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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section includes the history and objectives of the project, along with recommendations for expanding the interpretive scope of the Bishop’s House in Sitka to include its context within the Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscape in Alaska from approximately 1840 to 1920.

PROJECT OUTLINE

Through a cooperative agreement between the National Park Service and the Drachman Institute of the University of Arizona College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture, the Sitka National Historical Park and the Alaska Regional Support Office will gain a broader understanding of how the Russian Orthodox Diocese of Alaska functioned in its relationships with the church hierarchy in Russia and its parishes and missions in Alaska during the Russian colonial period and the transitional American period. These relationships will be illuminated through the development of a historic context and by landscape analyses at scales ranging from state-wide to individual clusters and properties, among them the Bishop’s House in Sitka.

PROJECT HISTORY

The Drachman Institute of the College of Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Planning of the University of Arizona, undertook this study in August 2014. The project was administered through a Cooperative Agreement with the Desert Southwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit of the University of Arizona (Cooperative Agreement Number H1200-10-001). Professor R. Brooks Jeffery served as Principal Investigator, with Helen Erickson as Project Director and John H. Erickson as Researcher and Historian. Nina Bogdan served as Russian translator for essential documents, and Nevenka Kitanovski, MLA, assisted with documentation of sites in the Anchorage area. Brinnen Carter, Ph.D., Chief of Resources at Sitka National Historical Park, served as Park Project Coordinator.

The study required both library research and site documentation. Members of the project team made a number of trips to Alaska during the course of the project.

In September 2014 R. Brooks Jeffery, Helen Erickson and John H. Erickson traveled to Sitka to meet with park staff to discuss the project and conduct initial site research. Helen Erickson and John H. Erickson subsequently traveled to Juneau to visit archives and to document ecclesiastical sites in Juneau and Douglas.

During the period from September 2014 to September 2016, Helen Erickson visited thirteen ecclesiastical sites.
• Juneau and Sitka (September 2014)
• Eklutna, Knik, Kodiak, Old Harbor, Ouzinkie, Sitka and Spruce Island (April 2015)
• Kenai, Kwethluk, Napaskiak, Ninilchik, Seldovia and Unalaska (July/August 2015)
• Kenai and Sitka (September 2016).

John H. Erickson also visited and contributed to the documentation of the following sites

• Juneau and Sitka (September 2014)
• Eklutna, Knik, Kodiak, Sitka and Spruce Island (April 2015)
• Kenai, Kwethluk, Napaskiak, Ninilchik and Seldovia (July/August 2015).

Helen and John H. Erickson undertook a review of bibliography and of archival resources. This review included visits to the Alaska State Library and the archives of the Sealaska Heritage Institute, Juneau AK (September 2014); the archives of the Orthodox Church in America, Syosset NY (December 2014 and January 2015); the archives of the Anchorage Museum (April 2015 and July 2015); and the archives of St. Herman’s Seminary in Kodiak AK, the diocesan seminary of the Orthodox Church in America’s Diocese of Alaska (April 2015). Special thanks are due to the University of Alaska Anchorage / Alaska Pacific University Consortium Library (July 2015) and to the University of Arizona Library Special Collections (June 2015) for obtaining microfilm access to important manuscript and rare print materials.

Helen Erickson undertook work on the development of a procedure for documenting ecclesiastical resources at remote locations in Alaska (Chapters 7.06 and 7.07). At St. Herman’s (April 2015), a text and photograph format was presented to the seminary students, who are drawn from villages across Alaska. A similar presentation was made for clergy wives at the annual Kuskokwim Deanery conference, held in Napaskiak, Alaska (July 2015). After these presentations, it was determined that video (phone) documentation rather than written documentation would be a far more effective medium for this crowd-sourced project. The footage for two video models was completed in October 2016. Robert Demers of the University of Arizona provided guidance in how to use an iPad to film on site and processed the final versions of the videos. Dorothy Gray of the Church of the Assumption (Kenai, AK) and V. Rev. Michael Oleksa of the Russian Diocese of the Orthodox Church in America narrated footage in Kenai and Sitka, respectively. Video releases for Gray and Oleksa, and also for Ana Ditmar, who rang the St. Michael’s Cathedral bells for the Sitka recording, are available from the Drachman Institute. His Grace Bishop David (Mahaffey) of Sitka and Alaska (Orthodox Church in America) supported and facilitated this segment of the project throughout the study.

1 Return visits to Kenai and Sitka undertaken in September 2016 provided an opportunity to film the two videos associated with this project, as well as to verify earlier documentation.
In December 2015, a draft document was submitted to Sitka National Historical Park. A final document was submitted in January 2017.

**METHODODOLOGY**

The project context was based on archival research and evaluation of preexisting documentation of Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical sites in Alaska. The context utilized both secondary and primary sources in an initial effort to create a comprehensive overview of the presence of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska.

National Register Nominations and Historic American Buildings Surveys provided an initial framework for the work. A review of these materials is contained in Appendix 7.01.

Historic photos of the sites chosen for documentation were obtained online from the Library of Congress, the National Park Service National Register, and VILDA, or, in a few cases, were scanned from publications and archival collections. Historic photos were used as a basis of comparison with today’s existing conditions, although only a minority of these provide landscape information. It should be noted that there has been no effort made to obtain publication permission for these historic photographs, but the information contained in them was essential to the completion of the study.

Thirteen ecclesiastical sites were chosen for documentation. The sites were selected on the basis of historic resources, geographic and ethnic distribution, and accessibility. Many sites are accessible only by air or water, and some visited sites are generally not open to non-residents. His Grace, Bishop David of Alaska, supported our efforts in visiting some of these locations, and John H. Erickson, as a priest in the Russian Orthodox Church, was always welcome.

Directions used in figures and in descriptions are based on liturgical east, not geographic east. More information on this aspect of the study is found in Chapter 4.00 (Introduction to Field Notes).

When materials in Russian were deemed especially important to the project, University of Arizona graduate student Nina Bogdan assisted with translations.

Because of the interpretive needs of the Russian Bishop’s House in Sitka, the study took place at several different scales, ranging from the geographic extent of the Russian Orthodox Church, to the state of Alaska, to individual towns and villages, to Sitka, and to the Bishop’s House itself. While the study of the landscape of the Bishop’s House is intended to be reasonably comprehensive, it should not be mistaken for a Cultural Landscape Report.
STUDY AREAS

In order to provide an appropriate interpretive context, the chosen study area is both extensive and intensive. Beginning with a general analysis of the geographic spread of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska and its links to Russia and, later, the lower United States, a number of specific sites were chosen for closer evaluation. These ecclesiastical locations were selected on the basis of historic importance, association with major figures, community size, ethnic background, and accessibility. To provide an expanded interpretive context for the Bishop’s House as part of the Sitka National Historical Park, a subsection of the project is focused on the Russian Bishop’s House, as well as on other ecclesiastical resources and their relationships in Sitka.

Study areas were selected at four different scales.

- The State of Alaska and selected connections to Russia (Figure 1.1)
- Selected sites providing an analytic context for Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical sites in Alaska (Figure 1.2)
- Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical resources and sites of former resources in Sitka AK (Figure 1.3)
- The immediate landscape of the Russian Bishop’s House in Sitka AK (Figure 1.4)
Figure 1. 1. Study area covered by this report with outlined area of more intensive study (imagery based on Google Earth 2016).

Figure 1. 2. Geographic location of study areas individually analyzed in this report (imagery based on Google Earth 2016).
Figure 1. 3. Study area in Sitka AK (imagery based on Google Earth 2016).

Figure 1. 4. Study area, Russian Bishop’s House property (Welzenbach 2011, 6).
PROJECT OBJECTIVES

As both a metaphorical and a physical landscape study, the primary objective was to provide contextual materials for a greater understanding of the intellectual and geographic impact of the Russian Orthodox Church on the Alaskan landscape. Recognizing the enormous scope of the project, this report is intended to serve as a point of departure for future work as well as to provide useful and immediate interpretive guidance for the Russian Bishop’s House, linking it to the wider ecclesiastical landscape of Sitka and of the larger Alaskan ecclesiastical landscape.

A secondary goal was to involve students and members of the public in this project. With directed reading, the University of Arizona graduate student translator became aware of a whole new area of Russian studies. As an NPS volunteer, Nevenka Kitanovski, MLA, assisted with documentation of sites in the Anchorage area. Students from St. Herman’s Seminary, Alaska, and Orthodox clergy and their families were involved in the planning of a tool to document important but relatively inaccessible historic ecclesiastic landscapes. This led to the development of a video model to implement such work.

A third objective was to acquaint park interpretive staff with currently available private and ecclesiastical resources in Alaska. Among these resources are the contemporary Diocese of Sitka and Alaska (Orthodox Church in America), individual historic ecclesiastical sites having active interpretive programs (Kenai and Kodiak parishes), and non-profits such as ROSSIA (Russian Orthodox Sacred Sites in Alaska).

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report is organized into four parts, each of which focuses on a specific aspect of this study. When needed, these are divided into chapters. Figures are identified by chapter number; to reduce the complexity of figure captions, sources for all historic photos in a chapter are listed in a table at the end of the section rather than referenced in the caption.

- The Introduction provides material on the background and methodology of the project, along with summary recommendations for the report as a whole.

- Part I provides a historic context for the Russian Orthodox Church, its origins in the Middle East and Russia, liturgical structures, organization and development in Alaska and the United States, along with field notes on the thirteen sites visited during the course of the study.

- Part II focuses specifically on the Russian Bishop’s House in Sitka. While this is an effort to provide fine-grained information about the resource and its history, it is not intended to serve as a Cultural Landscape Report, but rather an analysis of the potential of the Russian Bishop’s House to develop a cohesive
interpretative strategy in collaboration with other groups at a variety of scales throughout Alaska and beyond.

- The Appendices contain information on preexisting documentation and archival resources, a bibliography, a reference timeline, a glossary of terms and information on the two documentary videos completed as part of this project.

KEY FINDINGS

General

This study covers a large area, both in terms of geography and in terms of information, and thus must be regarded as a starting point for additional work.

Many aspects of the ecclesiastical landscapes studied have clear links to liturgical and administrative practices in the Russian Orthodox Church. These have been identified in the field site analyses in Part I and 2. Orientation of churches to a determined liturgical east is part of this linkage.

The work of scholars completed over the past fifty years includes much that is excellent, but also much that requires revision. Some of the difficulties to be overcome include

- Primary sources are scattered throughout archives in Alaska and elsewhere in the United States. Much primary source research remains to be done, especially in Russian archives, which were previously inaccessible.

- Approximately half of the historic photographs – including almost all of the photos in the Vinokouroff collection and those on the Sitka National Historical Park website – are undated.

- Access. Many resources are located in places difficult to reach by public transportation and have no public options for lodging or meals. Social considerations may also restrict access to sites.

Almost all NPS documentation of historic Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical sites in Alaska should be revised and/or expanded. National Landmark documentation forms provide information on church architecture and appropriate descriptions of Setting, but in most cases landscape components are ignored. National Register Nominations dating from the 1970s and 1980s contain minimal historical information and require updated historic contexts as well as documentation of significant landscape features such as cemeteries. Polygonal site boundaries should be determined, rather than relying on the supplied lat/long points. Important undocumented sites, such as Russian Mission, Old Harbor, and Kwethluk, should be documented.
Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical resources listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places should be documented through a series of Historic American Landscapes Surveys comparable to the Historic American Buildings Surveys completed during 1989-1990. Crowd-sourced video documentation of remote sites should be encouraged, following the two prototypes developed as part of this study.

Specific to the Russian Bishop’s House

The Russian Bishop’s House is well situated to provide a comprehensive interpretation of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska during Russian period and into the period following acquisition of Alaska by the United States. Interpretation should include its continually changing uses, illustrating the ongoing adaptations of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska.

Consideration should be given to the development of a Sitka historic ecclesiastical district, of which the Russian Bishop’s House could serve as interpretive center.

Regional Russian ecclesiastical resources in Juneau, Angoon, Hoonah and Funter Bay should be documented for inclusion in the Russian Bishop’s House interpretive materials.

Interpretation of the multiple roles of the Russian Bishop’s House within the context of the greater landscape of Sitka and of Alaska as a whole should be pursued.

Closer partnerships and possible cooperative projects with entities having similar, overlapping or complementary interests – such as the Sitka Historical Society and the Sheldon Jackson Museum in Sitka, the Baranoff Museum in Kodiak, and various divisions of the NPS (Katmai NP, Craters of the Moon NM, the World War II Valor in the Pacific NM, Alaska unit) should be explored.

Interpretive materials for the Bishop’s House and related resources should reflect the Russian Empire’s eastward expansion across the North Pacific and into Alaska to counteract the common perception of Russian Alaska as a northern outpost of the United States.

Further archaeological investigation of the Trinity Church, the Russian Cemetery, and the area of the location of the first St. Michael’s and its associated cemetery should be undertaken.
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OVERVIEW

STUDY AREAS

The establishment of Russian Orthodox churches in Alaska was not an isolated endeavor but rather part of a much wider missionary effort, as the Russian Empire expanded into central Asia and across Siberia to the Pacific (Figure 2.1) and eventually to California and Hawaii. The early history of Russian Orthodoxy in Alaska is closely linked to the history of Russian exploration and trade in Eastern Siberia, the Kurile Islands and even Japan and China. Churches were established along water routes, both ocean and river, following trade routes previously identified by Russian and native populations. Church life in all these regions was molded not only by regional circumstances but also by empire-wide developments in mission philosophy and by changes in institutional priorities. This wider Russian context has not yet been fully integrated into academic studies or popular presentations of the Alaskan Orthodox ecclesiastical landscape.

Figure 2.1. Map of Alaska and Siberia (imagery based on Google Earth 2016).
GEOGRAPHIC SPREAD OF THE RUSSIAN MISSIONS IN THE NORTH PACIFIC

The earliest Alaskan churches served by permanently assigned clergy were located in Kodiak (1794) and Sitka (1816), successive headquarters of the Russian-American Company. A new charter for the company in 1821 led to the establishment of new parishes (Figure 5.2) in Unalaska (1824) and Atka (1928), followed by mission parishes based in Nushagak (1841), Russian Mission (1945) and Kenai (1845). The geographic extent of these parishes was enormous. The Nushagak parish, for example, encompassed the Nushagak, upper Kuskokwim and Stone River basins. Priests traveled hundreds of miles annually to visit outposts and villages. In many of these, chapels (or prayer houses) were constructed to provide a stable place for worship, with some eventually being raised to the level of parish churches. By the turn of the twentieth century the number of parish churches in Alaska had more than doubled (Figure 2.3), and the number of chapels had increased proportionately. Today – with more clergy available to serve the church - the distinction between parish church and chapel is less rigorously maintained.

Figure 2.2. Russian Orthodox Parishes in Alaska in 1860.
CONTEXTUAL RELATIONSHIPS

One of the issues hindering a more comprehensive understanding of Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical resources in Alaska is the tendency, supported by the structure of early National Register practice, to see each resource as independent and unique, rather than as part of a connected whole. A church, as part of a parish, was rarely an isolated and independent unit as it is often unintentionally presented in architectural documentation, but was part of a larger cluster of housing, schools, orphanages, hospitals and cemeteries. Within villages these units tended to be closely grouped, but in urban settings they were more likely to be distributed throughout the surrounding urban matrix. Despite this, they remained part of a single setting, linked by a common social and religious concept. Often they were physically linked by ceremonial processions from place to place. They also shared a common orientation towards the east as established by the placement of the church altar. As will be further discussed in the Introduction to Field Notes (Chapter 4.00), liturgical east is a relative concept, possibly based on changing magnetic declination. New churches – even in urban areas - were likely to be built adjacent to old ones, and old churches were repurposed for other uses such as schools (or were taken apart to build or repair other ecclesiastical structures). Orphanages might be transformed into schools. Housing for clergy was located near the church, but might also accommodate a school.
At a larger scale, the parishes shared a common administrative structure which led to similar practices in geographically separated places. As a result, common patterns are reproduced across the ecclesiastical landscape. Radiating out from the church itself are processional areas and, often, cemeteries. Cemeteries reflect the overall ecclesiastical unit, manifesting, in many cases, the liturgical hierarchy, with readers or other clergy buried adjacent to the church entrance or altar. Fencing around a church rarely indicates a boundary, but rather a sphere of influence, much as the sound of bells defines a sphere of influence throughout a larger geographic range.

Examining these patterns and relationships opens a pathway for a more comprehensive view of the historic ecclesiastical resources of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska.

**THE RUSSIAN ROLE**

There were actually very few Russians in Alaska, and the majority of those returned to Russia at the time of the American Cession, before the great surge of Russian Orthodox development at the end of the nineteenth century. What is often missed in discussions of Russian Alaska is extent to which the native peoples of Alaska participated in the cultural fusion known as Russian Orthodoxy. The widespread practice of baptism before any mission contact helps to explain how the church came to permeate Alaskan culture through native agency rather than by foreign imposition.
PART ONE

THE ECCLESIASTICAL LANDSCAPE OF ALASKA

CHAPTER 3  HISTORIC CONTEXT

CHAPTER 4  FIELD NOTES
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THE ECCLESIASTICAL LANDSCAPE OF ALASKA

HISTORIC CONTEXT

References for all historic images contained in this chapter are listed in Figure 3.00. 15. No reproduction rights have been acquired for these materials, which are included here for reference only.

3.0 BACKGROUND

This survey of the historic and cultural context of Russian Orthodoxy in Alaska operates at several scales. Section 3.1 provides a brief overview of the history of the Orthodox Church from antiquity to the present. Section 3.2 offers a somewhat more detailed account of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church. Both sections call attention particularly to issues that will impinge on the history of Orthodoxy in Alaska. Thus, 3.1 considers East / West ecclesiastical relations, and 3.2 considers institutional characteristics of the St. Petersburg period of Russian history, from Peter the Great to the Russian Revolution.

Section 3.3 considers in very general terms some of the leading characteristics of Orthodox worship, while 3.4 – 3.6 become more detailed, with basic information on church organization, the church building and its liturgical space, cycles of worship, sacramental life, and popular piety, again drawing particular attention to features especially important for Orthodoxy in Alaska.

Sections 3.7 – 3.9 turn specifically to the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska. Of these, section 3.7 briefly summarizes the beginnings of Orthodoxy in Alaska. Section 3.8 gives a somewhat more detailed account of age of Innocent Veniaminov, and 3.9 covers the first three decades of American rule. Section 3.10 deals with the dramatic change in the demographic composition, geographic orientation and ethnic flavor of the Russian Orthodox Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska that began ca. 1890 with massive immigration to the United States from Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Near East. Section 3.11 returns to Alaska, with the establishment within the diocese of a separate vicariate of Sitka and Alaska (1903). It continues with new challenges for Orthodoxy in Alaska – and in all of North America - in the wake of the Russian Revolution. It ends with a brief appreciation the “rediscovery” of Orthodox Alaska in the mid-20th century.

The geographic scale and temporal ordering of this chapter runs from global, to Russian, to Alaskan and North American. Chapter 5 will narrow the geographic and temporal focus of the present study still further, to the historic context of the Russian Bishop’s House in Sitka during the period ca. 1840 – 1920.
3.1 THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

3.1.0 A faith ancient but little known

Many Americans are unfamiliar with Orthodoxy. Although there are well over four million Orthodox Christians in the United States and Canada and between 210 and 225 million worldwide, their history, beliefs and practices remain generally unknown or misunderstood (Krindatch 2011, 8). That is true even in Alaska, where Orthodox Christians are numerous and almost everyone knows someone who is Orthodox or whose grandmother was Orthodox. Some aspects of Orthodox church life are regularly covered in the local media: the liturgical pageantry of Holy Week and Easter (which generally fall some weeks after western Christians have observed these solemnities) or the colorful customs associated with Christmas (which for most Orthodox in Alaska falls thirteen days after the western observance). Readers of Russian literature may be familiar with certain aspects of Orthodox spirituality. Art-lovers may have encountered the world of icons. School children (at least in Alaska) may have read about (Russian) Orthodoxy in one of the early chapters of a history textbook. Yet even people with a passing acquaintance with Orthodoxy may be inclined to regard it as something foreign, a picturesque remnant from an alien past.

3.1.1 Beginnings

The Orthodox Church traces its history and spiritual roots to the earliest centuries of Christianity, to ancient eastern Christian centers like Jerusalem, Antioch and Alexandria, where the church has had a more or less continuous history since New Testament times. The church grew up in the Roman Empire, which at the time encompassed the entire Mediterranean world. The language that facilitated its spread was Greek, the language of the New Testament, which at the time served as a universal language in much the way that English does today. Most of the major theologians of the early church wrote in Greek and lived in the eastern part of the empire, where Christianity was then strongest. But Christianity was quickly embraced by people of many different cultures and languages both within the empire and beyond its borders.

The church of these early centuries was not a monolithic structure. Most theologians and church historians today would describe it rather as a communion or family of local churches. These churches had their own customs and distinctive ways of worshiping. At the same time, they were united in many ways, some very conspicuous, others less perceptible but no less real. These churches were united in their sacramental life, above all in baptism and the eucharist. They were united in the same apostolic faith, that is, they professed to hold the faith that was preached by Christ's apostles, expressed in the Scriptures, confessed by the martyrs, taught by the church fathers, and defined authoritatively in church councils. And they were united by bonds of charity, through the sharing of material resources and the exchange of letters, relics, and other tokens of fellowship.
To address issues of mutual concern, bishops who headed the local churches would meet together in councils. Some of these councils were regional. These would be organized and chaired by the chief bishop of the region, who by the 5th century was designated as a metropolitan (because he headed the church of the metropolis, or capital city, of the region) or as a patriarch (the chief "father" of the people of a region). Stressing the need for common decision-making, the Orthodox churches through the centuries have tried to organize themselves in this conciliar way. But in matters of particular urgency, when the integrity of the faith itself was challenged, an even wider gathering of bishops was needed: an ecumenical, or universal, council. The first of these ecumenical councils, the Council of Nicaea in 325 A.D., was especially important. Its creed, with amplifications from the second ecumenical council, held in Constantinople in 381 A.D., became the touchstone for Orthodoxy throughout the Christian world. Orthodox Christians emphasize its authority in various ways, both in their worship and in teaching. Along with the Lord's Prayer, the creed is something that practically every Orthodox Christian learns to say by heart. It also serves as the basis for catechetical instruction in Christian doctrine.

3.1.2 Constantinople, “New Rome”

The rise of Islam in the eastern Mediterranean in the 7th century swept away many of the structures for communication and cultural exchange that the Roman Empire had provided. Many ancient centers of eastern Christianity in Syria, Palestine and Egypt fell into decline. But already a new center for eastern Christianity had emerged: Constantinople, the city on the Bosporus now known as Istanbul, which had been founded by Emperor Constantine the Great in the 4th century to be a New Rome and co-capital of the empire. From the 9th century onward, Constantinople entered its golden age as the "ruling city" of the Byzantine Empire, an empire that was still officially Roman but in culture overwhelmingly Greek.

From Constantinople, missionaries went out especially to the Slavic peoples of the north, beginning with Sts. Cyril and Methodius in the 9th century. These saints set the pattern for mission in the Christian East. They emphasized the importance of adapting the ways in which the faith is expressed to the cultures of the people. Rather than imposing Greek, they established a written Slavic language, now most often called Old Church Slavonic, and translated liturgical services and other necessary works into it. In this vernacular form, Eastern Orthodox Christianity became deeply imbedded in the national cultures of the Bulgarian, Serbian, Ukrainian and Russian peoples. The churches established in this way enjoyed a high degree of independence in managing their own affairs, but they recognized Constantinople as their spiritual center.

3.1.3 Schism of East and West

Even as Constantinople was entering its golden age, its relations with Old Rome were growing strained. In the wake of the Germanic invasions that overwhelmed western
parts of the Roman Empire from the 5th century onwards, Rome had been left to its own devices. It had succeeded in converting the Germanic tribes to Latin Christianity without significant recourse to the vernacular. In the process it had helped to forge a relatively unified and uniform Latin Christendom in western Europe, which by the 11th century began to challenge the cultural and political dominance of Constantinople. In principle the churches of East and West remained one family, one communion, but they had grown estranged.

In 1054 A.D. Rome and Constantinople officially broke communion, formalizing the schism that already had begun to divide them. Contact between the churches continued after 1054. It even intensified, as crusaders from the west swarmed eastward intent on liberating the Holy Land from the forces of Islam. But when the knights of the Fourth Crusade (1204 A.D.) turned their attention instead to Constantinople, sacking it and forcibly imposing their own rule and church authorities, hopes for reunion faded. Estrangement gave way to the hostility and mistrust that characterized relations between the Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church for many centuries thereafter. Since the events of 1204, many Eastern Christians have been inclined to regard even the most well-meaning efforts towards reconciliation with suspicion.

3.1.4 Disciplinary and theological differences between East and West

Many of the issues initially in dispute between the churches arose because of differences in liturgical practice and discipline. For example, the chief issue that gave rise to the schism of 1054 was whether leavened bread (as in the East) or unleavened bread (as in the West) should be used in the eucharist. More divisive was whether celibacy should be a requirement for all the orders of the clergy. In contrast to the West, the East has always permitted married men to be ordained as deacons and priests. (Bishops, however, are chosen from among the celibate monastic clergy.)

Theological issues also divided the churches. The most enduring of these has to do with the doctrine of the Trinity. Although Christians East and West believe in one God in three persons – Father, Son, and Holy Spirit - they have explained the relationship of these three persons in slightly different ways. In the early Middle Ages the West added the words "and from the Son" (filioque) to the Nicaeo-Constantinopolitan Creed, so that it read "I believe in the Holy Spirit... who proceeds from the Father and from the Son." Orthodox theologians have seen this as symptomatic of an incorrect understanding of the place of the Holy Spirit in the Trinitarian mystery. They also have objected to the fact that this addition was made unilaterally, without due concern either for the authority of the ancient ecumenical councils or for the conciliar way in which the church should deal with such issues.

Closely linked to disagreements over discipline and theology has been disagreement over authority in the church, and more specifically over papal primacy. In the West in the course of the Middle Ages, the authority of the pope grew enormously. Theologians
and canon lawyers even came to describe it in terms of monarchy. The Orthodox objected when it became evident that such ideas had serious implications not only for the West but also for the East. In their eyes, the Roman understanding of primacy went beyond what the ancient ecumenical councils had envisioned. It appeared to undercut the eastern emphasis on conciliarity and consensus by suggesting that the pope was more than just "first among equals" in relation to his brother bishops. It also seemed to be at odds with the eastern understanding of the church universal as a communion of local churches.

