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Prologue: The Conquest of Kodiak Island, 1784-1786

In early August, 1784, two vessels under the command of Russian fur merchant Grigorii Shelikhov arrived on the outer coast of Kodiak Island, Alaska (Figure 1), a year after leaving the Siberian port of Okhotsk. The expedition took shelter in a small cove christened Gavan Trekh Svetelei ("Harbor of the Three Hierarchs," or more commonly in English "Three Saints Harbor;" cf. Black 1989:v).

Shelikhov's mission was to carve out a permanent Russian colony in Alaska, systematically exploit its Native population, harvest sea otters, and reap profits from the lucrative fur trade with China. Suppression of the Qikertarmiut inhabitants of Kodiak1, who had driven off earlier Russian parties under Glotov in 1763-64, Polutov in 1776, and Ocheredin in 1779-80, was essential to the success of this plan (Black 1992). Over the next several days, Shelikhov's men raided villages and took captives, from whom they learned that a large Qikertarmiut force was gathering atop an inaccessible refuge rock (local place name, A'wauq), located just offshore from nearby Sitkalidak Island (Knecht 1992). After abortive negotiations, the Russians attacked this position and killed several hundred men, women, and children. At least 400 more were taken as prisoners to Three Saints Harbor (Britiukov 1988; Holmberg 1985:59; Shelikhov 1981:38-40). In commemoration of this victory, A'wauq was renamed Razbitoi Kekur by the Russians (Efimov 1964:Map 178), derived from the Russian verb razbivat, meaning "to break, crush or defeat."

Qikertarmiut resistance was all but eliminated by the rout at Awa'uq, and within a few months Shelikhov had negotiated the fealty of many of the Native headmen and their hunters in exchange for the safety of the hostages held at Three Saints Harbor. By 1786, Russian parties

---

1. Qikertarmiut "people of the island" is a self-designation for the Native population of the Kodiak archipelago (Pullar 1994:23). The Qikertarmiut were called Kaniagi by the Russians (an Aleutian Islands term, Americanized to Koniags), and also "Kadiak Aleuts" or simply "Aleuts." Alutiiq (plural Alutit) has long been in use among the Native population (and recently among anthropologists) as a designation for the indigenous language of the region (also known as Sugpiaq or Sugcestun) and as a general term for the culturally related populations of the Kodiak archipelago, Alaska Peninsula, lower Cook Inlet, the outer Kenai coast, and Prince William Sound. Alutiiq is synonymous with Pacific Eskimo, a term used by ethnologists to emphasize the close linguistic and cultural affiliations between the coastal peoples of the Gulf of Alaska and their Yup'ik (Eskimo) neighbors to the north (Clark 1984).
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Figure 1. The Kodiak Island Region and Early Russian Settlements
had explored the Kodiak archipelago and Alaska mainland as far east as Prince William Sound, brought new villages under control, and established forts on Afognak Island and at English Bay (Alexandrovsk) in lower Cook Inlet (Black 1992; Senkevitch 1987). Shelikhov returned to Russia in 1786, with a cargo of furs worth some 56,000 rubles (Berkh 1974:106-107), leaving most of his officers and men behind to continue the work of exploration, conquest, and expansion of the fur harvest.

Three Saints Harbor and the Beginnings of Russian America

The founding of Three Saints Harbor initiated the Russian colonial period in Alaska, anticipating the formation 15 years earlier of the quasi-governmental Russian-American Company (RAC). Russian expeditions that preceded Shelikhov's -- including more than one hundred privately-financed voyages to the Aleutians -- were invariably of short duration (Berkh 1974; Fedorova 1973; Makarova 1975). Permanent shore bases were not established, with the apparent exception of the small outpost of Illilulik, built on Unalaska Island prior to 1778 (Senkevitch 1987:149-153). Lacking the specialized skills and equipment needed to do their own maritime hunting, Russian traders used a combination of armed force, coercion, and trade to induce the Unangan (Aleuts) to harvest furs and food supplies. Some voyages returned with lucrative cargoes of sea otter and fur seal pelts, while others ended in shipwreck or succumbed to retaliatory attacks. The risks increased as otter populations declined in the western Aleutians and Russian navigators pushed further eastward along the island chain.

The Shelikhov expedition was the product of far greater ambition. With the financial and political backing of Irkutsk merchant Ivan Golikov and his nephew M. S. Golikov, Shelikhov petitioned the government in 1781 for permission to establish a permanent Russian colony in Alaska. Shelikhov believed that permanent colonial settlements along the American coast would serve to uphold Russian territorial claims, generate large fur revenues, and assert government "protection" over indigenous peoples (Shelikhov 1988). He framed his mission in ideological terms as well. The Native population would be "civilized" by means of religious conversion, instruction in the Russian language and demonstration of the "utilities and advantages of Russian houses, clothing, and dietary practices" (Shelikhov 1981:43-44).

Three Saints Harbor was the founding settlement of this colonial enterprise, and served as headquarters for the Shelikhov-Golikov company until the building of Pavlovsk Gavan (or "Paul's Harbor," now the city of Kodiak) in 1792-93. Structures and facilities at Three Saints Harbor included wooden buildings used as dwellings and company offices, earthen-walled workers' barracks called barabaras, a school, cemetery, storehouse, gardens and animal pens (Figure 2). Shelikhov referred to this settlement as a "fort" (krepost), even though walls or other defensive constructions do not seem to have been built. Additional dwellings and production facilities were located at a nearby artel, or work station.

Archaeological Research at Three Saints Harbor

Today, the brush and grass-covered remains of Shelikhov's krepost extend for some 200 meters along the southern shoreline of the harbor. Located within the bounds of the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge, the site (number KOD-083 on the Alaska Heritage Resource Survey) was nominated as a National Historic Landmark in 1971.
In 1989, local interest in the historical and cultural legacy of the Russian conquest led to an invitation from the Kodiak Area Native Association (KANA) to undertake archaeological investigations at KOD-083. Work was carried out under my direction during 1990 and 1991, with funding provided by the National Science Foundation, KANA, and the University of California (Crowell 1994). Among the participants were archaeologists Donald Clark (Canadian Museum of Civilization), Valery Shubin and Olga Shubina (Sakhalin Regional Museum, Yuzhno Sakhalinsk, Russia), Kent Lightfoot (University of California, Berkeley), Richard Knecht (KANA), Louise Jackson (University of California, Los Angeles), and a total of more than forty students from Kodiak and the University of California, Berkeley. Field studies included topographic mapping, magnetic surveys, subsurface testing and excavation of the principal officers' residence and one of the *barabaras*. Earlier investigations of the historical component and underlying prehistoric levels (dating from ca. 100 B.C. to 900 A.D.) had been conducted by Clark in 1962-63 (Clark 1970, 1985, 1989).

Studies at Three Saints Harbor open new archaeological perspectives on early Russian American colonial society, including its economic foundations, social organization, and

Figure 2. Russian Settlement on South Shore of Three Saints Harbor (The Krepost Site). View to South. Painting by Luka Voronin, 1970. Tsentral'nyi gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Voenny-Morskogo Flota SSSR (Central State Archive of the USSR Navy). f. 1331, op. 4, d. 704.1.29. Photograph courtesy of the Limestone Press.
dynamics of cultural change. Findings at the site are relevant to the interpretation of multiethnic colonial entrepots in other North American settings (Lightfoot 1995).

