

NUMBER 69

THE ARCHITECTURE AND SETTLEMENTS OF RUSSIAN AMERICA

by

Anatole Senkevitch, Jr.

Conference on Russian America

Sponsored by

Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, The Wilson Center  
and  
The American Historical Association



## EARLY ARCHITECTURE AND SETTLEMENTS OF RUSSIAN AMERICA<sup>1</sup>

Anatole Senkevitch, Jr.  
University of Maryland

The architecture of colonial America spanned more than two centuries of time and the entire continent of space. It reflected in each region and in each generation not only the different prevalent conditions of climate, building techniques, and social organization, but even more the diverse national traditions of the different peoples settling the new continent. These diverse traditions encompassed such well known episodes as the more subdued Dutch, German, and English Colonial styles of the Atlantic seaboard, the livelier French Colonial architecture of the Mississippi valley, and the exuberant Spanish Colonial architecture of Florida and the Southwest.

Another of these traditions, one which remains virtually unknown, is embodied in Russian Colonial architecture, which developed over a period of about eighty years, from the establishment of the first permanent Russian settlement in 1784 on Kodiak Island to the purchase of Alaska by the United States in 1867; the impact of colonial Russian architectural traditions, however, has been felt well into the present in those parts of Alaska where the activities of the Russian Orthodox Church and the use of the Russian language have continued. To be sure, an immense gulf of beliefs, customs, and architectural traditions separates Russian developments from the colonial styles in the other regions of America. Nevertheless, the architecture of Russian America represents a fascinating and important chapter in American, as well as Russian, architectural history.

It would be well to note at the outset that the architectural history of Russian America has yet to be written or even fundamentally examined.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, just as Vitus Bering, who sailed on his initial expedition in 1726 to

discover just what it was that lurked beyond the mysterious farthest reaches of Siberia, so this paper too must perforce operate from the uncertain vantage point of exploring as-yet uncharted waters. Under the circumstances, it will not attempt to assay the development of all the settlements known to have existed in Russian America; even the certain identification of them all has not yet fully been accomplished or resolved. Instead, this paper will seek to focus on those settlements, factors, and individuals which, on the basis of the evidence thus far uncovered, appear to have proven instrumental in setting in motion those circumstances that gave rise and substance to the building enterprise in Russian America. In view of its connection to developments in eastern Siberia, a brief effort will be made to shed some light on the building traditions there which proved coterminous with or otherwise provided a general frame of reference for the founding of the first Russian settlements in America. The paper will also attempt to assess the state and availability of the primary source material and to suggest further avenues for research needed to document and comprehend the building enterprise of Russian America.

As had proven the case more than a century before with the colonial experience along the Atlantic seaboard, the growth of that building tradition had crude beginnings. When the Russian promyshlenniki or fur hunters and traders first landed, they had neither the time nor the facilities to build substantial structures such as they knew in the mother country. As circumstances improved and the situation stabilized, there emerged a greater concern for building something more permanent than merely shelter for survival.

Russian occupation of northwestern America followed in the wake of the voyages of Vitus Bering and Aleksei I. Chirikov in 1741 to explore the "great land" to the east of Siberia. Until the chartering of the Russian-American Company in 1799, this occupation was spearheaded by numerous private Russian

fur-trading companies whose energetic hunting for the prolific Alaska sea otter and fur seal led them to explore the Commander, Kurile, Aleutian, and Pribilof Islands, together with the coast and islands of the Gulf of Alaska. The most enterprising of these, the rival Golikov-Shelikhov and Lebedev-Lastochkin companies, established the first permanent Russian settlements. It was those of the former company in particular that laid the foundation for the building of Russian America.

The early settlements were usually sited on top of promontories at the heads of bays or at the mouths of rivers along the insular coast and mainland. Such locations reflected the exigencies of maritime hunting and native hostility. While the settlements of St. Paul on Kodiak Island and later New Archangel, or Sitka, were destined to become the successive centers of Russian America and so were susceptible to somewhat more elaborate planning and architectural treatment, the vast majority of Russian settlements were predominantly trading posts. They contained the omnipresent Orthodox church or chapel and an array of utility buildings and dwellings for the Russian promyshlenniki and their wares, and for the natives of the region who were the mainstays of the actual hunting enterprise. The modest scope and austere environment of these settlements are vividly portrayed in a descriptive passage from the personal account of Lavrenti A. Zagoskin's travels in Russian America. Although ostensibly describing the setting he observed while traveling in 1842-44 through the interior of Alaska along the Yukon River, Zagoskin seems also to have provided a broader, more insightful glance into the structure and modus vivendi of most settlements in Russian America. He observes that

. . . a Russian person is everywhere alike. No matter where he chooses his place, whether it be in the Arctic Circle or in the glorious valleys of California, he everywhere sets down his national log cabin, cook-house, bath house, and provides himself with a housekeeper. However, service in the colony is entered into by

people who have not seen the world in style. Beyond that, they exist in a semi-martial situation, and this is why the place, enclosed by a remote stockade, is called a redoubt; the log cabin, a barrack; the batten window, a loop-hole; the detached cook-house, a mess. Even the housekeeper is called something else.<sup>3</sup>

The settlements in Russian America, as suggested by Zagoskin's insightful comments, were indeed built almost entirely of wood. In this manner, they perpetuated at once a building tradition and a veritable cultural metaphor which had long flourished in the mother country. Until the nineteenth century, not only the spectacular and familiar wooden churches, but also the countless tiny villages scattered throughout the countryside as well as entire towns and cities--including the greater part of Moscow--had been constructed predominantly of wood. The picturesque image of wooden churches rising majestically over a cluster of wooden houses enclosed by a network of wooden walls and towers, which had been conveyed over centuries by native iconographers and foreigners alike, is emblematic of the "wooden Russia" whose abundant forests supplied the ubiquitous material for farm and city, for house and church, for street paving and eating utensils.<sup>4</sup>

The ancient town of Tsaritsyn on the Volga (now Volgograd) captured in Adam Olearius' seventeenth-century view is the very epitome of the traditional Russian wooden built environment. Sander's engraving of Tobolsk indicates the transposition of this aspect to Siberia in the process of the latter's colonialization by Russia. As numerous graphic representations of Russian American settlements illustrate, this same system of building in wood was brought over to northwestern America by the promyshlenniki. While an obvious common denominator links building developments in Russian America to the more familiar wooden construction in European Russia, a more direct springboard for the former is to be found in the building traditions established in Sibe-

ria in general and eastern Siberia in particular.<sup>5</sup>

# I

As in Russia proper, so in Siberia, wood was from the outset the fundamental building material. Supplied in great abundance by the dense and varied forests that stretched over the vast territory, it was a vital and intimate part of the repertory of building methods and forms brought to Siberia by the early Russian settlers. Here too, not only churches and houses, but also public and utilitarian buildings as well as walls and other fortifications sprang up in wood. The wooden walls and bastions dating from 1683 which until modern times stood around the city of Yakutsk reveal the early predilections for building in wood. This preference had been duly recorded in the Siberian chronicle, which was accompanied by Semen Remezov's unique graphic representations of early designs of Russian wooden architecture in highly descriptive, albeit scale-distorted, plans of fortified Siberian settlements.<sup>6</sup> The chronicle likewise noted favorably the extreme speed with which wooden structures could be erected under the most adverse circumstances.

Indeed, the Russian method of log construction, revolving around a remarkably rapid assembly of the frame of logs laid horizontally on a rectangular or polygonal plan and secured at the corners through interlocking ends by either semi-circular or angular cuts, had been perfected by the sixteenth century, if not earlier. Successfully combining an ingenuity in woodworking with the simplest structural techniques, this virtually prefabricated method of building in wood permitted the development of expressive and elaborate building forms within the context of an underlying traditionalism that encouraged a repetition, over centuries, of familiar methods and shapes.

The harsh Siberian environment, which helped breed a strong and hardened folk capable of withstanding incredible tribulations, likewise gave rise to

a more sober and severe mode of expression in architecture, as in other realms of Siberian culture. Just as Siberian folklore tends to be less vivid and fantastic than that of the Upper Volga region, Siberian costumes and embroidery less exuberant than those of the Russian south and northeast, and Siberian folksongs more melancholy and less melodic than those of western Russia, so too the buildings erected by the Russian colonists in Siberia proved to be more austere than those found west of the Urals. This proved especially the case in eastern Siberia, where most of the fur trading settlements assumed a rather more utilitarian aspect and buildings evinced a more restrained manipulation of form and detail.

A number of villages and towns of log structures arose at various centers throughout this great fur empire. Tomsk, founded in 1604, was the chief town of the Ob Valley. Irkutsk, built in 1660 forty miles from Lake Baikal, emerged as the administrative and trading center of eastern Siberia. Yakutsk, established on the Lena in 1632, became the great metropolis of all eastern Siberia. However, it was with the Pacific port towns of Okhotsk and Petropavlovsk, among the most unprepossessing of the eastern Siberian fur trade settlements, that the most direct links were established with Russian America. They proved the point of departure--and Okhotsk, the chief staging center--for the countless fur hunting and trading expeditions that made their way to northwestern America. Okhotsk was the port of embarkation on the eastern shore of the Sea of Okhotsk for Kamchatka, and Petropavlovsk became the port of shipping from the eastern or Pacific shore of the Kamchatka Peninsula to the lands across the Pacific.

Okhotsk had been established in 1641 as an ostrog or small fortified settlement by early Cossack travelers.<sup>7</sup> Completion of the port in 1741, however, transformed the once minor outpost into a trading center that began to



attract merchants, seafarers, and fur hunters. Having pushed across Siberia in pursuit of sable, mink, and the otter, these arrivals were lured to Okhotsk by the growing Chinese market for furs and the related anticipation of discovering new hunting and trapping grounds on outlying Pacific islands for the valuable fur seal and sea otter pelts.<sup>8</sup>

By the end of the eighteenth century, Okhotsk had grown through a succession of building programs which added scores of houses, as well as administrative buildings, churches, stores, warehouses, and other buildings. A plan of 1798 suggests that it may have acquired a more regular layout,<sup>9</sup> featuring a large citadel in the center, with church and numerous other buildings, as well as an alignment of streets with houses and other structures on either side extending to the west. Yet, the engraving and accompanying description published by Martin Sauer, secretary of the Billings expedition to Siberia and northwestern America, indicate that, for all that, the appearance of Okhotsk in 1788 was not terribly impressive.