For several centuries after the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks, Orthodox Christians in the Balkans and Near East were cut off from fruitful theological contact with the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestant churches that emerged in the west in the 16th century. At times Orthodox Russia enjoyed cordial diplomatic relations with the Protestant powers of northern Europe, but its relations with Poland, Austria and other Catholic powers were generally hostile, particularly after the Union of Brest (1596) and subsequent "unions" brought large groups of Eastern Christians living under Polish and Austrian rule into the Roman communion but at the expense of their spiritual and canonical unity with their Orthodox brothers and sisters.

In the course of the 20th century, the Orthodox churches developed generally amicable relations with the Protestant churches through common membership in the World Council of Churches and other ecumenical bodies. Relations with the Catholic Church also improved, especially after its Second Vatican Council increased opportunities for theological dialogue. Even so, the issue of "uniatism" to this day has remained a stumbling block in the quest for full unity between Orthodox and Catholics.

### 3.2 THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN RUSSIA

#### 3.2.1. The rise of Moscow

The "easternness" of Orthodoxy and its distinctiveness in relation to western forms of Christianity was reinforced with the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks in 1453. Turkish rule throughout the Balkans and the Near East made Orthodox Christians into second-class citizens, heavily taxed and subject to numerous restrictions affecting apparel, mode of transportation and many other aspects of daily life. Church life also was restricted in some very tangible ways. Many ancient churches were transformed into mosques, most notably Haghia Sophia in Constantinople. Built under the Emperor Justinian I in the 6th century, it had been the largest Christian church in the world for nearly 900 years. Public processions, external architectural display (towers, domes), the use of bells, and other projections of authority were prohibited.

While Ottoman rule was ghettoizing Orthodox church life in the Balkans and eastern Mediterranean, a new Orthodox power, Russia, was rising to the north. Christianity in its Byzantine Orthodox form had flourished in the lands of the Rus’ following the
baptism of Vladimir, Great Prince of Kiev, in 988 A.D., but the Kievan state – a loose confederation of principalities – was swept away with the sudden invasion of the Mongols (Tartars) in 1237-1240. Very slowly, the principality of Moscow consolidated its authority in the northeast, throwing off vassalage to the Mongols by the 16th century.

Moscow emerged as a "third Rome." Churches and monasteries proliferated, iconography and other forms of ecclesiastical art flourished, the grandeur of church services was augmented through rich vestments and extended chants. The metropolitanate of Moscow, de facto autocephalous (independent) since 1448, was raised to patriarchal status by a visiting patriarch of Constantinople in 1589, a decision confirmed subsequently by all four eastern patriarchs in 1593. But beneath the ritual splendor of Muscovite Russia lay certain tensions touching on its very identity. What should be the relationship between the tsar and the patriarch, between the civil authority and the ecclesiastical? What should be the relationship between “Holy Russia” and the rest of the Orthodox world, including not only Constantinople but also Ukraine and other western regions of the ancient Kievan state? And what should be its relationship with the Christian West, which by this point was divided in the wake of the Protestant Reformation?

3.2.2. Internal controversies and schism

A major controversy arose within the Russian Orthodox Church in the mid-17th century, when Patriarch Nikon of Moscow embarked on a program to revise the church’s liturgical books in order to bring them more closely into line with contemporary Greek usage. Some of the issues immediately in dispute may seem trivial – the number of syllables in Alleluia, the direction for processions, the number of fingers to be used in making the sign of the cross. But for many Russians, this was a question of religious and national identity. In 1667 a pan-Orthodox council in Moscow, which included representatives of the eastern patriarchs as well as Russian bishops, ratified Nikon’s liturgical “reforms” while deposing the patriarch himself. But many Russians rejected these “reforms,” in what has come to be known as the Old Believers’ schism - a division within Russian Orthodoxy that has lasted to the present day.1

In the course of this controversy over liturgical texts and practice, Tsar Alexis and Patriarch Nikon had a falling out over their respective roles within the state, but both envisioned Russia as a key player in international Orthodoxy, perhaps even as an instrument for recapturing Constantinople from the Turks. Both also envisioned closer engagement with the Orthodox in Ukraine and other western regions which until recently had been dominated by Catholic Poland.

1 There are four secluded Old Believer communities in Alaska, dating back to the 1960s, when their founders – originally from Siberia – arrived in the United States by way of China and Brazil.
The mid-17th century therefore marked a decisive turn not only for Russia’s political history but also for its cultural orientation. Art and architecture, music, apparel, the rituals of daily life – all were affected in ways that challenged received Muscovite norms. In the process, the external aspect of Russian church life acquired a western veneer. Iconography takes on a more naturalistic, westernized style. Monophonic chant begins to be supplanted by choral “part singing.” Theological scholarship adopts the Latinate style of the Kiev Theological Academy.

3.2.3 Peter the Great

This new western cultural orientation in Russia found its definitive institutional expression with the reign of Peter the Great (1672-1725). From an early age Peter was fascinated with the West – with its superior technologies whether in warfare or in commerce or in government. To advance his goal of acquiring a “window on the West,” he engaged in an extended struggle with Sweden for control of the Baltic, where he established a new capital for his empire, St. Petersburg. Symptomatic of this new orientation was Peter’s adoption of a new title, imperator, or emperor, in place of the old Muscovite designation, tsar. Like many of his contemporaries in the West, Peter was a proponent of absolute monarchy - of state sovereignty in all matters, including ecclesiastical matters.

Implications for the Russian church were spelled out in the Spiritual Regulation (Dukhovny Reglament), which Peter promulgated in 1721. This abolished the patriarchate and established in its stead a “Spiritual College,” later known as the Most Holy Governing Synod, which was composed of bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries chosen by the emperor. Given Patriarch Nikon’s attempt to assert patriarchal authority, the rationale for abolishing the office of patriarch in favor of a collective body is clear:

The fatherland need have no fear of revolts and disturbances from a collegial administration such as proceed from a single, independent ecclesiastical administrator. For the common people do not understand how the spiritual authority is distinguishable from the autocratic; but marveling at the dignity and glory of the Highest Pastor, they imagine that such an administrator is a second Sovereign, a power equal to that of the Autocrat, or even greater than he.... (Muller 1972, 10).

The Spiritual Regulation does not stop with abolition of the patriarchate. Most of the text addresses a host of issues for which bishops are responsible. An even longer supplement presents detailed rules for clergy and monastics. Among other things, clergy are to direct their attention to the extirpation of superstitious practices, careful record-keeping, and proper behavior (including proper deference to the emperor). Their training should include such practical subjects as geography, arithmetic and geometry as well as two hours daily for recreation “by way of straightforward and
physically active games” which “with amusement afford some instruction: for example, sailing on water in real vessels, making geometrical measurements, constructing regular forts…” (Muller 1972, 41).

As was true also with the absolute monarchies of the Enlightenment in western Europe, no detail of ecclesiastical life went unregulated. Like all the emperor’s subjects, clergy were expected to contribute in some way to the wellbeing of the state. They formed a distinct social class or estate (soslovie), alongside the noble, merchant/burgher, and peasant classes. This status gave the clergy – including not only priests and deacons but also readers, sextons and other church servitors - certain privileges (e.g., exemption from the poll tax). It also involved certain expectations and responsibilities that distinguished clergy (and their families) from other classes. They were educated in a separate school system intended specifically to prepare them for church service, above all for proper celebration of the liturgy and the sacraments. They were distinguished by attire and other aspects of appearance (e.g., beards, in the case of adult males). Their access to other career paths was limited in various ways (Freeze 1977, passim).

3.2.4 Ecclesiastical record-keeping

In the emerging modern world, an important mechanism for state control and supervision was record-keeping and reporting – a responsibility that fell heavily on the clergy. Satisfactory functioning of the church, or any governmental department, depended upon its bureaucracy. Orders, ultimately in the form of an ukaz (decree) from the emperor, were issued from above, and information deemed important by superiors was submitted from below. For historians these various reports are invaluable. For the bureaucrats themselves, including parish priests, they could become a source of frustration, especially for those serving in remote regions. For example, a reprimand could be received for failure to observe the provisions of an ukaz that had never been received.

Records that priests were expected to keep include the priest’s journal, school records, financial records, and church registers of various sorts.

- The journal (zhurnal’) was the priest’s primary way of informing his superiors of his activities. Some priests interpreted the requirement to keep a journal in a minimalist way, recording simply the liturgical services performed. Others followed instructions along the lines of those given by Metropolitan Innocent Veniaminov to a missionary priest, “to set down all thy acts, all the principal thoughts and words that shall have occurred in thy talks... and everything noteworthy generally” – such as travels (ROAM 3 [1999] 572).

- As schools associated with churches grew more common in the course of the 19th century, a separate school journal (klasnyi zhurnal’) often was kept in order to track student attendance and performance.
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Especially important was the church register (tserkovnyi vedomost’), which provided a comprehensive annual report on the state of the parish, including a brief history; description of the church, associated chapels, and their properties; a census of those living in the villages and settlements comprising the parish; and reports on members of the clergy attached to the parish, including not only ordained priests and deacons but also readers, sextons and other humbler members of the clerical estate.

- Financial records, including inventories of candles and other supplies, income and expenses, and special purpose donations.

- The metrical records book (metricheskaia kniga) contained annual accounts of births, baptisms, marriages and deaths in the parish, in each instance giving specific information about name, age, civil status, residence, and – in the case of death – its cause if known.

- The confessional record (ispovednyaia rospisi) recorded the names and other personal information on persons who filled – or did not fill - their “annual obligation” of going to confession and receiving holy communion at least once a year, indicating when necessary reasons for non-fulfillment.

A fair copy of such records would be submitted annually to the diocesan bishop, who in turn would prepare a comprehensive report on his diocese to submit to the Holy Governing Synod and its finance department. Meanwhile orders and instructions on various subjects would be relayed downward, from the emperor and the Holy Synod to diocesan bishops to parish priests. For example, an ukaz might prescribe a prayer service of thanksgiving on the occasion of the birth or marriage of a member of the imperial family. In remote places such orders often arrived long after the event in question took place. In its quest for information, the bureaucracy of the vast Russian Empire was comprehensive but not very efficient.

3.2.5 The Synodal period

The most conspicuous of the church reforms instituted by Peter the Great – replacement of the office of patriarch by the Holy Synod – would remain in place until the restoration of the patriarchate in 1917, in the midst of the Russian Revolution. The institutional history of the Russian Orthodox Church during this 200-year period is less the story of noteworthy churchmen than it is of successive “Overprocurators” of the Holy Synod.

In principle the Overprocurator, a layman, was simply the liaison officer between the Holy Synod and the emperor. But in fact he was in charge of organizing Holy Synod business, deciding on agendas, sending out invitations to meetings, and communicating.
any decisions to the emperor for approval or rejection. In this way successive
Overprocurators shaped church policies and procedures in a variety of ways. For
example, in the course of his tenure Prince A.N. Golitsyn (1805-1824) moved from the
fashionable rationalist thought of the Enlightenment to an equally fashionable
Protestant-style pietism, but with little discernable interest in traditional Orthodox
theology.

The long-serving Count N.A. Protasov (1836-55), a military officer, was a great believer
in discipline, in subordination to authority, in proper adherence to established
procedures, and in ranks and the decorations and awards that go with them. He also
implemented a new statute on diocesan consistories (1841), a detailed handbook for
diocesan administration that aligned its activities more closely with those of the
Overprocurator’s chancery in one highly centralized - but understaffed – bureaucratic
system.

Count Dimitrii Tolstoi served nearly simultaneously as Overprocurator (1865-1880) and
as Minister of Education (1866-1880). In Russia this was the era of the “Great Reforms,”
which included liberation of the serfs, modernization of the military, overhaul of the
financial system, extension of education, and a general loosening of the old system of
estates. Tolstoi worked to professionalize clergy education, to improve the priest’s
pastoral preparation, and to strengthen the priest’s role in the community. This
ambitious program helped improve the living conditions and social standing of priests,
but it also undercut the social solidarity of the clergy as a class. Those in humbler
clerical positions lost much of their earlier social and economic standing, and – absent a
seminary education – they no longer had much hope of advancement through the
clerical ranks.

Constantine Pobedonostsev (1880-1905) – pious, politically conservative, devoted to the
autocracy - was in office nearly as long as Protasov, but by the end of his tenure even
the bishops – for the most part his appointees - were growing restive. When queried
about possible church reforms, they joined a growing chorus of churchmen and scholars
who called for greater freedom of the church, greater participation of the laity in church
life and administration, less reliance on a centralized bureaucracy, greater involvement
in social issues, liturgical renewal with greater use of the vernacular, and – above all –
the convocation of an All-Russian Church Council and restoration of the patriarchate.

Despite many delays, complicated with the advent of World War I in 1914, the long-
awaited council finally convened following the democratic revolution of February 1917.
It acted to restore the office of patriarch and elected Tikhon Bellavin – a former
archbishop of the Aleutian Islands and America – to that high office. But following the
communist “October Revolution” later that year, new challenges and trials faced the
Russian Orthodox Church.
3.2.6 *In the wake of the Revolution*

On the eve of the communist Revolution in 1917, the Russian Orthodox Church, with about 117 million adherents, was the largest national church in the world. By the eve of World War II, it was close to liquidation. There were perhaps one thousand churches open in the entire country, those mostly in the cities in order to demonstrate to foreigners that there was freedom of religion in the Soviet Union. But a dramatic reversal came following Nazi Germany’s surprise attack on the Soviet Union in 1941. The church rallied to support the war effort against Germany, and in return restrictions on its activities were slowly eased.

The legal position of the church remained precarious, however, and its activities were closely monitored by the government. Subscription to Soviet propaganda was expected. Nothing could be said about darker aspects of Soviet life. Nevertheless, in the Soviet Union and – following World War II – in other predominantly Orthodox nations under Soviet domination, the Orthodox churches were able to find strategies for survival.

Following the fall of communism, the Orthodox churches in Russia and elsewhere in Eastern Europe emerged from decades of oppression with new possibilities for growth, and with new challenges. Symptomatic is the dramatic growth in the number of functioning parishes in Russia, from around 8000 in 1990 to nearly 35,000 in 2016 (http://www.patriarchia.ru/db/text/4366063.html). In this new context, the church has faced the delicate task of establishing its place within the political and social fabric of contemporary life. In principle, the changed international situation since the fall of communism has given all the Orthodox churches greater opportunities for contact and cooperation. At the same time, new tensions in inter-Orthodox relations have arisen, particularly between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Patriarchate of Constantinople. A new chapter in long history of the Russian Orthodox Church – and world Orthodoxy – is being written.

3.3 *THE SPIRIT OF ORTHODOX WORSHIP*

3.3.1 “*Right Worship*”

If approached only in terms of its history and its external structures, the Orthodox Church might appear disorganized and fragmented. But most Orthodox Christians do not approach their church in that way. Their perception of the church is molded by their experience of the church's sacramental life, its life of worship, and only secondarily by its organizational politics or even by the letter of its doctrinal formulations. For Orthodox Christians, worship is an essential aspect of Orthodoxy. As is pointed out so often, the very word "orthodoxy" does not mean simply adherence to right doctrine. It also means "right worship," the right way of giving glory -- *doxa* in Greek, *slava* in Church Slavonic -- to God.
The importance of worship for the Orthodox Church can be illustrated in many ways. For example, worship has played a major role in mission and evangelization. When Sts. Cyril and Methodius undertook their mission to the Slavs in the 9th century, they devised an alphabet that in principle made it possible to translate any texts whatsoever into the language of the people, but the texts that they translated were almost exclusively liturgical. A century later, when a delegation of still-pagan Rus’ came to Constantinople from Kiev on behalf of their prince Vladimir, they were taken to services in the great church of Haghia Sophia, the church of the Holy Wisdom. Earlier they had found the worship of the Muslims to be "abominable," that of the Germans to be "lacking in beauty," but in Haghia Sophia, "We knew not whether we were in heaven or on earth, for on earth there is no such splendor or beauty, and we are at a loss how to describe it. We only know that God dwells there" (Russian Primary Chronicle). Over the centuries, the beauty of Orthodox worship has attracted many to the faith -- not only Slavs and other eastern Europeans but also Africans, Indians, Japanese, Native Americans and many other ethnic groups. It has molded their understanding of the Christian faith, and it has helped them maintain their sense of identity not only when great temples like Haghia Sophia were still functioning churches but also in times of marginalization and persecution.

Visitors to an Orthodox church service often struck by how different the atmosphere is from what one finds in other houses of worship. The many icons, the rich vestments of the clergy, the clouds of incense, the postures and gestures of the worshipers, the melodies of the chants -- all this can be overwhelming, bewildering and perhaps a bit troubling. Those used to a less formal style of worship or to church services in which instruction and admonition play a major role may wonder what is the point of so much ritual. But the point of this elaborate ritual really is very simple: to communicate the basic truths of the Christian faith through "right worship," in ways that go beyond words alone. Orthodox worship is very tangible. It appeals to all the senses – sight, hearing, touch, taste. It engages the entire human person, body as well as mind and soul. Through ritual actions, such bows and prostrations or making the sign of the cross, the entire human person is drawn into prayer and praise. In this way the Church’s worship tries to make the meaning of the incarnation readily accessible to everyone, including children and others who might otherwise be marginalized.

3.3.2 Worship and community

"Right worship" gives Orthodox Christians an experiential knowledge of the Christian faith. It also manifests and reinforces their solidarity as a community. Visitors to an Orthodox church often are struck by the way that everyone seems to feel at home. Everyone seems to know his or her proper place and task. The priests and deacons and altar servers play a prominent role, but so do the cantors or choir, since in the Orthodox Church services are sung throughout. The congregation also are engaged in various ways (e.g., through their posture and gestures during the services). In all this, everyone
seems to have a good idea of what will happen next. One of the happier consequences of having a stable liturgy with predictable words and actions is that everyone knows its basic rules. The ordained clergy are not automatically in the position of being "experts" to the exclusion of others.

The sense of community created in Orthodox worship is not limited to those who are physically present. The icons of the saints, their commemoration in the course of the church year, the names of the deceased mentioned during the church services -- all this creates a powerful sense of tradition, a sense of the continuity of the church through the centuries despite the rise and fall of empires. More than any institution, worship has given Orthodox Christians their sense of identity in time as well as space, their sense of being "at home" in the church and their sense of belonging to the church.

Of course, Orthodox worship, like other aspects of the church's life, has undergone historical development. It is not static, utterly unchanged and unchanging. Nevertheless, the Orthodox liturgical tradition on the whole has been very conservative. It has not experienced the kinds of disruptions and revolutions that western Christian worship experienced, for example, at the time of the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century. This has helped make worship an independent and authoritative standard for practically all aspects of church life to a degree unmatched in the Christian West.

As the sometimes fractious history of the Orthodox Church suggests, however, it is not always easy to tell what represents an appropriate adaptation to new circumstances and what amounts to a betrayal of "right worship." In Russia, and through Russia in Alaska, there have been many adaptations that hardly call for comment. For example, native pussy willows are used on Palm Sunday rather than the palm fronds that are so readily available in the Mediterranean world. But over the centuries major schisms have resulted from seemingly minor changes. This was the case with the Old Believers' schism in 17th century Russia, which arose because of changes in such things as the way in which the sign of the cross is made and the direction in which processions around the church are to go. In the 20th century, similar issues have caused controversy and even division.

3.3.3 The liturgical calendar

A case in point is the question of the calendar. Until the 20th century, all the Orthodox churches – and the predominantly Orthodox nations of Eastern Europe - followed the Julian calendar, so called because it was originally devised under Julius Caesar in the first century B.C. By the 20th century, however, for both civil and ecclesiastical purposes, most of the world had adopted the Gregorian calendar, which was introduced by Pope Gregory XIII in the 16th century in order to correct for the ever-increasing discrepancy between astronomical reckoning and calendar dates.
From 1923 onward, for the calculation of fixed-date feasts like Christmas, some Orthodox churches adopted the Gregorian calendar while others – most notably the Russian Orthodox Church - retained the Julian. On both calendars, Christmas, for example, falls on December 25, but for those following the Julian calendar December 25 falls thirteen days later than on the Gregorian calendar – i.e., on January 7.

At the same time, in order to maintain a measure of unity with the other Orthodox churches, those adopting the “new” Gregorian calendar for fixed-date feasts retained the “old” Julian calendar for calculating the date of Easter and the moveable observances dependent on it. In principle, according to norms set down by the First Ecumenical Council in 325 A.D., Easter should fall on the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox, which at the time of the council fell on March 21 on the Julian calendar. Since then, however, with the progressive “lag” of the Julian calendar, March 21 has fallen progressively later than the astronomically observable vernal equinox. Because the date of Easter depends not only on the equinox but also on the phases of the moon, Eastern Orthodox and western Christian observances of the feast sometimes coincide. More often, however, the Orthodox observance falls some weeks after the western.

The change from "old calendar” to "new calendar” has not always gone smoothly. At times, disagreement over the calendar has contributed to major divisions within Orthodox church communities or has complicated relations between them. In Greece, for example, several Old Calendarist groups have broken off from the Church of Greece and other churches that follow the New Calendar. In Alaska, churches of the Orthodox Church in America’s Diocese of Alaska and the Serbian Orthodox Church generally follow the Old Calendar. Churches of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese and the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese follow the New Calendar. Fortunately relations between these churches are amicable, but parishioners and even clergy may find it difficult to explain why their calendars differ.

3.4 THE PARISH: CHURCH AND CHAPEL (Shevzov 2004, 54-130)

3.4.1 Church organization

The organization and administration of the Orthodox Church is based on the principle of territoriality. The parish, the diocese, the patriarchate and similar structures in principle comprise all the faithful living within a defined geographic area, without reference to ethnicity, language or other sociological factors. This ecclesiological principle reflects the church’s insistence that unity in Christ, expressed in sacramental unity, transcends all lesser ties and allegiances. Only in relatively recent times, since the rise of nationalism in the 19th and 20th century, have other factors become preponderant, so that today it is not unusual, in North America, Australia, South America, Western Europe and other areas of Eastern European and Near Eastern emigration, to find Orthodox
churches organized largely along ethnic lines and dependent in various ways on one or another Old World “mother church.”

In medieval and early modern times, in densely settled agricultural regions of the Mediterranean world and parts of western Europe, the geographic extent of parishes and even dioceses was generally rather small. The parish church of a farming village or of a compact urban neighborhood was the self-evident focal point for community life, both religious and social. But in thinly populated regions such as northern Russia and Siberia, where topography and climate limited agricultural production and encouraged other forms of economic activity (hunting, trapping, gathering of mushrooms and berries...), parish boundaries could extend for hundreds of miles. The parish church, or temple (khram), might be difficult to reach, especially in inclement weather. Often the solution in such cases was construction of a chapel (chasovnia) or prayer house (molitvenny dom). Generally this took place at lay initiative.

3.4.2 The chapel

As the Russian term chasovnia, from the word chas (hour), suggests, a chapel was primarily intended for the reading of the daily cycle of services, of which the liturgical “hours” form an important part. It might be a small and simple structure – perhaps just a roadside shrine or an appendage to a house. Or it might rival a church (khram) in size, internal spatial arrangements, and magnificence. In any case, the chapel was intended to recall and simulate the experience of prayer afforded in a consecrated church. In a larger chapel, an iconostasis might be present, and behind it an altar table and other appropriate furnishings in anticipation of an occasional visit by the priest of the parish. In humbler situations, the arrangement of icons on the chapel’s east wall might approximate that of a full iconostasis. But the canonical status of a chapel differed from that of a church (khram) in several important ways.

Among other things, even if it had an altar table and similar liturgical furnishings, a chapel (chasovnia) had no permanent antimension (antimens) - the silken cloth bearing an image of Christ entombed, containing the relic of a saint and signed by the diocesan bishop, without which no Divine Liturgy may be served. A Divine Liturgy could be served only if a priest brought a traveling antimension with him.

In addition, unlike a consecrated church, a chapel (chasovnia) had no specific liturgical service for its blessing. Often established and funded by one or more pious (and prominent) villagers, the chapel was largely under their care and subject to only minimal clerical supervision. In Russia this sometimes aroused the suspicion of ecclesiastical and civil authorities. For much of the 18th century and into the 19th, the construction of new chapels was officially banned, but this had little effect in remote regions like Alaska, where priests were few. The chapel, and chapel culture, offered villagers a way of relating to the wider world of Orthodoxy and of identifying as Orthodox Christians. At the same time, it allowed them to experience and express their faith within the context.
of their own very particular community, and not simply as isolated individuals. Large segments of the church’s liturgical cycle could be read and sung in a communal setting under the leadership of a church reader or an appropriately trained local layperson. Put simply, unlike the distant parish church – not to mention the even more distant cathedral of the diocesan bishop – the chapel gave villagers a sense of “ownership.”

Figure 3.1. A typical chapel of moderate size, in the village of Akutan, built in 1878.

In Alaska today, the distinction between church and chapel, khram and chasovnia, is not as sharply drawn as it once was. In part this may be because the English word “chapel” is not restricted to the chasovnia. Often it is used for smaller subsidiary structures that form part of a larger parish church complex (e.g., a cemetery chapel, or a side chapel of a particularly important church, with its own consecrated altar and altar feast day). Or the word may be used for a church dependent on an ecclesiastical authority outside the usual parish and diocesan administrative structures (e.g., the chapel of an academic or philanthropic institution or of the bishop’s household). For these, the term stavropegial (krestovaia) often is used, meaning that the bishop himself has established the church by planting his cross (Greek: stavros) on its site as an expression of his authority over it. This was the case with the church in the Bishop’s House in Sitka at the time of its establishment.

Thanks to growth in the number of priests over the past half century, many former village chapels in Alaska have become parishes, with their own assigned priests. At the same time, some parishes effectively function as chapels, with only occasional services led by a visiting priest. Nevertheless, the historic importance of the church/chapel distinction has left an indelible mark on the ecclesiastical geography and church life of the Orthodox Church in Alaska. Even small and isolated communities remain devoted to
the physical maintenance of their church or chapel and – as far as possible – to the maintenance of community liturgical life and community traditions.

### 3.4.3 The church building and its furnishings

An Orthodox church building is, as it were, designed from the inside out. Viewed from the outside, the church – whether a temple (khram) or an important chapel – frequently expresses its internal spatial organization very clearly, through the varying architectural forms and features of its constituent elements. Sometimes there may be only symbolic expressions of these elements (e.g., a decorative little onion dome positioned on the roof where one might expect a structural dome). But the internal space of the church is arranged for a particular purpose, and that is to accommodate the liturgical worship of the Orthodox Church.