**Russian Fur Trade Archaeology and the Capitalist World System**

*Contact Processes and Modes of Production*

Eric Wolf (1982:158-194) observed that the North American fur trade during the 17th - 19th centuries was characterized by two contrasting modes of production. The "commodity peonage" system evolved as French and English companies expanded westward from the Atlantic seaboard via the St. Lawrence and other subarctic river systems. Furs were harvested by autonomous Algonquin and Athapaskan groups, and exchanged for desirable European manufactures. From a World System perspective (Kardulias 1990; Wallerstein 1974), this trade was dependent upon well-developed manufacturing capacities in the core European countries, as well as reliable transatlantic shipping to the North American periphery. European manufactures such as glass beads, guns, metal ornaments, ceramics, and textiles found a ready market in America, and could be produced in quantity to meet the varied tastes and demands of Native American fur producers. The diversity and abundance of these imported trade goods has been demonstrated by excavations at forts and fur trade posts (Stone 1974) and at post-contact village and burial sites (Fitzhugh 1985; Mainfort 1979; Quimby 1966).

A second mode of fur production -- instituted by Russian companies in Siberia and Alaska -- was identified by Wolf as "tributary," referring to the extraction of fur taxes from subjugated indigenous populations. Although the collection of such taxes (called *iasak*) was discontinued after 1788, it was succeeded in Alaska by the imposition of mandatory hunting and labor requirements that pertained to those groups which were fully under Russian control, including the Qikertarmiut. These obligations were included among the terms of the RAC's 1821 charter. Officially, half of the male population between the ages of 18 and 50 could be required for company hunting each year, with a maximum of three years of mandatory service for any individual. Virtually all free and able persons could be forced to work whenever needed, however, including women and children who produced food and clothing for Russian use and redistribution (Okun 1979:197-207). Traditional Alutiiq slaves (whom the Russians called by the Itelmen word *kaiury*) were used by the Russians for full-time labor (Davydov 1977:190-191; Gideon 1989:61-66). Trade goods of a few types, especially cheap and easily transportable commodities such as glass beads and tobacco, were used as supplementary rewards to spur Native fur production. Unangan and Qikertarmiut headmen were held responsible for village production quotas. Despite increased payments to Native workers and amelioration of labor conditions in later years, this state of virtual serfdom continued throughout the entire Russian colonial period in Alaska (Liapunova 1987).

This mode of production was well suited to Russia's limited industrial capacity, poor transportation infrastructure, and "semi-peripheral" status in the late 18th century capitalist World System (Wallerstein 1989:141). Although Irkutsk (founded in 1661) had long been established as a central Siberian center for agriculture, manufacturing, and cross-border trade with China, the difficulties of moving supplies eastward from Irkutsk to the Pacific placed severe limitations on Russia's ability to sustain her Alaskan colony with either food or items for Native trade (Gibson 1969, 1976). Minimizing the need for home country goods was a critical
consideration in Russian America, and probably explains why a commodity exchange approach was never successfully employed by the RAC.

Although the predominant method for exploiting Native labor in Russian America was "non-capitalist" in the sense that there was no free labor market, the fur trade as a whole was unquestionably a capitalistic enterprise, financed by private investors. Russian managers and workers were paid with a combination of profit shares and wages, from which company-supplied provisions were deducted.

An archaeologically important consequence of the Russian system is that trade goods from early historical Alaskan Native village sites tend to be limited in quantity and variety despite an intensive degree of contact (Townsend 1975). A wider variety of ceramics and other trade items did come into circulation after 1839 when the RAC began purchasing colonial supplies from the Hudson's Bay Company, and these artifacts are well represented in later Russian period village sites (Jackson 1991). Another effect of material scarcities was to promote extensive Russian use of indigenous Alaskan foods, clothing, architecture, and technology (Fedorova 1973; Gibson 1987), a pattern which should be evident in the archaeological record of colonial forts and settlements like Three Saints Harbor. Cultural change in only one direction -- from Native American toward European models -- is often presumed in archaeological studies of contact, but this approach is clearly inadequate for Russian America and probably for other multiethnic colonial societies which emerged in the post-Columbian Americas.

Class and Ethnicity in Russian America

As in the Spanish and Portuguese empires, the population of Russian America included only a relatively small and almost entirely male group of adventurers and workers from the home country. This resulted in frequent interracial unions and the emergence of ethnically-stratified, hybrid colonial social systems that included large creole/mestizo classes (Hyatt and Nettleford 1995; Nash 1972). In descending order of status and power, the social hierarchy of Russian America was divided into "honorable" company managers, government officials, military officers, and ship commanders, "semi-honorable" Russian artisans, hunters, and workers (promyshlenniki), "colonial citizens" (an estate established in 1835 and comprised of Russian workers who wished to take up permanent residence in America), Creoles, and Native Alaskans (Fedorova 1973, 1976).

Awareness of class and ethnic differences was acute. Prejudice toward the Native population is evident in repeated references to "savages" and "heathens" by Shelikov and others. As Golovnin observed:

...this colonial population is constantly eaten away by class prejudices...On one hand, the Creole, feeling European blood in himself, thinks he is above the Aleut and does not want to work and live with him...On the other hand, the Russians as well as the Aleuts themselves remember even now the initial origin of the Creoles from illegitimate relationships with native women, and demonstrate disrespect and even contempt on every occasion (quoted in Fedorova 1976:14).

Archaeological perspectives on this social order focus on its material, behavioral, and ideological correlates. As a consequence of the shortages discussed above, imported
commodities such as cloth, porcelain, beef and bottled spirits were prohibitively expensive or totally unavailable to all but the privileged ranks of colonial society. Any such supplies from company stores, as well as many types of ordinary tools and provisions, were charged heavily against workers' accounts, and cut into their return for long years of labor in America (Pierce 1976:74-87). A positive correlation between social status and the "import content" of consumption is to be expected in the archaeological analysis of Russian colonial households (Crowell 1994).

Beyond this, objects, architecture and diet are often more than simple indicators of status, and can play an active role in conscious social and political strategies, including ethnic claims (Hodder 1986; McGuire 1982). From this point of view, the use of imported food and material culture may have been a means of asserting a Russian ethnic identity that maximized social and cultural distance from "savagery," its antithesis in the imported value system. For example, Zagoskin recounted that a promyshlennik of his acquaintance minimized his consumption of Yup'ik foods as much as possible for fear of "polluting" himself (Zagoskin 1967:115). Separation of living areas is similarly viewed as a strategy for class and ethnic boundary maintenance (Lightfoot 1995). Though such distancing strategies may have been desirable from the Russian point of view, it seems evident because of the weakness of colonial supply that the lower Russian ranks must often have had to live among, and in a manner similar to, the Native population they disdained. Studies of spatial organization and household archaeology at Three Saints Harbor provide insights into this social order and its internal tensions.

Material Distinctions and Spatial Organization at Three Saints Harbor: an Historical Perspective

A review of historical sources suggests that space, housing and activities at Three Saints Harbor were allocated on the basis of class and ethnicity. The krepost and artel at Three Saints -- represented by archaeological sites on the south and north shores of the harbor, respectively -- were interrelated components of a single settlement and production system.