The city of Ochotsk is . . . chiefly composed of sand, shingles, and driftwood, the whole thrown up by the surf. . . . The town occupies the space of about 1 verst [.66 miles] in length, contains 132 miserable wooden houses; a church and belfry; several rotten storehouses; and a double row of shops, badly stocked. . . .<sup>10</sup>

Indeed, the fortress which looms so impressive in plan was, judging by Sauer's engraving, a meager gabion, or vertically spaced logs providing a primitive enclosure. While the church and belfry and other towered structures did enliven the town's panorama, there was an apparent unkemptness to the town. "The air is unwholesome in the extreme," Sauer also complained, as Grigori Shelikhov was later to do, "as fogs, mists, and chilling winds constantly prevail." He also complained about the instability and shallowness of the harbor, as well as about a violent surf whose spray sometimes "wets the houses of the town, and seems to threaten the destruction of the whole place."<sup>11</sup>

Petropavlovsk was established in 1741 by Bering as a harbor. Thereafter, it

flourished, and in 1813 became the administrative center of Kamchatka. Becoming the second most important port after Okhotsk on the Pacific, SS. Peter and Paul Harbor acquired numerous buildings and physical improvements. However, eyewitness accounts are virtually unanimous in suggesting that its condition and appearance at the time the first Russian settlements were being established in Alaska were, at best, unprepossessing. "Nothing is visible here," sea captain Ivan F. Kruzhenstern noted of the place in 1803, "that could at all persuade any one of its being inhabited by civilized people."<sup>13</sup>

Archibald Campbell, who docked at SS. Peter and Paul Harbor a while after Kruzhenstern on his own journey round the world, provided an analogous description:

The town, although the principal sea-port of the Peninsula of Kamschatka, is nothing more than a miserable village, containing 300 or 400 inhabitants, of whom about two-thirds are Russians and the remainder natives. It is situated on an eminence above the harbor, and, with the exception of the governor's house, consists of huts of one story high, built of logs and covered with thatch. In a few of them the windows are glazed with talc, but more generally the intestine of the seal supplied the place of glass.<sup>14</sup>

Kruzhenstern's lengthy diatribe on the appalling condition of the port town and of its houses does include a useful description of the building methods employed there, especially of the difficulties in obtaining an adequate supply of building materials--a problem that was to plague numerous coastal settlements in Russian America.

The construction of a house at St. Peter and St. Paul is very expensive, no timber fit for the purpose growing in the neighborhood of the town, and the people being obliged to bring it from the interior. When any public building is to be erected, thirty or forty soldiers are dispatched under the command of an officer, and are employed for several weeks, and at imminent risk, in floating the felled timber down the rapid rivers. In this manner the whole garrison of Kamtschatka has been occupied during two years in building some barracks for ten or twelve men, nor were they yet completed; and the church on which they have been several years employed is in the same predicament . . . .<sup>15</sup>

Thus, the inherent advantages of rapid assembly ordinarily afforded by log construction were all but negated in SS. Peter and Paul Habor, as they had been to some extent in Okhotsk and were surely to be in Three Saints Bay on Kodiak Island, by the unavailability of nearby forests to supply the needed quantities of the basic building material. Other more developed alternatives, such as building with brick, were not at hand in the absence of adequate provisions for making brick or of skilled masons to lay it. As a result, the early pioneering settlements in Siberia and Alaska lacking direct access to forest timber sometimes resorted--but only temporarily--to building methods and dwelling types developed by the native inhabitants. In Alaska, such sites tended to be abandoned fairly quickly for those having the necessary supply of timber for shipbuilding and construction.

## II

The initial phase in the establishment of permanent Russian settlements in what was to become Russian America was effectively launched by the ambitious and enlightened Siberian merchant Grigori I. Shelikhov. In the 1770s he and Ivan L. Golikov had joined forces to send out several fur-trading expeditions to the Kurile and Aleutian Islands. As they met with limited success, Shelikhov concluded that any hope of eventual success would require his own personal involvement in an expanded program of expeditions. Accordingly, enlisting Golikov and his brother Mikhail as investors, he established in 1781 the Northeastern American Company to operate for a period of ten years, rather than only for the duration of a single voyage, as had previously been customary. Shelikhov proposed "to establish villages and forts on the American coast and islands"<sup>16</sup> in order to save time and money by reducing the number and length of voyages while, at the same time, improving hunting conditions.

Three galiots, the Archangel Michael, the St. Simeon and St. Anna the Prophetess, and the Three Saints, which had been built with the investment capital, set sail from Okhotsk on August 16, 1783, under Shelikhov's command. After a difficult voyage during which the Archangel Michael disappeared--to turn up finally at Kodiak Island two years later after many mishaps--the two remaining ships landed on Kodiak Island on August 3, 1784.

Selecting a convenient harbor on the southwestern coast of the island, Shelikhov and his men proceeded to erect rough barracks, store houses, a crude temporary church, and other necessary shelter on the site, which he named Three Saints Harbor after the flag ship on which he and his wife had sailed.

In his published account of the Billings expedition, Martin Sauer included both a description and an engraving of Shelikhov's first settlement. The harbor itself, where Billings' ships had anchored in 1790,

. . . is on the south-west side of the Bay formed by a low spot of land running out from the side of one of the loftiest mountains; and, taking a circular sweep north and west, forms a harbour of about two miles in circumference . . . . Near the dwellings, is a fresh water brook issuing out of the mountain; and at the bottom of it are their cook-houses. . . .<sup>17</sup>

According to Sauer, the settlement itself numbered about fifty Russians, including the officers of the Company. In addition:

The buildings consist of five houses after the Russian fashion. Barracks laid out in different apartments, somewhat like boxes at a coffeehouse, on either side, with different offices: An office of appeal to settle disputes, levy fines, and punish offenders by a regular trial . . . . An office of receipt and delivery, both for the company and for tribute: The commissaries' department, for the distribution of the regulated portion of provision: Counting-house, etc.: all in this building, at one end of which is Delareff's habitation. Another building contains the hostages. Beside which, there are storehouses, warehouses, etc. rope-walk, smithy, carpenter's shop, and cooperage. . . . Several of the Russians have their wives with them, and keep gardens of cabbage and potatoes, four cows and twelve goats.<sup>18</sup>

The legend underneath Sauer's view of Three Saints Harbor notes the presence of a "travelling church," an "astronomical tent," and "galliot's haul'd ashore." His interesting description of the church, while perhaps conjuring up images of the first tent revival in Alaska, doubtless is a euphemism for the most primitive and temporary of structures, perhaps made of seal or otter skin and thus somewhat like a tent. Inclusion of the astronomical tent, on the other hand, probably was intended to affirm the expedition's conscientious efforts to fulfill one of its more conspicuous assignments--performing astronomical readings and observations.

Given Shelikhov's later concern, almost obsession, with establishing elaborate "places of permanent Russian habitation," it is highly unlikely that he ever intended this modest, indeed primitive, settlement to serve as anything more than a temporary base of operation. Soon after its completion, he turned his attention to exploring the rest of Kodiak Island as well as neighboring islands and the mainland coast. In 1796 he established the Fort of the Holy Three Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Divine, and John Chrysostom on Afognak Island; the Fort of St. Simeon the Friend of God and Anna the Prophetess on the Kenai (Cook) Inlet, and a small fortress on Cape St. Elias. The first two of these provide the first evidence of the impressive scope of planning Shelikhov was willing to undertake in pursuing his company's objective to found permanent settlements.

Departing shortly thereafter for Okhotsk in order to use his influence in Russia to advance the cause of obtaining for his company a monopoly of the Russian American fur trade, Shelikhov appointed K. A. Samoilov, formerly a Siberian fur merchant, as manager of his infant colony. In a memorandum to Samoilov, Shelikhov instructed that:

The harbors and fortresses laid out by me on Afognak Island and in the Kenai should be laid out as sturdily as possible, according to plan; every kind of comfortable and separate structure and fort; and a shed for the kayaks, and, beyond the fort-

ress, for the arriving Aleuts, a good and warm bath house with a partition, in which the natives and hostages can bathe; a shed for drying fish in inclement weather; good warm stalls of various kinds for goats; and a large hayloft for the hay, as I am going to send over some cattle from Okhotsk . . . . And for garden produce, a fenced in kitchen garden, for which my seed have been left behind, and more of which will be sent from Okhotsk.<sup>19</sup>

It is apparent from this specification that, even here, Shelikhov envisioned a good deal more than a conventional fortified post. He was concerned, as is generally known, with establishing agriculture as a mainstay of his settlements. At the same time, he also wished to create, even in a fort, a kind of durability that was involved with more than structure or defense.

There is no evidence to document that the plan for the two forts in question, dating from 1787, was prepared by Shelikhov himself, who at that time would probably have been in Irkutsk.<sup>20</sup> In a memorandum of November 30, 1787, to Catherine II recommending that the Golikov-Shelikhov Company be granted its request for a fur trade monopoly in Russian America and enclosing a copy of the plan for imperial review, Irkutsk Governor-General Ivan V. Yakoby was ambivalent on the point. He spoke, on the one hand, of "Shelikhov's construction plan and building notes" for the two forts,<sup>21</sup> while on the other hand suggesting later in the same memorandum that Shelikhov be provided the "engineering expertise of a knowledgeable person, so that the fortifications would be built according to the rules of site selection and principles of fortification."<sup>22</sup>

In any case, the plan for the Afognak and Kenai forts, elaborate geometrical schemes dating from the Italian Renaissance and subsequently elaborated in eighteenth-century Russia, called for an efficient but expressive scheme, one far more elaborate than those of any other Russian American posts. In that same memorandum to Catherine II, Yakoby described the fortresses too modestly as "nothing more than field fortifications with deep moats and elevated breastwork."<sup>23</sup> He went on to claim, probably paraphrasing Shelikhov's

report, that "the fortress on the American mainland [in the Kenai Inlet] can defend the entire American coast that extends northeastward to Cape St. Elias," while the one at Afognak "will have all the islands in the vicinity under its command, thereby discouraging other encroachments."