Regardless of the shape and style of the church building, it is always surmounted by a cross, or more often by multiple crosses; and it is almost always oriented toward the east – the direction of the rising sun, the direction from which Christians anticipate Christ’s return in glory – with a tripartite organization of internal space.

- The altar area or sanctuary is located at the east end of the building, with the altar table (prestol') freestanding at its center. Lying enthroned on the altar table is the gospel book, often with a richly adorned cover. Beneath the gospel book, folded, is the antimension (antimins), a silken cloth bearing an image of Christ entombed, into which the relic of a saint is sewn. No Divine Liturgy may be served without it. Signed by the diocesan bishop, the antimension attests to the dependent relationship of the eucharistic assembly on its archpastor, the bishop. On it, as a sign of the connection between the bishop and the local church, the sacramental gifts of bread and wine are placed in the course of the Divine Liturgy, or eucharist.

- Also on the altar table is a tabernacle in which the consecrated eucharistic gifts are reserved for the communion of the sick and the dying. Behind this may be a seven-branched candelabrum. This, like other symbolic furnishings and liturgical vocabulary, reflects the Orthodox Christian understanding of the Jerusalem temple and its worship as a prototype for Christian worship.
Figure 3.2. The second church at Russian Mission, 1895-1938, illustrates the tripartite arrangement of a typical Orthodox church: altar area (right), nave (center, surmounted by dome), narthex (surmounted by bell tower), and porch.

Figure 3.3. Altar table with antimension given to the team of missionaries from Valaam Monastery that set out for Kodiak in 1793.
To the north side of the altar area is a subsidiary “table of oblation” on which the bread and wine used in the Divine Liturgy are prepared. On it are kept the chalice, paten and other liturgical instruments and coverings needed for that service.

The altar area is separated from the main body of the church (the nave), but at the same time joined to it, by the iconostasis, or icon screen. This is pierced by the central “royal doors,” through which only bishops, priests and deacons may pass, and by flanking “deacons’ doors,” through which attendant servers also pass in the course of the church services. Placement of icons on the iconostasis is carefully planned. Generally those on the royal doors include the four evangelists and – in two panels – the Annunciation, with an icon of the Last Supper directly above the doors. To the right of the royal doors is an icon of Christ, and to the left, an icon of the Virgin Mary, who in Orthodox terminology most often is referred to as “Birthgiver of God” (*Theotokos, Bogoroditsa*). The deacons’ doors usually bear icons of angels or of deacon saints. Additional icons on the lower tier of the iconostasis typically include St. John the
Baptist and the church’s patron saint. Upper tiers of the iconostasis may include icons of additional saints or of the Twelve Great Feasts of the church year.

- The front (east) portion of the nave of the church may have space set off for singers to the left and right (kleros, or krilos), but for the most part the nave is where worshippers stand for the services, traditionally men to the right, women to the left. Usually there are no pews, but benches or chairs may be provided. Even in modest churches there may also be a choir loft. A central dome – sometimes externally expressed, sometimes simply suggested internally by a recess in the ceiling - often surmounts the nave. Beneath it a chandelier not only provides illumination but also helps organize the interior worship space.

- A third major space, to the west (rear) of the nave, is the narthex or vestibule. Besides serving various utilitarian purposes (e.g., to block drafts), the narthex, along with the door between it and the nave, is where certain liturgical actions take place. A stand for the sale of candles, often staffed by the church warden (starosta) or an assistant, may also be found in the narthex or else just inside the doors to the nave. Often the narthex is surmounted by a bell tower, and sometimes a shallow open porch protects the narthex entrance from the elements.

Orthodox Christians and popular presentations of the Orthodox faith frequently ascribe symbolic significance to the various constitutive elements of the church building. The central dome, for example, is symbolic of the heavens; usually depicted in its center is the image of Christ as ruler of the universe (pantocrator). The tripartite organization of the church is interpreted in multiple ways. For example, in some interpretations the narthex symbolizes the earth; the nave, heaven; the altar, the heaven above the heavens. But the overall thrust of these symbolic interpretations is the same: the church is the meeting place of heaven and earth, not simply a utilitarian structure. Its beautification and adornment – with images, gilding, rich fabric hangings and banners, devotional lights, seasonal decorations – provides a focus for both individual and community piety. Its site – and particularly the site of its altar table – is honored and memorialized in various ways even if the church building itself is relocated or destroyed.

3.4.4 Church behavior

When entering the church, Orthodox Christians typically make the sign of the cross, holding the thumb, index finger and forefinger together, and the ring finger and little finger pressed against the palm, beginning with forehead and breast, then right shoulder and left shoulder. Often they stop next at the candle stand and make a small offering. Then, with candles in hand, they visit the principle icons displayed on stands along the front and sides of the church. At each they make a three-fold reverence, making the sign of the cross and bowing from the waist, with right hand extended nearly to the floor. They venerate the icon, light their candle, place it the appropriate candle stand, and pause in prayer. In performing these acts, Orthodox Christians are reminded
both of the rich symbolism of worship and also of its highly tactile, physical manifestations.

For Orthodox Christians, candles – along with lamps hung in front of icons and torches borne in liturgical processions - are not meant simply for purposes of illumination. They are symbolic of light, revelation and inner illumination. Besides lighting candles upon entering the church, the faithful typically hold them during memorial services for the departed, during nighttime processions around the church, and especially at Easter, the feast of the resurrection. At Christmas and other special occasions, they also place candles or torches on the graves of the departed in the cemetery. As circumstances allow, they light a candle or oil lamp in front of the icons arranged in the family’s icon corner at home. There, the central icons typically depict Christ and the Virgin Mary, just as in church, effectively extending the church’s presence into the home. The surrounding icons typically include those of saints particularly dear to family members, such as those of their patron saints, whose names they were given at baptism and by which they receive communion in church.

So also, icons - as well as relics, the cross, the gospel book, and other sacred objects - are not meant simply to be reminders of sacred events and personages of the past. They frequently are described as windows into eternity, as very tangible means for entering realities that are no longer subject to the time and space of this world. Icons communicate in ways that complement the written word of Scripture. Both require some “translation,” some explanation of what is being represented. But because of its plastic character, the icon is able to communicate and unite in situations where cultural and linguistic differences might otherwise impede understanding and prompt division. By pointing the faithful to the transcendent truth reflected in the sacred image, the icon also brings them into a closer, more immediate relationship with each other.

3.5 CYCLES OF WORSHIP (Ware 1969, Ware 1978)

3.5.1 Daily and weekly cycle

For Orthodox Christians the liturgical day begins at sundown, with Vespers. In monasteries and on the eves of certain feasts, Compline and Nocturn may be said during the course of the night. The next major service of the day is Matins, in early morning. Especially in churches of Russian tradition, Vespers and Matins may be linked together on the eves of Sundays and major feasts to form a long “All-Night” Vigil service (vsennochnoe vdeniie). (In actual parish practice this service is about two hours in length.) In the course of the day, services of the First, Third, Sixth and Ninth Hours also
are read, but usually in combination with other services rather than at dawn, mid-morning, noon, and mid-afternoon, as their names suggests.

On Sundays, major feasts and other days when the Divine Liturgy (eucharist) is celebrated, this usually follows the Third Hour. Sometimes the Typika (Obednitsa) – consisting of the psalms, hymns and readings for the day – is served in place of the Divine Liturgy. Like the regular cycle of daily services, the Typika service, with certain adaptations, may be led by a duly-authorized deacon, reader, cantor, or knowledgeable layperson in the absence of a priest. In fact in many parts of Alaska, the Typika was probably the most common form of Sunday and feast-day worship for many years. Relatively few communities had permanently resident priests, and even when a missionary priest visited, he was not always able to serve a full Divine Liturgy due to lack of the necessary elements of bread and wine.

Each day of the week also is marked by special hymnography and prayers. Sunday always celebrates the resurrection of Christ; Monday honors the angels; Tuesday is dedicated to the memory of John the Baptist and the prophets; Wednesdays and Fridays commemorate Christ’s betrayal and crucifixion; Thursday is dedicated to the apostles and saintly bishops, including St. Nicholas as foremost among the latter; Saturday is dedicated to Mary the Theotokos and to the memory of the departed.

3.5.2 Annual cycles

September 1 marks the beginning of the church year for fixed-date feasts and commemorations, such as Christmas (December 25). These fall on the same calendar date each year, regardless of the day of the week. More important for determining the course of the liturgical year is Easter (or Pascha, as many Orthodox prefer to call it), the feast of Christ’s resurrection. The annual paschal cycle begins with the fasting season of Great Lent, preceded by special pre-Lenten Sundays. It continues with Palm Sunday and Holy Week and culminates with Easter Sunday. Following Easter, fifty days of celebration are punctuated by the feast of the Ascension (40th day) and Pentecost (the 50th day). Each Sunday and week thereafter, until the next paschal cycle begins, is a Sunday and week “after Pentecost.”

These two yearly cycles – for fixed dates and for moveable dates dependent on Easter – coincide slightly differently each year. Coordination of their readings, hymnography and other liturgical features requires a high level of specialized knowledge and training on the part of those leading the services.
3.5.3 Major feasts and fasts

In addition to Easter, the Feast of Feasts, the Orthodox church year celebrates “Twelve Great Feasts.” Of these, three are moveable, dependent upon the date of Easter: Palm Sunday (Entrance of Christ into Jerusalem); the Ascension of Christ; and Pentecost (Sending of the Holy Spirit). The remainder are fixed-date feasts: The Nativity of Mary the Theotokos (September 8); Exaltation of the Holy Cross (September 14); Entrance of the Theotokos into the Temple (November 21); Christmas: the Nativity of Christ (December 25); Epiphany: the Baptism of Christ (January 6); the Meeting of Christ in the Temple (February 2); the Annunciation (March 25); the Transfiguration of Christ (August 9); and the Dormition (Falling Asleep or Assumption) of Mary the Theotokos (August 15).

Each day of the year honors one or more saints. Quite understandably, the popularity of a given saint varies somewhat from one Orthodox church to another. Often this depends on the significance of the saint for a particular community or nation. For example, St. Nicholas, patron saint of mariners, is particularly popular in fishing communities. Preferences such as these often determine the dedication and patronal feast day of a given church or chapel.

Particularly important feasts have their own cycles of pre-festal preparation and post-festal celebration. The Christmas cycle, for example, is patterned on that of Easter and includes a forty-day preparatory fast analogous to the fast of Great Lent. The feasts of the Dormition and Sts. Peter and Paul also are preceded by fasting periods of shorter duration.

Although coordination of these liturgical cycles, their hymnography, and their readings can be a daunting task even for trained professionals, keeping track of the weekly cycle and its relationship to major holidays was facilitated for native households in Alaska by use of peg calendars. Probably introduced by Russian promyshlenniki in the mid-18th century, they remained in use well into the 20th century (Black 2004, 225).

3.6 SANCTIFICATION OF LIFE

3.6.1 Sacraments and sacramentals

Textbooks and catechetical material in use in the Orthodox Church typically enumerate seven sacraments, or “mysteries”: baptism, chrismation (confirmation), eucharist, holy orders, matrimony, penance, and anointing of the sick. This enumeration, corresponding to that developed in the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, is not particularly ancient. Through the Middle Ages, Orthodox presentations made no sharp distinction between what later theologians would refer to as “sacraments” and “sacramental”. For example, in some presentations, the funeral service, monastic tonsure, and the consecration of a church were included among the “holy mysteries” of
the Church (Meyendorff 1974, 192). Such “mysteries” were understood less as isolated “means of grace” and more as aspects of the unique mystery of Christ and the church, in which God shares divine life with human beings by renewing creation as a means of communion with Him.

- In the Orthodox Church today, as in the early church, the three sacraments of Christian initiation — baptism, chrismation, and communion in the eucharist — are closely linked. Baptism whether of adults or children normally is performed by a priest, by triple immersion, and is immediately followed by chrismation with perfumed ointment distributed by the bishop and by reception of the eucharist. “Normally”: but in circumstances when priest is unavailable, baptism may be performed by a layperson. Sometimes also, circumstances such as extreme cold may make baptism by pouring advisable. Such circumstances were hardly exceptional through much of the history of Orthodoxy in Alaska. The theological relationship of these three sacraments was maintained in church teaching, but their temporal unity was disrupted. In remote villages, in the absence of a priest, infants were baptized by a layperson soon after birth. Anointing with chrism and reception of communion would follow only later – sometimes much later – when a priest was able to visit the community.

- The eucharist often is referred to as the “sacrament of sacraments,” because other aspects of the church’s sacramental life are oriented to it and receive much of their meaning from it. In the Orthodox Church today, the eucharist is celebrated through much of the church year according to the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, but on Sundays in Lent and certain other especially solemn days, it is celebrated according to the much longer Divine Liturgy of St. Basil the Great. The Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts – basically a Vespers service with the addition of communion using the Holy Gifts consecrated on the previous Sunday – is served on Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent and on the first three days of Holy Week.

- Many Orthodox Christians receive communion infrequently — perhaps only once a year in order to fulfill their “annual obligation” of confession and communion. This is not because of any disrespect towards the sacrament, but rather because of the great seriousness with which being “joined in the holy mysteries” is regarded. In such cases communion is typically preceded by an extended period of preparation (goevenie), including fasting, rites of contrition, and confession. In recent times, however, the ancient practice of receiving communion more frequently has gained ground. In any case, infants and young children are admitted to communion at any time, without extended preparation. Whether young or old, lay communicants receive communion on a spoon. After receiving communion and at the end of the Divine Liturgy, it is customary to receive a piece of holy bread (antidoron) that was left over after holy communion was prepared.
Confession and reception of communion outside the usual liturgical context is a common practice for persons seriously ill or nearing death. In such cases, the priest (or bishop) typically carries to the person a small portion of the reserved sacrament from the altar tabernacle. He carries this in a tabernacle-shaped container. Usually this container is small enough to be borne suspended around the priest’s neck, but sometimes it is considerably larger.

Marriage, as understood in the Orthodox Church, gives a very specific significance to what otherwise might be appear to be a merely human institution. It is meant to reflect the union of Christ and the Church, enduring, grounded in mutual love, and a source of blessing not only for husband and wife but also for the wider community. Today’s marriage service is the product of long historical development. Patterned after the sacraments of Christian initiation, it includes a ceremonially crowning that is at once martyric and celebratory (see Figure 3.8). Scripture readings, a triple circular procession, and participation in a common cup. Only a bishop or priest can perform the marriage service and “sacramentally bless” a union otherwise entered into by local custom. Before doing so he must ascertain that the marriage meets canonical and legal requirements relating to such matters as age, consanguinity and consent.

In the Orthodox Church ordination involves a sacramental setting apart for a specific ministry. Three major orders – of bishop, priest, and deacon – involve service at the altar table. They are conferred in the course of the Divine Liturgy, at the altar table, by the laying-on of hands of a bishop (in the ordination of a priest or deacon) or of multiple bishops (in the ordination of a bishop, as a collegial act). Minor orders – of subdeacon, reader/cantor, and in the past certain others – are conferred outside the altar area, by formal appointment, or “setting apart,” by a bishop.

The sacrament of unction, or anointing, is intended for the healing of soul and body. In its full form, this is a communal church event, involving seven priests, seven sets of readings and seven major prayers. In practice, it more often involves a single priest coming to the bedside of someone who is ill.

While many of the prayers associated with death and burial are meant to be read by a priest or bishop, the rites themselves – from deathbed and preparation of the body to the funeral service and interment – may be read and sung by laypersons. Basically the service follows the order of the daily offices of Matins and the Typika.
providing one final occasion for the church community to worship together with the departed.

- The consecration of a church, a particularly complex rite, must be performed by the bishop. If, however, “for reason of remoteness or any other reason,” he is unable to do so, he may appoint an “experienced priest” to so in his stead, using an abbreviated rite (Great Book of Needs 2, 2000, 119). Like other important church rites, the full order in many ways is analogous to the sacraments of Christian initiation, including a washing and vesting of the altar, anointing of the walls with chrism, and bearing of the antimimension on a paten for solemn conveyance to the altar table.

3.6.2 Occasional services

The Great Euchologion, or Book of Needs, includes special prayers and services for use on various occasions. There are prayers for the blessing of liturgical vessels, vestments, service books, processional banners, icons, bells (with “naming” of the bell, sprinkling with holy water, and censing), candles (on the feast of the Presentation), palms (on Palm Sunday), meats and dairy products (at Easter), fruits (at the feast of the Dormition), cemeteries, fields, herds, beehives, wells, vehicles, fishing nets, ships and boats... The list goes on and on.

- Of special significance are services for the Great Blessing of the Waters at Epiphany (Theophany), when Christ’s baptism in the River Jordan is commemorated. A first blessing in the church sanctifies water for use in homes and the church during the coming year. A second blessing follows a solemn procession to a nearby river, lake or spring. During the following days the priest – often with groups of parishioners – goes from home to home to bless them.

- Additional “cross processions” take place on certain appointed days, very often with the blessing of water, on major feast days, and on occasions of special significance to the parish. Typically these processions are led by altar servers bearing a processional cross, lamps and banners. Next come singers, clergy, and prominent parishioners carrying festal icons, followed by members of various church organizations and the congregation. When feasible, funeral processions from church to cemetery are organized in a similar fashion. (See Figures 4.11.19 and 20.)

- Special prayer services (molebens) – conducted whether in the church or in the home or elsewhere - typically are devoted to intercession (for the sick, before a journey, at the beginning of instruction, in time of pestilence, etc.) and to thanksgiving (for healing, for safe return from a voyage, on important anniversaries, etc.).
The presence and liturgical life of the church extends beyond its walls. Bells rung in various ways – from simple tolling to a lively day-long trezvon – convey information, prompt prayerful reflection, and stimulate an emotional reaction, whether of grief or celebration. The light of candles from an illuminated church interior or a nighttime procession stimulates a sense of wonder even when viewed from afar. Processional routes whether around the church or beyond the church - to the riverside, the cemetery or a subsidiary shrine - suggest the mystery of life as a pilgrimage that is at once spiritual and physical. Paraliturgical activities – “starring” and other ritual exchanges of hospitality – bring the church into the home (Inouye 1987). “Sacred” space may be delineated in various ways - by the iconostasis within the church building itself, by simple fencing around the churchyard – but the blessings of this “sacred” space overflow into a wider world of human activity, mundane but not profane.

3.6.3 Extension of communion in time and space

Especially in a relatively remote region, a chapel or parish church community could easily become ingrown, preoccupied with its own joys and sorrows. The community might have some sense of its connection with the diocesan bishop because of his occasional visits, when he examines the church records, gives appropriate liturgical awards to members of the clergy, bestows certificates of appreciation (gramota) on prominent members of the church community, and distributes icon prints, crosses and other small gifts to the faithful. But a wider sense of belonging and connectedness was promoted in other ways as well.

On occasion, special offerings were taken up (e.g., the annual Palm Sunday collection for the Palestine Mission of the Russian Orthodox Church). Links with other communities and individuals were established through the gift of bells, liturgical objects, and – especially – icons. These gift exchanges helped bring distant places and personalities into quasi-immediate contact.
In Unalaska the sight of icons acquired from Russia to mark the coronation of the reigning Russian sovereigns, Tsar Nicholas II and his wife Alexandra, certainly would have reminded worshippers not only of the depicted saints but also of the cathedral’s historic and cultural ties with Russia. In Seldovia’s St. Nicholas Chapel, two icons of St. Theodosius of Chernigov – canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church in 1896 - served to remind worshippers of the enlargement and refurbishment of their chapel in that year. Many churches received gifts of icons crafted on Mount Athos, the holy mountain of world Orthodox monasticism. In many churches, copies and adaptations of the famous icon of Our Lady of Kazan link worshippers not only to the Virgin Mary and Jesus but also to miracles wrought through that icon in Russia. These adaptations recall Alaska’s own famous icon of the Kazan type, Our Lady of Sitka, in St. Michael’s Cathedral.

Examples could be multiplied. Such icons, rather than large-scale cycles of wall paintings or mosaics, fill the wall space of the churches and chapels of Alaska. Often donated to commemorate a special occasion or reproduce a favorite object of devotion, they offered the local community a sense of trans-temporal communion. They reminded viewers not only of the saints and sacred events depicted in the icon but also of the circumstances of its arrival in their midst (Shevzov 2004, 171-213).

3.7 ORTHODOXY IN ALASKA: THE BEGINNINGS (Black 2004, 223-253)

3.7.1 The age of exploration

During the age of European exploration and expansion, as Spain, France and Great Britain crossed the Atlantic to establish colonial empires in America, another European power, Russia, was pressing toward America from the opposite direction. During the 16th and 17th centuries, Russian explorers and trapper-traders (promyshlenniki) made their way across Siberia in search of sable and other valuable furs, and navigators made their way to the Chukchi Peninsula and Kamchatka. Emperor Peter the Great had more ambitious plans for making his land-based empire a maritime power. Before his death in 1725, he laid plans for systematic exploration of lands still farther east. After an inconclusive voyage in 1728, Vitus Bering, a Dane in Russian employment, and Alexei Chirikov led a second eastern expedition in 1741. After mapping some of the Aleutian Islands, they sighted the Alaskan mainland in July of that year.

The return voyage was marred by shipwreck, disease, and the death of many of the company, including Bering himself, but the expedition had achieved its scientific goal of...
charting the northwestern coasts of North America. It also carried home a valuable cargo of sea otter pelts, thus touching off a “fur rush” to Alaska.

3.7.2 Promyshlenniki

For the next half century independent Siberian-Russian promyshlenniki plied the Alaskan waters in search of quick wealth. The rapacity of these trapper-traders provoked occasional resistance on the part of the native peoples of Alaska, but circumstances also encouraged what historian Lydia Black has referred to as “professional cooperation” in hunting activities and also daily life (Black 2001, http://www.loc.gov/rr/european/mofc/black.html). The Russians – and the Siberian native peoples working with them – were expert at trapping sable and other valuable fur-bearing animals on land, but they had little experience of the pelagic hunting of sea otters. They needed the navigational and hunting expertise of the Alaska natives.

The promyshlenniki also recognized certain commonalities of religious belief and practice. As one of these wrote of the Aleutian natives:

They live and act in everything simply. Just like we Russians, when we set out on any enterprise, call on the name of the Lord God to aid us and bless [the enterprise] or when at sea in the baidaras on the way to our hunting, all keep silent for a while and then, having called on God for aid and in hope of His mercy we say “God aid us,” likewise these foreign peoples, leaving for the hunt, say the prayer “Lord, bless.” And when setting out in the baidaras, like ourselves, all keep silent and then say, like we do, “God help us” (Black 2004, 223-224).

This led to many instances in which Russians adopted young native hostages. Almost invariably these were returned home, where they served as interpreters and cultural middlemen. The best known example of this is Ivan Stepanovich Glotov of Umnak Island, the nephew of a local toion (headman), who became a godson of the Russian promyshlennik Stepan Glotov. The newly baptized Ivan Glotov often served as his godfather’s interpreter. Eventually he became the toion on Umnak, where he

Figure 3.11. Shrine marking the putative site of the first baptism in the Aleutian Islands, that of Ivan Stepanovich Glotov, a godson of Russian promyshlennik Captain Stepan Glotov.
settled at the village now called Nikolski, built the first Orthodox chapel in the eastern Aleutians (dedicated to St. Nicholas), and conducted reader services on regular basis (Black 2004, 224-225). At some point a cross and thereafter a small shrine were erected near the entrance to the Nikolski church in order to memorialize this early baptism (Smith 1994, 3).

In time, some promyshlenniki settled in permanently in Alaska, picking up native languages, taking native wives and adopting native ways, in much the way that their forebears had among the native peoples of northern Russia and Siberia. So completely did they assimilate that by the end of the century, when British Captain James Cook visited the Aleutian Islands, John Ledyard, who kept a journal for the voyage, found it hard to distinguish the Russians from native Alaskans (Black 2004, 229).

Even though their material culture was largely native, the promyshlenniki generally maintained their Orthodox beliefs and practices even in the absence of ordained clergy, building chapels and prayer houses, holding reader services, baptizing their native wives and children, and communicating to them the rudiments of the Christian faith. Thus, when Fr. Jacob Netsvetov returned as a priest to his home island of Atkha in 1828, he found that the entire population had already been baptized, even though no priest had been there previously. Fr. Ioann Veniaminov had much the same experience when he arrived on Unalaska in 1824. Both priests spent their first years in the Aleutians traveling from settlement to settlement in order to complete these baptisms with chrismation and reception of the eucharist.

3.7.3 The Golikov-Shelikhov Company

The days of the independent freebooter promyshlenniki were numbered, however. Larger trading companies competed for fur stocks, often setting their hunters and native allies against their rivals. By the 1780s, Gregory Shelikhov, partner in the most aggressive of these companies, was arguing for the establishment of permanent outposts in Alaska. These, he argued, would not only permit more efficient exploitation of natural resources. They also would extend Russian military and political influence throughout the Pacific rim. After a savage massacre of resisting natives, Shelikhov established a small Russian colony on Kodiak Island in 1784.

In 1787 Shelikhov traveled to the imperial court in St. Petersburg to boast of his accomplishments and to seek a monopoly on the fur trade. Empress Catherine the Great was not greatly impressed. The company established by Golikov and Shelikhov, after merging with two lesser trading companies, gained its coveted monopoly only in 1799, when it was chartered by her successor, Paul I, as the Russian-American Company. But at least one prominent figure was moved by Shelikhov’s importunities. With characteristic exaggeration, Shelikhov had written to Metropolitan Gabriel of St. Petersburg, one of the highest-ranking churchmen in the Russian Empire, boasting of the number of natives whom he had baptized and of the many native children who were
attending the company school and frequenting the company chapel. He begged for a priest to be assigned to his fledgling colony and promised that the company would cover all expenses.

3.7.4 Missionaries from Valaam Monastery

Shelikhov probably had in mind a member of the “white,” or married clergy, who would serve as chaplain for his fledgling colony. Metropolitan Gabriel responded to his request by recruiting an entire missionary team from the Valaam Monastery, a famous center of spirituality and mission located on the Russo-Finnish border. On December 25, 1793, a band of eight monks, headed by Archimandrite Ioasaf Bolotov, left St. Petersburg for America. After a journey of 293 days and 7,327 miles, they arrived on Kodiak on September 24, 1794. They had traversed one third of the world’s circumference without ever leaving the Russian Empire (Tarasar 1975, 15).

Archimandrite Ioasaf and his associates were the heirs of a long tradition of monastic mission in the Christian East. They could look back at Sts. Cyril and Methodius, the 9th-century evangelizers of the Slavs, and at St. Stephen of Perm, whose labors among the Zyravian people in Siberia included the invention of a Zyravian alphabet and translation of the gospel. Once on Kodiak the missionaries energetically began imitating these models, traveling throughout the region and baptizing the native peoples.