López De Haro Expedition, 1788

Construction of dwellings and storage facilities at KOD-083 (the krepost, or main Russian occupation area) began almost immediately after the battle at A'waq (Shelikhov 1981:42), and was still underway when Spanish commander Gonzalo López De Haro visited Three Saints Harbor in the summer of 1788 (Gormly 1977:15; López De Haro 1975:17-19). Mortality, dispersion to other posts, and the return of Shelikhov and others to Russia had reduced the Russian² population at Three Saints from 130 to between 50 and 60 by this date, augmented by a small contingent of Unangan employees from Unalaska. Under Russian supervision, a large Qikertarmiut workforce was engaged in the pursuit of sea otters, preparation of pelts for

---

² Among the Russian nationals employed by the company were several Yakuts ("The Personnel Book of the Three Saints," in Shelikhov 1981:114-117) and probably others of Native Siberian origin.
shipment, and the harvesting and processing of foods for Russian consumption, including halibut and whale oil.

Most Qikertarmiut workers seem to have been required to reside on the north shore of Three Saints Harbor, rather than at the krepost site itself. "Two Indian villages, one of them quite large" were noted by López De Haro's pilot on the "right hand" of the Russian settlement, suggesting the expanse of habitable ground located on the north side of the harbor entrance (Figure 3). In 1962, house depressions and a midden containing gravel-tempered aboriginal pottery and stone tools were found in this area by Donald Clark, who named it the artel site. His small excavation also turned up glass fragments indicative of historical period occupation (Clark 1970). The segregation of Native residences from the Russian krepost was consistent with a general directive from Shelikhov ordering that dwellings for Native workers should be 100 sazhen (213 meters) away from Russian forts as a security precaution (Shelikhov 1952b:46).

The 1788 account underlines disparities between officer and worker accommodations at the krepost. López De Haro visited a large, multi-roomed log house occupied by officer-in-charge Evstrat Delarov and other ranking members of the Russian contingent. His description of this structure shows that every effort had been made to supply the company elite with the comforts of home:

The separate place or apartment where the Captain and the officers live is very well furnished, all hung with Paper printed in China, with a Great Mirror, many pictures of Saints well painted, and Rich Beds. Besides they have at the end of the apartment a sort of square Stove of iron about three feet high, in which they always keep a Fire to cook something and give Heat to the Apartment. (Deltaro 1975: 18-19)

The use of logs and sawn planks to construct the headquarters building at Three Saints Harbor was itself an extravagance in the nearly treeless environment of western Kodiak Island. The cost of imported building materials such as nails, chimney brick, and glass would also have been high.

Near this house, López De Haro saw vegetable gardens, a two-story log warehouse under construction, a school for Native adults and children, and what he called "Huts of the Indians". It is likely that these "huts" were actually the previously mentioned barabaras, which were built as inexpensive houses for Russian and Unangan employees of the company (Shelikhov 1952b:46). In style, cost, and comfort, these humble dwellings contrasted sharply with the officers' barracks. Built almost entirely with local materials (earthen walls, grass thatch, driftwood frames), the design of these structures incorporated both Russian and indigenous Alaskan elements.

The Billings and Fidalgo Expeditions, 1790

Several weeks after López De Haro's visit, the Kodiak region was rocked by a major earthquake and tsunami. Residents of Three Saints Harbor escaped the tidal surge by climbing an adjacent hill, and the settlement sustained relatively minor damage. Several buildings were destroyed, as well as gardens of vegetables and tobacco (Baranov 1979:36; Davies et al 1981:3829; Davydov 1977:206). Of greater long-term import was tectonic subsidence of the
Figure 3. Residential Zones at Three Saints Harbor
land, which reduced the habitable area along the southern shore of the spit, and underlined the inadequacy of the location for a large and permanent colonial capital.

Descriptions of Three Saints Harbor were recorded in 1790 by a Russian expedition under Captains Billings and Sarychev (Merck 1980; Sarychev 1969; Sauer 1802), and by a second Spanish voyage under Don Salvador Fidalgo (Fidalgo 1975). These accounts indicate substantial continuity with the pre-earthquake settlement, as well as some new construction. Martin Sauer, Secretary to the Billings-Sarychev expedition, left the most extensive account:

The buildings consist of five houses after the Russian fashion. Barracks laid out in different apartments, somewhat like the 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; here Delareff presides; and I believe few courts of justice pass a sentence with more impartiality: An office of receival and delivery, both for the company and for tribute: The commissaries' department, for the distribution of the regulated portions 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, carpenters' shop, and coopage.

Two vessels (galliots) of about 80 tons each are now here, quite unrigged, and hauled on a low scaffold near the water's edge. These are armed and well guarded, and serve for the protection of the place. Several of the Russians have their wives with them, and keep gardens of cabbages and potatoes, four cows, and twelve goats...

(Sauer 1802:173).

Fidalgo's description, recorded only one month later, adds several new details:

There I found a Russian Establishment, which consists of a large House for the Crew with an inner apartment in which the Chief lives; next to it is a Store-house of rather large capacity where they keep the Whale oil, dried fish for the winter, the Carpenter's and the Blacksmith's tools, and the fishing gear; adjoining this is a School where they teach the Indian children to read and write the Russian language; and farther on, the living quarters of a Pilot, and of the person who looks after the Warehouse, all of these being of wood; and there are numerous huts of the Indians... (Fidalgo 1975:4).

Sauer's "barracks" and Fidalgo's "Large House for the Crew" correspond with López De Haro's description of a multi-roomed headquarters building where Delarov and his subordinates resided (and where Shelikhov had also lived), although Sauer's account suggests that several rooms had been added or converted for use as company offices. We know from Vasilii Merkul'ev, Shelikhov's warehouse manager, that this building was flooded during the 1788 earthquake, but survived (Davies et al 1981:3829).

A painting by expedition artist Luka Voronin (Figure 2) depicts Three Saints Harbor at the time of the Billings-Sarychev visit. Correspondences between this drawing and textual descriptions of the Russian krepost may be examined (Figure 4A and Appendix A). Based on
Figure 4.  A.  Key to Buildings Depicted in Voronin Painting of the Three Saints Harbor Krepost, 1790
B.  Site Topography, Archaeological Features, Excavated Areas, and Magnetic Survey Blocks.  Three Saints Harbor Krepost Site (KOD-083), 1990
size and construction, the Shelikhov-Delarov house is most likely to have been building "C," a large wooden structure with several rooms and extensions. Building "C" is depicted with both windows and a chimney, the latter suggesting the presence of an interior oven or stove as described by López de Haro.

If "C" is the Shelikhov-Delarov house, then "D" is probably the nearby storehouse described by Fidalgo and "E" would be the adjoining school. The open space in front of "C" might have been the area of the kitchen gardens mentioned by both López de Haro and Merkul'ev, and "B" is possibly one of Sauer's "cookhouses." The round, thatch-roofed buildings adjacent to the tidal lagoon ("G" and "H") could have been dwellings or small storehouses. Sauer also lists "five [additional] houses after the Russian fashion" -- presumably meaning log cabins -- corresponding to the five small rectangular cabins shown by Voronin ("I," "J," "M," "N," and "O") spread out over the central and eastern portion of the settlement area. One of these would have been the residence of Gerasim Izmailov (the Russian navigator), while another belonged to "the person who looks after the warehouse," i.e. Merkul'ev, whose earlier house had been washed away in 1788. At least two semi-subterranean *barabaras* are shown (A and Q). A plan map of the settlement in Sarychev's *Atlas* (1826:Plate 28) shows only the log buildings from this list.