In the plan, the Afognak fortress, the larger of the two, is rendered as a distinctive rhomboid plan, each side measuring 560 feet in length. It is enclosed by a 14-foot high wall whose horizontal logs are held in place by regularly spaced timber posts. In the center of the fort stands a citadel of similar shape, each side measuring 210 feet. The hipped roof log structure contains barracks and a warehouse. An open yard separates the citadel on all sides from the exterior wall of the fort.

The Kenai fortress, though smaller and an equilateral triangle in plan, employs a similar structural and spatial system. Its outer walls are each 490 feet long, while each of the walls of the citadel in the center measures 140 feet in length. The corners of both forts are reinforced by small log bastions topped by a hip pyramidal roof.

The basic aspect of the both fortresses, indicated by the elevation shown for the one at Afognak, is a rather simple one. Still, it exudes a quiet elegance and dignity, conspicuously lacking at either Petropavlovsk or Okhotsk, that Shelikhov must obviously have wished to impart to his outposts. Its basic appearance, at the same time, invites comparison with the ancient wall of the Yakutsk ostrog, which employed a very similar method of building the fortification walls and towers; hence, the resulting similarity of form and appearance. Assuming Shelikhov's familiarity with this ancient east Siberian town, it is not unlikely that he should have considered adapting its most revered and, at the same time, proven fortification as a model.

Three Saints Harbor remained the Golikov-Shelikhov Company's chief settle-

lement until 1791, when Alexander A. Baranov, the new company manager whom Shelikhov had recruited at Okhotsk the year before to replace the ineffectual Evstrat Delarov, established St. Paul Harbor in Chiniak Bay, on the northeastern portion of Kodiak Island. Erecting a temporary fort on the site, Baranov named the outpost in honor of Catherine II's son Paul, heir to the throne.

Shelikhov had encouraged Baranov to move the company's principal settlement to a more advantageous site. The reasons lay partly in a desire to obtain a better harbor, but chiefly in the determination to find more arable land for developing an agricultural base and a greater abundance of timber needed to building ships and constructing more substantial buildings and fortifications.<sup>24</sup> St. Paul Harbor proved satisfactory on all three counts to Baranov and, with Shelikhov's concurrence, the headquarters were moved in 1792 to the new settlement, the present location of the town of Kodiak. It became one of the largest settlements in Russian America. Thereafter, Three Saints Harbor declined. To be sure, the first permanent church on Kodiak Island was built there in July 1796, doubtless the initial "travelling church" noted by Sauer six years before, and a school had been opened the month before, indicating that, as proved the case, the settlement would continue in use; these two buildings may have been designed by Father Yuvenali, one of the priests comprising the first Russian Orthodox Church mission to Alaska.<sup>25</sup> By 1880, however, Bancroft reports that "only one dilapidated log house and one native semi-subterranean hut marked the site of the earliest permanent location of the Russians."<sup>26</sup>

The first buildings erected by Baranov at St. Paul Harbor, shown in the unusually foreshortened view of 1798 rendered from the mountains behind the settlement, included a two-story administration building and a fur storage warehouse. These plain log wall structures, a typical Russian variant of a utilitarian wood structure, had steep plank gable roofs, hipped at the ends.



The only distinctive aspect was the lookout platform and octagonal watchtower perched over the entrance bay of the administration building. The horizontal bands of loopholes on both buildings underscore the fortifications aspect of the early structures here.

By 1795, the delightful Church of the Resurrection had been built close to these two buildings; Lisiansky referred to it as "the only one to be found on the coast."<sup>27</sup> It was comprised of a narthex with an octagonal belfry attached to the broader mass of the nave, surmounted by a substantial octagonal dome. The apse wall was trimmed as an octagonal form, a popular device in Russian wooden churches. This church, which regrettably burned to the ground in 1943 after surviving the great Katmai volcanic eruption of 1912, was not only the first but, judging from available materials, among the finest built in Russian America in any period. It is perhaps second only to the second St. Michael's in Sitka in its ability to fuse exterior form and a remarkably sophisticated interior space into an integrated whole. The is, moreover, a refinement of proportion and detail, albeit judged on the basis of later photographs,<sup>28</sup> that made its architectural significance fully the equal of its obvious historic importance. Rounding out the early noteworthy structures was the hospital built in 1796, the first in Russian America.<sup>29</sup>

In 1804, Captain Yuri F. Lisiansky and the crew from his sloop Neva helped erect a redoubt with a battery of cannons to the east of the fort proper, intended to guard the entrance to the harbor. Lisiansky's colored lithograph features his crew's handiwork, as well as shows several other buildings which had been added by that date. Among the most striking of these is the large circular building, topped by a clerestory drum with conical roof, which stands well to the left and back of Lisiansky's redoubt. According to Archibald Campbell, who anchored at St. Paul Harbor in 1808, this struc-

ture was a barrack for sixty Aleuts attached to the settlement.<sup>30</sup>

In his avid description of St. Paul Harbor, Georg von Langsdorff maintained that, by that time of his visit there, it had

. . . by degrees assumed the appearance of an European village; it contains about thirty dwelling-houses, a church, warehouses for merchandise, barracks, workshops for mechanical trades, etc. In the latter years a school has also been erected, and it certainly does honour to the Russo-American Company that they have made such a provision for instructing the rising generation . . . .<sup>31</sup>

For all its extravagance, Kruzhenstern's account sheds important light on the apparent role as designer and planner that appears to have been undertaken in this period by Ivan I. Banner, Deputy Commander of St. Paul Harbor.

According to Langsdorff

. . . M. Bander [sic] laid the plan of a new building to be begun the following spring [of 1809] for a library and permanent museum. At the same time he gave orders that in building this, and all other new houses, a certain regularity should be observed, so as to form a street; thus Kodiak may by degree vie in this respect with the best-built European town.<sup>32</sup>

The establishment of a museum and library was indeed a mark that St. Paul Harbor had rather emerged out of its early aspect of a fortified settlement to assume dimensions of a developing colonial town with cultural appurtenances. No other references have yet been found to support Langsdorff's identification of Banner as a designer or planner. In the latter respect, however, an 1808 plan of St. Paul Harbor drawn by Ivan F. Vasiliev, a navigator aboard Lisiansky's sloop Neva, seems to affirm at least that portion of Kruzhenstern's remarks referring to Banner's calling for a greater regularity of street and building layout.<sup>33</sup> While the plan does not reveal its author, it does reveal traces not only of an emerging sense of regularity, but also of the use of lot lines to regulate further building activity. This device, first introduced in St. Petersburg through architect Domenico Trezzini's project in 1714 for prototypical houses in the new capital was later applied on a broad scale in the campaign sponsored by Catherine II to develop new plans for all the

provisional and district capitals in the country.<sup>34</sup> The ostensible use of it suggested by this plan, if not merely a figment of Vasiliev's imagination, suggests either a passing acquaintance with Catherine II's planning program or perhaps a determined effort to emulate it in the nascent colonial capital. In any event, though still rather rudimentary, the planning activity discernable in St. Paul Harbor already seemed to be at least on a par with developments in Okhotsk and Petropavlovsk.

Lisiansky's assessment of St. Paul Harbor seemed more reserved than those of Kruzhenstern, perhaps due to the fact of having spent five winter months there. The place, he observed, was "small in extent, and with few civilized inhabitants," and for that reason, "could afford us little occupation or amusement" for the winter. Indeed, by all accounts, the winters in the less developed environment of early Russian America seemed particularly long, rainy, and dark. Life in the posts was dull and harsh.

Yet, clearly, St. Paul Harbor by this time was no longer merely an obscure post, having advanced well beyond that scope on every count. Campbell's description of the town, for example, suggests the extent of progress obtained in the realm of residential building alone, a telling barometer of the general level of urban amenities.

The town consists of about fifty houses, built of logs, the seams of which are calked with moss, and the roofs thatched with grass; they are, in general, divided into three apartments below, and as many on the upper story. They are heated by stoves or ovens; when the wood is reduced to ashes, the vent is closed by means of a slide fitted for the purpose, and the heated air then diffusing itself through the room, renders it extremely comfortable. The windows, instead of being glazed, are covered with pieces of the gut of the seal, split up and sewed together; this, after being well oiled, is stretched on a frame, and defended from the wind by cross-bars on each side. Talc is also used for the same purpose. This substance is found in flakes about the size of the palm of the hand, and several of these are puttied together to form a pane.<sup>35</sup>

With the transfer of Company headquarters to New Archangel in 1808, other administrative and service facilities followed suit, including the

Russian Orthodox mission, which moved in 1816. The resulting decline arrested the town's earlier accelerated growth.

A panoramic view of St. Paul Harbor drawn in 1842 by Ilya G. Voznesensky, who had been sent by the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg on an extended expedition to Russian America to collect specimens of various kinds, provides descriptive glimpses of some of the more significant buildings. To the right stands the same Church of the Resurrection, although the removal of the early administrative offices and warehouse now made it seem somewhat more remote. From it, stairs lead down to the bank table and a group of buildings overlooking the harbor. The two-story columned building housed a barrack for the fur trappers, the administrative offices, and officers quarters. Its striking aspect of long veranda below and long balcony above, with supporting posts running full height to the roof of the facade bears a certain resemblance to the so-called Spanish California houses that are to be found in such towns as Monterey, San Juan, and Sonoma--all in proximity to Fort Ross.<sup>36</sup>

Behind this building stands a rather more plain two-story structure containing store rooms and an array of workshops. Standing somewhat apart from these buildings, to the left, is the Company store, one of the earlier buildings at St. Paul Harbor, dating virtually from the inception of the settlement. Though in the background and thus not as prominently exposed to view, the building reveals traces of period stylishness, most notably the gabled rood and a central pedimented gable gracing the facade. Within the pediment is placed a large lunette, or semi-circular window which proved emblematic of the neoclassical style in Russian architecture. Similar treatment is found in the array of houses in Piedmont Virginia that emulated Thomas Jefferson's innate neoclassical mode, with its own appropriation of the characteristic Palladian lunette.

