testaments to the achievements of a people of “inveterate travelers.”¹⁰⁶

Moravian reports on their educational activities also suggest a particular Inuit interest in geography. In 1873, the missionaries at Zoar reported that “the children appeared to have taken peculiar pleasure in studying...geography.”¹⁰⁷ Jacobson's comments on Ulrikab's

impressive knowledge of the world, and his map-making abilities, also suggest a strong interest in the physical environment. But his longstanding desire to see Europe was not simply a curiosity about the unknown, but also a pilgrimage to the heart of the Moravian world. Although the Inuit did not survive to visit Herrnhut, their joy in meeting members of the Brethren in each city they visited, their delight in the musical and social experience of visiting the church in Berlin, and Ulrikab's effusive writing on these subjects demonstrate the importance of the religious side of their journey.

Conclusions

Ulrikab and his family did not return home. Sara died in a hospital in Krefeld, the rest of her family in the Hôpital Saint-Louis in Paris. They were buried in the Saint-Ouen cemetery, but five years later, when the Muséum national d'histoire naturelle's request to have them exhumed was granted, they were put on display in the “Comparative Anatomy gallery,” with over 20,000 other now nameless human remains.¹⁰⁸ This ending seems to be the most dehumanizing part of their tour. Today, the Nunatsiavut, Canadian, and French governments are working to repatriate the bodies, but first the Labradormiut must prove a relation between living descendants and the travelers to Europe.¹⁰⁹

To understand the diverse motivations that led Ulrikab across the Atlantic Ocean, the question of authenticity provides a helpful frame. Hagenbeck, Ulrikab, the Moravians, and other Inuit all constructed different expectations of what authentic experience and identity meant. Hagenbeck and Jacobsen literally trafficked in “authenticity,” for the interest of European public and development of anthropology. Rainer Baehre has shown that Virchow's studies of Inuit bodies had

105 Mary Simon, “Canadian Inuit: Where We Have Been and Where We Are Going,” *International Journal* 66, no. 4 (2011): 879.

106 Rundstrom, “Inuit Map Accuracy,” 162.

107 A. F. Elsner and C. A. Hirt, “Letter from Zoar, July 14th, 1873,” *Periodical Accounts Relating to the Missions of the Church*

of the United Brethren, *Established Among the Heathen* 29, no. 302 (1873): 5.
108 “Trapped in a Human Zoo.”

109 “Trapped in a Human Zoo.”

a significant influence on Franz Boas' decision to study in the Arctic, and it was Jacobsen's next exhibition of nine Nuxalk, which Boas visited several times, that inspired him to pursue ethnography.¹¹⁰ Yet, as Gareth Griffiths has argued, claims to authenticity can "[over-write] the actual complexity of difference," making it into something static, something singular, and something that has never actually existed.¹¹¹ Ulrikab's diary depicted European efforts to control authenticity and his own struggle to navigate these constraints.

Missionaries to Labrador regularly reported to the rest of the Moravian world that they truly did not know what their converts believed. As one missionary wrote of an Inuit family, "the man seldom speaks of his inner life, the wife is less reticent on the subject; but the Lord alone knows their hearts."¹¹² The importance of *isuma* to the Inuit challenged European notions of sincerity and selfhood. At the same time, they worried that their converts were being corrupted by the wrong kind of Europeans on the southern coast of Labrador, and strove to keep the Inuit isolated from much of European culture. Henningsen has argued that Moravian expectations constituted a double bind of authenticity, revolving around "racial categories linked to notions of difference and sameness: the Moravian mission theories involve an emphasis on racial authenticity simultaneous with an insistence on 'civilising practices.'"¹¹³ Within this framework, converts could never be authentic enough. Ethnic exhibitions could also present a similar double bind, demanding primitiveness and efforts toward civilization at once.

110 Rainer Baehre, "Early Anthropological Discourse," 23.

111 Gareth Griffiths, "The Myth of Authenticity," in *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*, eds. Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin (New York: Routledge, 2006), 237.

112 P. Dam, "Letter from Hebron, August, 1873," *Periodical Accounts Relating to the Missions of the Church of the United Brethren, Established Among the Heathen* 29 (March 1874): 69.

113 Anne Folke Henningsen, "On Difference, Sameness and Double Binds," 131.

And what did Ulrikab believe was authentic? He certainly valued music, his relations, his faith, and the land he came from. He was disappointed to find that European society was not as pious as the Moravians had made it out to be, and he was shocked by European spectators' hunger for the exotic. One of the few things that we know for certain is that Ulrikab, his family, Terianiak, Paingu, and Nuggasak were deeply homesick. In his final letter to Brother Elsner, Ulrikab wrote that "I do not long for earthly possessions but this is what I long for: to see my relatives again, who are over there, to talk to them of the name of God as long as I live."¹¹⁴ As Paige Raibmon has argued, "Whites imagined what the authentic Indian was, and Aboriginal people engaged and shaped those imaginings in return. They were collaborators—albeit unequally—in authenticity."¹¹⁵ Raibmon points out that authenticity was not irrelevant to Indigenous groups: they cared about their traditions, their livelihoods, and their ability to lead self-determined lives. But when authenticity (whether in the form of Moravian emotion or ethnographic spectacle) was the only framework through which Indigenous people could participate in conversations on these subjects, and with the definition thereof in European hands, discourses of authenticity were fraught with misunderstandings and impossible demands. Even today, the requirement that Nunatsiavut prove a living connection to Ulrikab's family shows that the idea of authenticity continues to carry powerful influence.

In 1893, over 60 Inuit who would have certainly known of Ulrikab's story (Elsner's account of the Inuit visit to Europe was distributed to all mission stations) participated in an exhibition at the Chicago World's Fair.¹¹⁶ As many have noted about Buffalo Bill's Wild West show, these kinds of spectacles provided oppor-

114 Lutz and Ulrikab, *The Diary of Abraham Ulrikab*, 65.

115 Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 3.

116 Raibmon, *Authentic Indians*, 39.

tunities to travel, earn money, and even practice traditional skills, that were otherwise not afforded to Indigenous people.¹¹⁷ All of these possibilities had powerful appeal, but participation in these exhibitions meant navigating impossible contradictions and unreasonable expectations. In 2016, Johannes Lampe, Nain's chief elder and now President of Nunatsiavut, traveled to Europe in Ulrikab's footsteps as part of the documentary "Trapped in a Human Zoo." While visiting the Berlin Zoo, Lampe remarked that "Abraham and his family felt a hunger and a thirst and a homesickness," much of which Ulrikab recorded in his diary.¹¹⁸ The ways in which Ulrikab wrote about his experiences in the zoos and churches of Europe suggest that even in the realm of double binds and fake authenticity, real feeling—as rational emotional restraint or pious outpourings of faith—remained a vital method of survival for those who were exhibited.

117 In addition to Raibmon, see Linda Scarangella McNenly, *Native Performers in Wild West Shows* (Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 2012); Lisa Blee, "I came voluntarily to work, sing and dance': Stories from the Eskimo Village at the 1909 Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition," *The Pacific Northwest Quarterly* 101, no. 3 (2010): 126–139, among others.

118 "Trapped in a Human Zoo."