The accounts from 1790 provide confusing information about the number of hostages and Native employees. Sarychev speaks of a few child hostages in a hut, while Merck states that "a number" of boy and girl hostages were kept in a "large log cabin." Sauer specifies that there were 200 hostages, consisting of "the daughters of the chiefs...kept at the Russian habitations near our anchoring place," with another 100 off on home visits (1802:171).

To return to an earlier point, none of the log buildings pictured by Voronin appear large enough to have housed several hundred Qikertarmiut hostages and workers, not even "C" and "D," which have in any case been interpreted as the Russian officers' barracks and warehouse. Accounts by López de Haro, Sauer, and Gideon (see below) all confirm that a large Native labor force was also in residence at Three Saints to carry out hunting, fishing, gathering, and fur processing. These factors support the idea that the main residential area for Qikertarmiut hostages and workers was across the cove at the artel site.

*Three Saints Harbor after 1790*

In July, 1791, Alexander Baranov arrived at Three Saints Harbor as the new Company manager. Baranov's appointment began a new phase of Russian expansion that saw the chartering of the Russian-American Company in 1799 and the establishment of fur trading posts throughout southern Alaska and at Fort Ross in California. One of Baranov's earliest decisions was to leave Three Saints Harbor, with its limited timber resources and sunken shoreline, and to build a new and more elaborate capital at Kodiak (Pavlovsk Gavan), where he took up residence in 1793. Damage from a second severe earthquake and tsunami in 1792 may have contributed to this decision (Davydov 1977:206).

After this date, the principal function of Shelikhov's establishment at the "old harbor" became the production of food for company distribution. A staff of one or two Russians was in charge of a Native work force that resided at Three Saints Harbor and in nearby villages (Clark 1989). Activities now included fox trapping and the harvesting of whales, salmon, and plant foods (Gideon 1989:37-38; Khlebnikov 1994:35-36). We know that the original Russian *krepost*
site on the south shore of the harbor was abandoned at some time during the early 19th century, while occupation of the artel site continued even into the 1880s (Petroff 1884:29 and Map 1). Bracketing dates for abandonment of the original site are provided by Lisiansky's 1805 map, which places a "Company Settlement" on the south shore of the harbor (Lisiansky 1968; map following p. 168), and a Russian-American Company map of 1848 that shows only "Three Saints Artel" on the north shore (Arkhimandritov 1848).

Gideon's 1804 description of Three Saints Harbor bears little resemblance to earlier portrayals of the south shore settlement, suggesting that he was describing structures at the artel site and that even at that early date the krepost had fallen into disuse. He describes three very large barabaras (15 sazhens, or more than 100 feet long) for storing fish, whale oil, and berries, structures that are not mentioned in earlier accounts nor discovered by archaeological investigations at KOD-083. In addition, the artifact assemblage from KOD-083 includes very few 19th century items, suggesting that the original krepost may have been completely abandoned not long after 1800.

Discussion. It thus appears that the krepost was occupied for a relatively brief span of time, while its companion artel functioned throughout most of the 19th century. During the first decade (1784-93), top-ranking personnel were in residence and Three Saints Harbor was the principal base of operations for the Shelikhov-Golikov company. At this time, the total settlement was divided into three zones that mirrored fundamental social and ethnic divisions among the resident population (Figure 3). The company manager and other "honorable" were housed at the western end of the krepost site on the south shore. This was the showcase portion of the settlement, where leaders of visiting expeditions were entertained. Construction was of logs and imported materials, and followed traditional Russian methods and design (Senkevitch 1987; Shubin 1990). In addition to a headquarters building containing offices and well-appointed residential apartments, there were cabins, storehouses, gardens, animal pens, a kitchen with a bread oven, a bathhouse and school where Qikertarmiut child-hostages were taught the Russian language. Two beached ships provided space for Russian Orthodox services, served as defensive redoubts, and were used as vaults to store furs. In sum, this zone supported an imported Russian lifestyle in its pure form, and demonstrated Russian agriculture, technology, education, and religion as symbols of the colony's mission civilatrice.

An ethnically heterogeneous population (Russian, Unangan, possibly Qikertarmiut) and mixed Russian-Alaska Native material culture characterized a second, peripheral zone at the krepost. In ideological and social terms, this part of the settlement suggests the incorporative aspects of Russian colonialism, which recognized the practical necessities of adapting to the local culture and building a multiethnic work force. Spatial segregation of the main body of Qikertarmiut workers and hostages at the artel site (the third zone) signified their unincorporated, uncivilized, dangerous, and subservient status. Characteristically, few details of life outside the elite zone were recorded by literate observers.

Archaeological Investigations at Three Saints Harbor, 1990-91

Archaeological investigations were directed toward identification of structural remains, correlation of archaeological features with historical depictions, and comparative investigation
of the architecture and domestic inventories of officer and worker dwellings. One example of each type was selected for excavation.

**Surface Features**

Structural remains recorded at KOD-083 in 1990-91 correspond fairly closely to the buildings depicted by Voronin and described by Russian and Spanish visitors. Earthen-walled and/or semisubterranean structures shown in Figure 4A can be matched in almost all cases to house depressions discovered in 1990-91 (Figure 4B). Suggested correspondences are shown in Appendix A. The three-roomed barabara designated as Building "Q" (recorded as Structure 3 in 1990) was excavated in 1990-91, providing data on construction, domestic activities, and consumption patterns of the workers who were housed there.

Structures built of logs or planks (B, C, D, E, F, I, J, M, N, O) did not leave "footprints" on the surface with the exception of Building C. The position of this large log cabin, the only dwelling shown by Voronin with paneled windows and a chimney, corresponds with the remains of a square foundation wall of rock rubble (S-1) that was excavated in 1990. Structure 1 (S-1) contained window glass, iron nails, and a central cluster of brick fragments from a possible chimney fall, supporting the identification of these remains with Voronin's building "C," the headquarters building.

**Russian Period Midden**

Excavations in 1962-63 and 1990-91 established that the Russian midden is 20 to 50 cm thick, beneath a thin surface layer of duff and humus. The midden is a stained sand deposit containing fire-reddened slate, charcoal fragments, beach pebbles, bone fragments and Russian period artifacts. This layer is continuous over the elevated western portion of the site, where it overlies up to 1.5 meters of prehistoric midden. The contact between the two components is not always distinguishable, and vertical mixing (probably dating to activities during the Russian occupation period) has brought Kachemak stone tools and bone fragments up into the historical horizon. Stratigraphic mixing is not a factor in the eastern and southern portions of the site (beyond about 60 meters east and 20 meters south of datum), where Kachemak material is absent. Russian period deposits in these outlying areas are thin and discontinuous, with concentrations in and around dwellings.