The building in question, i.e., the Company store, still stands, al-

though in radically altered fashion, as the Erskine House.<sup>37</sup> Purchased by the Alaska Commercial Company after Russia ceded Alaska to the United States, it was converted to a residence in 1911. It is now maintained by the Kodiak Historical Society, and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Perhaps the most significant and as yet unknown episode in the architectural history of Russian America is Shelikhov's enlightened but abortive efforts, thwarted by his death in 1795, to build a colonial capital fully worthy of the name Slavarossiya (Glory of Russia) that he wished to call it. The New Russia settlement built by Baranov in Yakutat Bay after Shelikhov's death is a pale shadow of the original conceived by the latter.

Shelikhov's determined campaign to petition the government for approval to set up a monopoly of the Russian American fur trade reflected his earnest desire to obtain a franchise similar to those enjoyed by the well established English Hudson's Bay and East India companies. Anticipating a favorable reaction, Shelikhov moved confidently in 1794, a year before his death, to create a more elaborate and stable base for Russian settlement than the existing Russian trading posts or even St. Paul Harbor could afford. He conceived of such a settlement as a fitting capital for his fledgling colony, one that would establish in practical and symbolic ways the enhanced status both of his own franchise and of the Russian presence in northwestern America. To express the enhancement of this status in the most conspicuous way, Shelikhov determined to create for his colonial capital a more substantial and refined built environment that had previously been achieved at St. Paul Harbor, much less at Pavlovsk or Okhotsk. This new administrative and residential center, he insisted in a letter to Baranov dated August 9, 1794, had to be

. . . laid out with as much taste and building amenities as possible, so that this settlement, from its inception, would pass for a town and not a village; so that, in the event of the arrival of a foreign vessel, id seeking deliverance from it were to prove impossible, it would be possible to boast that Russians live comfortably with

all the amenities, so that it could not be thought that Russians live as wretchedly in America as they do in Okhotsk, with its putrid air and lack of all the necessities.<sup>38</sup>

Although he did not live to see his dream fulfilled, and the subsequent settlement of New Russia on Yakutat Bay was attacked and burned in 1805 by the distrustful Yakutats who successfully barred white occupation there for nearly a century, Shelikhov nevertheless left behind an ambitious building program of impressive scope and vision. Like Peter the Great, who had proceeded against incalculable odds to establish his new imperial capital of St. Petersburg on the barren marshes of the Neva delta as a practical and symbolic demonstration of his desire to break medieval Moscow's archaic dominance of Russia by opening up this new "window to the West" and bringing his new empire into the orbit of European affairs, so too Shelikhov was driven, despite overwhelming hazards and impediments, by a similar dream writ large. Although Shelikhov obviously was not a sovereign, the analogy does not appear invidious. His grand design for the colonial capital, though far more modest in scale than was the one for St. Petersburg, may likewise be seen as having sought, in its own way, to open up something like a "window to the east." It appears, moreover, to have been inspired by two fundamental considerations which bear further upon the analogy: surpassing what were perceived to be the retardataire situation of Russian fur trading centers in northwestern America and eastern Siberia alike, and making the fledgling Russian colony's presence in the north Pacific waters felt in a more forceful and impressive manner in order to improve its ability to deal on an equal basis with the other European colonial powers seeking to operate in the area.

Shelikhov had for some time considered establishing a "permanent Russian place of residence" on the mainland coast in the vicinity of Cape St. Elias. Given its more moderate climate and abundance of fertile soil and good forests,

he believed that this area afforded more favorable circumstances than either Kodiak or nearby islands for supplementing the rudimentary existence of a fur-trading post--diversifying it, really--with the farming, cattle-raising, and ship-building activities essential for sustaining a more permanent form of settlement.<sup>39</sup> At the same time, there were other strategic and tactical reasons for preferring a mainland site here over one on an island. The latter, Shelikhov explained in a letter to Baranov, "can be approached by foreigners from whom, in times of need, refuge can more conveniently be sought on the mainland." In addition, "for political reasons that are familiar to you," by which he was alluding to the need to discourage the growing foreign incursions into fur-hunting territory both staked out and coveted by the Golikov-Shelikhov Company, "it is necessary to exert a greater effort to settle the mainland rather than the islands."<sup>40</sup>

Accordingly, Shelikhov instructed Baranov to select the most suitable of the sites available beyond Cape St. Elias on which to establish the proposed new colonial center. After responding that only the area from Yakutat Bay south was suitable for the kind of settlement Shelikhov had in mind, Baranov selected a site on the Phipps Peninsula, on the south side of the entrance to Yakutat Bay about four miles west of the present village of Yakutat. Because of numerous abortive attempts to send colonists and begin construction failed in 1795, actual work on the site did not commence until the summer of the following year. In the meantime, however, Shelikhov had died in Irkutsk on July 20, 1795, leaving Baranov to fulfill his dream of establishing a worthy colonial capital, but not without an extraordinary, detailed instructions for the purpose. The fulfillment of Shelikhov's dream at Yakutat Bay was thwarted both by Baranov's establishment of a far less imposing settlement which he named "New Russia," in lieu of Shelikhov's more lofty and ten-

dentious appellation of "Glory of Russia," as well as, ultimately, by the brutal attack of the Yakutats which sealed the fate of the young settlement. Baranov's establishment of New Archangel in 1804 near the site of the recently destroyed Fort St. Michael may be seen, partially at least, as an attempt to continue the line of development suggested by Shelikhov. Here too, however, the end results obtained during Baranov's administration, though impressive in so many other ways, were to fall short of Shelikhov's bold conception of a colonial capital.

Shelikhov's unwavering confidence in Baranov's keen administrative capabilities, which proved well-founded, the Hawaii experience aside, in matters affecting the efficient management of fur hunting and trade, apparently did not extend to planning and architectural matters. While Baranov had built the early simple structures at St. Paul Harbor, available evidence suggests that others assumed responsibility for directing subsequent planning and building activity, as has already been discussed above. The most persuasive evidence of Shelikhov's strong disinclination to have Baranov assume any direct responsibility for inspiring or directing the actual building of the settlement comes from his detailed instructions for laying out and constructing his "permanent place of Russian habitation." The extent of their detail and especially their repeated admonitions that Baranov defer to other specified individuals in all matters relating to planning and design belie Shelikhov's transparent profession of faith that his manager's "efficiency, skill, zeal, and sensibility" will enable him to be "the first to establish a comfortable, well-built habitation in a land lacking such since the dawn of the world."<sup>41</sup>

The most vivid and overt of several such instances of admonition occurs, not surprisingly, in the portion devoted to the problem of laying out the town proper, an adjoining fort also having been intended by Shelikhov. Having al-



ready advised Baranov that he was sending out one "Ivan Grigor'evich Mr. Polomoshnoi" for the purpose of directing all facets of the project and later remaining to become the permanent manager of the new settlement "as you will have to become involved with much else," Shelikhov felt compelled

. . . to ask that, in laying out the streets and houses, you follow in all respects the directions of His Excellency, having prepared plans in advance for all the necessary buildings and availing yourself in the process of the counsel and opinion of the Holy Archimandrite and Fathers Yuvenali and Stefan, who in that respect will be like tutors for you, as they are people engaged in geodetics and architecture.<sup>42</sup>

Apart from the apparent slighting of Baranov, another point of interest in this context is the identification of named individuals who might have actually engaged in some design work. Reference has already been made to Father Juvenaly's possible design of the school and church erected in Three Saints Harbor in 1796.<sup>43</sup> The archimandrite to whom Shelikhov refers is Archimandrite Iosaf who, in a decree issued by Catherine II on June 30, 1793, ordering a Russian Orthodox mission to be sent to the colony, was named head of the mission. The latter was composed of seven priests, including Hiermonk Yuvenali and Archdeacon Stepan.<sup>44</sup> The clerics' apparent role as architectural consultants had likewise been sited in Shelikhov's instructions concerning the the fort to be attached to the new settlement. In selecting the actual site on which to build the fort, Baranov was instructed to

. . . invite Hiermonk Yuvenali and Hierdeacon Stefan, as they evidently were employed in mining factories when they were in secular life and thus are knowledgeable in science and mathematics; they even promised me here to help you in this matter.<sup>45</sup>

Later in the letter, Shelikhov described the church to be erected in the new settlement. "Its plan, evolved in Irkutsk, has been entrusted by me to the Holy Archimandrite," he wrote Baranov, "and the plan can be reduced or enlarged, depending on the circumstance."<sup>46</sup> Regretably, the letter sheds no light on the individual or circumstances responsible for the "evolution" of the church plan, or design.<sup>47</sup>

Shelikhov's instructions illuminate his concern not only for building a "comfortable, well-built habitation," but also for imbuing the new settlement with an architectural character befitting an emerging colonial capital.

In plan and in actuality create squares for public gatherings and streets, though not very long ones, as they can be extended from the squares in several rows--but make them wide. And, if you settle in the most forested site, then, clearing the site according to plan, leave unfelled those trees which, for the sake of beauty and air, would be suitable along the streets, in front of the actual houses, and in the kitchen-gardens. Orient houses longitudinally along the streets in such a way that there would be great distance from one house to another--you would thereby increase the size of the settlement--and, in addition, have roofs of equal height and in all other respects identical. See that the kitchen gardens be the same for each house and that they be enclosed by good fences along the street. For public buildings, such as churches and monasteries, an office for the ecclesiastical administration of the Archimandrite, stores, a guardhouse for the office and shops were the village elders [starostas] and clerks will keep the Company and domestic goods, select proper sites and arrange them according to the style of fine cities, distinguishing these buildings as much as possible from the others.<sup>48</sup>

Reference to constructing public buildings "in the style of fine cities" seems to provide unmistakable evidence supporting the likelihood that Shelikhov envisioned far more than merely an agricultural community, as has sometimes been supposed by scholars examining Shelikhov's undertakings at Yakutat Bay and elsewhere from other standpoints.<sup>49</sup> This memorandum, like the other missive which he also produced for Baranov on the same day, provides strong evidence of Shelikhov's far-sightedness, energy, ambition, and architectural and planning sensibilities.