The missionaries faced unexpected hardships. Their greatest trials came at the hands of the all-powerful manager of the Russian-American Company, Alexander Baranov. When they arrived, not only did they discover that the church and supplies promised by Shelikhov did not exist. They also were appalled by the brutal treatment that the native Americans received at the hands of Baranov and his men – native hunters forced to work at gunpoint, young women kept as concubines, little children separated from their mothers.

Ioasaf sent vivid reports of abuse back to Shelikhov: “Since my arrival at this harbor I have seen nothing done to carry out your good intentions. My own pleasure is that so many Americans are coming from everywhere to be baptized, but the Russians not only make no effort to encourage them, but use every means to discourage them. The reason for this is that their depraved lives become evident if compared to the good conduct of the Americans” (Oleksa 1987, 58-59; Tikhmenov 2, 1979, 77).

Receiving no reply from Shelikhov, who in fact was not the generous and supportive patron of the mission that he made himself out to be, Ioasaf and two other monks returned to Russia in 1798 to report firsthand on conditions in the colony. In 1799 Ioasaf was ordained to be Bishop of Kodiak, a vicar bishop within the diocese of Irkutsk. This position would have given him moral and political influence far greater than Baranov’s. He also was given books, vestments and other church supplies. On the
voyage back to Alaska in 1799, however, the ship carrying him and his entourage was lost in heavy seas. All on board perished.

3.7.5 New challenges for the mission

Even before the death of Ioasaf and his companions, the mission had lost one its most energetic members, Fr. Iuvenali, who was killed by hostile natives while on a preaching expedition in 1796, probably near Quinhagak on Kuskokwim Bay (Oleksa 1986; Oleksa 1987, 14; Black 2004, 251 n. 41). Now it was reduced still more. Nevertheless, with the lay monk Herman in charge, the remaining missionaries continued to defend the native Alaskans. In 1800 Baranov retaliated by placing them under house arrest and forbidding further contact with the natives. Within a year the missionaries infuriated Baranov still more by attempting to administer to the natives the oath of allegiance to the emperor, which would have given them greater legal protection as Russian subjects. This time Baranov threatened to put them all in irons.

Some hope for improvement in conditions came when the Holy Synod appointed Archimandrite Gedeon to inspect the colony and revive the flagging mission. During his visit (1804-1807) he gained a shrewd appreciation of the source of the mission’s problems. As he reported to his superiors in Russia, “the personal insults which the missionaries endured from the employees of the company were the results of the prevailing attitude that ‘God is in heaven, the Czar is far away,’ and only Baranov is to be feared” (Gedeon, in Russian Orthodox Religious Mission 1978, 58). But Gedeon’s report was undercut by letters from Nicholas Rezanov, a company lobbyist, who defended Baranov’s management and belittled the monks, who “have never known how to enter into the extensive plans of the Government or the company” (Tikmenev 2, 1979, 167).

Continuing complaints about the management of the Russian-American Company led to yet another inquiry, this one conducted by Captain Vasili Golovnin in 1818. He was favorably impressed by the simple piety and good sense of Father Herman and took seriously his assessment of Baranov’s regime (Black 2004, 205 n. 3). Golovnin’s findings would be taken into account when the company’s charter came up for renewal in 1821. By the terms of its new charter, the company was subjected to much closer government supervision, and it was obliged to provide and support a sufficient number of priests and church readers to serve the religious needs of its far-flung North American holdings.

But already conditions in Alaska were changing. Baranov had retired to Russia a few months before Golovnin’s arrival. His replacement, Symeon Ianovskii, admitted that he at first had believed slanderous stories that claimed Father Herman was encouraging the natives to rise in rebellion against the authorities, but after meeting him and viewing the situation personally, he changed his opinion. This well-read and cosmopolitan gentleman later would write to the abbot of the Valaam monastery: “To my great surprise, the simple, uneducated monk Father Herman, inspired by God’s grace, spoke so skillfully, forcefully and convincingly, and offered such proof, that no learning or
earthly wisdom could stand against it!” (Russian Orthodox Religious Mission 1978, 32). In time he came to regard Father Herman as his spiritual mentor, and following the death of his wife, he himself became a monk.

3.7.6 Father Herman on Spruce Island

Father Herman, the last surviving member of the original mission team, spent his last years in seclusion on Spruce Island, away from the bustle of Kodiak. He named his little hermitage “New Valaam”, after his old monastery in Russia. His ascetical way of life was patterned on that of the ancient desert fathers. He slept on a wooden bench with a brick for his pillow, wore heavy chains under his simple homemade clothes, and spent much of his time in prayer. But he also ran a school, nursed the sick, cared for numerous orphans, and raised food for himself and them in an experimental garden.

At the time of his death in 1837, Father Herman was largely forgotten by the wider world, but his memory was still alive among the natives and in ecclesiastical circles, especially among the brethren of his beloved monastery of Valaam, who had received his letters over the years. In a few years his reputation for sanctity had spread. By the mid-19th century pilgrims were visiting the site of his grave on Spruce Island. In 1970 he was canonized as the first Orthodox saint of America.

3.8 ORTHODOXY IN ALASKA: THE AGE OF VENIAMINOV

3.8.1 Changing times

During the first decades of the 19th century, the relationship between Alaska and the rest of the Russian Empire changed in several significant ways. The Alaska exploited by the promyshlenniki in the 18th century had been, in effect, an extension of Siberia. Lines of communication, commerce and material culture passed through Siberia. In the 19th century, from being an extension of Siberia, Alaska slowly evolved into an overseas colony of a land-based European empire (Vinkovetsky 2011). Symptomatic of this change was transfer of the headquarters of the Russian-American Company from Irkutsk to St. Petersburg in 1801 and a corresponding shift in the control of its board of directors from Siberian merchants to metropolitan aristocrats. An important contributing factor was development of the modern Russian navy. Beginning in 1803-1806, Russia undertook a series of round-the-world voyages devoted to exploration and cartography as well as trade with foreign markets and provisioning of distant outposts like Alaska (Vinkovetsky 2001). After the departure of Baranov as General Manager in 1818, top management of the Russian-American Company in Alaska was drawn almost exclusively from well-traveled, cosmopolitan naval officers.

During this period the social composition of Alaska was growing more complex and also becoming increasingly distinct from that of Russia itself. Company employees
previously had been engaged on contracts that assumed their eventual return to their hometowns in Russia, but what was to be done with those with long years of service who now had no inclination or incentive to return to Russia? For them the new social category of “colonial citizen” was created (Arndt 1996). Retirees were given certain incentives to establish agricultural settlements on the condition that they remain permanently in the colonies. The most significant of these – at Ninilchik and Afognak – maintained traces of their distinctive origin well into the 20th century.

Numerically more significant than the “colonial citizens” were the creoles. Used generically the term most often refers to a person of mixed race, but in Alaska – in the second and third charters of the Russian American Company - it acquired a specific legal meaning that was only tangentially related to race. Creoles constituted a new social estate established specifically for Alaska. In Alaska creoles were exempt from the poll tax and various other obligations, but if they chose eventually to settle in Russia they assumed some other legally recognized status, in most cases merchant/burgher (commoner, one might say), but possibly even gentry or clergy, depending on career accomplishments (Miller 2010, Blumlo 2010). It would be hard to overstate the importance of the creole estate for Alaska during the period of Russian-American Company control. As Lydia Black has pointed out:

> By the end of the Russian period, the number of persons in company service belonging to the creole status was considerable: in 1893, their numbers approached 2,000. Their role in managing the colony was of prime importance. Creoles were managers of remote outposts and of districts. They were teachers, clergy, navigators, cartographers, ship commanders, and artists. (Black 2004, 217)

### 3.8.2 The missionary calling (Pierce 1990, 521-527)

During the early 19th century, as Alaska was acquiring a distinctive identity within the Russian Empire, the Russian Orthodox Church was developing a new zeal for missions. It was sending out missionaries to the many tribes and peoples of Siberia and Central Asia, translating Scripture and liturgical texts into the native languages, and encouraging development of indigenous church leadership. Especially noteworthy was the work of Hieromonk Makarii Glukharev (1792-1847), canonized in 2000 for his role as Apostle to the Altai, followed later in the century by the work of linguist and educator Nikolai Ivanovich Il’minskii (1882-1891) and Hieromonk Nicholas Kasatkin (1836-1912), canonized in 1970 as Apostle to Japan. Alaska – through the work of St. Innocent Veniaminov – would be among the earliest beneficiaries of this new zeal for mission and of the new approach to mission that it represented.

Veniaminov was born in 1797 as Ivan Popov, in a village in the Irkutsk province. He was one of four children of the sacristan of the local parish church – a member, albeit a lowly one, of the clerical estate. After the death of his father 1806, young Ivan lived with his
uncle, the deacon of that church, who gave him the rudiments of an ecclesiastical education. In 1806, at the age of nine, he enrolled in the Irkutsk seminary, where he spent the next eleven years. There, to honor the memory of the late Bishop Veniamin (Benjamin) of Irkutsk, he was given a new surname, Veniaminov. Name changes of this sort were common in Russian seminaries, if only to distinguish between students having common priestly family names like Popov.

Young Veniaminov married in 1817, to the disappointment of his ecclesiastical superiors, who had expected him to go on to one of Russia’s elite theological academies. In the same year he was ordained as a priest and assigned to a church in Irkutsk. Very likely Fr. Ioann (as he was now called) would have remained in Irkutsk permanently had he not met an aged promyshlennik, Ivan Kriukov, who in 1823 had returned to his hometown in order to visit his family. At the time, the bishop of Irkutsk was looking for a priest to send to far-away Unalaska, and no one – including Veniaminov – wanted to volunteer. But after hearing Kriukov describe the native Alaskans’ hunger for Christianity, Veniaminov changed his mind. In May 1823, he set off from Irkutsk with his mother, his younger brother, his wife, and two young sons on the long journey to Alaska.

3.8.3 Fr. Ioann Veniaminov, missionary priest

In 1824, after a long lay-over in Sitka, Fr. Veniaminov and his family arrived on the island of Unalaska. He quickly learned the local dialect of the Aleut/Unangan language, developed an alphabet and compiled a dictionary. With the help of a local native chief, Ivan Pan’kov, he translated the Gospel of St. Matthew, parts of the eucharistic liturgy and the standard catechism, and wrote a work of his own in Aleut, entitled *Indication of the Pathway into the Kingdom of Heaven*. A jack-of-all trades, Veniaminov taught the natives the basics of carpentry and metal work, and together they built Unalaska’s Church of the Ascension. He and his wife Catherine also established an orphanage and a school, where over one hundred boys and girls learned diverse trades as well as reading (in both Aleut/Unangan and Russian), writing and arithmetic.

From Unalaska Veniaminov traveled on a regular annual circuit throughout his parish, which stretched along the eastern islands of the Aleutian chain. Everywhere he went, Veniaminov took careful notes on all aspects of the locale -- geology, climate, population, customs, flora and fauna. His three-volume *Notes on the Islands of the Unalaska District* and other ethnographic works would eventually earn him membership in the prestigious Imperial Academy of Sciences.

In 1834 Governor Ferdinand Petrovich Wrangell persuaded Veniaminov to move to Sitka, then called Novo-Arkhangelsk, or New Archangel, the capital of Russian America. There Veniaminov set about learning the language and culture of the local Tlingit Indians, who traditionally had been hostile towards the Russians and their Aleutian and Alutiiq confederates. Conversions were few at first, but Veniaminov did manage to gain
the Tlingits’ confidence when he helped combat a smallpox epidemic by undertaking a program of immunization.

During his years in Sitka Veniaminov did not have to travel as frequently as he did when he was stationed in Unalaska. Included as part of his Sitka parish, however, was one of the most distant outposts of the Russian-American Company, Fort Ross, about eighty miles north of San Francisco. The settlement had been established in 1812 in hopes that it would supply much-needed agricultural provisions for Alaska, and it still served as the base of operations for a mixed flock of about 260 men and women, the latter mostly Pomo Indians. In 1836 Veniaminov undertook a six-week pastoral visit to the Ross settlement. On his return trip to Sitka he was able to tour the Spanish-Mexican missions of the San Francisco Bay area. He conversed with the padres in Latin, which he had learned as a seminarian, and as a token of appreciation for their hospitality, he built several small barrel-organs for them upon his return to Sitka.

3.8.4 Bishop Innocent Veniaminov (Nordlander 1995; see also Chapter 5.5 below.)

In 1839 Veniaminov traveled to European Russia to arrange for publication of his scientific studies, report on his mission work, and urge establishment of a separate diocese for Alaska. (Until then it had formed part of the diocese of Irkutsk, in Siberia.) Ever curious to explore new places, he traveled as chaplain on one of the Russian navy’s round-the-world voyages. While in European Russia, he learned of the death of his wife, who had traveled home to Irkutsk following the old Siberian land route from Okhotsk. After visiting her grave and being assured that his children would be cared for, Veniaminov took monastic vows, taking the name of Innocent, the name borne in the 18th century by the famous missionary St. Innocent of Irkutsk. In December 1840 he was appointed and ordained to be bishop of the newly-established Diocese of Kamchatka, the Kurile and Aleutian Islands.

Veniaminov, now Bishop Innocent, returned to Sitka the following year. For the next eighteen years traveled extensively throughout his vast diocese. To evangelize the Yup’ik and Dena’ina native peoples in the heart of Alaska, he established three new mission districts. These were based in Ikogmiut, or Kwikhpak (now called Russian Mission), served first by his old friend Fr. Jacob Netsvetov; in Nushagak, served first by Bishop Innocent’s son-in-law Fr. Elia Petelin; and in Kenai, served first by Hieromonk Nikolai Militov, one of the clerics who had arrived in Sitka with the new bishop. In his diocesan see of Sitka, Bishop Innocent initiated a major building campaign which included construction of the Bishop’s House and its Annunciation Church, the oldest Russian-period structure still standing in Alaska (1843); a new St. Michael’s Cathedral (consecrated 1848); and the Holy Trinity Church, also sometimes referred to has the Church of the Holy Resurrection (consecrated 1849, to serve the native Tlingit population in their own language). Also important for the future of Orthodoxy in Alaska was the establishment of a seminary where native and creole candidates for ordination
followed a curriculum that included not only theological subjects but also native languages, elements of medicine, and Latin.

3.8.5 Fr. Jacob Netsvetov

Among Veniaminov’s associates in America, none accomplished more than Jacob Netsvetov, a creole of mixed Aleut and Russian ancestry, who was probably born on St. George Island in the Pribilofs in 1802. After completing seminary studies in Irkutsk, Netsvetov was ordained in 1828 and assigned as priest at Atkha, with a parish covering the western Aleutian Islands and the Kurile Islands. After many personal calamities, including the death of his wife in far-away Sitka, where ill-health had forced her to travel for treatment, with Veniaminov’s encouragement Netsvetov devoted himself to translation work, native education and other missionary activities.

After Veniaminov was ordained bishop, he assigned Netsvetov to begin missionary work among the Yup’ik in the Yukon River region. With the aid of his creole assistants Innokentii Shaiaashnikov and Constantine Lukin and his nephew Vasili Netsvetov, Fr. Jacob established a mission center at Ikogmiut (Russian Mission) to serve as his base of operations. From there he traveled widely, both to Yup’ik villages and to the Athabaskan peoples farther upstream on the middle Yukon and the Innoko. Netsvetov’s work at Ikogmiut would mark a new stage in the Alaska mission. For eighteen years he and his associates carried on without the military protection and logistical support of the Russian-American Company, hundreds of miles from its nearest major outpost, St. Michael’s Redoubt on Norton Sound.

Feeble and nearly blind, Fr. Jacob was unceremoniously relieved of his responsibilities at the Ikogmiut mission in 1863 and made his way to Sitka, where he served as priest at the Tlingit Holy Trinity church. He died there on July 26, 1864, and was buried at the church entry, not far from the grave of his beloved wife. In 1994 Netsvetov was canonized by the Orthodox Church in America as St. Jacob, Enlightener of the Native Peoples of Alaska. Long before that, however, he was being honored as a saint throughout western Alaska.

3.8.6 Veniaminov as archbishop and metropolitan (See also Chapter 5.9)

In 1850 Bishop Innocent was raised to the rank of archbishop and given a greatly expanded jurisdiction in northeastern Siberia. In 1858 the archdiocesan see as well as the seminary were officially transferred from Sitka to Yakutsk, where Innocent himself had been living since 1853. In view of the vast extent of this archdiocese, Hieromnonk Peter (Petr) Sysakov, or Ekaterinovskii, was ordained in 1859 to assist Archbishop Innocent as vicar bishop for Alaska; the widowed priest Paul (Pavel) Popov was ordained in the following year to assist him as vicar bishop for Yakutia. Innocent himself took up residence in Blagoveschensk, the newly founded city on the Amur River, where the see of his archdiocese was officially transferred in 1862 (Black 1997, 27-29).
The year 1867 was a turning point both in the life of Archbishop Innocent and in the history of his beloved Alaska. In October 18, Alaska was ceded to the United States. On getting word of the impending event in August (Pierce 1990, 526), Archbishop Innocent addressed two letters to his friend and mentor, Metropolitan Filaret Drozdov of Moscow, the highest-ranking churchman in the Russian Empire, expressing his concerns: What would be the legal status of the Orthodox Church under America rule, and how would it be supported? (Black 1996, 89-90). He did not know at the time that Filaret had passed away (November 19) and that he would soon be chosen to succeed him.

In the early months of 1868 Innocent slowly made his way to Moscow where, on May 26, he was solemnly installed as Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna. His interest in mission never waned. In 1870 he founded the Orthodox Missionary Society, which would help finance the work of the Alaskan mission until the communist revolution of 1917. The great missionary died on March 31, 1879, at the age of eighty-two. In 1977 he was formally canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church as Saint Innocent, Enlightener of the Aleuts and Apostle to America. He is buried in the Holy Trinity – St. Sergius Monastery, next to Metropolitan Filaret Drozdov, himself canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church in 1994.

By the 1860s, a vibrant indigenous Orthodox culture had developed in Alaska, thanks in large part to the inspiration and leadership given by St. Innocent Veniaminov. The native and creole population was assuming a dominant role in the economy and religious life of this distant outpost of the Russian Empire. According to 1860 company figures, Sitka, the capital, had a population of 1024, of whom only 452 were Russians. In the Kodiak district, out of a total population of 3086 there were only 67 Russians. In other districts the Russian population was even less significant. In all the Aleutian Islands, for example, there were only eight Russians (Oleksa 1992, 157). But the church numbered approximately 12,000 Orthodox Christians, with nine consecrated churches and 35 chapels. Church personnel included the bishop, nine priests and two deacons, and approximately twenty readers (Kapalin 2009, 161).

It was largely through the work of creole and native leadership, including dozens of lay readers and church wardens as well as ordained clergy, that the church in Alaska was able to survive -- and at times even to thrive -- following the sale of Alaska to the United States in 1867.

3.9 ORTHODOXY IN ALASKA: AMERICAN RULE

3.9.1 Russian reactions to the Cession (See also Chapter 5.10 and 5.11.)

For some in the Russian Orthodox Church, the sale of Alaska represented a new opportunity. For Metropolitan Innocent Veniaminov, this event was “one of the ways of Providence by which our Orthodoxy can insert itself into the United States.” In a letter
to the Overprocurator of the Holy Synod, he sketched a number of measures to encourage the mission of the Orthodox Church throughout North America: The seat of the bishop should be transferred from Sitka to San Francisco; a bishop and staff should be appointed who know the English language; the clergy should be allowed to use English in church services; translations of service books and other materials into English should be undertaken; and pastoral schools should be established to train future clergy, in which “the curriculum must be in English and not in Russian, which will sooner or later be replaced by the former language” (Garrett 1979, 275-77; Afonsky 1977, 78).

Innocent’s recommendations were largely implemented over the next couple decades. Diocesan headquarters were transferred to San Francisco (1870-1872) and then to New York (1905). Most of the bishops were fluent in English or nearly so, and they appear to have been selected on basis of certain relevant competencies. Bishop John (Ioann) Mitropol’skii (1870-76) authored a five-volume study on *The History of Religious Sects in America*. Bishop Nestor Zass (or Zakkis, 1879-1882) had previously spent a year in (or near) the United States during the American Civil War as a Russian naval chaplain. Bishop Vladimir Sokolovskii-Avtonomov (1888-91), who made two visits to the United States while stationed as a missionary in Japan, created English-language settings for the most common Russian liturgical chants, though his critics complained that “neither we ourselves nor Americans can understand the resultant mutilated English” (Emmons 1997, 15).

Unfortunately neither Bishop John nor Bishop Nestor nor Bishop Vladimir significantly advanced Metropolitan Innocent’s vision for Orthodoxy in America. Bishop John’s administration was marked by scandals so serious that they resulted in his recall to Russia. Bishop Nestor had a zeal for mission and many ambitious plans, but his short tenure ended with his apparent suicide as he was traveling in Alaskan waters, leaving the diocese without a bishop for six years. Bishop Vladimir’s tumultuous tenure as bishop was also brief, cut short in his case by recall to Russia. Until the 1890s, survival of the Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska depended less upon its bishops than upon less conspicuous figures operating behind the scenes. Of these the most important was the long-time head of the diocesan consistory in San Francisco, Fr. Vladimir Vechtomov, who saved the church from several embarrassing situations and also helped reinvigorate its flagging mission in Alaska.

### 3.9.2 Church properties under American rule

The sale of Alaska offered new opportunities for Orthodox mission in the New World, but it also presented some unprecedented problems and challenges. The 1867 Treaty of Cession had promised that the Orthodox Church could retain its properties in Alaska and continue its mission, protected by constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion. Alaska, however, was effectively under military rule. A civilian government would not be established until congressional passage of the Organic Act of 1884. Meanwhile church property – inadequately surveyed at the time of the Alaska Cession – was easily
misappropriated by squatters and homesteaders or lost through fraudulent business deals.

The Treaty of Cession also did little to protect the property and cultural heritage of the native population or the legal status of the creoles. Engaged in successive Indian wars as white settlers pushed westward, the government of the United States largely ignored the legal claims of Alaska’s natives and “half-breed” creoles. Physical violence was minimal, although American soldiers stationed in Sitka at one point looted St. Michael’s Cathedral, and a naval gunboat shelled the Tlingit village of Angoon. The battle for the Alaskan native peoples would be fought out in the classroom, through aggressive programs intended to replace indigenous culture, with its important Orthodox component, with American culture and mainstream white Protestant values (Oleksa 1987, 311-339; Oleksa 1992, 171-186; Dauenhauer 1980; Dauenhauer 1997).

3.9.3 Battles over education

An important leader in this campaign of Americanization and assimilation was Dr. Sheldon Jackson, a Presbyterian minister whose social and political connections in Washington gained him appointment as the first Territorial Commissioner of Education (1885-1906). Following what was then accepted practice for education on American Indian reservations, Jackson encouraged establishment of boarding schools run by federally funded Protestant missions. Native and creole children would be removed from their homes, sometimes by force, and enrolled in these schools in order to bring them to “the Anglo-Saxon frame of mind” (Oleksa 1992, 172).

In contrast to the bilingual or trilingual approach to education followed in the schools of the Orthodox mission, these boarding schools insisted on the exclusive use of English, even when students were speaking among themselves. One of Jackson’s associates, the Reverend S. Hall Young, explained in his autobiography why this English-only policy was pursued: “One strong stand, so far as I know I was the first to take, was the determination to do no translating into...any of the native dialects. I realized...that the task of making an English-speaking race of these Natives was much easier than the task of making a civilized and Christian language out of the Native languages. We should let the old tongues with their superstitions and sin die -- the sooner the better -- and replace these languages with that of Christian civilization, and compel the Natives in our schools to speak English and English only” (Oleksa 1992, 171).

Along with the native languages, these schools often tried to suppress Orthodoxy. Students would be encouraged to choose an “American” rather than a “Russian” religion. Orthodox priests would not be allowed to administer the sacraments to them. Only religious instruction according to the Protestant faith would be permitted (Oleksa 1992, 171-178).
3.9.4 Orthodox advocacy

Spokesmen for the Orthodox Church protested against the aggressive policies of Jackson and his associates. Eventually articles appeared in church periodicals denouncing abuses. Petitions – some by native leaders - were sent to federal officials in Washington. In 1898 Bishop Nicholas Ziorov, then the head of the Russian North American diocese, addressed a sharp letter to President McKinley in which he appealed for protection from officials who are “sent to Alaska without any discrimination and exclusively on the recommendation of Alaska’s immovable guardian, Sheldon Jackson.... Alaska must be delivered from that man. By his sectarian propaganda he has introduced dissension, enmity and iniquity where those evils did not before exist. It was the Orthodox Church which brought the light of truth to that country; why then try to drive her out of it by every means, lawful or unlawful?” (ROAM 3 [1899] 6-9).

Unfortunately such protests did not succeed in stopping abusive practices. Rather, they prompted even sharper attacks on the Orthodox Church. In its coverage of the letter to President McKinley, the New York Tribune denounced Bishop Nicholas for his “blind and unwarranted prejudice against this Protestant country and its excellent schools” (Oleksa 1992, 179-180). Sheldon Jackson also reacted angrily, warning that the “days of the Orthodox Church are numbered” and that “twenty-five years from now, there will not be any Orthodox church members left in Alaska” (Oleksa 1992, 182). But Jackson underestimated the resilience of Orthodoxy in Alaska -- a resilience which was the direct result of its approach to mission. As a 1901 article in the Russian American Orthodox Messenger noted, Orthodox missions do not aim at promoting a political agenda or imposing a particular culture. Rather, they are open to all cultures (ROAM 5 [1901] 90-94, 110-119, 132-139, 150-157).

Its openness to native culture allowed the Orthodox mission in Alaska to succeed in situations where Jackson’s assimilationist policies only alienated the native peoples. For example, the Tlingit Indians of southeastern Alaska initially had shown little interest in Orthodoxy. In the 1880s, however, in the face of mounting pressures from Jackson and his associates, their leaders began to petition the Orthodox bishop for teachers and clergy and encouraged their people to accept baptism in the Orthodox Church. As they recognized, acceptance of Orthodoxy would allow them to maintain their cultural identity. A century after Jackson’s angry predictions of its impending demise, the Orthodox Church in Alaska has remained alive and strong.