**Magnetic Survey**

The spatial extent of subsurface cultural deposits was investigated by using a fluxgate gradiometer. Magnetic anomalies are caused by the presence of ferrous metal, by the thermoremanent magnetism of fired materials such as hearths, burnt rock, brick, and slag, and by the enhanced magnetic susceptibility of disturbed soils in pits and ditches. Because of the damping effects of the soil matrix, the detectable signal strength of an object is inversely proportional to its depth of burial. Signals from the Kachemak layer at Three Saints Harbor comprise a relatively weak level of background noise compared to the strong signals recorded for shallower historical features and artifacts.

A concentration of heterogeneous, mixed-strength signals, produced by fire-cracked rock, nails, and small fragments of iron, slag, and ceramics is present in the area of Structures 1, 2, and 4 (Figure 4B). A clear drop-off in signals marks the southern edge of the midden. A
number of very strong, tightly focused signals were also recorded in the area of Structure 5. The peak signals suggest large or near-surface iron objects and may indicate a forge or ferrous debris associated with the smithy mentioned in Sauer's 1790 description.

Excavations at the Shelikhov Log House (Structure 1)

Rock wall bands defining Structure 1 (S-1) were discovered during clearance of brush at the western end of the site (Figure 5). Excavations totalling 136 m² were undertaken in order to test identification of S-1 as the foundation of the large log headquarters building occupied by Shelikhov and subsequent managers (building "C"), and to obtain artifact and faunal samples. An adjacent outbuilding not shown by Voronin (S-2) was discovered at the southwest corner of S-1 and also partially excavated (Figure 5).

S-1 walls and fill. S-1 consisted of collapsed rock walls forming a square roughly 15 meters across, with a rock-free interior measuring about ten by ten meters. Gaps in the wall occurred at the northwest and southeast corners. A trench through the south side demonstrated that the wall was built of several courses of undressed slate slabs, graywacke cobbles, and small boulders. No traces of planks or logs remained.

The stratigraphy of deposits inside the walls consisted of a thin surface duff; a 20 cm layer of homogeneous gray sand containing nails, beads, glass fragments, and other small Russian period artifacts; a 10-20 cm Kachemak layer; and non-cultural basal strata of volcanic ash, sand, and beach gravel. Stone tools and fragments of burnt bone originating in the Kachemak layer were mingled with the lower portion of the historical deposit.

Although direct evidence is lacking, the absence of pits or other features inside S-1 is consistent with historical information that the headquarters building had a wooden floor. The homogeneous, rock-free soil within the walls of S-1 is interpreted as a subfloor fill deposit that may have been washed under the building by hillside runoff and/or during the 1788 and 1792 floods. Additional soil and artifacts may have filtered down to this layer through the floor boards of the structure, or may have been deposited during construction or following abandonment.

Brick scatter. A cluster of several hundred red brick fragments was discovered in the center of S-1 (Figure 5), probably evidence of the chimney shown on Voronin's building "C." The low total weight of recovered fragments (1.9 kilograms) suggests that usable whole bricks were salvaged. Evidence for the salvage of reusable, non-local construction materials is to be expected at the site because of the scarcity and value of all imported goods in the early years of the colony. Brick fragments have not been found elsewhere at the site.

Artifacts. In addition to brick fragments, excavation of the house interior and extramural midden area yielded a total of 385 Russian artifacts, including glass trade beads (286); Chinese porcelain holloware and other ceramics (23); bottle and window glass fragments (14); nails, a drill bit, and miscellaneous wrought iron artifacts (46); lead musket shot and other lead, copper and brass items (12); and cut mica fragments (4). Mica, also occurring in the form of about 70 small, uncut flakes, was used to make window panes for Russian colonial houses (Shubin 1990).

The S-1 trade beads were both wire-wound and drawn, with 19 color/shape varieties. The most common wound variety was the large, light greenish-blue "Cook Type" bead of
Figure 5. Three Saints Harbor (KOD-083), Structures 1 and 2. Excavation Plan Showing Features and Distribution of Brick Fragments
probable Chinese origin (12), while the drawn beads were dominated by "Glacier Island" light
greenish blues (154) and clear-over-whites (65) (cf. de Laguna 1956). Drawn Venetian
"Cornaline d’Aleppo" beads with clear and translucent green centers were present (24), but none
of the later white-centered variety. Seriation analysis of trade bead assemblages from 15 Russian
and American era sites in southern Alaska confirms that the Three Saints sample is characteristic
of the very early contact period (Crowell 1994:201-205).

Chinese export porcelains (12 sherds) in plain white, underglaze blue-on-white, and
overglaze red-orange on white also date from the late 18th century (Mudge 1981; Noël Hume
1976). Other ceramic varieties from S-1 were non-diagnostic white earthenware (2), fragments
of terra cotta crucibles probably used for melting lead (8), and one piece of gravel-tempered
indigenous pottery. While the porcelain found at S-1 is of high quality, the overall scarcity of
imported ceramics at Three Saints Harbor underlines the difficulties and expense of transporting
such fragile luxury items from Siberia. Most Russian American tableware during the pre-1840
period seems to have been made of iron, copper and tin (Jackson 1991:42-43). Glass was equally
scarce at S-1 (14 fragments), but included pieces of dark green "case bottles" used for spirits
(Jones and Sullivan 1989:72).

Stone tools (80), mostly non-diagnostic fragments of ground slate, were found in both
the Russian and Kachemak levels, but should be entirely or almost entirely of prehistoric origin.
All culturally identifiable stone tools were Kachemak, including a "Three Saints" style barbed
slate endblade (Clark 1970).

Faunal remains. Faunal remains were concentrated in a midden pile located just
outside the foundation wall at its southeast corner, where lenses of wood ash were also found
(Figure 5). A mixture of wild and domesticated species was identified (Amorosi 1993). The
domesticates included pig (Sus scrofa) cow (Bos taurus), horse (Equus caballus), dog (Canis
familiaris), and sheep or goat (Ovis/Capra), all of which are mentioned in historic accounts of
the settlement except for horse. Wild species included harbor seal (Phoca vitulina), sea lion
(Eumetopias jubatus), and other marine mammals, as well as various mammal, bird, fish, and
molluscan species.

Discussion. Historical data and archaeological evidence allow Structure 1 to be
identified as the Shelikhov house with a fairly high level of confidence. The presence of brick
fragments from a collapsed or dismantled chimney provides a direct link to the visual record of
the building created by Voronin in 1790. The preserved quadrangular rock outline was probably
a low, roughly-constructed rock foundation upon which the lowest course of wall logs for the
main part of the building would have rested. Built between 1784 and 1788, the building survived
two major earthquakes and was used at least until 1793. Archaeological evidence suggests that
the end of its use cycle came when it was dismantled to salvage valuable construction materials
including timber, bricks, and iron nails.

Post-occupation salvage efforts and restricted artifact deposition during occupancy are
inferred as reasons for the small size and low density of artifacts. While the documentary record
reveals that the building was outfitted with rich furnishings and amenities, the archaeological
record yielded only faint indications of the material culture and activities of the occupants. Large
numbers of beads (possibly lost through the floorboards) relate to the building’s secondary
function as a company storehouse. Fragments of rum or vodka bottles and porcelain tea cups and
bowls show consumption of imported luxury items, but occur in frequencies too low for detailed interpretation. Domestic animal bones among the faunal refuse indicate that agricultural production at Three Saints Harbor was used to supply the upper ranks with a diet that was at least partially based on home country foods. The remains of a probable bread oven in S-2 provide further evidence of this pattern.