Shelikhov did not live to see either the construction of his cherished Slavorossiia (Glory of Russia), as he wished to call his colonial capital, or the establishment by Baranov of its abortive nucleus in Yakutat Bay. Nor did he live to see the formation on July 8, 1799, of the Russian-American Company, for which he had paved the way. Modeled on the East India and Hudson's Bay companies, the Russian-American Company was empowered by its charter to

monopolize Russian settlement, exploitation, and trade in America. With this move, Russian America acquired more capital and more prestige.

At the time that the Russian-American Company was coming into existence, Baranov was preparing to carry out a project he had been contemplating for some time. This was the establishment of a new Russian settlement on Sitka (Baranof) Island. Evidently having cooled--prophetically, it would appear--to the idea of establishing a "Slavorossiya" in the marginally hospitable area of Yakutat Bay, Baranov was drawn to the prospect of establishing a settlement in a region that afforded an ice-free port the year round and a chance to circumvent American, British, and Spanish penetration of southeastern Alaska by settling an area that had long been a rendezvous for traders. Not least, hunting parties he had sent there after first visiting the area himself in 1795 had brought back large bounties of valuable sea otter pelts. Thus, in 1799, Baranov decided to build a new post there.

Vasili Medvednikov, who had been dispatched ahead to select a site, had picked a spot about six miles north of the present town of Sitka. Although Baranov would have preferred the location where Sitka now stands, its occupation by a Tlinglit village forced him to accede to the one chosen by Medvednikov. Work commenced in the winter of 1799-1800 and, by the spring, the new post built entirely of wood, named St. Michael, was almost completed. It contained a large two-story warehouse, a blacksmith shop, barracks for the officers, a house for Baranov, a bath house, and a temporary kitchen.<sup>49</sup>

In a letter to the Company describing the building of the new post, Baranov conveyed the extremely primitive conditions which prevailed, focusing upon the harsh frontier environment in which this and other enterprises were called upon to function. At first, he wrote,

. . . we erected a large shed, into which we unloaded all the materials from the ships and in which we stored the prepared food. Then we built a modest bath house, into which I moved in October, having had to exist until then in a torn tent open

to the elements; during the winter I suffered from the smoke and the dampness from the leaks in the rotten roof, and the interminable bad weather until February. Next, we built a two-story barrack building with two watch towers at the corners. The building was eight sazhen [56 feet] long and four [28 feet] wide, with a cellar for storing supplies. . . . All this was completed with a very small working force, because we were only 30 in all, of whom 20 were occupied in construction, while ten were used as guards.<sup>50</sup>

In June 1802, when Baranov was on Kodiak Island, a band of Tlingit Indians mounted a surprise attack on Fort St. Michael and massacred all but a handful of the Russian and Aleut inhabitants. The fort was set on fire, and only a few buildings were left, "which had either escaped the ravages of the flames, or which probably the savages had not thought it worth while to destroy to the foundation."<sup>51</sup>

After struggling for some time to round up adequate supplies and men for the purpose, Baranov launched an expedition in the summer of 1804 to recover Sitka from the Tlingits. At Norton Sound, he was joined by the Russian warship Neva under the command of Captain Yuri Lisiansky. The Neva's guns helped assure the eventual surrender of the fort, although Lisiansky later observed that the fort "was constructed of wood so thick and strong that the shot from my guns could not penetrate it at the short distance of a cable's length"<sup>52</sup> After a siege lasting four days, the Indians took advantage of nightfall to flee, leaving the site to the Russians. The Tlingit fort was demolished, and work on construction of a new Russian fort on the site was begun immediately, with the assistance of Lisiansky's crew. This new fort, which proved the nucleus of the new center for the Russian American colony, received the name of Novoarkhangelst, or New Archangel, to underscore its lineage from the original fort.

Lisiansky returned to New Archangel less than a year later. Describing the sight, he professed surprise

. . . to see how much the new settlement was improved. By the

active superintendence of Mr. Baranov, eight very fine buildings were finished, and ground enough in a state of cultivation for fifteen kitchen-gardens. His live stock also made no dispicable appearance.<sup>53</sup>

Lisiansky's rather distorted color lithograph appears to have romanticized, probably like his description, the reality of the situation. Both his remarks and his lithograph, in other words, appear consiously to have aimed at casting the best possibly light on both the building of the fort and of Baranov's role of supervision. His view of the fort both diminishes the height of the rocky promontory on which it was located and greatly increases the size of the fortification itself.

A more sober portrayal of the scene came from the lithograph and commentary of Georg von Langsdorff, who followed Lisiansky into New Archangel. "The settlement of New Archangel," he wrote, "was at our arrival quite in its infancy."

Under such circumstances, nothing like the conveniences of life could be expected: the habitations were for the greater part unfinished, and consisted of small chambers without stoves, with so thin a thatch, that the rains, which we had continually, often came through. The Promüschleniks were kept constantly hard at work upon the barracks, warehouses, and other buildings, which were so exceedingly wanted.<sup>54</sup>

Indeed, the fort depicted here is far less imposing and more spare than the one served up in Lisiansky's engraving, suggesting that it might well have been no more advanced, and perhaps even less developed, than its immediate predecessor just up the coast. Not least, the promontory here looms much more realistically to scale. Apart from the very modest structures, the fort is also shown to be surrounded by a modest gabion, or vertically spaced logs, which are barely adequate for defense.

The description of the fort which seems most closely to correspond to the image conveyed in Langsdorff's view is the one supplied by Nikolai I. Korobitsyn, a clerk with the Russian-American Company who sailed into New

Archangel aboard Lisiansky's ship Neva.

The New Archangel fort is situated on a high promontory which, projecting out from the coastline into the sea, presents a pleasant view; and, considering its situation, is fairly safe from any kind of foes. Its fortification consists, because the settlement is new, of a gabion around the entire fort, interspersed with twenty cannons . . . . Inside the fort is the Manager' [Governor's] residence with his office and kitchen . . . [and] a house, consisting of four rooms, for the officers and ship captain of the Company's maritime fleet. In the middle of the fort is a square, measuring 20 sazhen [140 feet] long and 10 sazhen [70 feet] wide. In the center of the latter stands a flagstaff on which the Company flag is hoisted on festive and ceremonial days, as well as upon the entry of vessels into the harbor . . . .<sup>55</sup>

The above description is supplemented in a few helpful instances by the one rendered by Nikolai P. Rezanov in his report to the Company. Shelikhov's son-in-law and High Chamberlain to the Emperor, Rezanov had traveled to New Archangel and the colony in 1805 as a special emissary of the Company, to survey and assess the latter's operations. His description of those facilities situated outside the fort provides a more vivid picture of their interrelationship in experiential space than does the mere enumeration of them by Korobitsyn.<sup>56</sup>

The fort stands on a high hill, or kekur, on a peninsula in the gulf. On the left side of the kekur close to the peninsula is built an immense barrack with two projecting block-houses or towers. The entire building is made from mast timber, from the top down to the foundation, under which there is a cellar. Beside this building are two warehouses, a storeroom for provisions with two cellars, also two large sheds for storing food; under the sheds are quarters for the workmen. On the side opposite the fort is a shed for storing cargo, on the right side is the kitchen, bath house, and quarters for the servants of the Company: clerks, etc., and along the shore are the blacksmith shops and other [locksmith and cooper] workshops.<sup>57</sup>

In the next several years, the gabion around the fort was replaced by a more substantial fortified wall. Peter Corney, a British seaman who was in Sitka in 1814, indicated the scope of the improvement in fortification. Observing that the fort was "well calculated to defend them [the Russians] from Indians" but otherwise incapable of withstanding an attack by a "good

ship, which would soon destroy it," he noted that the fort

. . . is enclosed by a high paling, and look-out houses built at the distance of twenty yards from each other, where there are people on watch, both day and night . . . . The have also block-houses, and . . . a look-out house on the top of the fort, where a man is continually kept with a spy-glass in his hand . . . .<sup>58</sup>

According to Corney, the town also had about 60 wooden houses, a church, a shipyard and other miscellaneous structures. He also noted, parenthetically: "Finding our boarding defenses [on the ship] of no use, we sold them to the governor, who had them fixed round his house."<sup>59</sup>

When Baranov was relieved of his position as chief manager of the Company in 1818, he left behind an impressive record of accomplishments. The Russian possessions in northwestern America had attained their widest extent under his direction, stretching out to Fort Ross in California as well as to the Pribilof and Kurile Islands. Numerous outposts, churches, schools, and ships had been built under his management. And yet, the architectural legacy which Baranov bequeathed to his successors, embodied in his new settlement of New Archangel, was that of a rough frontier building tradition whose essential improvements over the period of his term in office tended to be far more quantitative than qualitative in nature.

The reasons for this apparent state of affairs are difficult to ascertain as yet with any degree of precision. Descriptive evidence thus far uncovered seems strongly to suggest that Baranov simply had little proclivity for this type of undertaking, tending evidently to regard the act of building merely as an expedient to obtain needed shelter and facilities --which historically has been the modus operandi of most frontier situations-- rather than as an opportunity to embody a programmatic concept. Nor does he appear to have been particularly endowed with keen aesthetic sensibilities, although he evidently was a devotee of Russian literature. Perhaps the gist of the problem lies in a fundamental trait that Baranov's biographer Kiril

Khlebnikov discerned in his personality when he described him, almost in passing, as a man who

. . . had no love of fashion, and preferred the uniform he had worn when promoted (1805) to anything new, regardless of the fact that, in fourteen years, fashions had made it outmoded.<sup>60</sup>

The obvious parallel suggested here between fashion in apparel and fashion in architecture seems both apt and fair, and Shelikhov may well have sensed the trait when he sought earnestly to divest Baranov of all primary responsibility for siting, laying out, and building his abortive colonial capital of Slavorossiia.