At the time of the Alaska Cession, Orthodoxy was a significant cultural force in Alaska. Despite periods of neglect, it remained so in the decades that followed. In some parts of Alaska, brief intervals of prosperity brought new church construction. In addition, support from Russia, both public and private, helped finance clergy salaries and educational and philanthropic activities.
3.9.5 A new boom in furs

During the first decades of American rule, the Orthodox native population of Alaska continued to depend heavily on the fur trade. Sea otter stocks, depleted earlier in the century, had rebounded because of conservation measures introduced during the last decades of Russian rule. One consequence was that, during the years between 1867 and 1890, the average annual kill rose dramatically. But then, in just a few years, it dropped even more dramatically as the sea otter population plummeted. At first, growing scarcity caused the price of a pelt to rise to astronomical levels, but by the time an international treaty banned commercial hunting in 1911, the sea otter had been nearly exterminated.

During the boom years, Aleut/Unangan, Alutiiq and Indian hunting parties on board American and British schooners were among those profiting from the hunt. Orthodox communities along the Pacific coast of the Alaska peninsula, the Kodiak archipelago, and the Gulf of Alaska would be among the beneficiaries of their work. New parishes were created in Nuchek, Unga and Belkovski, each with dependent chapels.

With its elegant Church of the Holy Resurrection (1887), Belkovski for a time was one of the most prosperous Orthodox parishes in Alaska. But as the sea otter trade declined, so did the town. Its survival depended on the development of a local commercial fishing industry and -- increasingly -- on seasonal cannery employment in nearby King Cove. Although Belkovski’s church was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1980, after the town’s last residents left later in the decade its upkeep became impossible. St. Herman’s church in King Cove, established in 1984, became its successor, receiving its magnificent iconostasis and bells.²

Also thriving during the early American period, but for slightly different reasons, were the stand-alone parishes of Sts. Peter and Paul and St. George in the Pribilof Islands. Unlike the rest of Alaska, which was administered by the army and -- for a time -- the navy, the Pribilofs, breeding grounds for the fur seal, were under the supervision of the U.S. Treasury Department, which granted monopoly leases on seal harvesting to the Alaska Commercial Company (from 1870 to 1890) and the North American Commercial Company (from 1890 to 1920). These leases were extremely profitable to the government as well as to the lessees. During its twenty-year lease to the Alaska Commercial Company, the Treasury Department received $9.6 million dollars (Hoagland 1993, 296; and 1997, passim). Also benefiting, but not nearly so spectacularly, were the Aleut/Unangan workers, who financed construction of handsome new churches on both islands – both of which are now on the National Register.

² In 1992 the Belkovski church collapsed, and in 2013 nearly the entire site of Belkovski was destroyed by fire.
Another center of church activity was Nushagak, off Bristol Bay, where many decades earlier the Russian-American Company had established a trading post, New Alexander Redoubt, and Bishop Innocent Veniaminov had created a mission district that stretched all the way from Bristol Bay up the river systems into the lake country. From the late 1870s, John W. Clark, for whom Lake Clark is named, ran trading operations at Nushagak for the Alaska Commercial Company. His various commercial undertakings thrived in part because of his friendship with the Orthodox priest at Nushagak, Fr. Vasilii Shishkin, and Deacon Vasilii Orlov, whose daughter Clark married. As Clark’s biographer John B. Branson observes, “the Clark-Shishkin-Orlov clan... was made up of the three most influential families in all of the Bristol Bay region in the late nineteenth century. Between them they controlled the commercial and religious reins of the region” (Branson 2012, 58).

Nushagak’s relative prosperity continued into the early 20th century, but with shifts in regional trade and economic activity, due in part to shifting river current and mud flats, Nushagak was eventually eclipsed by Dillingham across the bay. The icons and other accoutrements of the latest Nushagak church, built in 1903, were transferred to parishes in Aleknagik and Dillingham. The church itself eventually succumbed to the elements and was taken down. A large cross was erected on the site of its altar. Toppled during a violent storm, it was replaced by an even larger cross slightly higher up the bluff overlooking Nushagak Bay.

For several decades Unalaska was a convenient hub for church and commerce alike. Bishop Nestor considered making it the base of his activities in Alaska and contracted with the Alaska Commercial Company for the construction of the Unalaska “bishop’s house” and a school building there, as well as substantial new rectories in Nushagak, Kodiak and Kenai. After upstart Belkovski built its fine new church in 1887, the Church of the Transfiguration at Unalaska was expanded and thoroughly remodeled in 1894. In the process it acquired two side chapels, one over the site of Veniaminov’s original Unalaska church. Acquisition of these second and third altars boosted the status of the Unalaska church. Like St. Michael’s Cathedral in Sitka, it now qualified as a cathedral, or sobor, though unlike St. Michael’s it never became a kafedralny sobor, the seat of a bishop.

3.9.6 Advent of the canneries

A second and more enduring change in Alaska’s economy and church life came with the arrival of commercial fish canneries in coastal Alaska during the late 19th century. The canneries would transform Alaska’s economy and, in time, the face of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska. Initially, however, the cannery owners were reluctant to hire Native Americans, who were regarded as unreliable – mostly because they could resume their accustomed subsistence activities if they got dissatisfied with working conditions in the canneries. Cannery operators and management preferred to engage
Asian contract laborers, who would be totally dependent on them not only for housing, food and wages but also for transportation to and from their point of origin.

This changed in the wake of the San Francisco earthquake and fire of 1906. In his 1906 travel diary, Fr. Nicholas Kashevarov recounts his visit to Akhiok, on Kodiak Island, for that village’s feast day. He had not expected the natives to be working at the cannery.

I said to the captain: this is not the first time I have been here, and I know very well that the residents here never worked at the cannery, which is why I sent the baidarka to let them know of my arrival. But I am not pressuring anyone to lose out on their pay, either now or in the future. The captain said to me that it was true that the residents had not worked like this before, but because of the catastrophic earthquake in San Francisco, the company was unable to recruit enough Chinese people, and therefore it really needed the local residents to work at the cannery. “Well,” I said, “I am not summoning them by force; let them earn money, especially since they do need it.”

As a compromise measure with the cannery manager, Kashevarov compressed the usual two- or three-day period of preparation for communion into one long night. The workers were free to resume their cannery labors after the Divine Liturgy early the next morning (ROAM 11 l1907] 207-210).

The economic benefits of the canneries eventually extended to Orthodox communities through much of coastal Alaska. One of the earliest and most remarkable examples of the concern of local workers for their church can be seen at Karluk. If one excludes the church in the Bishop’s House in Sitka, the Ascension of Our Lord Chapel in Karluk is probably the oldest extant Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska. As Hoagland notes,

Its size and style are probably attributable to the prosperity afforded by the rich salmon runs in the Karluk River, which brought canneries to this site in the 1880s.... When the Karluk Packing Company began constructing new houses for the Natives, a Native named Melety requested that the company build him a church instead. A stenciled plaque in the church reads “Melety’s Memorial Church, Built in 11 June 1888, by Charlie Smith Hursh, Karluk, Alaska” (Hoagland 1993, 289).

One may suspect that the arrival of canneries also prompted the construction, enlargement and embellishment of other charming churches along Cook Inlet, including Holy Assumption Church in Kenai (1894-1895, with remodeling and the addition of a massive bell-tower in 1900) and St. Nicholas Chapel in Seldovia (1891, expanded with bell-tower ca. 1896). The place of these and comparable churches within their historic landscape setting can be gathered from early photographs. With the disappearance of the canneries, churches like that at Karluk - now standing in splendid isolation on its
promontory - seem more distant from the life of their local communities than they did at the time of their construction.

Figure 3. 12. Karluk, on Kodiak Island, 1900-1901, showing church with cemetery and the government school on the high promontory, village homes along its slope and in the foreground, and canneries along the shoreline (background far right).

3.10 ORTHODOXY IN THE UNITED STATES

3.10.1 New immigration

By the time of the Alaska Cession, Orthodoxy had made very little impact in the United States itself. Consular officials, shipping agents and merchants from Greece and Russia provided an Orthodox presence in a handful of port cities, but organized church life was only beginning. Orthodoxy seemed destined to remain a peripheral element in American life. Within a few decades, this situation changed dramatically. From the late 1880s onward, a growing tide of immigration from Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Middle East made Orthodoxy one of the fastest-growing faiths in America.

When Bishop Nicholas Ziorov arrived in the United States in 1891, only two of his parishes lay outside Alaska. One was his cathedral parish in San Francisco. The other had just been received into the Orthodox Church. The circumstances surrounding its reception into the Russian Orthodox Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska were part of a
movement – often called “the return of the Unia” - that would transform the diocese, its geographical distribution, and its cultural make-up.

3.10.2 The “return of the Unia”

The first large-scale immigration in the late 19th century came from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, from the Carpathian mountain regions that today are divided among Poland, Slovakia, Hungary, Moldova, and Ukraine. The people in question were known by various names: Carpatho-Russians, Ruthenians, Rusyns, Uhro-Rusyns (if they came from Hungary), Galicians (if they came from the areas of Poland then ruled by Austria) or Trans-Carpathian Ukrainians. Most arrived in the United States as Greek Catholics, or – as the Orthodox called them – Uniates. Through a series of "unions" in the late 16th and 17th centuries, beginning with the Union of Brest in 1596, their Orthodox forebears had accepted the authority of the Pope while retaining their Eastern liturgical traditions and many Eastern customs and practices.

Catholic bishops in the United States were generally ignorant of the many liturgical, cultural and linguistic peculiarities that distinguished these Eastern Catholics from their Latin Catholic fellow-immigrants. Many opposed the establishment of Eastern Catholic parishes. If these people are good Catholics, their reasoning went, let them attend the existing Latin-rite parishes of their Slovak, Polish and Hungarian neighbors. From 1891 onward, the hostility of the Roman Catholic bishops provoked a massive “return” of these Greek Catholics to their ancestral Orthodoxy – a movement spearheaded by the fiery Fr. Alexis Toth. By 1917, some 163 Carpatho-Russian communities in America had entered the Russian Orthodox Church.

3.10.3 A shift of orientation

This "return of the Unia" profoundly transformed the Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska, giving it not only many thousands of new members but also a new demographic composition, geographic orientation, and ethnic flavor. When leaders of the missionary diocese moved the diocesan see from Alaska to San Francisco, they can hardly have imagined that their mission to mainstream America would achieve its first major success with the mass conversion of new immigrants from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The diocese now faced several new challenges. How should it minister to the new immigrants who were now pouring into the United States, not only the former Uniate Carpatho-Russians but also the many Orthodox Serbs, Greeks, Arabs, Albanians, Romanians and Bulgarians?

The ruling bishops of this period -- Nicholas Ziorov (1891-98), Tikhon Bellavin (1898-1907), Platon Rozhdestvenskii (1907-14, and later 1922-34) and Evdokim Meshcherskii (1914-17) -- addressed these challenges in a variety of ambitious ways. The missionary diocese, in 1900 renamed the Russian Orthodox Diocese of North America and the Aleutian Islands, would include over 350 parishes and chapels, a seminary, a women’s
vocational training school, a monastery and a convent, several orphanages, an immigrant aid society and savings bank, with a projected annual central administrative budget totaling over a quarter of a million dollars. But only a small percentage of these parishes and institutions were in Alaska. A directory of parishes for 1917-1918 lists seventeen Alaska parishes, of which only nine had resident priests at the time. Meanwhile the vicar bishop for Alaska, Philip Stavitskii was listed as “on vacation in Russia”. He would never return (Tarasar 1975, 347).

3.10.4 Bishop Tikhon Bellavin

Of ruling bishops in this period, certainly the most beloved and most consequential was Tikhon Bellavin. Thirty-three years old at the time of his arrival in the United States, he was one of the youngest bishops in the Russian Orthodox Church. After his return to Russia, he became in quick succession Archbishop of Iaroslavl, Archbishop of Vilnius, Metropolitan of Moscow, and - in the midst of the communist revolution of 1917 - the first Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia in over two hundred years. Subjected to constant harassment and persecution by the communists, he died while under house arrest in 1925. With the fall of communism in 1989, he was formally canonized as a saint by the Russian Orthodox Church, but long before that he was universally recognized as one of the 20th century's greatest confessors of the Christian faith.

On arriving in America, Bishop Tikhon undertook a series of pastoral visits throughout his far-flung diocese. One of the first took him to the more remote parts of Alaska, where he had to travel by kayak and “sleep for twelve straight nights on bare ground, to experience the lack of the most essential provisions and wage a ‘bloody’ war against besieging insects” (OCA Archives, bishop’s report for 1900). He also noted difficulties of communication, since “not only is there no telegraph, but even the mail is delivered only once a month and takes almost a full month to arrive” (ibid.).

To his chagrin, Tikhon “noticed that several priests were engaging in trade” – a frequent complaint of earlier bishops, their consistories, and the Russian consular officials. For members of the clerical estate, engaging in trade and commerce – along the lines of the Shishkins and Orlovs and other creole dynasties in the Alaskan church – was considered altogether inconsistent with their high calling. Accordingly, Tikhon issued an encyclical to all Alaska clergy urging them “to acquire furs and pelts from their parishioners at market prices” and “by no means to engage in the sale of furs” (ibid.).

In 1902, finding himself unable to visit Alaska because of the great distances involved, Tikhon insisted, with added emphasis in his annual report to the Holy Synod, that “it is essential to provide the Bishop of the Aleutians with a vicar for Alaska to help him” (OCA Archives, bishop’s report for 1902). Invited to attend a session of the Holy Synod the following year, Tikhon vigorously insisted on the need for reorganization of his far-flung diocese. He requested that a vicar bishop be appointed specifically for Alaska, in view of its distance and special needs. Selected for this role was Innocent Pustinskii, a well-
educated archimandrite who in the 1890s had ministered for a few years in the United States. He was ordained as a bishop in St. Petersburg in December 1903, with Bishop Tikhon serving as one of his ten ordainers.

On March 11, 1904, in the first Orthodox episcopal ordination ever performed in the New World, Tikhon and his new Alaskan vicar bishop ordained a second vicar bishop, Raphael Hawaweeny, to have responsibility specifically for Arab Orthodox immigrants. Archimandrite Sebastian Dabovich, though not a bishop, already was exercising similar responsibility for Serbian immigrants, organizing parishes in mining towns throughout the west, including Douglas AK (opposite Juneau). Tikhon envisioned analogous arrangements for the rapidly expanding Greek Orthodox community as well, although this dream would never be realized.

In 1905, as a final seal of approval on his labors in North America, Tikhon received permission to transfer the diocesan see from San Francisco to New York, where it would be closer to the new immigrant parishes of the industrial northeast. He also was honored with the title of archbishop. What had begun as a Russian missionary diocese in Alaska was on its way to becoming a multi-ethnic American Orthodox church. This new orientation would have important consequences for Orthodoxy in Alaska.

3.11 THE VICARIATE OF SITKA AND ALASKA

3.11.1 Vicar bishops in Sitka (See also Chapter 5.17 and 5.18.)

With the administrative changes put in effect under Archbishop Tikhon, the newly created vicariate of Sitka and Alaska again had a resident bishop who was immediately responsible for Alaskan affairs. Bishop Innocent Pustinskii was extraordinarily energetic. He traveled extensively within his Alaskan diocese to parts that hitherto had never seen an Orthodox bishop, and he worked to develop diocesan and parish institutions, such as temperance societies and schools in which English would be taught. His annual reports on the state of the Alaskan church and many articles on education and related subjects provide a comprehensive picture of church life and institutions during what was certainly the most thriving period of its history since the days of Veniaminov.3

Bishop Innocent was succeeded in turn by Bishops Alexander Nemolovskii (1909-1916) and Philip Stavitskii (1916-1919). But these Alaskan vicar bishops had additional responsibilities that took them beyond the diocese to the United States. In addition, the Alaskan diocese itself was expanded to include the Chukchi Peninsula in Russia.

________________________
3 In March 1909, Bishop Innocent returned to Russia to become Bishop of Yakutsk and thereafter Archbishop of Alma-Ata (Tashkent, now Uzbekistan). His life after the ascendancy of the Bolskeviks, which included association with the schismatic “Living Church,” or “Renovated Church” (see §3.11.4), reveals many of the ambiguities and horrors of the Soviet period. In 1937 he was arrested by the secret police (NKVD) for the final time and executed in Alma-Ata.
life in Alaska continued with little change, save that as parish communities in many parts of the territory declined economically, so also did church morale.

3.11.2 Disasters and other changes

Alaska was rapidly changing, and in ways that diminished the economic and cultural clout of the Russian Orthodox population in many places. The gold rush brought an influx of newcomers, along with new ways of exploiting natural resources. In a few places native peoples entered into the new economy. This was the case with the Athabaskans of the upper Kuskokwim, who benefited from transit along the Iditerod Trail. Orthodox churches in places like Telida and Nikolai as well as in the Cook Inlet vicinity are a reminder of those days. But many regions with a significant Orthodox population experienced disasters that altered and weakened church life.

These included such typical misfortunes as shifting currents, erosion of village sites, and changes in trade routes, as was the case at Nushagak. Disease also played a part. In the early 20th century an influenza epidemic dramatically reduced village populations in much of western and southwestern Alaska. The global “Spanish ‘Flu” pandemic of 1918 added to the death toll.

More dramatic was the Novarupta / Katmai volcanic eruption in 1912 (Clemens 1999). Ash from the eruption covered wide swaths of the Alaska peninsula and the Kodiak archipelago, blotting out the sun for days. The most affected populations were forced to relocate, villagers of Katmai and Cape Douglas to Perryville, of Savonskii to New Savonskii - itself now abandoned. In the process, villagers lost much of their cultural patrimony, their churches included.

Figure 3. 13. The chapel at Katmai showing the aftermath of flooding that accompanied the 1912 volcanic eruption. The high-water mark of the flooding reached half way to the top of the bell tower.
Clergy morale also was adversely affected, especially in areas that had been booming just a few years earlier. Obituaries and extended tributes to prematurely deceased priests supplanted adventuresome clergy travel journals in the pages of the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger* and other ecclesiastical publications.

Diocesan vicar bishops continued to tour Alaskan villages and report on conditions as time allowed. Even ruling bishops of the North American diocese occasionally paid a visit, but more as tourists than as pastors. A sign of the times is the serialized account of a visit of Archbishop Platon Rozhdestvenskii written by his “traveling companion,” probably Fr. Alexander Hotovitskii, editor of the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger*, the diocese’s flagship publication. The bishop had hoped to make his first stop at Sitka in order to serve at its historic St. Michael’s Cathedral, but the ship bypassed “Old Lady Sitka” and proceeded directly to Juneau, the new territorial capital. With wry humor, the bishop’s traveling companion describes all the symptoms of the gold fever that was sweeping Alaska: the clamor of the Treadwell mines, the boisterous vitality of the Serbian miners across the Gastineau Straits in Douglas. He is at once fascinated and disgusted by the American preoccupation with money (ROAM 14 [1910] 329-335; 15 [1911] 92-95, 195-203, 213-214, 234-236, 249-253, 264-270, 278-289).

### 3.11.3 War and Revolution: Links to Russia change

As institutional inertia, political crisis, and the advent of World War I began to shake Russia, uncertainty about the future of the Alaskan vicariate mounted. Rumors circulated that the Russian Orthodox Church intended to withdraw its support (ROAM 20 [1916] 572; OCA Archives, miscellaneous correspondence file for 1915-1916). But neither Alaska nor the North American diocese was prepared for the dramatic changes that would come in the wake of the communist revolution in Russia.

Prior to the revolution, leaders of the North American diocese sometimes had spoken of its eventual need for autocephaly, that is, ecclesiastical independence. But in fact the diocese was still quite dependent, both financially and administratively, on the Russian Orthodox Church and on the empire to which that church was so closely linked. Hitherto that relationship had been advantageous for the American diocese. For example, a subsidy from Russia covered nearly all of its hefty central administrative budget. With the advent of communist rule in Russia, that relationship became an overwhelming liability. The diocese was plunged into financial and administrative chaos. With financial support cut off, disposable income was negligible. Total receipts for 1922 would come to only $2,557 (Tarasar 1975, 180). As a result, practically all educational and philanthropic programs were terminated, not to mention support for clergy salaries.

The North American diocese also faced a constitutional crisis. Archbishop Evdokim Meshcherskii had departed for Russia in summer 1917 for the long-anticipated All-Russian Church Council, leaving administration of the diocese in the hands of his senior
auxiliary bishop, Alexander Nemolovskii. But Evdokim never returned, and Alexander was left to deal with financial and administrative problems far beyond his ability and competence, including a debt of over $100,000 that Evdokim had incurred. In 1922 Alexander resigned and left America, turning over administration to Metropolitan Platon Rozhdestvenskii, who previously had headed the diocese (1907-1914) and who now had returned as a refugee. The generosity of private benefactors helped stem the immediate financial crisis, but the church now faced a new question: Who was to be regarded as its legitimate head? Hitherto legitimization had depended on Russia, but who now could legitimately speak for the Russian Orthodox Church?

3.11.4 New challenges for the North American diocese

In 1922 a plenary church council of diocesan clergy and laity, the “Third All-American Sobor,” meeting in Pittsburgh, proclaimed Platon as “Metropolitan of All America and Canada,” a position that he would hold until his death in 1934. Nevertheless, his authority was challenged from several directions.

The first and most ominous challenge had its roots in Russia. With the support of the new Soviet regime, a group of “progressive” clergy seized control of church headquarters in Moscow, declared Patriarch Tikhon deposed, and proceeded to introduce a number of liturgical and canonical innovations. This group, known as the “Living Church” or “Renovated Church,” appointed a defrocked American priest, John Kedrovsky, to be its archbishop in America.

In 1924, threatened by Kedrovsky’s lawsuits and unable to communicate freely with Patriarch Tikhon, the “Fourth All-American Sobor” met in Detroit and proclaimed the North American diocese to be a “temporarily self-governing church” until a future council of the Russian Orthodox Church could deal with ecclesiastical affairs under conditions of political freedom. Henceforth the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (to give it its official name) or Metropolia (as it was popularly called) would pursue its own troubled course in the Orthodox world.

Although Kedrovsky did gain possession of the church’s historic cathedral in New York City, his lawsuits met with little success on the parish level. However, two other groups entered the struggle for the spiritual allegiance of Russian Orthodox Christians in America. One was the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia, or the “Karlovtsy Synod,” which was organized in 1921 by a group of refugee bishops in Yugoslavia to unite the scattered branches of Russian Orthodoxy outside the suffering Soviet Union. In the eyes of its critics, however, the “Synod” compromised itself by adopting an overtly pro-monarchist political stance. The second competitor was the Russian patriarchal church itself, which, after the death of Patriarch Tikhon in 1925, won a measure of recognition at the price of a highly controversial pledge of loyalty to the Soviet state by Metropolitan Sergei Stragarodskii, Deputy Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Throne.
3.11.5 Alaska nearly forgotten

Despite the establishment of these rival Russian church groups in America, the vast majority of clergy and parishioners remained loyal to Metropolitan Platon and his successors. The struggles between Russian Orthodox factions had little direct impact on parish life in Alaska, but they did affect the relationship of bishops and other senior churchmen in America one to another. The mutual trust necessary for development of common programs and consistent policies was largely absent. In any case, even when grand programs were proposed, financial means to bring them about were non-existent.

From the 1920s into the 1960s, the Orthodox Church in Alaska was practically forgotten by the wider world. A few figures, however, stand out for their dedication to ministry in the Alaskan context.

Amfilokhii Vakulskii, a graduate of the Kazan Theological Academy with a specialization in languages and missiology, began his ministry in America when Bishop Tikhon Bellavin appointed him as missionary priest for the Yukon region, with headquarters at Ikogmiut/Kvikhpak (now known as Russian Mission). He quickly mastered the Yup’ik language, and traveled extensively up and down the river systems of the region by dogsled in the winter and kayak in the summer. He made his mission at Ikogmiut into an educational center for the training of village catechists. His enthusiasm for the Yukon region never waned. Even as bishop of the Alaskan diocese (1924-1930), he continued to use Russian Mission as his base of operations, its imposing church serving as his “cathedral on the Yukon” (Smith 1982 passim).

Ministry of a different nature is exemplified in the work of Fr. Andrew Petrovich Kashevarov. Member of a large ecclesiastical family (his father and four brothers all were priests, two of his sisters were the wives of priests), he followed a typical ecclesiastical career for many years, as serving as a teacher, psalmist (song-leader), and – after marrying – priest in various postings in Alaska. In time he became a permanent member of the Alaska ecclesiastical consistory and was given the rank archpriest, serving as rector of the Juneau parish. But in 1917, with the coming of the Russian Revolution, Fr. Kashevarov found his salary cut off. While continuing to serve as a priest, he supported himself and his growing family with odd jobs, including work as librarian in the office of the territorial governor. He approached the territorial legislature with a proposal to establish a Territorial Museum and Historical Library. The proposal was approved, and in 1920 Kashevarov was appointed its curator – a post that he would fill until his death on April 3, 1940. In 2016, to honor Fr. Kashevarov’s many contributions to the study of Alaskan history and culture, the new Alaska State Library, Museum and Archives facility in Juneau was named for him.

William Wanamaker (or Vasili Shaku, to use his Tlingit name) was one of a small cadre of students educated in Sitka’s Russian School, located in the lower of level of the Russian Bishop’s House. Later in life he began to keep a diary, with newspaper clippings often
inserted (Sealaska Heritage Institute Archives, Wm. S. Wanamaker Collection Mss 47, Box 1, Item 1). Recorded, among other things, are the dates of his election as vice-president of Sitka’s St. Michael’s Brotherhood (1917) and as vice-president of the Alaska Native Brotherhood (1920). Later Wanamaker and his wife settled in Juneau, where they were active in Fr. Kashevarov’s parish, St. Nicholas. Included among entries and clippings for April 1940 are obituaries for Kashevarov. Here are Wanamaker’s entries for later that month, during Orthodox Holy Week:

April 25, 1940. The reading of 12 Gospels
Friday 26. Winding Sheet was brought in center of church. At 7 P.M. some evening processions with winding sheet.
April 27. Decorating of the St. Nicholas church.
April 28, 1940. Easter at midnight. All services were conducted by C. Zuboff [Cirill Zubov, another prominent member of the Tlingit community] and W. Wanamaker. First time on Easter since the church was built no priest.

From its beginnings in the mid-eighteenth century to the days of William Wanamaker and Fr. Andrew Kashevarofv in the mid-20th century, Orthodoxy in Alaska had come full circle, from Russian promyshlenniki baptizing their native godchildren to native laymen leading Russian Orthodox Holy Week services.