Excavations at a Promyshlennik Barabara (Structure 3)

Structure 3 is a three-chambered, oval house ruin some 22 meters long and 14 meters wide, outlined by low, grass-covered wall mounds, at the location of Voronin's building "Q." The plan of this structure is similar to Russian-style barabaras at Illiuliuk (Senkevitch 1987) and Korovinski (Veltre 1979), but no examples of this hybrid form of earthen-walled architecture had been previously excavated. Given the aims of the Three Saints Harbor study, the combination of introduced and indigenous influences and materials represented by such a dwelling -- in contrast to the strictly Russian heritage of S-1 -- was of particular interest. The ethnic composition of the household was also open to investigation; were its occupants Russians, Alaska Natives, or both? The inventory of artifacts and food remains from the house would be indicative of the material culture, diet, and activities of the residents, for comparison with S-1.

A 61 m$^2$ excavation block was extended to include major portions of all three rooms of the house, as well as the divider between Rooms 1 and 2 and a section through the north wall (Figure 6). Hearths, post holes and other features were discovered. More than 600 artifacts were recovered from the house floor and interior features, as well as a diverse faunal assemblage.

Architectural reconstruction. By reference to the excavation plan and a north-south profile through wall and house interior (Figure 7), the construction of S-3 and the arrangement of living space inside may be described.

The natural stratigraphy of the eastern shoreline area at KOD-083 consists of beach sands overlying water-rounded gravel and cobbles. No prehistoric component is present. The first step in building S-3 was to dig shallow basins (20 - 30 cm deep) into the sand to form the floors of Rooms 1 and 2, leaving a ridge of undisturbed beach between the two excavations. Several layers of sod were placed on top of this ridge to make an interior bench or sleeping platform. The floor of Room 3 was left at ground level.

Material from the pits was thrown up around the periphery, forming the base of the exterior wall. A gap in this wall at its southwest corner may indicate an entryway that opened into Room 1. Layers of sand, beach gravel, rocks and grass sods were added to the top of the wall (shown in cross-section on Figure 7), most likely banked against poles or planks which were in turn supported by an arching framework of light driftwood poles. Evidence for this framework is supplied by the curving line of postmolds found along the inner side of the wall, and by the preserved base of a vertical post in Room 2. The small diameter of these posts and absence of a sod layer across the interior of the dwelling indicate that a lightweight material -- probably grass thatching -- was used to roof the structure. By comparison, massive internal uprights were required to support the roofs of indigenous earth (sod)-covered houses. Fragments of flat glass and many pieces of cut mica were found, suggesting that the structure had glazed windows and that these needed occasional repair.
Russians in Alaska

Figure 7. Three Saints Harbor (KOD-083), Structure 3. North-South Profile Through Feature 3 and the North Wall

Internal features. Each room of the house contained its own repeatedly-used central hearth for heating and cooking (Features 1, 3 and 4), while smaller fires were occasionally built near the walls (Features 7, 8 and 9). These open fires imply that there was probably some type of smoke vent through the roof of the house. Hearths consisted of simple pits dug into the sandy floor, augmented in Feature 4 by a lining of slate slabs. Hearth pits were filled with layered deposits of charcoal, partially-burned sticks and branches, stained sand, faunal remains and fire-cracked rock. Adjacent to Feature 4 were two shallow postmolds with wedging rocks that may have supported a drying rack. Other small pits (Features 5, 6, 10 and 11) lacked charcoal, and may have been used for food storage.

Artifacts. The S-3 artifact sample was larger (n=641) and more diverse than at S-1, despite the smaller scale of the excavations. Contributing to this difference was the fact that the
house had a sand floor in which objects were easily lost or deliberately buried. Real differences in consumption patterns, economic activity, and ethnic composition are also indicated.

Contrasts with S-1 are more evident in some artifact categories than in others. The S-3 bead assemblage (n=286) differs from that found at S-1 only by the presence or absence of a few minor varieties. Trade beads from the same company stocks were apparently handled and stored at both locations. Bottle and window glass are very minor components at S-3, although a few case liquor bottle fragments were found like those from S-1. Imported ceramics were more scarce at S-3 than at S-1, and did not include any porcelains. Non-local ceramics from the *barabara* consisted of a single shattered pearlware plate fragment and part of an earthenware cup rim with a blue annular band. Both were probably of British manufacture, predating 1800 (Noël Hume 1976; Sussman 1977). Sample sizes for glass and ceramics are too small to warrant statistical comparisons between S-1 and S-3.

Metal artifacts from S-3 are more informative about *promyshlennik* life. A total of 255 iron, lead, copper and brass articles from S-3, considered along with functionally related materials, represents a far wider array of maintenance and manufacturing activities than indicated at S-1. The firearms complex at S-3 includes gun spalls and iron gun components, musket balls, small shot, a possible powder flask nozzle and lead splatter from shot production. Knives and other iron hand tools were found, along with whalebone cutting blocks. Nails, tacks, spikes, scraps of sheet iron and sheet copper, bar stock, nuts and bolts, unidentified metal scraps, broken parts and forge slag all testify to the conduct of craftsmanship, carpentry and mechanical repairs. Trade rings of copper (5) and lead (2) were also found, probably issued to the *promyshlenniki* for distribution (along with beads) to the Native hunters.

It should be noted that the presence of gun-related artifacts, iron, and knives -- categories of material to which Qikertarmiut access had been prohibited (Shelikhow 1952a:35; 1952b:45, 48) -- supports the hypothesis that the S-3 *barabara* was occupied (at least principally) by Russian or Unangan employees of the Shelikhow company rather than by Qikertarmiut workers or hostages. Beads and other trade items were also far more abundant than would be expected from an early contact period Qikertarmiut house floor.

Other artifacts from S-3, however, indicate the adoption of indigenous technology and/or the direct participation of Qikertarmiut -- most likely women -- in the household economy. Over 200 fragments (in 53 lots) of gravel-tempered local pottery, representing at least three different charcoal-encrusted cooking pots, occurred in a dense cluster around the central hearth in Room 2. S-3 also yielded ground slate women's knives (ulukaqs), a slate scraper, a net float carved from pumice, a grooved line weight, a notched pebble netsinker and part of a stone oil lamp. The problem of distinguishing intrusive Kachemak artifacts from historic Qikertarmiut types is minimal at S-3 because no prehistoric stratum in present.

**Faunal and floral remains.** Bones and shell fragments were concentrated in and around the S-3 hearth features. A few additional specimens were recovered from a thin external midden on the seaward side of the dwelling. An important characteristic of the S-3 faunal assemblage was the total absence of bones from any domestic animals. It appears that meat in the *promyshlennik* diet at Three Saints was derived entirely from local fish (cod, salmon, flatfish), sea mammals (seals, sea lions, dolphins, and whales), birds, and intertidal species. These foods were harvested for Russian use by the Native work force. Sauer, for instance, noted
that "small [Native] parties are sent out daily to fish for halibut, cod, etc. Females are employed in curing and drying fish..." (1802:170-171). We know that food supplies were not always adequate for the workers at Three Saints, for they complained bitterly of hunger and other deprivations suffered during the winter of 1784-5 (Pierce 1976:75).