There is, in fairness, perhaps yet another cause which, while attributable to Baranov, appears as well to have been fundamental to a far broader range of circumstances that gave rise and substance to the built environment in Baranov's time. That probable cause springs from the fact that almost everything about Russian America, certainly in his day, appears to have been a "company" enterprise, with everything the term implies. In his reflections on the last days in Sitka before the official transfer of Alaska to the United States on May 3, 1867, M. I. Vavilov observed that, by that time, "The center of the Russian colony in America was then regarded to be New Archangel, from which Russian 'civilization' had spread out over the vast expanse beyond the Bering Strait to the north and the shores of eastern Siberia to the east."<sup>61</sup> Seeking to put that claim into larger perspective, however, Vavilov suggested that the civilization peculiar to the Russian colonies was just a shadow of that to be found in the other colonies established in northwestern America:

In 1799, when New Archangel was founded, there was as yet no state of California, with its wonderful city of San Francisco that now reigns supreme over the shores of the Pacific Ocean. After the passage of seventy years, New Archangel in the spring of 1867 still represented a rather sorry settlement of a few Russians and Creoles, where all facets of life were circumscribed by the singular interests of the fur-trading Russian-American Company. The majority of residents, with the exception of a few dozen employees, were illiterate. The extremely boring way of life caused the rise of an almost universal alcoholism, the resources for which



arrived yearly on the trans-world vessels in the form of enormous barrels of alcoholic spirits with the stamp "R.A.K.," which signified the Russian American Company.<sup>62</sup>

Commenting on his visit to the town in 1841, Sir George Simpson had felt similarly disposed to observe--perhaps not entirely without ulterior motives, given that he was also governor of the Hudson's Bay Company--that "of all the drunken as well as of all the dirty places that I had visited, New Archangel was the worst."<sup>63</sup> More to the point was his description of the town's physical appearance some forty-two years after its founding by Baranov.

Of all the dirty and wretched places that I have ever seen, Sitka is pre-eminently the most wretched and most dirty. The common houses are nothing but wooden hovels, huddled together, without order or design, in nasty alleys. the hotbeds of such odors as are themselves sufficient, independently of any other cause, to breed all sorts of fevers. In a word, while the inhabitants do all they can to poison the atmosphere, the place itself appears to have been planned for the express purpose of checking ventilation. But Governor Etholine, whose whole management does him infinite credit, sees the evil, and is introducing many improvements which, when completed, will materially promote the comfort and welfare of the lower classes.<sup>64</sup>

Lest the contemplation of Simpson's remarks leads to incurable depression, it should be pointed out that he also availed himself of the opportunity to observe, doubtless basking in the glow of the warm reception he had been accorded by Etholin:

New Archangel, notwithstanding its isolated position, is a very gay place--much of the time of its inhabitants is devoted to festivity; dinners and balls run a perpetual round, and are managed in a style which, in this part of the world, may be deemed extravagant.<sup>65</sup>

This last observation suggests that social life in Sitka during Etholin's and later governors' administrations--but quite unlike the situation during Baranov's term in office--echoed the polarity between gentry and popular culture which epitomized Russian life in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Apart from that, however, three general points seem noteworthy about the essential thrust of Simpson's remarks. The first of these is his casting

aspersions upon, in effect, the town as a whole for what he saw as a conspicuous lack of planning, or a lack of "order and design." This aspect would seem to be fairly attributable to Baranov, for reasons that have already been discussed. The second point is Simpson's alluding to the apparent severity of the maintenance problem that he saw plaguing the town. Here, parenthetically, Baranov's own description of the conditions prevalent in Fort St. Michael may perhaps take on added meaning. The third and final point is Simpson's referring to Etholin's concern for the general situation and his apparent intention to take effective measures to improve it. Here, of course, one can no longer draw Baranov into the picture.

During Etholin's time as chief manager and governor (the two positions were synonymous), many improvements indeed were made in New Archangel and the colony. A man of culture and a member of an old Swedish-Finnish family, Etholen had also brought his new bride Margaretha with him, and together they served to bolster the social life of the town as well.<sup>66</sup>

At issue here, however, is the real likelihood that the assumption of responsibility for implementing basic as well as more developed measures for improvement, such as good planning and design, appear to have been the product of an individual governor's predisposition toward such concerns and not of any established Company policy or program to that effect. Too, it must be said that, apart from the numerically small upper level of society, the predominant breed of promyshlennik whose raucous way of life set the time for the town's and indeed the colony's ambiance as a whole might well have provided little incentive for seeking anything but the most expedient improvements. According to Andrews, the "employees of the Russian American Company were a varied, turbulent group of men recruited from the political exiles, bankrupts, convicts, and adventurers that formed the population of eastern Siberia."<sup>67</sup>

The picture which thus emerges seems to bear out Vavilov's contention

that the ills which plagued the social and cultural--and, by extension, built--environments of New Archangel had stemmed fundamentally from the Company's almost obsessive preoccupation with fur trading as the great and all-absorbing pursuit. Here, in contrast, Shelikhov's efforts, however flawed, to seek simultaneously to enhance other fundamental aspects of colonial life as well provides further proof of his enlightened far-sightedness. As it was, New Archangel, during Baranov's term in office, does not appear ever to have gone beyond the aspect of a Western frontier "boom" town.

After Baranov, the Company selected naval officers as chief managers or governors of the colony. A number of them proved men of some culture and enlightenment. It was in their terms in office that the most significant improvements were made in the life and built-environment of the colony in general and New Archangel in particular. After examining the U.S. Record of Public Buildings some years ago, Andrews calculated that most of the buildings transferred to the United States in 1867 were constructed between 1835 and 1850, or the period roughly encompassing these men's terms in office.<sup>68</sup>

When Leontii Hagemeister assumed management of the Company in 1818, he found that many of the buildings were decaying, and proceeded to make extensive improvements and to erect some new buildings, including one of the later octagonal towers for the old fort. Semen I. Yakonkovsky added another of these towers as well as a wharf with a dock and a windmill. Matvei Muraviev, in 1821-26, built the second governor's house in the upper fort, which subsequently came popularly but erroneously to be known as "Baranof's Castle." He also added a third octagonal tower to the fort, and built a battery of eight guns and numerous other buildings.<sup>69</sup> Under Mikhail Tiebenkov, foundations were laid in 1847 for the new Cathedral of the Holy Archangel Michael, although its construction had evidently been ordered as early as 1830 by

Baron Wrangel.<sup>70</sup> The Cathedral was consecrated by Bishop Innokenti on May 18, 1850. The original St. Michael's on the waterfront had deteriorated badly and was torn down. The Church of the Holy Trinity for the Tlingits was begun in 1846 inside the Indian Village, and was consecrated on April 24, 1848. Under the Lutheran Etholin, a Lutheran chapel, the first non-Orthodox church in Alaska, was built by a young Lutheran pastor, Uno Cygnaeus, who sailed to Sitka aboard the same ship as the governor and his wife.<sup>71</sup>

The exquisite lithographs included in the historical atlas accompanying Fedor P. Lütke's Voyage autour le monde provide the first descriptive views of the early post-Baranov period.<sup>72</sup> Three views in particular, rendered in 1827, provide invaluable graphic evidence concerning key structures of the period and the larger built environment as a whole.

The first of these views is of the fort itself, perched on top of the Sitka kekur. The governor's house within it is still the rather plain izba, probably still the one which Baranov had erected, but with minor embellishments. What strikes the eye here, apart from the impeccable draftsmanship and sense of dramatic composition, are the two front corner towers. These two-story octagonal hewn-log structures with eight cannons each are doubtless the ones built during the administrations of Hagemeister and Yankovsky. The one on the right, with roofed over look-out platform, again recalls its much larger counterparts and likely progenitors in the ancient Yakutsk ostrog. Its basic aspect is virtually identical, moreover, to the one of the octagonal tower which survived into modern times. The tower on the left is similar, but appears more stark or plain by virtue of having an open platform with exposed stairwell core.

Despite its still evoking the essential character of a frontier outpost, the looming presence of the now-more-substantial fort, poised dramatically

atop the jagged kekur, must, as this view by the artist Baron von Kittlitz clearly suggests, have presented a strangely alluring aspect, its silhouette framed against the the broad mountainous backdrop. It was an aspect that, whether by instinct or design, made the post-Baranov New Archangel a rather spectacular and unique Russian-American environmental landmark, one whose expressive image as well as impact encompassed the entire visual context in which it was situated. In this respect, it may have been approached, but surely not equalled, by the redoubt which Lisiansky and his men had helped build in St. Paul Harbor.

This haunting dichotomy of primitive structure and powerfully expressive silhouette, so typically and uniquely Russian in its innate feel for the aesthetic lay of the land, permeates Kittlitz' lithograph of the fortress. A dramatic composition recalling something of the French eighteenth-century architectural and landscape painter Hubert Robert's power to achieve dramatic, hauntingly evocative effects through the carefully orchestrated play of sunlight on selected elements looming in his pictorial space, this view ultimately conveys

. . . environs qui sont extrêmement pittoresques, composés de hautes montagnes sortant de la mer et couvertes de magnifiques forêts d'arbres conifères. Au milieu de ce tableau majestueux et sauvage, la citadelle présente un aspect très-riant.<sup>73</sup>

Captain Vasili M. Golovin, who had arrived in New Archangel aboard the Russian man-of-war Diana in 1810, had similarly been impressed with this imposing aspect.

The fort stands on a high rocky hill beside the harbor, and, judging from the purpose of its construction, it is the Company's Gibraltar, for, standing on a lofty site and enclosed by a thick palisade with wooden towers serving as bastions and supplied with dozens of cannons of various kinds and calibers and an adequate number of small arms and munitions, it is quite awesome and impenetrable to the local savages. But it is not fortress to a European power or even to the power of a single frigate.<sup>74</sup>

Two other lithographs included in Lütke's atlas provide invaluable clues to early Sitka, depicting both building and early setting that gradually made way for later development. The first of these is Kittlitz' view, taken from the vantage point of the fort and governor's house above, of the town proper. Two aspects are especially noteworthy here. The first is that of a descriptive glimpse of New Archangel's emerging urban environment. The lithograph shows a road, described as passing for the town's only thoroughfare, running more or less along the line of the present Lincoln Street; the bridge spans a stream which runs approximately where Marine Street is today. All but one of the structures lining the road on both sides are the ubiquitous izbas, with characteristic log walls and steep, hipped plank roofs that predominated, as Zagoskin so aptly put it, everywhere that Russians chose to settle.