3.11.6 Further disasters

From the 1920s into the 1960s, the Orthodox Church in Alaska faced not only financial challenges but also depletion of its cultural patrimony due to disasters both natural and unnatural. In the former category one must include fire (as in Kodiak, where the historic cathedral went up in flames in 1943) and earthquake followed by tsunami (as at many church sites along the Gulf of Alaska coast during the 1964 “Good Friday” earthquake). The resultant topographical changes caused some church communities to relocate completely (e.g., Afognak to Port Lyons). In other cases, post-earthquake reconstruction changed historic patterns of circulation within communities (as at Seldovia).

Among unnatural disasters, one must include the evacuation of the native population from the Aleutians and Pribilofs during World War II and their internment in make-shift camps in southeastern Alaska and elsewhere far from their homes. Barbara Smith describes what ensued after the war ended:
When the Aleuts returned to their villages, they found a world entirely changed. Those from the tiny Unalaska Island communities of Makushin, Kashega, and Biorka were not allowed to return home and were forcibly relocated, mostly to Unalaska and Akutan. The Attuans, returning from prisoner-of-war camps in Japan also were forbidden to return to Attu and were told to relocate in Atka. The Atkans themselves returned to desolation, their homes and church burned to the ground, everything gone. The residents of Akutan and Nikolski found their churches vandalized by the U.S. military personnel who had occupied the villages. The distinctive cupola – or onion dome – at Nikolski had been used as target practice, letting water into the ceiling and walls. At Akutan, the door had been hacked with an axe and windows boarded from the outside were broken on the inside. The floor of the venerable Unalaska “cathedral” (built in 1895) was wet throughout, from bullet holes in the roof and broken windows left unrepaired by the military (Smith 1994, 7-8).

3.11.7 Orthodoxy in Alaska rediscovered

After the stress and trauma of the half century following the Russian Revolution, Orthodoxy in America – and in Alaska – began to take on new life in the 1960s. In the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in America, or Metropolia, as in most of the other Orthodox jurisdictions in America, there was increased use of English, increased emphasis on education, increased concern for Orthodox unity, and increased presence in American life. The decade culminated in May 1970, when the Russian Orthodox Church granted a Tomos of Autocephaly (ecclesiastical independence) to its daughter church, recognizing it as the Orthodox Church in America (OCA).

In Alaska, the decade was marked by a consciousness-raising disaster. On January 2, 1966, Sitka’s historic St. Michael the Archangel Cathedral - standing tall since its dedication by St. Innocent Veniaminov in 1848, designated as a National Historic Landmark in 1962 - was destroyed in a fire that swept through downtown Sitka. Nearly all its priceless icons and other movables were saved, but the building itself was a total
loss. Fortunately it had been documented in the 1940s by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS), the first such documentation in Alaska. This made possible its faithful reconstruction, completed with reconsecration in 1978.

Word of this disastrous fire prompted renewed interest in Alaska’s Russian Orthodox heritage not only in the state but also throughout North America. This was accompanied by renewed concern for theological education in and for Alaskans. One fruit of this concern was St. Herman’s Seminary, initially near Kenai, eventually in Kodiak. Its important role in revitalizing Orthodoxy in Alaska was due especially to the labors of diocesan chancellor Archpriest Joseph Kreta and to Bishop Gregory Afonsky (1973-1995), the longest serving Orthodox hierarch in the history of Alaska. One result of this revival has been a significant growth in the number of native Alaskan priests, especially in the Yup’ik regions of western Alaska.

If the first major event in the life of the OCA in 1970 was the recognition of its autocephalous status by the Russian Orthodox Church, the second major event of that year was also a major event in the life of its Diocese of Alaska. On August 9, in ceremonies in Kodiak and on Spruce Island, the Venerable and God-bearing Father Herman of Alaska, the last surviving member of the original 1794 Kodiak mission, became the first canonized Orthodox saint in America. Described as the “North-star of Christ’s Holy Church,” St. Herman continues to guide Orthodox Christians in Alaska and all America through his example of humility, patience and love. Annual pilgrimages to his hermitage on Spruce Island continue to remind Orthodox Christians of the Alaskan roots of Orthodoxy in America.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.1</td>
<td>Akutan</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
<td>Thwaites Collection, PCA-18-493, Alaska State Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith 1994, 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.2</td>
<td>Russian Mission</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Clark M. Garber</td>
<td>Clark M. Garber Collection</td>
<td>UAF-2015-181-74</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm11/id/41551/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm11/id/41551/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.3</td>
<td>Antimension (1793)</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Orthodox Church in America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://oca.org/reflections/fr.-john-jillions/february-1-2013">https://oca.org/reflections/fr.-john-jillions/february-1-2013</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.4</td>
<td>Table of Oblation</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hapgood 1956, xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Caption</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Sign of the Cross</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alaska State Museum 395 Whittier Street, Juneau, AK 99801-1718</td>
<td>ASL-2001-10-1</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm30/id/52/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm30/id/52/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Peg calendar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church, Seldovia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Wedding crowns</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen Erickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Kazan Mother of God, Sitka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokouroff</td>
<td>Kazan Mother of God Photograph Collection, ca. 1880’s-1970’s. PCA 243</td>
<td>ASL-P243-1-036</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5004/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5004/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Baptism shrine</td>
<td>Ca. 1950</td>
<td>Dr. William S. Laughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith 1994, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>Karluk</td>
<td>1900-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRC. William J. Aspe Collection</td>
<td>AMRC-b90-13-1</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/467/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/467/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>Funter Bay</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Harold F. Hargrave</td>
<td>Alaska State Library Place File, Photographs, ASL.</td>
<td>ASL-FunterBay-12-ASL-P01-3749</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/96/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/96/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.15. Sources of historic photographs.
INTRODUCTION TO FIELD NOTES

Because of the lack of documentation of ecclesiastical landscapes of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska, site visits were determined to be an essential aspect of this study. Sites were chosen on the basis of ethnic, geographic and ecclesiastical diversity, as well as accessibility.

During the period from September 2014 to September 2016, Helen Erickson visited thirteen ecclesiastical sites

- Juneau and Sitka (September 2014);
- Eklutna, Knik, Kodiak, Old Harbor, Ouzinkie, Sitka and Spruce Island (April 2015);
- Kenai, Kwethluk, Napaskiak, Ninilchik, Seldovia and Unalaska (July/August 2015);
- Kenai and Sitka (September 2016). ¹

John Erickson also visited and contributed to the documentation of the followings sites

- Juneau and Sitka (September 2014);
- Eklutna, Knik, Kodiak, Sitka and Spruce Island (April 2015);
- Kenai, Kwethluk, Napaskiak, Ninilchik and Seldovia (July/August 2015).

Analysis revealed that all visited sites are comprised of a Russian Orthodox church and a cemetery. For liturgical reasons, the church is surrounded by processional space, often set apart from the adjacent landscape by a fence. This church yard, which may or may not contain graves, is a secondary consecrated area rather than merely a way of setting a property boundary. A church may be linked to an adjacent cemetery, or, especially in urban areas, a cemetery some distance from the church. Like church yards, cemeteries are consecrated spaces. Several Alaskan Russian Orthodox cemeteries originally linked to visited sites have been destroyed by natural forces (such as a tsunami), by urban renewal, or by uninformed “clean-up” campaigns. Additional elements of the ecclesiastical landscape may include clergy housing (which may also have been used as a teaching facility), vegetable gardens, schools or orphanages. Overall, the visited Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscapes demonstrate two typical patterns:

- a church building surrounded by a churchyard, which may also contain graves; supporting facilities may be adjacent or at a distance.

- a landscape district with multiple resources, of which the church and its immediate surroundings form one segment.

¹ Return visits to Kenai and Sitka undertaken in September 2016 provided an opportunity to film the two videos associated with this project, as well as to verify earlier documentation.
The former landscape structure is typical of village churches, while the latter is typical of urban churches, which tend to have components distributed throughout the urban matrix. In some cases, this is the result of loss of church lands through sales or takings.

The altar area of Orthodox churches is traditionally located at the east end of the building. “East” is a flexible concept, perhaps determined by the sunrise when the construction was initiated or by variations in magnetic declination. In the churches surveyed, actual orientation ranged within a 90° arc from northeast to southeast. Once liturgical orientation was determined, it in turn determined the grid of the cemetery and adjacent ecclesiastical buildings. The asymmetrical three-barred Russian cross helps the observer to identify this orientation in discontiguous areas. When facing east, the lower bar of the cross angles downward to the right.

Figure 4.00. 1. Characteristic landscape elements associated with churches in smaller communities.
Figure 4.00. 2. Characteristic organization of an urban ecclesiastical landscape.

**ECCLESIASTICAL LANDSCAPES IN SMALL COMMUNITIES**

The great majority of village churches are set in a churchyard surrounded by a fence. This fence rarely if ever runs along the property boundary but instead defines an ancillary consecrated space, an extension of the sacred space contained within the church. This area provides room for liturgical processions and, in some cases, for elite burials.

Graves sited in the churchyard or cemetery are traditionally aligned with the orientation of the church. Just as the altar is placed at the east end of a church, burials are aligned east/west with the foot to the east, where a wooden cross is placed. Sometimes a marker, often of stone, indicates the name and dates. This may be placed at the foot of the grave, or less commonly at the head. In the case of churchyard burials, people most closely associated with the church - clergy or psalm readers, or in some cases clergy wives - are buried immediately adjacent to the church building. Typical locations are at the east end (nearest the altar), or to the west end near the porch or entrance. The unbaptized may be buried in a separate location with a different type of grave marker. In some instances non-Orthodox may be buried within the cemetery, often in peripheral areas with a different type of cross or grave marker. Graves may be covered in some way, or may be surrounded by a fence, a concrete frame, or by stones.
Housing for clergy and for resident readers was typically part of the village landscape. Many of these buildings doubled as schools, although larger villages might include a separate school or orphanage. The housing might or might not be adjacent to the church.

Given the Alaskan climate, it is not surprising to find that an existing church may be the second, third, fourth or fifth building in close proximity to the original site. Frequently the location of the former altar table is marked by a protective structure or shrine, or in some cases by a large three-barred cross.

**URBAN ECCLESIASTICAL LANDSCAPES**

Churches in urban areas – Unalaska, Kodiak, Sitka and (to some extent and for different reasons) Kenai – tend to have discontiguous elements. For these sites, the church forms part of a larger district including clergy housing, a school, orphanage, agricultural areas, or a discontinuous cemetery. Today these individual elements may be dispersed throughout the urban matrix.

Cemeteries, or subsidiary cemeteries, may be at a distance from the church in urban situations. Cemeteries divorced from the church are at-risk resources, and some have been lost completely through urban renewal or natural disasters. Urban cemeteries may also demonstrate intrusions into their edges as a result of land lost to sale or taking.

**PROCESSIONS AND LANDSCAPE CONNECTIVITY**

Processions linking elements of the landscape, such as churches and cemeteries, are a common feature of Russian Orthodox liturgical practice. This is of particular importance in linking features in discontiguous urban sites, such as Sitka. Liturgical practice includes processional visits to cemeteries or to sites where water is blessed. Certain occasions specify processions around the perimeter of the church. For these reasons even an urban churchyard is likely to contain an area outside the western door for assembling a procession and provide a clear processional pathway around the buildings. If the procession takes place at night, light shining out from church windows helps to provide illumination. Banners, icons, a cross, large candles, and smaller candles held by parishioners are associated with processional practice.

**VISUAL CONNECTIVITY**

Russian Orthodox churches in Alaska are almost invariably set on a high point, and the addition of a characteristic tower or dome extends visibility. Visual connections between the community church or cathedral and other ecclesiastical sites may not have been intentional, but the connections are clear, especially in more complex sites such as Sitka,
Kodiak and Unalaska. Flag poles are also found at many locations, but the significance of this is unclear.

**AURAL CONNECTIVITY**

Bells are an important feature of Russian Orthodox churches in Alaska, and, with the exception of Sts. Sergius and Herman of Valaam on Spruce Island (a hermitage rather than a village or urban church)\(^2\), each church had at least one, and usually more. Bells extend liturgical practice into the landscape.

**CROSSES**

There are four styles of crosses typically found at Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical sites in Alaska.

- Traditional Russian three bar cross
- Flowering cross
- Latin cross
- Capped cross

Another cross – to mark the grave of an unbaptized baby - is found only at Napaskiak.

![Typical cross styles](image)

Figure 4.00. 3. Typical cross styles.

Of these, the three bar cross is most often seen in Russian Orthodox cemeteries. This cross has three horizontal crossbeams—the top one represents the notice “Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews” that was put in place on the orders of Pilate at the crucifixion. The bottom one is a footrest. Christ was crucified between two thieves. The thief on the left cursed and rejected him, while the thief on the right repented and was admitted to paradise. When facing the Russian three bar cross, the foot rest is higher on the left side (the side of the penitent thief), which provides a clue to the orientation of the grave or the church. Traditional practice is to set the cross at the foot of the grave,

\(\text{\footnotesize 2 This site has acquired a set of bells during recent renovations.}\)
which is oriented to the east (often the liturgical east of the church, as distinct from true geographic east).

**DOCUMENTATION FORMAT OF SITE VISITS**

The documentation of each ecclesiastical site visited during the course of the project is organized into three sections:3

- Geographic Context – a discussion of location, orientation and cluster arrangements
- Brief History – an abridged historic context usually drawn from available Historic American Buildings Surveys or from National Register Nomination forms; also an analysis of historic photos
- Field Visit Summary – discussion and photographic documentation of visited sites

**RESEARCH PROCEDURE**

Notes were taken on characteristic features of individual sites. Each site was extensively photographed. These notes and photographs provide materials at the level required for completion of a short-form Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS), although these field notes are not intended as a replacement for a survey. Boundaries have not been determined in the majority of cases.

Historic photographs were researched and analyzed. Because of the prevailing focus on the architecture of the church building itself, information about ancillary buildings, cemeteries and churchyards was for the most part sparse; but at a minimum these photos provided baseline information. The great majority of photographs included in this section are available from VILDA (Alaska’s Digital Archives) or the Library of Congress (HABS photography). Complete documentation of historic photographs is located in a table at the end of each section to avoid long and potentially confusing captions for individual figures. *It should be noted that these photos are intended to be used for research only; no effort has been made to secure publication rights.* All photography dated 2014, 2015, and 2016 is by Helen Erickson.

Documentation through National Register Inventory – Nomination Forms and Historic American Buildings Surveys is available for most of the field sites visited. Within the study sites there are two exceptions: the church at Old Harbor is not listed in the National Register (although it is eligible), and there is no HABS documentation for the old church at Kwethluk.

---

3 Eklutna/Knik and Sitka are organized differently to accommodate the unique complement of resources at those sites.
Characteristic site components were mapped on a base adapted from Google Earth, as, with some exceptions noted in the field notes, no other readily available source was located for orthophotos. GPS Visualizer was used as a basis for the Sitka schematic diagram, as there was no reasonably scaled Google Earth image available. The use of these materials in any publication must take copyright issues into consideration.

The orientation of the churches was documented using the sources mentioned above. Common to all the visited sites was altar orientation to the east, which ranged from ~59° in Kodiak to ~141° in Kenai - approximately a 90° range, but generally facing east, northeast or southeast. Some potential correlations were noted with the direction of sunrise on the date of construction, but this needs to be studied further. Magnetic declination may be a more important factor. Once the orientation was selected, however, it typically determined the layout of streets and property lines in the surrounding area.
Cemeteries usually followed the eastern orientation of the associated church, with crosses marking the foot of the grave to the east. Ninilchik is a significant exception, with most graves oriented perpendicular to the church. Here the cross is placed at the foot of the grave to the north. There does not appear to be an explanation for this unique practice. Other variant orientations appear to be the result of accommodation to topography.

To avoid confusion in directional terminology when discussing individual sites, each site’s liturgical east was adopted for reference rather than determinations of exact direction. With figures and maps, however, the indicated north is true north.

**GENERAL TYPOLOGIES OF VISITED SITES**

The visited sites fell into three basic categories – village or urban, as outlined above - and monastic/pilgrimage. While clergy with a monastic background (priest-monks, deacon-monks) were common, for the most part these came from Russia. And despite multiple attempts to establish monasteries or hermitages in Alaska during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, monastic communities were not common among the Russian Orthodox in Alaska during the study period. Thus the documentation of the pilgrimage site of Monk’s Lagoon / Spruce Island falls into a category of its own.

**Village Sites**
- Eklutna (Knik)
- Kwethluk
- Napaskiak
- Ninilchik
- Old Harbor
- Ouzinkie
- Seldovia

**Urban Sites**
- Juneau
- Kenai (which has characteristic features of both village and urban sites)
- Kodiak
- Sitka
- Unalaska

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>St Nicholas</td>
<td>~ 119°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninilchik</td>
<td>Holy Transfiguration</td>
<td>~ 127°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>Holy Ascension</td>
<td>~ 134°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>Holy Assumption</td>
<td>~ 139°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>St. Nicholas</td>
<td>~ 141°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.00. 6. Altar orientation of visited sites in order from northeast to southeast.
Monastic / Pilgrimage Site
  o Monk’s Lagoon / Spruce Island
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ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH, EKLUTNA / KNIK
(APRIL AND AUGUST 2015)

OVERVIEW OF GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The story of a church moving with its people is not unfamiliar in Alaska, for a changing ecological or economic situation may result in an entire village moving to a new site – in this case from Knik to Eklutna. In this case, it appears to have been an opportunity for employment in a cannery newly established on the eastern shore of the Knik Arm that led the population of Knik to pick up and move to Eklutna. It seems that they brought their church with them. The sites of both the former and new churches are similar in that both are located on a slight rise above sea level (Figure 4.01.1).

Figure 4.01. 1. Location of Knik and Eklutna.

KNIK: GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The former location of the village in Knik (Figure 4.01.2), adjacent to the Iditarod Trail, retains a cemetery with characteristic spirit houses (Figure 4.01.3). Graves in the cemetery are oriented to the east (Figure 4.01.4), as is traditional with Russian Orthodox cemeteries. In addition to the grouped graves found in the cemetery, remains of additional spirit houses are scattered between the Iditarod Trail and the Knik-Goosebay Road, suggesting possible vandalism or a construction disturbance. The ownership of this cemetery property is not known at this time.
The general orientation of the graves at the cemetery is close to east, suggesting the possibility that this may have been the orientation of the church when it was sited here.
EKLUTNA: GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Eklutna Village Historic Park is located at 26612 Eklutna Village Rd, Chugiak, AK 99567 (Figure 4.01.5). It is not only a major tourist attraction but also an active Orthodox parish and cemetery. The area surrounding the cemetery is heavily forested.

![Schematic plan of Eklutna churches and cemetery.](image)

Figure 4.01.5. Schematic plan of Eklutna churches and cemetery.

![Orientation of Eklutna churches.](image)

Figure 4.01.6. Orientation of Eklutna churches.

Eklutna offers an excellent example of the common practice of building a new church adjacent to an older one. In the Alaskan climate, wooden Russian Orthodox Churches frequently deteriorate past the point of repair. In such cases, the former church may be mined for materials to build the new church or other ecclesiastical buildings such as rectories or schools, or it may be left to deteriorate in place. In Eklutna, however, the old church was repaired and maintained in recognition of its historic significance. Although both churches are oriented roughly to the east/southeast, their orientation varies slightly, with the old church at ~ 111° and the new church at ~102° degrees (Figure 4.01.6).


Listed in the National Register in 1972, the old St. Nicholas Church is among the most visited Russian Orthodox churches in Alaska – perhaps better known for its colorful
cemetery than for the church itself. The log church is conservatively dated at 1870, and the adjacent new St. Nicholas church came into active use in 1962.

It is believed that the old St. Nicholas church was moved to this location in 1897 when a group of Dena’ina relocated here from the village of Knik, on the other side of the Knik Arm. Oral tradition reports that the church at Knik was dismantled and brought to Eklutna when the village moved.¹

In the 1960s the new St. Nicholas (not listed in the National Register) was built next to the old one by Mike Alex (1907-1977), a Dena’ina chief, and his sons. Mike Alex’s cabin (Hoagland 1993, 107) is located across the road from the churches and cemetery, all of which are now part of Eklutna Village Historical Park, a privately-owned resource.

The Eklutna cemetery is made up of brightly-colored spirit houses, the result of an assimilation of Russian and native traditions.

Today, the dead are buried and the grave covered with a blanket – whose colors often denote clan associations – for forty days.² Then the small gable-roofed structure known as a spirit house is erected. The color scheme is selected by the family and often is consistent within a family grouping; color and shape of the ridge ornament are particular to the individual. The fences around the graves are a Russian influence, as are the Orthodox Crosses at the foot of the grave and the tradition of graves looking east (Hoagland 1993, 106-107).

There is some evidence that spirit houses indicate a connection with Old Believers, Russian religious dissidents who refused to accept the Russian Orthodox liturgical reforms instituted by Nikon, Patriarch of Moscow (1652–58) (Currier 1999). Further research is needed in this area.

The earliest discovered photographs of the old log church are from 1923 (Figure 4.01.7), at which point there was no porch or bell tower. The church is encircled by a white picket fence, creating a defined processional space. The native vegetation has not been mown, a typical Alaskan practice. By 1940 (Figure 4.01.8), the church had acquired a bell tower and porch, and the fence had been removed. A 1952 photograph (Figure 4.01.9) shows unmown native vegetation surrounding the church, with a clearly trampled circular processional path around the church. By 1954 (Figure 4.01.10), the surroundings of the church appear much as they are today, and signage indicates its position as a tourist attraction. The area around the church is neatly mown in the European/American manner.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.01.16).

¹ A field visit to Knik in April 2015 revealed a cemetery similar in style to Eklutna (see above).
² The fortieth day is, by Orthodox tradition, the culmination of the separation of soul and body.
Figure 4.01. 7. Old St. Nicholas church, looking north/northeast, 1923.

Figure 4.01. 8. Old St. Nicholas church, looking north, 1940.
Figure 4.01. 9. Old St. Nicholas church, looking northeast, 1952.

Figure 4.01. 10. Old St. Nicholas church, looking northwest, 1954.
KNIK AND EKLUTNA CEMETERIES

It is difficult to determine whether certain historic photographs (Figures 4.01.11 and 12) were taken at Old Knik or at Eklutna ("New Knik"), which is also occasionally and confusingly referred to as "Old" Knik. For this reason it is possible that the earliest photos found in the course of this research document a regional style rather than a chronological development. The 1918 photographs suggest that the spirit houses may be intended to serve as shelters over the graves (Figure 4.01.11); the crosses at the foot of the graves are traditionally oriented to the east. The surrounding fences are typical of Russian practice, here integrated with native custom. The grass surrounding the graves is unmown (Figures 4.01.12 and 15).

After 1946 (Figures 4.01.13 and 14) spirit houses became more individualistic in style, apparently paying tribute to the interests of individuals. In these photos the crosses appear to be traditionally oriented, rather than reversed as is sometimes seen today at both Knik and Eklutna. It could be theorized that the reversal of the cross at the foot of the grave demonstrates an alignment appropriate for a visitor standing or praying at the foot of the grave, whereas formerly the cross was aligned in such a way to permit the dead, standing aright at the resurrection, to see the cross as it was liturgically intended to be seen. Churches with a strong and continuous liturgical practice are more likely to maintain eastern orientation than those experiencing discontinuity.

Figure 4.01.11. Indian graves at Old Knick [sic], 1918.
Figure 4.01. 12. Indian graves, Old Knick [sic], 1918.

Figure 4.01. 13. Indian graveyard, Eklutna, 1923.
Figure 4.01. 14. Russian Orthodox cemetery, Eklutna, 1946.

Figure 4.01. 15. Russian Orthodox cemetery, Eklutna, looking west, 1949/1950.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Old Russian Church Eklutna</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Alaska Railroad Tour Lantern Slide Collection, 1923. ASL-PCA-198</td>
<td>ASL_P198-20</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/4453/rec/3">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/4453/rec/3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Old Russian church, Eklutna, Alaska</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Oliver T. Edwards</td>
<td>Oliver T. Edwards papers, Archives and Special Collections, Consortium Library, University of Alaska Anchorage.</td>
<td>uaa-hmc-0105-S3-T2-56</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg13/id/8088/rec/10">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg13/id/8088/rec/10</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>A Russian Orthodox Church, Ukarutna [Eklutna Village, Alaska]</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>William O.L. Chinn</td>
<td>William O. L. Chinn photographs, Archives and Special Collections, Consortium Library, University of Alaska Anchorage.</td>
<td>UAA-hmc-0620-series1-f2-60</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/6644/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/6644/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Eklutna Church</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Steve McCutcheon</td>
<td>AMRC. Steve McCutcheon Collection</td>
<td>AMRC-AMRC-B1990-014-5-AKNative-28-57</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/6644/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/6644/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Indian graves, Old Knick [sic]</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>H.G. Kaiser</td>
<td>Alaska Engineering Commission Collection</td>
<td>AMRC-aec-g935</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/2013/rec/14">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/2013/rec/14</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Indian grave, Old Knick [sic]</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>H.G. Kaiser</td>
<td>Alaska Engineering Commission Collection</td>
<td>AMRC-aec-g936</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/2009/rec/13">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/2009/rec/13</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Indian graveyard, Eklutna</td>
<td>6-Apr-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Alaska Railroad Tour Lantern Slide Collection, 1923. ASL-PCA-198</td>
<td>ASL-P198-21</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/4454/rec/45">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/4454/rec/45</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Eklutna graveyard</td>
<td>c. 1946</td>
<td></td>
<td>AMRC. Johns Collection</td>
<td>AMRC-b89-20-154</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/412/rec/21">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg2/id/412/rec/21</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 4.01.16. Sources of historic photographs.

**APRIL 2015 AND AUGUST 2015 FIELD VISITS SUMMARY**

Two visits were made to the St Nicholas Eklutna site, in April and in August. The Knik site – former location of the old St. Nicholas church – was visited in April.

**Old Knik Cemetery**

Located behind the Knik Museum (9668 South Knik Goose Bay Rd, Wasilla, AK 99654), north of the Iditarod Trail, this site remains an active cemetery (Figure 4.01.18).

Compared to the spirit houses found at Eklutna, these are lower and more consistent in style, with a sloped roof and a decorative feature protruding from the peak of the roof (Figure 4.01.16). One example of an unusual raised grave fence (Figure 4.01.17) suggests a more recent link between the Knik and Eklutna cemetery, where a similar raised fence marks the grave of Chief Mike Alex (Figure 4.01.27). Remains of additional spirit houses are to be found between the Iditarod Trail and the Knik – Goosebay Road, suggesting that the cemetery may originally have occupied more area than it does today, and that it may have been impacted by construction. The graves at Knik are more or less – and with an occasional exception - oriented to the east (Figure 4.01.3). The majority of them are not marked by crosses (Figure 4.01.17), but when a cross is present it is located at the foot of the grave. There is no fence to set the cemetery apart from the larger landscape, and the grass surrounding the graves is unmown, with visitor’s footpaths winding from burial to burial (Figure 4.01.17).
Figure 4.01. 17. Spirit houses at Knik cemetery, looking west/southwest, April 2015.