Abundant scatters and clusters of elderberry (Sambucus racemosa) and salmonberry (Rubus spectabilis) seeds were found around the hearths in S-3 (Winant 1992). Russian consumption of berry juice was observed by the Cook expedition at Illiuliuk, where the Russians prepared a meal of blueberry juice, halibut, and whale blubber. Fresh juice may have been taken as an antidote to the scurvy which killed nine men at Three Saints Harbor during the first winter, or fermented for the preparation of vodka (cf. Beaglehole 1967:1339; Davydov 1977:176).

**Discussion.** Architecturally, Structure 3 was an adaptation of the indigenous earth-covered longhouses of the Aleutians, with Russian modifications that included a ground-level doorway (as opposed to a roof entrance), windows covered with glass or mica, and a thatched roof over an arching internal frame. A larger but structurally identical house was present at Illiuliuk when visited by the Cook expedition in 1778:

The dwelling house is about 70 or 75 feet long & about 20 or 24 feet broad & about 18 feet high in the middle, being built in an Arch'd form with American timber & well thatch'd with straw and dry'd grass, & a netting over it...The principal people live at the East end of the house; having a window at that end made of tulk [talc, i.e. mica] gives a tolerable good light, with a sky light over head & cover'd with the intestines of some of the large sea animals, gives very good light also. The next apartment to this lives some russians & the better sort of Kamscadales [Native Siberians (Itelmen) from the Kamchatka Peninsula], the lower sort of russians and Kamscadales spreading their skins on dry'd grass and sleeping on the ground. They cook all their provisions in large copper kettles in the middle of this house...There is a wooden bulk head that runs across the house with a door in it dividing the house into two apartments, the westernmost being about 14 or 15 feet long, which they make a store house or pantry of... (Beaglehole 1967:1354-55).

Foods consumed by the occupants of Structure 3 at Three Saints Harbor reflect dependence on local sources and technologies, rather than on imports from Russia or locally-produced agricultural products. Possible exceptions are suggested by the tea cup and a few pieces of glass from bottles of imported spirits. Even alcohol may have been mostly home-made, however, from local berries.

Imported trade goods, iron tools and weapons in the S-3 artifact assemblage leave little doubt that the principal inhabitants of the dwelling were promyshlenniki. While the gender associations of pottery and other non-Russian artifacts found in the house are ambiguous, historical data indicate that Qikertarmiut women were willingly or unwillingly involved in sexual unions with the Russian workers, and performed domestic tasks for them. Stone tools in S-3 indicate that these tasks may have included cooking and food or skin preparation. Fishing items (float, net and line sinkers) may represent either women's fishing activities, or adoption of this technology by the Russians.
Overview and Conclusions

The krepost site at Three Saints Harbor site is a historical snapshot of the Russian American colonial system in its earliest phase of development. The settlement was a briefly occupied foothold in prime fur territory, gained by conquest and coercion, a stepping stone in Grigorii Shelikhov's ambitions of empire. The general paucity of imported artifacts at the site, from ceramic dishes to glassware, bricks, and basic tools, reflects both the short span of occupation and the very great difficulty and expense of shipping food and supplies from Irkutsk to the Alaskan frontier. As Gibson (1974; 1989) has described, these difficulties would pinch the growth of Russia's American Colony throughout its history, until the territory was relinquished in 1867. In Wallerstein's global conception, Alaska was a distant and difficult periphery of the newly-emergent capitalist world system, in which Russia herself was a marginal extension of the industrialized European core.

Under these conditions, Russian colonialism on the Pacific was bound to have a different character than the more affluent, Atlantic-focused enterprises of its North American rivals in the fur trade, the British and French. Russian relations with Alaskan Native people combined dominance and dependency. Military actions and harsh political control were applied as needed to suppress resistance and increase fur production, especially during the early conquest period when Three Saints Harbor was founded. On the other hand, the shortage of Russian manpower in Alaska and extensive reliance on indigenous production led to Russian-American Company policies that encouraged intermarriage and social fusion between Russian workers and Alaska Natives in order to promote the growth of a cooperative, ethnically-mixed labor force. While the prejudices described by Golovin may never have been overcome, mixed marriages were blessed by Russian Orthodox priests and Creoles were allowed to advance through the ranks of government and military service on an equal par with Russians. A Russian education, religious instruction, and technical training were offered to Creole boys, promoting their class elevation (Black 1990).

At Three Saints Harbor, the lines of class and ethnic division were clearly drawn, emphasizing the hierarchical structure of the new colonial society and suggesting that Russian adaptation and acculturation to Native lifeways was a function of worker poverty, from which the owner and managerial ranks were insulated. The spatial segregation of the company officers, their comfortable quarters in log houses built to Russian architectural standards, their preferential access to home country foods and domestic meats all signify class privilege which at the same time carried an ideological justification -- the display of Russian culture in the purest form possible, as a tool for cultural conversion and pacification of the Native population. The houses of these officers were surrounded by other symbols of Russian culture, values and civilization (however humble in actual appearance): a chapel, a school, gardens, a bathhouse and a bread oven.

As for the promyshlenniki, Vancouver's haughty note on Russian fur traders in Cook Inlet in 1794 suggests that they:

...appeared to be perfectly content to live after the manner of the Native Indians of the country; partaking with equal relish and appetite their gross and nauseous food, adopting the same fashion, and using the same materials for their apparel... (Vancouver 1801:207).
The actual attitudes of the promyshlenniki at Three Saints Harbor are not known, but their dwellings, diet, cooking practices, clothing and other aspects of material culture (e.g. the gayaqs [kayaks] they used for transportation) reflected extensive dependence upon both local resources and upon Alaska Native skills, traditions, and labor. Beyond these material borrowings, Russian workers had far greater direct contact and daily interaction with the Native population than their superiors, formed long-term relationships with Qikertarmiut women, and must have learned indigenous languages as a matter of practical necessity. Many would live long years or the rest of their lives in Alaska, where they inevitably became acculturated to indigenous lifeways. While such men may have maintained a fundamentally Russian self-identity, they had neither the motivation nor resources to invest in its material signifiers.