The second aspect that of particular interest in this view, however, is that of what may be the only fairly detailed view of the first Church of St. Michael, built about 1817. The church may have been designed by Father Aleksei Sokolov, who arrived in Sitka just prior to its construction. Its altar, according to Bancroft, was "built of timbers cast ashore after the wreck of the Neva."<sup>75</sup> Judging from this drawing, the first St. Michael's, named after the first Russian fort at Sitka, is surely one of the most remarkable small churches to be found in any Russian setting. Employing the basic format of the traditional octagonal tent-church so popular in Russian wooden churches, this small but elegant structure commands the bold geometry of tiered octagonal forms with authority, recalling the vigorously geometrical facet of the neoclassical architecture that flourished in Russia during Catherine II's reign. The effects of the underlying geometry of form are, in this Sitka "Tempietto," everywhere underscored: the simple octagonal blockwork of the base, framed by interlocking logs; the smaller octagonal dome, its walls

now clapboarded and their intersecting corners marked by corner boards that meet the cornice beneath the moderately projecting eaves of the tent roof, whose ridges likewise are articulated by ribs that terminate in a suave spirelet. The walls of the lantern-like dome are punctuated by handsomely proportioned round windows which at once evoke an aspect of neoclassical geometry and of the more immediate nautical aspect of a porthole. Far less comprehensible from this view alone are the eight intriguing gabled ridges that spring from the sloping roof of the octagonal base. The modern eye might be tempted to suspect some sort of skylighting, but, of course, that could hardly be the actual case. Whatever their function, these elements do much to enliven an already vibrant silhouette. This church, if its rendering in this lithograph presents anything like an accurate image, must be judged as being one of the great architectural landmarks of Russian America. Kittlitz described its interiors as being richly decorated. According to Bancroft, its liturgical vessels were all of silver fashioned by colonial craftsmen, and the bestments and draperies were of Chinese silk.<sup>76</sup>

The third Kittlitz lithograph of Sitka in Lütke's atlas is a view of Sitka Bay, also from the governor's house. Apart, again, from the dramatic rendering of the setting, the building at the bottom of the view, one of the fur warehouses most likely built during Muraviev's administration (1821-26), is likewise noteworthy. It presents a charming, classic image of Russian provincial neoclassical architecture in wood. It is almost as ubiquitous a phenomenon in the Russian provinces as are the provincial wooden variants of the Greek Revival mansion popularized throughout the settled and expanding portions of America by the books of Benjamin and Lafever. No evidence has yet surfaced to suggest that comparable guidebooks existed in Russian America for the design of warehouses and other service buildings, although it would not be im-

plausible to imagine that such sources as St. Petersburg architect Vasili Stasov's prototypical designs for quartermasters' stores, which were adapted far and wide in Russia, might have inspired a comparable standardization of design and building in New Archangel.

The warehouse in question is a long two-story building with the classic five-part facade. The pedimented gables of the central and end pavilions are supported by two colossal columns, an aspect similar to one that Stasov manipulated in numerous of his buildings. Moreover, in each gable, we encounter the same ubiquitous lunette seen earlier in the Company store at St. Paul Harbor, the probable embryo of today's Erskine House. Another aspect seen earlier at St. Paul Harbor though in a rather less classic aspect, is superposition of continuous veranda and balcony, obtained by the exterior colonnade. Here, of course, these elements serve a decidedly more utilitarian purpose of loading dock and circulation space. Nevertheless, their integration into the overall design is rather more successful here. Although the structural system employed in this building was undoubtedly that of traditional log construction, as suggested by the initial phase in the assembly of a building to the right in the present view, the exterior facade or envelope of the building is largely clapboarded, as indicated by the gables that are prominently detailed and in view. The move, in less vernacular and by extension more urbanized wooden Russian architecture, away from exposed log to clapboarded walls tended to be a sure sign of the approaching classicizing of the structure. The application of such details as gable lunettes and, in more developed examples, selected elements from the classical orders or the latter in their entirety was used to manifest the emerging neoclassical sensibilities.

It thus becomes possible to sense that the influence of Russian neoclassical architecture was evidently fairly strong in Russian America during the



period in question. That this influence continued to flourish is apparent from the drawing of New Archangel in 1842 depicting the central portion of the town. Looming above the town proper is the last governor's house to be built, dating from about 1837. The formal but highly provincial, treatment of its facade, with its central pedimented pavilion, gable lunette, and lighthouse rendered almost as the Choragic Monument to Lysicrates. In the foreground stands a smaller house which is strikingly reminiscent of the Palladian three-part houses with two-story central block and flanking single story wings with hipped roofs, especially as interpreted by Robert Morris and adapted by Thomas Jefferson in this country. Equally neoclassical in spirit is what is cited as the old Church of St. Michael, although it bears no outward resemblance to the one illustrated in the Lütke atlas. The view offered by Voznesensky seems, in short, to represent a veritable oasis of different variations on a neoclassical theme while, at the same time, suggesting a fairly compact, sense urban environment. Narrow passages substitute for streets. There is a randomness reflective more of medieval villages than of a planned community. New Archangel thus maintained, even in the face of building activity that made it a veritable "golden age," the aspect of a study in contrasts.

### III

The architectural history of Russian America has yet to be written or fully explored. The National Park Service has, over the years, produced a number of studies of individual buildings acquired by the U.S. government.<sup>77</sup> Survey forms for the few Russian Colonial architectural landmarks recorded by the Historic American Buildings Survey offer varying degrees and amounts of basic data. Nomination forms for structures and sites entered on the National Register give somewhat more detailed information, but of comparable

scope.

The only significant attempts at an architectural history of Russian America thus far have been the studies of two Soviet scholars. The first, published in 1967 by Viktor I. Kochedamov, assayed the formation of the various settlements in Russian America, providing a useful overview of the enterprise.<sup>78</sup> The second study encompasses the section on buildings, forts, and settlements which Svetlana G. Fedorova included in her admirable study of the Russian population in Alaska and California.<sup>79</sup> Though treating fewer developments, Fedorova's examination of the building enterprise in Russian America probes more deeply into the underlying circumstances that gave rise to the settlements and fortified outposts under discussion.

In order to prepare an adequate architectural history of Russian America, it is necessary to find, identify, and evaluate the wealth of published and unpublished source materials, in both American and Soviet repositories, pertaining to the period 1784-1867. Based on research undertaken thus far, the following categories of information seem particularly relevant: 1) published accounts, travel notes, and diaries of Russian, European and American sea captains and explorers who traveled to northwestern America; 2) published accounts, correspondence, travel notes, and diaries of both the employees of the Russian-American Company and of the missionary priests attached to the Russian Orthodox Mission in America; 3) published reports, letters, diaries, and other materials produced by Russian and other scientific expeditions to the region; and 4) collections of illustrative material (ranging from etchings, lithographs, engravings, water colors, and paintings to maps, plans, photographs, and original architectural drawings) in both public and private archives.

Research indicates that there is probably a good deal more original source material relating to the subject than may previously have been sup-

posed; most of it, however, is in Russian. The systematic search for these materials should be continued, if possible, through the cooperation and perhaps collaboration of scholars from both countries.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Research and travel for this paper have been made possible by grants from the Faculty Development Fund and the Division of Arts and Humanities at the University of Maryland.

<sup>2</sup>See Section III below.

<sup>3</sup>Lavrenti A. Zagoskin, Puteshestviia i issledovaniia leitenenta Lavrentiia Zagoskina v Russkoi Amerike v 1842-1844 gg. (Moscow: Gosizdat geograficheskoi literatury, 1956), pp. 183-184.

<sup>4</sup>See Mikhail V. Krasovsky, Kurs istorii russkoi arkhitektury (Petrograd: R. Golike & A. Vil'borg, 1916); S. Zabello, V. Ivanov and P. Maksimov, Russkoe dereviannoe zodchestvo (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii arkhitektury SSSR, 1942); I. V. Makovetsky, Pamiatniki narodnogo zodchestva russkogo severa (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1955); George H. Hamilton, The Art and Architecture (2d ed.; Baltimore: Penguin, 1975); and Arthur Voyce, The Art and Architecture of Medieval Russia (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1967).

<sup>5</sup>See E. A. Ashchepkov, Russkoe narodnoe zodchestvo v zapadnoi Sibiri (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii arkhitektury, 1950); E. A. Ashchepkov, Russkoe narodnoe zodchestvo v vostochnoi Sibiri (Moscow: Gosizdat lit-ry po stroitel'tstvu i arkhitekture, 1953); I. V. Makovetsky, "Dereviannoe zodchestvo srednego priangaria (XVII-XX vv.), Byt i iskusstvo russkogo naseleniia Vostochnoi Sibiri, vol. 1 (2 vols.; Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1971), pp. 106-143; I. V. Makovetsky, "Arkhitertura russkogo narodnogo zhilishcha zabaikala," Byt i iskusstvo russkogo naseleniia Vostochnoi Sibiri, vol. 2 (2 vols.; Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1971), pp. 33-47; I. V. Vlasova, "Poseleniia zabaikala," Byt i iskusstvo russkogo naseleniia Vostochnoi Sibiri, vol. 2 (2 vols.; Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1971), pp. 21-32.

<sup>6</sup>Kratkaia Sibir'skaia letopis' (kungurskaia) so 154 risunkami (St. Petersburg: F. G. Eleonsky, 1880). Cf. Semen E. Remezov, Chertezhnaia kniga Sibiri, sostavlenaia Tobol'skim synom boyarskim Semenom Remezovym v 1701 godu (St. Petersburg: Golike, 1882). For an insightful article on the particular value of Remezov's work for planning and architectural history, see L. A. Goldenberg, "The Atlases of Siberia by S. U. Remezov as a Source for Old Russian Urban History," Imago Mundi, vol. 25 (1971), pp. 39-46.

<sup>7</sup>See Aleksandr I. Alekseev, Okhotsk--kolybel' russkogo Tikhookeanskogo flota (Khabarovsk: Khabarovskoe knizhnoe izd-vo, 1958), and Fedot G. Safronov, Russkie na severo-vostoke Azii v XVII--seredine XIX v. (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), pp. 185-194; for Petropavlovsk, see pp. 195-198.

<sup>8</sup>See Stuart R. Tomkins, Alaska Promyshlennik and Sourdough (Norman, Okla.: University of Oklahoma Press, 1945).

<sup>9</sup>Published in Sarafianov, op. cit., p. 191.