Figure 4.01. 18. Recent burial at Knik cemetery, looking southeast, April 2015.
Figure 4.01. 19, Raised grave fences at Knik cemetery, April 2015.

Figure 4.01. 20. New St. Nicholas church (left) and old St. Nicholas church (right), with cemetery in the background, looking west/northwest from Eklutna Village Road, April 2015.
St. Nicholas Churches and Cemetery, Eklutna

Two churches and a cemetery comprise the Eklutna Historic Park, which is managed by the Orthodox Church in America, successor to the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska. A gift shop offers guided tours and souvenirs.

A white picket fence runs along the eastern side of the property. The two churches are located near the road, but separated from it by a parking lot (Figure 4.01.20). The cabin of Mike Alex, the chief who was responsible for the restoration of the old church at this site and the construction of the new church, is located across the street to the east. The cemetery lies to the west of the churches (Figure 4.01.21).

The old and new churches are located adjacent to each other, a typical Alaskan pattern of siting a new church next to an earlier one (Figure 4.01.5). Open processional space surrounds both churches.

Today the grounds are kept much like a park, in keeping with the multiple purposes of the site. Here the fence clearly marks a property line, a pattern not found elsewhere among the study sites.

Figure 4.01. 21. The two churches at Eklutna with the cemetery in the foreground, looking southeast, April 2015.
An interesting feature of the old church is the presence of window candelabras (Figures 4.01.22 and 23) to provide lighting for the processions that circled the church at night. (For another example of this kind of external lighting in a different style, see the section on Seldovia, Chapter 4.07.)

**Eklutna Cemetery**

Like many Alaskan Russian Orthodox Church cemeteries, the vegetation surrounding the graves is not mown, but pathways are imprinted as visitors walk between them (Figure 4.01.25). There is a background of spruce interspersed with poplars to the west of the cemetery (Figure 4.01.24). Most of the graves are located directly west of the old church, although the cemetery has spread southward to the area west of the new church.

The graves in the cemetery show considerable variation (Figure 4.01.25), ranging from the traditional style found at Knik to far more elaborate constructions. Some include foot stones (Figure 4.01.29). Some are crafted with reference to the skills or interests of the individuals buried there (Figures 4.01.30 and 31). Colors frequently indicate clan affiliation. Small spirit houses indicate the graves of young children (Figure 4.01.26). Many recent graves are decorated with plastic flowers (Figure 4.01.27). There is a Jewish grave, marked with a six-pointed star, at the far southwestern edge of the cemetery – the husband of an Orthodox woman buried nearby. A grave with a raised fence (Figure 4.01.28)) is identified as that of Mike Alex, the chief responsible for the rehabilitation of the old church and the building of the new one. A grave with a similar raised fence is found at Knik (Figure 4.01.19). The condition of the spirit houses ranges from pristine to dilapidated (Figure 4.01.26 and 27).

In addition to the traditional three bar cross, there are simple western-style crosses and flowering crosses (Figure 4.01.24). A large three bar cross stands to the west of the old church surrounded by a rock border. Most of the three bar crosses in this cemetery are reversed, but they are placed in the traditional position at the foot of the grave. Sometimes both
orientations occur next to one another (Figure 4.01.25). Two burials at the western edge of the cemetery are marked with three bar crosses, traditionally oriented (Figure 4.01.32).

Figure 4.01. 24. Eklutna cemetery, looking northwest, April 2015.

Figure 4.01. 25. Eklutna cemetery, looking southwest, April 2015.
Figure 4.01. 26. Spirit houses for children (left front) at Eklutna cemetery, looking northeast, April 2015.

Figure 4.01. 27. Spirit houses at Eklutna cemetery, looking west/southwest, April 2015.
Figure 4.01. 28. Grave of Chief Mike Alex at Eklutna cemetery, looking northwest, April 2015.

Figure 4.01. 29. Footstone, Eklutna cemetery, looking west/southwest, April 2015.
Figure 4.01. 30. Spirit house for a carpenter, Eklutna cemetery, looking southwest, April 2015.

Figure 4.01. 31. Fenced grave with pick, Eklutna cemetery, looking northwest, April 2015.
Figure 4.01. 32. Burials at the edge of Eklutna cemetery with traditional crosses at the foot of the grave, looking northwest, April 2015.
ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH, KWETHLUK
(AUGUST 2015)

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Kwethluk is located at the confluence of Kuskokwim and Kwethluk Rivers, some sixteen miles northeast of Bethel (60.811872°, -161.437575). There is a direct route from the beach to the entrance of the old church, used as a processional way when needed; for example, when a bishop visits or during the Theophany blessing of the water. The church is set on a bluff thirteen feet above the level of the river.

The old church is oriented to 113° southeast, defining a liturgical east. This alignment does not conform to the rectangle of the churchyard. When the new church was built, it adopted an identical orientation. A gentle ascent from a narrow beach along the river leads to the entrance of the old church, providing water connectivity. Roads in Kwethluk are made of compacted earth or boardwalk, and the most common means of transportation is by four-wheelers. Pathways link the old and new churches to each other and to the water.

Today’s church is located approximately 250 feet south of the old church and maintains an identical orientation (Figure 4.02.23).

BRIEF HISTORY

The old St. Nicholas Church was built in 1935 at the site of one or more earlier structures, including a log building constructed ca. 1901-1918. This former church was demolished in 1936. The location of any other earlier churches is unknown. A fenced churchyard and cemetery surrounds the church, and some of its graves are said to predate the 1935 church (Antonson and Lane 1992, §7). A more recent grave, that of Matushka Olga Michael (+1979), now widely venerated as a saint (Oleksa 1992, 203), lies to the northwest of the church next to the grave of her husband, Fr. Nikolai O. Michael.

1 Matushka (little mother in Russian) is a frequently used form of address for the wife of a priest.
Although in relatively poor condition, the historic church has not been demolished, and villagers want to preserve it (Antonson and Lane 1992, §8:6). Its deteriorating dome and belfry were removed in 1984 or 1985 to avoid ongoing weather damage (Antonson and Lane 1992, §7:4). The church was listed in the National Register in 1991. The boundary includes the churchyard. A new church currently in use is sited slightly further south, within walking distance of the old church.

Few historic photographs of the church have been located during the course of this project, and no picture of the front of the church has been discovered. To fill this lacuna a watercolor by Alaska artist Sam McClain² (Figure 4.02.4) has been included here. However, many of McClain’s drawings were not taken from life, and consequently they cannot be considered conclusive in matters of detail or setting.

An older church is said to have existed when the old St. Nicholas church was built in 1935 (Antonson and Lane 1992, §8:5). A photograph of the former (non-extant) church is included by Fern Wallace in The Flame of the Candle (Wallace 1974, Plate 99), but this photograph does not reveal much about context. A photograph of the extant old St. Nicholas indicates that it originally had three domes and an attached bell tower (Figure 4.02.5).

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.02.10).

Historic photographs indicate that a significant number of the graves in the cemetery had elaborate fences, indicating a tradition dating back to at least the middle of the twentieth century (Figures 4.02.3 and 7). A section of fencing immediately opposite the church entrance was composed of pickets, while the rest of the cemetery was fenced with welded wire fencing supported by wooden posts (Figure 4.02.6). The dome was removed by 1987 (Antonson and Lane 1992, §7:4), and can be seen on the ground (Figures 4.02.5 and 6) to the south of the church. Three bar crosses in the historic photos are located at the foot of the graves and are oriented in the traditional manner, with the slanted bar higher on the left than on the right.

² For more information about McClain, see Appendix 7.09.
Figure 4.02. 3. Kwethluk cemetery, 1948/50.

Figure 4.02. 4. Watercolor of Kwethluk church by Sam McClain.

Figure 4.02. 5. Kwethluk church predating old St. Nicholas church, n.d.
Figure 4.02. 6. Old St. Nicholas church, looking northwest, before 1974.

Figure 4.02. 7. Kwethluk church, looking east, 1987.
Figure 4.02. 8. Kwethluk church, looking north, 1987.

Figure 4.02. 9. Kwethluk church, looking south, 1987.
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Figure 4.02. 10. Sources of historic photographs.
AUGUST 2015 FIELD VISIT SUMMARY

The Kwethluk church lies close to the river, approached by means of a sloping path leading upwards from a narrow beach (Figure 4.02.11). Even today, despite a significant number of surrounding buildings, the church is easily visible from the water (Figure 4.02.10). Located on a high point (Figure 4.02.12) in a relatively flat area, the church yard / cemetery is surrounded by a fence. A row of pickets runs along the center of the front (west) side; a wire fence encloses the rest of the area (Figure 4.02.13). The open tower of the church originally held five bells (Antonson and Lane 1992, §7:4), three of which have cracked. The remaining two have been transferred to the new church, where they are installed in a freestanding tower.3

The graves are located close together in a crowded church yard. Graves are typically marked by foot crosses, either the three bar cross or a variant of the flowering cross (Figure 4.02.9). Frequently the name of the dead is written on the lower cross bar, along with the date of death or of birth and death. A number of the graves are fenced, some with pickets, others with plywood pierced by symbols (Figures 4.02.16 through 19).

The eastern area of the church yard is filled with white crosses, almost all of which have the traditional three bars (Figure 4.02.20 through 22), although some are of the flowering cross design. Some of the crosses have fallen over due to deterioration caused by the Alaskan weather; some of these have been restored to an upright position by the addition of a piece of wood at the base. All graves and crosses are oriented to the church. The churchyard is mowed, although pathways have also been trampled between the graves (Figure 4.02.18). At the east end of the churchyard a large cross is mounted on a pole supported by a fencepost (Figure 4.02.21).

Many of the fenced graves form clusters directly north or south of the church building, with the greatest concentration to the north and northeast, adjacent to the porch (Figures 4.02.16 through 18). Most of these appear to be the graves of people directly connected to the church – clergy and their wives, readers, psalm leaders and church wardens.

Among these graves is that of Matushka4 Olga Michael, now widely venerated as a saint (Figures 4.02.18 and 19). Her husband, Archpriest Nicolai Michael, is also buried in this area of the churchyard. A wooden sign found inside the church porch lists those

---

3 Open bell towers are an ongoing maintenance problem for Alaskan churches as they permit water to enter the building, with resulting structural damage. One solution has been to hang the bells in an independent structure detached from the church building.

4 Matushka, the title given to the wife of a priest, literally means “little mother” in Russian. Priests are sometimes familiarly referred to as Batushka, which means “little father”.

---
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responsible for the church services: Fr. Nicolai Michael, Pastor; Y. Fisher, Choir Leader; and E. Eyapan, Starosta or church warden (Figure 4.02.15). These are the names of people whose graves are located in this cluster.

A native Yup’ik Eskimo, Matuska Olga (1916 - 1979) was known for her clairvoyance, compassion and charitable work. She served the community as midwife and generous benefactor, despite her own limited circumstances (Wigglesworth 2008).

Figure 4.02. 12. Setting of the church on a raised area, facing southeast, August 2015.
Figure 4.02. 13. Road leading up to the church from the beach, looking southeast, August 2015.

Figure 4.02. 14. Road leading to the church, looking east, August 2015.
Figure 4.02. 15. View of the church showing churchyard fencing, looking northeast, August 2015. The blue dome on the right side of the church ornaments a grave.

Figure 4.02. 16. Processional way surrounding the church, facing east, August 2015.
Figure 4.02. 17. Sign found inside the church porch, August 2015.

Figure 4.02. 18. Plywood grave surrounds southeast of the church, facing east, August 2015.

Figure 4.02. 19. South churchyard, facing east, August 2015.
Figure 4.02. 20. Burials to the south and southeast of the church; Matushka Olga’s grave, with cross outlined in pink, is in the center background, facing east, August 2015.

Figure 4.02. 21. Grave of Matushka Olga, facing east, August 2015.

Figure 4.02. 22. Eastern area of the churchyard, facing east, August 2015.
Figure 4.02. 23. Raised cross at eastern end of the churchyard, facing east, August 2015.

Figure 4.02. 24. Churchyard facing southwest towards the church, August 2015.
Figure 4.02. 25. Path leading south from the old church towards the new church, facing south southeast, August 2015.
ST. JAMES’S CHURCH, NAPASKIAK  
(AUGUST 2015)

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Napaskiak is located on the south side of the Kuskokwim River. The altitude of the church site is only approximately six feet about the level of the river in this very level area. There is a direct route from the beach to the church, which serves as a processional way when needed. It is traditional to meet the bishop to escort him to the church for a service of thanksgiving for his safe arrival. Hymns are sung as the procession moves to the church with the cross and banners.

This site includes a cemetery surrounded by a chain link fence. In the recent past a rectory, which no longer exists, was located to the west across from the old church.

St. James’ church is called St. Jacob’s church in some documents (James and Jacob being different forms of the same name of the brother of Jesus), but – according to local informants – actually dedicated to the not-yet-canonized Creole missionary St. Jacob Netsvetov.

The church is oriented to the southeast. Given the alignment of the structure over the altar of the old church, it appears that the new church followed the old church’s orientation of ~114°, significantly south of east. The coordinates of the church are 60.706885°, -161.766562°

Figure 4.03. 1. Schematic plan of Napaskiak churches and cemetery.

Figure 4.03. 2. Orientation of Napaskiak churches.
BRIEF HISTORY (Kreta and Mongin 1980, §7:9-10)

The earlier church was built in Napaskiak in 1931 (Figure 4.03.3). In 1979 the present church was built approximately ninety feet south of the earlier church, a parallel construction practice seen in a number of sites visited during this project. The 1931 church was demolished in 1989, and the site of the former altar table was covered by a structure topped with a cross (Hoagland 1990). The former church was described as an “example of extension, enlargement, preservation, and appropriate modernization” (Kreta and Mongin 1980, §7:9). The current church continues this tradition, having removed two of its domes and belfry and installing an unenclosed structure to support the bell outside the porch. A new bell was blessed in summer 2015 (Figure 4.03.9).

One of the very few available photographs of the old church is found in Figure 4.03.3. Note the external bell tower to the left, and the fence with gate in front of the church, suggesting than the church and cemetery together comprised a churchyard. Today the main part of the cemetery is surrounded by a fence which separates it from the church. The five-pointed star on the front of the church is a common feature of Alaskan Russian Orthodox Churches, especially in the Yukon-Kuskokwim region, but its specific origin and symbolism is unknown. In the course of reroofing the church, two of the cupolas photographed by Jett Lowe in 1990 (Figure 4.03.4) were removed. The western cupola (Figure 4.03.11) remains.

Until at least 1990, a rectory was located across the boardwalk to the west of the church (Figure 4.03.5), providing a third unit to the church complex.

In the cemetery, graves are placed close together (Figure 4.03.6). Three types of crosses – among them the traditional three bar cross and the flowering cross - are found in the cemetery today. The third type of cross - essentially a triangle on a post – was noted during the 2015 site visit. This type of cross is used to mark the grave of
unbaptized babies, and may reflect a practice initiated after 1990. Wire or wooden fences surround the graves. Within the fences, various materials are used to cover the grave to prevent heaving due to freezing and thawing.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.03.7).
Figure 4.03.7. Sources of historic photographs.

AUGUST 2015 FIELD VISIT SUMMARY

The church is located a short distance from the beach, on a rise in a low, flat area along the Kuskwokwim River. Boardwalks link the beach to the church (Figure 4C – 11) and to the village A boardwalk around the church provides a processional way (Figure 4C – 12). Northeast of the church is a large cemetery, crowded with graves, and for the most part these are traditionally aligned to the east. At the northern end of the cemetery, however, there are some graves that are not aligned to the east, but rather positioned at variety of angles (Figure 4.03.15). No one at Napaskiak was able to explain this unusual positioning. A
number of graves on the south side of the church are marked with a triangular emblem, indicating the graves of unbaptized babies (Figure 4.03.16).

Graves show a variety of fencing styles and grave coverings, ranging from simple wire fencing to elaborately carved grave covers and surrounds. The covers should not be seen as spirit house but rather as a practical solution to keep bodies from being forced out of the ground during alternating freezes and thaws (Figure 4.03.10). Some of the more recent graves have elegant covers (Figure 4.03.17). There is a clear need for better documentation of this folk art tradition and its craftsmen, both here and at Kwethluk, and also, no doubt, elsewhere in the region.

In the center of the cemetery is a structure covering the site of the altar table of the old church (Figure 4.03.18). This is a practice seen at a number of visited sites. In addition, the line of the older church’s processional path remains marked by earlier graves (Figure 4.03.14). The cemetery has two gates: a utility gate along the board walk to the north of the church, and the other a formal entrance near the bell tower (Figure 4.03.13). A new bell was installed in the freestanding bell tower directly west of the church in August 2015 (Figure 4.03.9).

For the most part, the area to the west of the graves, enclosed by the fence, and the area around the older graves is mowed (Figures 4.03.10 and 11), while areas around some newer graves show pathways trampled in the unmown grass (Figure 4.03.17).
Figure 4.03. 11. Boardwalk leading to the church, looking south, August 2015.

Figure 4.03. 12. Boardwalk processional way surrounding the church, looking northwest, August 2015.
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Figure 4.03. 13. Cemetery entrance, looking northeast, August 2015.

Figure 4.03. 14. Graves aligned along processional path of former church, looking east, August 2015.
Figure 4.03. 15. Northern section of the cemetery with unaligned graves (cross at center right is traditionally aligned), looking east, August 2015.

Figure 4.03. 16. Triangular crosses to the south of the church mark graves of unbaptized babies, looking east, August 2015.
Figure 4.03. 17. Well-crafted recent graves, looking east and northeast, respectively, August 2015.

Figure 4.03. 18. Shrine covering altar area of former church, looking east, August 2015.
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Ninilchik is located on the west side of the Kenai Peninsula near Cook Inlet between Soldatna and Homer, at the mouth of the Ninilchik River. The site of the present church is at an elevation of 77’, standing high above the water and also above the old and current town of Ninilchik, which is at an elevation of 25’. A pathway descends down the steep slope to the village to the southwest and from there to the water.

The church is oriented to ~ 127° - almost southeast, an outlier in orientation among the churches visited. It may be that this alignment is responsible for the orientation of the graves in the surrounding churchyard, as most are placed at right angles to the church (facing north), which is not a common practice. The site is accessed directly from the Cook Highway, the exit located just south of the village. There is no direct connection for motor vehicles between the two entities.

Ninilchik was created in 1835 as a settlement for Russian-American Company pensioners who wished to remain in Alaska as “colonial citizens” along with their Alaskan wives and children, rather than return to Russia, as they had previously been expected to do (Arndt [1996]). The community grew potatoes and turnips and ran cattle to support retirement.

The first church at Ninilchik was located in the village to the south. Constructed in 1884 as a chapel (i.e., without an altar), an altar was added in 1893. The existing church was built in its present location on the bluff to the north of the village (Figures 4.04.3, 4 and 9) in 1900-01 under the supervision of builder Alexi Andreev Oskoloff from Sitka, and was consecrated in 1901. The church is unusual in that it is one of only four Russian Orthodox churches in Alaska with a cruciform plan (Figures 4.04.7 and 8). Looking west from the church, there is a dramatic view of Mt. Edgecomb across the Cook Inlet (Figure 4.04.8)).

A school was, until recently, located near the church, replacing an earlier parochial school which burned (Figures 4.04.3, 4, and 5). A rectory is said to have been located on the slope towards the southwest (Figure 4.04.4), but historical documentation is lacking for this building. The originally open bell church tower was closed in by 1977 (Figure 4.04.6).

The board and wire fence is typical of those surrounding Alaskan churchyards. A picket gate marks the entrance on the west (Figure 4.04.6).

The church was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1977. The surrounding church yard and cemetery are not mentioned in the nomination, but this omission was common practice during the early period of National Register documentation. Two types of crosses are seen in these photos: the traditional three bar cross and the flowering cross.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.04.10).
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Figure 4.04.3. Location of Ninilchik church and school on bluff north of the village, facing northwest, 1952.

Figure 4.04.4. Village of Ninilchik church, school, and access path from across the Ninilchik River, looking northwest, 1952.
Figure 4.04.5. Foundation of parochial school, with new school and church in background, facing northwest, 1954.

Figure 4.04.6. Entrance to church looking east/northeast, 1977.
Figure 4.04.7. Ninilchik church and path leading down to the village, facing northwest, July 7, 1978.

Figure 4.04.8. Ninilchik church and graveyard, facing southwest, 1990.
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<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm13/id/12903/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm13/id/12903/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.04.7</td>
<td>Russian church of Ninilchik</td>
<td>7/7/78</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Dolores Mann Slides</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm2/id/8203/rec/4">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm2/id/8203/rec/4</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.04.9. Location of Ninilchik church on a bluff north of the village, looking north, 1990.
Field Visit Summary (July 2015)

Ninilchik is located approximately half way between Kenai and Homer on the Kenai Peninsula, just off of the Cook Highway. The dramatic site of this church (Figures 4.04.11 and 12) makes the building visible not only from highway but also from the water. Across the Cook Inlet are magnificent views of Mount Edgecomb (Figures 4.04.13 and 14). This is one of the most picturesque of the Russian Orthodox churches in Alaska.

Between 1990 and today the wire fence surrounding the churchyard has been replaced by a white picket fence (Figure 4.04.15). The area immediately around the church is mowed to permit processions, but the greater part of the churchyard is not mowed and is marked by walking trails among the graves (Figures 4.04.16 and 17). Two spruce trees are widely spaced to frame the western entrance. One of these may have been a young tree in 1990 (Figure 4.04.8).

The cemetery is unique among the sites visited in the orientation of the graves, many of which are set at a 90° angle to the alignment of the church. While this alignment is dependent on the church, it does not follow the more common east/west alignment seen in other sites. In most cases the graves are surrounded by a picket fence or by a custom-designed fence (Figure 4.04.19). Some graves have headstones, some have footstones (Figure 4.04.19). In some instances the cross is placed at the head of the grave. A majority of the three bar crosses are positioned in such a way as to be viewed correctly if looking from the church (Figure 4.04.21). Most crosses are in the traditional three bar style, but some three bar crosses with flowering ends were also noted (Figure 4.04.19).

Two groups of graves are worthy of special mention, as they follow the tradition of burying individuals closely associated with the church in certain special locations. At the east end of the church are a group of clergy graves, traditionally aligned with cross and foot to the east (Figures 4.04.20 and 21). Nearby, at right angles to these graves, is the grave of a starosta, or church warden (Figure 4.04.21). Here a headstone and foot cross are found in traditional positions; however, the foot of the grave is pointed north.
Along the fence at the west end of the cemetery, north of the church, are depressions that appear to indicate unmarked graves (Figure 4.04.18). The status of these graves – if they are indeed graves – is unclear.

Across the road to the northwest is a gift shop. This church is a popular tourist destination; during the field visit approximately a half dozen sightseeing vans brought visitors to the site. To the southeast is a Veterans’ cemetery with at least one Orthodox grave (Figure 4.04.22).

Figure 4.04.11. View of church looking north from the village, July 2015.
Figure 4.04.12. View of the village of Ninilchik, looking south, July 2015.

Figure 4.04.13. Setting of the church above Cook Inlet, facing southwest, July 2015.
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Figure 4.04.14. View across Cook Inlet, looking west to Mount Edgecomb, July 2015.

Figure 4.04.15. Entrance to churchyard and cemetery, looking east, July 2015.
Figure 4.04.16. Church with unmowed cemetery in foreground, looking southwest, July 2015.

Figure 4.04.17. Pathways created by visitors among the graves, looking southwest, July 2015.
Figure 4.04.18. Depressions suggesting unmarked graves along the fence, looking north from church entrance, July 2015.

Figure 4.04.19. Headstone outside the fenced area, cross at foot of grave, looking south towards the church, July 2015.
Figure 4.04.20. Recent clergy graves near the north end of the church with traditional orientation, facing southeast, July 2015.

Figure 4.04.21. East of the church, showing different orientation between recent clergy graves (right) and characteristic Ninilchik orientation (background), looking north, July 2015.
Figure 4.04.22. An orthodox grave in the Veteran’s Cemetery east of the churchyard, looking southeast, July 2015.
THREE SAINTS CHURCH, OLD HARBOR
(APRIL 2015)

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The church is located at the west end of town, looking down on the harbor (Figure 4.05.1). Behind the area of the church and cemetery the land rises sharply. Although water rose to the level of the church during the 1962 tsunami, the church itself was undamaged.

The church has a general orientation towards the east at ~ 72° (Figure 4.05.2), although, as is the case with many visited sites, not to the true east. In comparison with the streets of the town, which are aligned to the shoreline, it is clear that the church was deliberately set at this angle to accommodate eastern orientation.

BRIEF HISTORY (Hoagland 1989a)

Three Saints1 Church in Old Harbor was one of the properties considered but determined to be ineligible for the National Register in 1979 (Alaska Office of History and Archaeology, 11/27/15). Because listing at that time was largely dependent on the age of existing architecture, the present church, built in 1953, was ineligible due to age. Two previous churches were constructed in Old Harbor – in the 1880s and in 1911. The 19th-century church is said to have been situated in the cemetery where a

---

1 It is useful to know that the three saints are Sts. Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, and John Chrysostom. This explains why the shrine marking the site of the former church is dedicated to St. Basil, the first of the group.
Historic Ecclesiastical Landscapes Study – Sitka National Historical Park

Shrine to St. Basil is located today, and the 1911 church was located just south of the present church, its location also marked by a shrine to St. Basil. During the 1964 tsunami the church was one of the few buildings of Old Harbor left undamaged, a fact considered by some members of the congregation (Krumrey April 25, 2015) as a miracle, but which may also be due to its elevated location. There is a rectory immediately to the north of the church, which contains an interesting collection of icons, processional banners, and a folding altar to be used by priests when traveling.

All cemetery crosses are of the three bar style. They are oriented towards the east in the traditional way.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.05.12).

Figure 4.05. 4. Looking south across the bay, 1989.
Figure 4.05. 5. Looking southeast across the bay, 1989.

Figure 4.05. 6. Looking east from the cemetery, 1989.
Figure 4.05. 7. Looking north towards the rectory, 1989.

Figure 4.05. 8. East end of church, looking west, 1989.
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Figure 4.05. 9. Looking southwest towards the cemetery gate, 1989.