An eventual historical-archaeological synthesis of Russian America as a multiethnic colonial society must combine results from Russian outposts like Three Saints Harbor, Fort Ross, and Fort Elizabeth with studies of contemporaneous Native American sites (e.g. Knecht and Jordan 1985). The Three Saints Harbor study suggests that cultural influences were complex, bi-directional, and influenced by the hierarchical structure of the Russian colonial population and of many indigenous societies, especially in southern Alaska. Archaeological investigations have much to contribute to the understanding of contact processes, particularly because they can be a rich source of data on segments of the colonial population (e.g. Russian and Native workers) which were largely ignored in contemporary texts. It is important, however, that archaeological models of the fur trade and its consequences derived from other North American regions not be applied uncritically in Alaska, California and Hawaii, where fort and village sites reflect an economy and mode of fur production that were particular to Russian America.
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### Appendix A: Correlations Between Historical and Archaeological Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1790 Voronin illustration (Fig. 5A)</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence (Fig. 5B)</th>
<th>Historical References and Descriptions of the Three Saints Harbor Krepost Site Between 1784 and 1790</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building &quot;A&quot;</td>
<td>Structure 4</td>
<td>Shelikhov instructed in 1786 that &quot;mud huts and barracks&quot; be built at company outposts where timber was in short supply (Shelikhov 1952b:46). This could have referred to semi-subterranean structures like &quot;A&quot; and &quot;Q&quot; and/or to above-ground wattle and daub houses like &quot;G&quot; and &quot;H&quot;. Sarychev observed &quot;mud-walled huts&quot; at Three Saints Harbor in 1790 (1969:17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semisubterranean house</td>
<td>Basin-shaped depression 8 meters in diameter, 50 cm deep. Test pit in 1990.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &quot;B&quot;</td>
<td>Not located</td>
<td>During their 1790 visit with the Billings-Sarychev expedition, Sauer noted Russian cookhouses at the base of a hillside stream (1802:182) and Merck (1980:96) observed a bath house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooden building or platform with conical thatched roof; possible cookhouse or bath house</td>
<td>Structure 1 15 x 15 m rock foundation, brick fragment scatter from chimney, window glass. Partially excavated in 1990.</td>
<td>We know from Merkul'ev (quoted in Davies et al 1981:3829) that Shelikhov's house at Three Saints Harbor had windows, and Shelikhov mentions a room where he received Native leaders which contained books, a large mirror, and a portrait of Empress Catherine II (1981:44-45). This is where Delarov later met with López de Haro, in a building described by the Spaniard as a large, multi-roomed structure made of &quot;well-hewn Planks&quot; with a stove, large mirror, and rich furnishings, which served as an officers' residence (1975:17-19). In 1790, Sauer described a multi-roomed wooden building that served as Delarov's residence and company headquarters (1802:173) and Fidalgo noted a &quot;Large House for the Crew with an inner apartment in which the Chief [Delarov] lives&quot; (1975:4). All of these descriptions almost certainly refer to Building &quot;C&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &quot;C&quot;</td>
<td>Structure 1 15 x 15 m rock foundation, brick fragment scatter from chimney, window glass. Partially excavated in 1990.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log-walled headquarters building. Identifying features: multiple rooms, chimney, windows.</td>
<td>We know from Merkul'ev (quoted in Davies et al 1981:3829) that Shelikhov's house at Three Saints Harbor had windows, and Shelikhov mentions a room where he received Native leaders which contained books, a large mirror, and a portrait of Empress Catherine II (1981:44-45). This is where Delarov later met with López de Haro, in a building described by the Spaniard as a large, multi-roomed structure made of &quot;well-hewn Planks&quot; with a stove, large mirror, and rich furnishings, which served as an officers' residence (1975:17-19). In 1790, Sauer described a multi-roomed wooden building that served as Delarov's residence and company headquarters (1802:173) and Fidalgo noted a &quot;Large House for the Crew with an inner apartment in which the Chief [Delarov] lives&quot; (1975:4). All of these descriptions almost certainly refer to Building &quot;C&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &quot;D&quot;</td>
<td>No structural remains identified; Russian midden deposits and magnetic anomalies throughout this area</td>
<td>This building was described by López de Haro (&quot;a very large Storehouse of two stories which they are finishing of great Logs of Pine well hewn,&quot; 1975:17-19) and by Fidalgo (&quot;a Storehouse of rather large capacity where they keep the whale oil, dried fish for the winter, the Carpenter's and Blacksmith's tools, and the fishing gear&quot; 1975:4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large wooden warehouse for food supplies and tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &quot;E&quot;</td>
<td>No structural remains identified; Russian mid-den deposits and magnetic anomalies throughout this area</td>
<td>Shelikhov ordered in 1786 that the children's school was to be enlarged (Shelikhov 1952b:44) and López de Haro in 1788 saw &quot;a house in which they have a school, with many Indians, adults and children&quot; (1975:17-19). The location of this school is made clear by Fidalgo, who wrote that &quot;adjoining this [the Storehouse, Building D] is a School where they teach the Indian children to read and write the Russian language&quot; (1975:4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building &quot;F&quot;</td>
<td>Not located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &quot;G&quot; and &quot;H&quot;</td>
<td>Structures 7 and 8 Circular depressions with raised wall mounds, 8.5 and 6.5 m in outside diameter, respectively.</td>
<td>In 1786, Shelikhov instructed that a combination dwelling and storeroom for company supplies be built for Merkul'ev and his wife. It was to have log walls, a wooden floor, windows, and stoves (Shelikhov 1952b:50). López de Haro wrote that &quot;The house of this officer (Merkul'ev) was large but rather low, made of well hewn planks, with several Divisions inside for the various Russians,&quot; implying that others were living there by 1788. This house was destroyed by the 1788 tsunami wave (Davies et al 1981:3829). In 1790, Sauer observed &quot;five houses after the Russian fashion&quot; (1802:173). While most of these houses were probably occupied by company officers, including Merkul'ev and the navigator Izmailov (Fidalgo 1975:4), one was used as a dwelling for Qikertarmiut child hostages (Merck 1980:96).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings &quot;I,&quot;&quot;J,&quot;&quot;M,&quot;&quot;N,&quot;&quot;O&quot;</td>
<td>No structural remains identified; these smaller cabins apparently lacked rock foundations and did not leave mounds or depressions. Magnetic anomalies are present throughout the general area where the cabins were located.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;K,&quot; &quot;L&quot;(?),&quot;V&quot;</td>
<td>No structural remains identified. These were probably temporary summer dwellings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;P&quot;</td>
<td>Structure 6? This is a low 10 x 15 m mound, covered with luxuriant plant growth</td>
<td>Domestic animals mentioned in connection with the Three Saints Harbor settlement include goats, cattle, pigs, goats, and rabbits (Shelikhov 1952c:80; Sauer 1802:173).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building &quot;Q&quot;</strong></td>
<td><strong>Structure 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>In 1786, Shelikhov instructed that &quot;mud huts and barracks&quot; be built at company outposts when timber was in short supply (Shelikhov 1952b:46).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-roomed, semi-subterranean barracks; for Russian or Unangan (Aleut) company employees</td>
<td>Excavated in 1990-91; sand floor, internal divider walls, open hearths, thatched roof.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>&quot;R&quot;</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cemetery with rock grave features mapped at this location in 1990-91.</strong></th>
<th><strong>The cross is also shown on Sarychev's map of the settlement and harbor (1826:Plate 28).</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross marking location of cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>&quot;S&quot;</strong></th>
<th><strong>None.</strong></th>
<th><strong>A &quot;traveling church,&quot; &quot;astronomical tent&quot; and field kitchen were set up at the eastern end of the settlement by Billings' men during the 1790 visit by the Billings-Sarychev expedition (Sarychev 1969:18; Sauer 1802:Pl. opposite p. 182)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group of European-style tents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>&quot;T,&quot;&quot;U&quot;</strong></th>
<th><strong>None</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shelikhov ordered company vessels to be demasted, beached, and covered over for safe storage (Shelikhov 1952b:51). On shore, one of the vessels served as a sentry post, arms magazine, and place for storing sea otter furs, while religious services were apparently held in the other (López de Haro 1975:17-19; Sauer 1802:173).</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two beached Russian vessels (galiots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Building &quot;V&quot;</strong></th>
<th><strong>Possibly related to Structure 5. (a house depression with small sideroom, dimensions 14 x 20 m) but seems too small.</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small semisubterranean house or storage hut with two square openings, possibly a low door and window.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>