<sup>10</sup>Martin Sauer, An Account of a Geographical and Astronomical Expedition to the Northern Parts of Russia Performed by Commodore Joseph Billings in the Years 1785, etc. to 1794 (London: Cadell & Davies, 1802), p. 40.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

<sup>12</sup>See. inter alia, Sarafianov, op. cit., pp. 195-198.

<sup>13</sup>Ivan F. Kruzhnster, Voyage Round the World in the Years 1803, 1804, 1805, 1806, by Order of His Imperial Majesty Alexander the First on Board the Ships "Nadezhda" and "Neva" under the Command of Captain A. J. von Krusenstein 2 vols. in 1 (London, 1813), p. 217.

<sup>14</sup>Archibald Campbell, A Voyage Round the World, 1806-1812 (Edinburgh: A. Constable & Co., 1816), p. 23.

<sup>15</sup>Kruzhnster, op. cit., pp. 235-236.

<sup>16</sup>In Russkie otkrytiia v Tikhom Okeane i Severnoi Amerike v XVIII veke, ed. Aleksandr I. Andreev (Moscow: Izd-vo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1948), p. 208.

<sup>17</sup>Sauer, op. cit., p. 182.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 173.

<sup>19</sup>In Russkie otkrytiia v Tikhom Okeane..., pp. 52-53.

<sup>20</sup>Published in Russkie otkrytiia v Tikhom Okeane..., p. 256.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 262.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 263.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 262.

<sup>24</sup>In Russkie otkrytiia v Tikhom Okeane..., p. 337.

<sup>25</sup>Hubert H. Bancroft, History of Alaska, 1730-1885 (New York: Antiquarian Press, 1960; rpt. of 1886 ed.), pp. 362, 365.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., p. 324n.

<sup>27</sup>Yuri F. Lisiansky, A Voyage Round the World in the Years 1803, 4, 5, & 6 Performed by Order of His Imperial Majesty Alexander the First, Emperor of Russia, in the Ship Neva (London: John Booth, 1814), p. 215.

<sup>28</sup>Photographs of the exterior and interior are published in: Nikolai, Bishop of the Aleutian Islands and Alaska, Iz moego dnevnika (St. Petersburg: Sinodal'naia tip., 1893), pp. 49 and 53. Bishop Nikolai described it: "The Church is of purely Russian architecture, a wooden one. The walls are painted white and the roof in green" (p. 57).

<sup>29</sup>A reference in Campbell's Voyage Round the World..., p. 190, indicated that the hospital was "called the Chief District College of Counsellor and Chevalier Baranoff."

<sup>30</sup>Campbell, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>31</sup>Georg H. von Langsdorff, Voyage and Travels in Various Parts of the World During the Years 1803-06, vol. 2 (2 vols.; London: H. Colburn, 1814), p. 229.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 79.

<sup>33</sup>Published in Svetlana G. Fedorova, Russkoe naselenie Aliaski i Kalifornii (Moscow: Nauka, 1971), pl. 8.

<sup>34</sup>See Yuri A. Egorov, The Architectural Planning of St. Petersburg, trans. Eric Dluhosch (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1969), Chap. 1.

<sup>35</sup>Campbell, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>36</sup>See inter alia, Hugh Morrison, Early American Architecture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952), pp. 242-250.

<sup>37</sup>For first bringing my attention to this probable correlation, I am indebted to the caption under the Voznesensky drawing which appears in Colonial Russian America. Kyrill T. Khlebnikov's Reports, 1817-1832, trans. Basil Dmytrishin and E. A. P. Crownhart-Vaughn (Portland, Ore.: Oregon Historical Society, 1976), n.p.

<sup>38</sup>Quoted in Semen B. Okun, Rossiisko-Amerikanskaia kompaniia (Moscow-Leningrad: Gossotsekonizdat, 1939), p. 33.

<sup>39</sup>As will be seen, however, Shelikhov's proposal was for much more than merely an agricultural community.

<sup>40</sup>In Russkie otkrytiia v Tikhon Okeane..., p. 337.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 341.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 342.

<sup>43</sup>See ftn. 25 above and accompanying text.

<sup>44</sup>Petr A. Tikhmenev, A History of the Russian-American Company, trans. Richard A. Pierce and Alton S. Donnelly (Seattle-London: University of Washington Press, 1978), p. 35.

<sup>45</sup>In Russkie otkrytiia..., p. 340.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid, p. 343. Shelikhov continued, indicating that the "first cold [summer] church will be the Church of the Resurrection of Christ; the second warm winter one, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary."

<sup>47</sup>It is not clear whether the church was designed by someone from Irkutsk or that perhaps Shelikhov's own or someone else's design adapted an Irkutsk model.

<sup>48</sup>Quoted in Federova, op. cit., p. 196. This letter, the second one which Shelikhov wrote to Baranov on this day, evidently was scribbled in haste.

<sup>49</sup>Baranov's letter to Medvednikov of 19 April 1800 containing instructions for completing the fort is an excellent source for the elements and methods of the fort's construction. Reprod. in P. N. Pavlov, ed., K istorii Rossiisko-Amerikanskoi kompanii. Sbornik dokumental'nykh materialov (Krasnoyarsk: Krasnoyarskoe knizhnoe izd-vo, 1957), pp. 95-106.

<sup>50</sup>Tikhmenev, Istoricheskoe obozrenie obrazovaniia Rossiisko-Amerikanskoi kompanii i deistvie ee do nastoiashchago vremeni, II (2 vols.; St. Petersburg: E. Veimar, 1861-63), p. 144; Baranov's letter to Larionov.

<sup>51</sup>Lisiansky, op. cit., p. 218

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., p. 163.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. p. 218.

<sup>54</sup>Langsdorff, op. cit., II, p. 87.

<sup>55</sup>In Russkie otkrytiia v Tikhom Okeane..., p. 188.

<sup>56</sup>Korobitsyn continued his description with an inventory of buildings below the fort along the shore. These includes "1) a Company storehouse for merchandise, provisions, and materials; 2) a Company retail shop; 3) store-rooms for the provisions prepared by the Company employees; 4) a shed for building rowboats, with a cooper's workshop; 5) barracks for Company employees, with 2 bastions at the corners for cannon; 6) a blacksmith's shop, a locksmith's shop, and 4 suites of rooms for the blacksmiths, locksmiths, and cooper; 7) a cook-house and kitchen for the Company employees; 8) a public bath house for Company employees; 9) and 10) barracks for the Kodiak Aleuts employed by the Company; 11) a shed for drying the fish and meat that are stored away for winter consumption. At a distance of 100 sazhen [700 feet] from the settlement, a site has been designated for a dock, where there is a small garden belonging to the manager, with a palisade around it, and past it flows a small stream which empties into the harbor."

<sup>57</sup>Tikhmenev, op. cit., II, pp. 197-198.

<sup>58</sup>Peter C. Corney, Voyages in the North Pacific. The Narrative of Several Trading Voyages from 1813-18, between the Northwest Coast, the Hawaiian Islands and China, with a Description of the Russian Settlements and California (Honolulu: H.I. & T.G. Thrum, 1896; rpt. of 1821 ed.), pp. 30-31.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 73.

<sup>60</sup>Kiril T. Khlebnikov, Baranov. Chief Manager of the Russian Colonies in America, ed. Richard A. Pierce, trans. Colin Bearne (Kingstone, Ont.: Limestone Press, 1973), p. 117.

<sup>61</sup>M. I. Vavilov, "Poslednie dni v Russkoi Amerike. Iz zapisok ochevidtsa," Russkaia starina, Pt. I, vol. 49 (March 1886), 551.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>George Simpson, Narrative of a Journey Round the World During the Years 1841 and 1842. London: H. Colburn, 1847), p. 207.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. 190.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 269.

<sup>66</sup>Richard A. Pierce, "Alaska's Russian Givernors: Etholen and Tebenkov," Alaska Journal, vol. 2 (Spring 1972), 19-23.

<sup>67</sup>Quoted in Khlebnikov, Baranov, p. 52.

<sup>68</sup>Clarence A. Andrews, "Alaska Under the Russians--Industry, Trade and Social Life," Washington Historical Quarterly, vol. 7 (October 1916), 284.

<sup>69</sup>Khlebnikov, Colonial Russian America..., p. 74.

<sup>70</sup>Pierce, "Alaska's Russian Governors," Alaska Journal, vol. 1 (Autumn 1971), 42.

<sup>71</sup>Pierce, "Alaska's Russian Governors," Alaska Journal, vol. 2 (Spring 1972), 21.

<sup>72</sup>Fedor P. Lütke (Litke), Voyage autour du Monde fait par ordre de sa majesté l'Empereur Nicolas Ier sur la Corvette le Sèniavine, pendant les années 1826, 1827, 1828, & 1829. Partie Historique Atlas. Lithographie d'après les dessins originaux d'Alexandre Postels, Professeur Adjoint de l'Université Imperiale Imperiale de St. Petersbourg, et du Baron Kittlitz. (Paris: Engelmann et Co., 1835).

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>74</sup>Vasili M. Golovnin, Puteshestvie na shliupe "Diana" iz Krinshtadta v Kamchatku sovershennye v 1807, 1808, i 1809 gg. (Moscow: Izd-vo Glavseмор-puti, 1961), p. 140.

<sup>75</sup>Bancroft, op. cit., p. 700.

<sup>76</sup>Ibid., p. 700.

<sup>77</sup>Cf. inter alia, A. Hussey, R. S. Luntz, R. Mortimore, Erskine House, Kodiak, Alaska. Feasibility Report. National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Western Regional Office, San Francisco, 1965, and J. Mote, Historic Structure Report. The Bishop's House, Sitka National Historical Park, Sitka, Alaska. National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Denver Service Center, Denver, 1976.

<sup>78</sup>Viktor I. Kochedamov, "Russkie poselenia v Severnoi Amerike," Arkhi-tekturnoe nasledstvo, no. 16 (1967), 107-120.

<sup>79</sup>Fedorova, "Postroiki: Kreposti, reduty, odinochki, poselenia," in her Russkoe naselenie Aliaski i Kalifornii, pp. 195-207, with 14 plates at the end of the book.