Figure 4.05. 10. Looking west towards the cemetery entrance.
Figure 4.05. 11. Shrine of St. Basil at site of 1911 church, looking east, 1989.
April 2015 Field Visit Summary²

There are two shrines dedicated to St. Basil near the Old Harbor church, both of which were built to protect the site of the altar area of an earlier church by restricting inadvertent access to them. St. Basil, as the first of the Three Hierarchs, appears to serve as a shorthand dedication for these sites. Both shrines, along with the graves in the cemetery, are oriented to the alignment of the present church. This suggests that the eastern orientation as originally determined was maintained during the building of two new churches half a century apart. This alignment does not conform the that of the village streets, which are aligned to the shoreline (Figure 4.05.3).

² It rained heavily throughout the field visit, which is reflected in the quality of the photos.
The present church is sited at the higher end of the town (Figure 4.05.16), visible from the water as well as from the village streets. The 1911 church is marked by the shrine of St. Basil adjacent to (just south of) today’s church. A similar relationship between former and present church is seen in Ouzinkie and Napaskiak. The location of another shrine in the cemetery suggests that the nineteenth century church was sited further up the hill, surrounded by the cemetery (Figures 4.05.22 and 23). The cemetery is located on a bluff above the site of the present church (Figure 4.05.16); behind the cemetery is a steep hillside (Figures 4.05.17 and 18).

Some changes have been made to the church since the 1989 photographs were taken (Figure 4.05.13). On the west front an added porch is in need of repair, and the bell tower has been enclosed. Presumably both changes result from weather damage. A mown area around the present church indicates processional use. The church is linked directly to the central pathway of the cemetery, which begins just across the road (Figures 4.05.14 and 15). Processions from church to cemetery reflect traditional practice.

Next to the church is a rectory (to the north) which may also date to the 1950s. The presence of these three landscape units – church, rectory and cemetery – was noted at a number of other field sites. A pathway leads from the front door of the church to the rectory.

Across the road from the church, an ornamental gateway formerly marked the cemetery entrance (Figure 4.05.10), but this has been removed for repair/reconstruction (Figure 4.05.14). Wooden beams provide retaining wall steps up to the central gravel pathway through the cemetery. Further along, stone retaining steps provide access to upper areas (Figure 4.05.15). The cemetery is unfenced, but a significant change in elevation provides a boundary (Figure 4.05.16). The vegetation has not been mown, and pathways have been trodden between the gravesites (Figures 4.05.19 and 20).

Most graves are surrounded by a low lumber frame supported on posts (Figures 4.05.19 and 20) rather than by the more traditional fences, although there are several fenced graves. Three bar crosses are placed at the foot of the grave in the traditional way (Figure 4.05.20), and some graves also have headstones (Figure 4.05.24). In some instances the graves are individualized by the presence of objects specific to the deceased (Figures 4.05.16 and 21).
Figure 4.05. 13. Pathway from cemetery to church, looking east, July 2015.
Figure 4.05. 14. Steps leading to the cemetery, looking west, July 2015.

Figure 4.05. 15. Steps leading to upper cemetery, looking west, July 2015.
Figure 4.05. 16. Cemetery, looking east towards village, July 2015.

Figure 4.05. 17. Looking east to the church and village from the cemetery, July 2015.
Figure 4.05.18. Cemetery, looking southwest to the hill beyond, July 2015.

Figure 4.05.19. Cemetery, looking southeast, July 2015.
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Figure 4.05. 20. Cemetery, looking southeast, July 2015.

Figure 4.05. 21. Cemetery, looking northwest towards the hill, July 2015.
Figure 4.05. 22. Cemetery, looking southwest toward shrine, July 2015.

Figure 4.05. 23. Shrine of St. Basil, looking south/southeast, July 2015.
Figure 4.05. 24. Grave of Mayor Sven Haakanson with cross and footstone, facing east, July 2015.
This page intentionally left blank.
The village of Ouzinkie surrounds a bay on the southern side of the northwest end of Spruce Island. This area is relatively level once it rises sharply from the water. The church is placed on a high point above the bay; a street useable during low tide, named Church Street, runs along the bottom of the incline. The area is heavily forested.

The church has a general orientation towards the east at ~ 80°, although not to the true east. The graves to the north and south sides of the church follow this same orientation. Sited high above the beach, the church is visible from a distance.

The church was built in 1906 to replace an earlier church built just to the north, said to have been constructed in 1849 or 1855. The old church was left to decay, and in 1978 it was reported that the site of the former altar was marked by a cross. In 1939 or 1940 a
major renovation removed the bell tower of the current church, which is now a separate structure set slightly at an angle to the west of the church.

The Church of the Nativity of Our Lord was originally a chapel served from Kodiak, and it retains this nomenclature in the National Register. Nothing is known about additional ecclesiastical buildings at the site, but it has been said that there was a house for the psalmreader at some point. Tatiana Chichenoff, a former reader, reports that her family lived in Karluk until her father, Larry Ellinek, was asked to come to Ouzinkie, as Karluk had two readers and Ouzinkie had none. They lived in a house ‘next to the church’ when they arrived (Chichenoff April 23, 2015).

Building a new church next to the old one is a practice seen in many of this project’s site visits. A framed photograph hanging in the church narthex (Figure 4.06.4) shows the old church in position to the left (north) of the current church. In this photograph the bell tower is still attached to the church, but the bridge walk to the west of the church is as it is today. The evergreens in the background appear similar to the spruce trees on site now.

The site of the original church appears to have been at the highest point above the water, and the second church, closer to the water, is set a bit lower on the bluff. It remains in a commanding position (Figure 4.06.6).

Photographs from ca. 1975 (Figure 4.06.5) and from 1989 (Figure 4.06.7) show a wire fence enclosing the church yard on the south and west sides. A gate closes the entrance from the west through the bell tower, which had by then been removed from the church and relocated to the west (Figure 4.06.5). Graves are set far enough away from the church to permit a processional way around it. The area around the church is unmown in the traditional manner, and pathways have been trodden among the graves (Figures 4.06.9, 10 and 11).

The graves are surrounded by wooden or concrete frames (Figures 4.06.9, 10, and 11), with three bar crosses at the foot. A single capped or roofed cross is seen in Figure 4.06.8, dated 1989. Additional items such as flowers, a statue or a lantern may personalize the graves.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.06.15).
Figure 4.06.4. Nineteenth-century church on the left and 1906 church on the right.

Figure 4.06.5. Church, looking uphill to northeast, ca. 1975.
Figure 4.06.6. View of church, looking north, 1989.

Figure 4.06.7. Belltower / entrance, looking east from bridge.
Figure 4.06.8. Church, looking northeast, 1989.

Figure 4.06.9. Church, looking south, 1989.
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Figure 4.06.10. Church, looking north, 1989

Figure 4.06.11. Church and cemetery, looking northwest, 1989.
Figure 4.06.12. Cemetery to north of church, facing northeast, 1989.

Figure 4.06.13. Cemetery to north of church, facing north/northeast, 1989.
Figure 4.06.14. Cemetery north of church, facing north/northeast, 1989.

| Figure 4.06.4 | Old and new churches | ? | Unknown | Holy Nativity of Our Lord Church | n.a. | Holy Nativity of Our Lord Church Narthex |
| Figure 4.06.5 | Looking northeast uphill | Ca. 1975 | Kreta/Merculief | National Register of Historic Places | 80004582 | http://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp/AssetDetail?assetID=cebdeb303-0b44-464d-a313-7d4f4fec2ccc |
| Figure 4.06.6 | Looking north from water | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-56 | https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=4 |
| Figure 4.06.7 | Belltower | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-56 | https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=3 |
| Figure 4.06.8 | Looking northeast | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-56 | https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=8 |
**Figure 4.06.9** Looking south 1989 Jet Lowe Library of Congress HABS AK-56 https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0260.photos/?sp=6

**Figure 4.06.10** Looking north 1989 Jet Lowe Library of Congress HABS AK-56 https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=p=7

**Figure 4.06.11** Looking northwest 1989 Jet Lowe Library of Congress HABS AK-56 https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=p=9

**Figure 4.06.12** Cemetery 1989 Jet Lowe Library of Congress HABS AK-56 https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=p=17

**Figure 4.06.13** Cemetery 1989 Jet Lowe Library of Congress HABS AK-56 https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=p=18

**Figure 4.06.14** Cemetery 1989 Jet Lowe Library of Congress HABS AK-56 https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0263.photos/?sp=p=19

Figure 4.06.15. Sources of historic photographs.

### APRIL 2015 FIELD VISIT SUMMARY

The church is located on a high bluff above the water (Figure 4.06.16). From the west a wooden bridge / walkway crosses a drainage channel to connect to the village (Figure 4.06.18); to the north it is accessible from 3rd Street by a footpath. There is very little open space surrounding the church, especially at the west end, where the land drops off sharply. However, a clear processional path surrounds the church. The fence that is seen in historic photographs has been removed; in its place is a fence along the waterline – a boundary rather than the delineation of a churchyard (Figure 4.06.17).

As is the case with a number of other Alaskan churches, the bell tower has been set apart from the church itself. Because openings to the outside are important for acoustic reasons, an open bell tower is an advantage, but an attached open bell tower can easily lead to weather damage of the church building as a whole. Here the tower is set slightly askew to the northwest, where it forms an arched entrance to the church itself (Figure 4.06.18). A utility storage shed is adjacent to the bell tower.

There are graves to the north and south of the church (Figures 4.06.18, 19 and 20). They follow the traditional orientation (aligned with the church) with three bar crosses at the foot. A number of the traditional
three bar crosses are “roofed” or “capped”, a practice to protect the cross from weathering that is found in many places across the globe. Some graves are fenced or delineated by concrete frames or, more commonly, by 2x8 or 2x10 lumber.

A level terrace to the north of the church is no doubt the site of the nineteenth century church (Figure 4.06.4 and 21). A wooden cross, noted in the National Register Nomination of 1979 (Kreta and Mongin 1979, §7:29) no doubt indicates the location of the former altar area. New graves are arranged in rows just to the east of this marker, i.e., just outside the area of the former altar (Figure 4.06.21). The cemetery extends from the north side of the church to 3rd Street (Figure 4.06.22). A path from the street leads through the cemetery to the church.

Figure 4.06.16. Site of church above the water, looking north, April 2015.
Figure 4.06.17. Bridge to the church across a drainage, looking east, April 2015.

Figure 4.06.18. Church and cemetery on south side, looking northeast, April 2015.
Figure 4.06.19. Cemetery to the south of the church, looking southeast, April 2015.

Figure 4.06.20. Cemetery to the north of the church, facing southeast, April 2015.
Figure 4.06.21. Cemetery to north of church with cross marking altar of former church, April 2015.

Figure 4.06.22. Cemetery from intersection of 3rd and F Streets, looking west, April 2015.
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**GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT**

Seldovia is located across from Homer along the Cook Inlet at the opening of Seldovia Bay. It is accessible by boat. The church stands high above the village at an elevation of 64’. At one time there was an associated cemetery nearby. This cemetery was severely damaged during the 1964 tsunami, and subsequently bulldozed during harbor stabilization. While some bodies were removed, others were not, and from time to time human bones wash up on the beach (Gruber July 20, 2015). For this reason, the beach is called Cemetery Beach.

Figure 4.07. 1. Schematic plan of church location.

Figure 4.07. 2. Schematic plan of immediate surroundings of the church.
The church is oriented almost true east at ~ 92°. Among the sites visited in this study, the orientation of this church is the closest to true east. Its elevation of 64’ places it high above the harbor.

**BRIEF HISTORY** (Hoagland 1993, 126)

Information about this church is surprisingly sparse, given that it is the oldest church on the Kenai Peninsula. The existing church was constructed in 1891, replacing an earlier 19th-century log chapel served from Kenai. It was expanded and given a bell tower around 1896. In 1997 it got two new bells, bring the total to three. At the end of the nineteenth century it had an active school and a brotherhood association (Andrei Znamenski 2003, 40-41).

A natural disaster followed by urban renewal significantly transformed the setting of this church.

The 1964 earthquake caused the town to drop almost 4 feet. The subsequent urban renewal project encompasses the area below a 32-foot elevation and called for a major reconstruction of the waterfront. Although planners Lutes and Anderson encouraged residents to retain some of Seldovia’s more charming characteristics, such as steep slopes, piling foundation and boardwalks, many of them were lost in favor of economic revitalization. A hill was leveled to provide a site for residential development in the heart of the city, and the boardwalk that had constituted the main street was replaced with asphalt (Hoagland 1993, 125-126).

An early photograph (1906) shows the site of the church set back some distance from the edge of a bluff above the town (Figures 4.07.4 and 6). After the 1964 tsunami, this bluff was cut back towards the church entrance, either by tsunami erosion or by subsequent harbor stabilization (Figure 4.07.11). Another early photograph (Figure 4.07.7) indicates that the distance between the water and the bluff on which the church was sited was considerably greater that it is today.

The original ascent from the beach to the church would appear to be more gradual than it is today, suggesting possible processional routes to and from the water and to the cemetery (Figures 4.07.8 and 9). Remnants of the path to the northwest (Figure 4.07.9)
remain, although the land drops off abruptly as it leads down to the street below (Figure 4.07.25). The road or path to the southwest (Figure 4.07.8) no longer exists, and today the church is difficult to reach from the west.

A photograph of the church dated before 1913 shows an open bell tower and a picket fence surrounding the processional area of the church (Figure 4.07.6). Today’s fence is in much the same location, although the pickets had been replaced by a chain link fence by 1989 (Figure 4.07.13). The position of an oil tank (Figure 4.07.14) at the northeast east corner of the church blocked the processional route by 1989, suggesting that processional practices had been modified or discontinued at that point. The function of the pole in front of the church is unknown (Figure 4.07.5), but – as with a number of other visited churches - it is assumed to be a flag pole.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.07.10).

Figure 4.07. 4. Looking south over Seldovia with church in center, July 6, 1906.
Figure 4.07. 5. Seldovia church, looking northeast, before 1913.
Figure 4.07. 6. Seldovia church, looking northeast, 1900 (?).
Figure 4.07. 7. View of the Seldovia church from the water, looking southeast, before 1913.
Figure 4.07. 8. Looking south over the Seldovia church, before 1939.
Figure 4.07. 9. Looking northeast towards the Seldovia church, mid-20th century (before 1964 earthquake).
Figure 4.07.10. Seldovia church looking uphill to southeast, April 1964 (just after the earthquake of March 27).

Figure 4.07.11. Looking east from below the bluff, 1990.
Figure 4.07. 12. Seldovia church, looking northeast, 1990.

Figure 4.07. 13. Seldovia church, looking north, 1990.
### Figure 4.07.4
Church, looking northeast
1900 (?)
Gordons
Frank and Frances Carpenter collection (Library of Congress)
99614803
[https://www.loc.gov/item/99614803/](https://www.loc.gov/item/99614803/)

### Figure 4.07.5
View over Seldovia
1904-10
Case & Draper
Eric William Young Photo Collection
ASL-P111-09
[http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/13910/rec/16](http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/13910/rec/16)

### Figure 4.07.6
Looking northeast
Before 1913
Phinney S. Hunt
Crary-Henderson Collection
AMRC-b62-1-a-501

### Figure 4.07.7
View of the church from the water
Before 1913
Phinney S. Hunt
Crary-Henderson Collection
AMRC-b62-1-1392

### Figure 4.07.8
Looking South over the Church
Before 1939
Laurence Sydney
Pyatt Original Negative Collection
AMRC-b83-146-210
Figure 4.07.15. Sources of historic photographs.

**JULY 2015 FIELD VISIT SUMMARY**

The site of the church has been much altered since the first half of the twentieth century, and the associated cemetery was removed more or less completely after the 1962 tsunami and the rebuilding of the harbor. The church retains its dominant position above the water and village (Figures 4.07.16 and 17), but the paths or roads that linked it to the village and waterfront were destroyed either by the tsunami or by the post-tsunami urban renewal. There is an abrupt drop from the area west of the church (Figure 4.07.18), and the edge of the bluff is much closer to the west end of the church than it was historically (Figure 4.07.19). Today the church is more easily reached from the south, and the likely former processional link to the site of the former cemetery has become a steep footpath (Figure 4.07.25).

The church is surrounded by a chain link fence in much the same position as the picket fence of historic photographs (Figures 4.07.20 and 21). ADA access has been added by means of a ramp leading to the west door (Figure 4.07.20). The fence does not delineate the church property, which extends some distance to the east, but rather marks the former processional route around the church (which is now obstructed by the oil tank at the northeast corner). Window candelabras were designed to provide light.
for such processions (Figure 4.07.23), and cobbles outline the pathway at the recessed corners between the porch and church nave (Figure 4.07.24).

The three original bells remain in the open bell tower (Figures 4.07.20 and 22).

Because of the changes caused by the tsunami and urban renewal, the location of the cemetery is known only through the memory of Seldovia residents (Gruber July 20, 2015). Human bones have been known to wash up at Cemetery Beach, located some 400 yards northeast of the church, which suggests that the cemetery was in this area (Figures 4.07.26 and 27).

An iron frame for a five-pointed processional star (Figure 4.07.28) was discovered on the north side of the church, and a more commonly-found six or twelve-pointed star was found inside the church (Figure 4.07.29), indicating that at some point starring was a practice followed in this community. Starring, or Selaviq (Slava, meaning “glory” or “praise” in Russian), begins with a blessing in the church, after which a procession forms to bring the star to the households of the community. In each house a small service is held and food is served (Inouye 1987, 159). This extra-liturgical practice takes place in many Russian Orthodox communities in Alaska.

Figure 4.07. 16. Looking southeast toward the Seldovia church, July 2015.
Figure 4.07. 17. Looking south towards the Seldovia church from the reinforced beach, July 2015.

Figure 4.07. 18. View of the Seldovia church from Main Street, looking east, July 2015.
Figure 4.07. 19. View from the door of the Seldovia church, looking west, July 2015.

Figure 4.07. 20. Seldovia church, looking northeast, July 2015.
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Figure 4.07. 21. Seldovia church, looking northwest, July 2015.

Figure 4.07. 22. Seldovia church bells, looking northwest, July 2015.
Figure 4.07. 23. Candelabra at the window provided light for processions around the church, from interior looking northwest, July 2015.
Figure 4.07. 24. Outline of former processional route around church, southwest corner, facing southeast, July 2015.

Figure 4.07. 25. Pathway to Seldovia church from Main Street, from the north, looking east, July 2015.
Figure 4.07. 26. Cemetery Beach, looking north, July 2015.

Figure 4.07. 27. Cemetery Beach, looking south, July 2015.
Figure 4.07. 28. Processional star, north side of Seldovia church, July 2015.
Figure 4.07.29. Star found in northeast corner of interior of Seldovia church, July 2015.
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ST. NICHOLAS CHURCH, JUNEAU
(SEPTEMBER 2014)

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

St. Nicholas Church is set at an elevation of 131’ feet, high above the harbor. The site of Juneau itself is in a relatively narrow level area along the Gastineau Channel, with development spreading up the steep hills to the northeast. The church is located near the top of the settled area. Its orientation is ~ 119° south/southeast. Set at an angle on its rectangular lot, it is oriented to the liturgical east. The adjacent church house, to the northeast, is aligned with the street.

The cemetery is located approximately a half mile west of the church. A Serbian Orthodox section was located during the field visit, but the Russian Orthodox section of the cemetery was not visited due to lack of information on its location. Its condition is said to be poor (Martin February 17, 2010). Across the Gastineau Channel, on Douglas Island, burials with Orthodox three bar crosses are found along Third Street, which runs along the water. A Serbian Orthodox church was located in Douglas, and Russian and Serbian Orthodox graves are similar (Janes and Hughes September 1995).

Base maps for schematic designs in this section are taken from the City/Borough of Juneau GIS.
Figure 4.08.2. Location of ecclesiastical landscape elements in Juneau, AK.

Figure 4.08.3. Schematic plan of Juneau church complex.
Figure 4.08.4. Location of Russian and Serbian Orthodox Cemeteries within Evergreen Cemetery (City/Borough of Juneau GIS).

Figure 4.08.5. 3-D model of Juneau church created for the Historic American Buildings Survey (Mauro and Schara 2013).
BRIEF HISTORY (Oleksa et al. 1994, 6-10, Wallace 1973)

Led by a Tlingit, Yees Gaanaaly, with land supplied by another Tlingit, construction of a church and rectory was completed in 1893. Three acres adjacent were acquired for a cemetery in 1894; this area was fenced in 1915. At some point, the cemetery was sold off, and a noncontiguous area to the west acquired for a cemetery (Figure 4.08.4). The condition of this cemetery is said to be poor (Martin February 17, 2010). Shortly after the construction of the church, a school building (which no longer exists) was added to the complex (Figures 4.08.7 and 8). A belfry was added to the church in 1905 or 1906 (Figure 4.08.9).

Historic photos indicate a processional boardwalk around the church. As with most churches, natural vegetation boarders the pathways and is not trimmed elsewhere (Figure 4.08.9).

The church appears to have been constructed following a nineteenth-century church plan book (Figure 4.08.6), similar to one found at St. Herman’s Seminary in Kodiak (Unknown 1855). The Juneau church is the only remaining octagonal Russian Orthodox church in Alaska (Hoagland 1989c, 175).

Across the channel in Douglas, several sequential Serbian Orthodox churches dedicated to St. Sava of Serbia were constructed beginning in 1903, only to be destroyed by fire. The last church at the site (Figure 4.08.10) burned in 1937. Sebastian Dabovich, who founded this church along with many other Serbian churches in North America, was canonized by the Serbian Orthodox Church in 2015. The two churches enjoyed a cordial relationship and were mutually supportive.
Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.08.12).

Figure 4.08.7. Juneau church and school (right), looking southeast over Gastineau Channel, before 1905/06.

Figure 4.08.8. Juneau school (left), church, and rectory (right), looking west across Fifth Street, probably early 20th century.
Figure 4.08.9. Juneau church with bell tower, looking southeast, after 1905/06.
Figure 4.08.10. St. Sava Serbian Orthodox Church on Douglas Island, location unidentified, before 1937.

Figure 4.08.11. Church and rectory, looking northwest, 1989
| Figure 4.08.7 | Church and school | Before 1905/6 | William R. Norton. Photographs, ca. 1890-1920. ASL-PCA-226 | ASL-P226-225 | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/6968/rec/4 |
| Figure 4.08.8 | Church, school and rectory | Early 20th Century | Michael Z. Vinokuroff Photograph Collection, ca. 1880's-1970's. PCA 243 | ASL-P243-2-031 | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5178/rec/6 |
| Figure 4.08.9 | Church, school and rectory | Early 20th Century, after 1905/6 Winter and Pond | Michael Z. Vinokuroff Photograph Collection, ca. 1880's-1970's. PCA 243 | ASL-P243-2-030 | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5177/rec/11 |
| Figure 4.08.10 | Serbian Church, Douglas | Between 1903 and 1937 | Alaska State Library Place File. Photographs. ASL. | ASL-Douglas-Churches-5b | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/2070/rec/1 |
| Figure 4.08.11 | Church and rectory | 1989 | Jet Lowe Library of Congress | HABS AK-59 | https://www.loc.gov/resource/hhh.ak0266.photos/?s=p=1 |

Figure 4.08.12. Sources of Historic Photographs.

**SEPTEMBER 2014 FIELD VISIT SUMMARY**

The church is located high above the water on a steeply sloping lot, a stiff climb up from the harbor. Because of the slope, the rectory and the church are set on different levels, and a pathway with steps to the south of the rectory links these two remaining buildings of the original complex (Figures 13-19), which originally included a school. During the visit the foundation and the steeple of the church were under repair.

The orientation of the church on the property reflects the traditional practice of placing the altar at the liturgical east. By contrast, the rectory and the former school are aligned with the Juneau street grid (Figures 4.08.13 and 17). Indications of an original processional pathway around the church remain on site (Figure 4.08.19), but at some point this was interrupted by a fence and plantings as seen in a 1989 photo (Figure 4.08.12). This suggests a discontinued practice. The pathway on the north side of the
church remains, providing the connection to the rectory and the street (Figures 4.08.16, 17 and 18).

The sloping lot is covered with turf. To the southwest of the entrance to the church is a mature spruce tree.

A search for the cemetery led to the Serbian section of the Evergreen Cemetery (Figure 4.08.20). Here the graves are aligned facing east in the traditional manner. We were unaware of the location of the Russian cemetery, which should be documented and a condition assessment completed. Some preliminary work has been done on this project (Martin February 17, 2010).

Across the Gastineau Channel on Douglas Island a number of isolated cemeteries and small groups of graves were noted along the Douglas Highway (Figure 4.08.21). These graves appear to have been oriented in relationship to the highway or in response to topography, but the survey was not comprehensive. Documentation of cemeteries on Douglas Island has been initiated (Janes and Hughes September 1995).
Figure 4.08.14. The rectory, looking southwest along Fifth Street, September 2014.

Figure 4.08.15. The rectory from Fifth Street, looking southwest, September 2014.
Figure 4.08.16. View of the church with the rectory in left background, looking southeast, September 2014.

Figure 4.08.17. Pathway along the north side of the church leading to the rectory and street, facing east, September 2014.
Figure 4.08.18. North side of the church and pathway leading to the entrance from the street, looking southwest, September 2014.
Figure 4.08.19. Remnant of an earlier processional path along the south wall of the church, looking east, September 2014.
Figure 4.08.20. Serbian section of Evergreen Cemetery, looking east, September 2014.

Figure 4.08.21. Small memorial chapel behind grave along Douglas Highway, looking north, September 2014.
HOLY ASSUMPTION CHURCH / ST. NICHOLAS CHAPEL, KENAI (JULY 2015 AND SEPTEMBER 2016)

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The Kenai church complex is sited on a bluff approximately 75 feet above the Cook Inlet, on the west side of the Kenai Peninsula just north of the Kenai River. This defensive position was chosen by the Lebedev – Lastochin Company for establishment of the Nikolaevskii Redoubt in this location just somewhat less than a mile to the west of a large Kahtnuht'ana Dena'ina settlement. The bluff (Figure 4.09.16) falls away sharply to the north and west - to a freshwater drainage on the north and to the beach on the west. From this point it is possible to monitor the mouth of the Kenai River as well as any ship traffic from the Inlet. A steep trail links the site to the beach.

The Assumption church is oriented to the south / southeast at ~ 139° – an outlier among the sites visited in 2014 -16. The St. Nicholas Chapel has a similar orientation at ~ 141°.

The chapel, the old cemetery, the church, the rectory and the new cemetery form a group, which in the past included a school, on the site of which a replica of Fort Kenay was built in 1967.

There was a cemetery in the area of the St. Nicholas chapel, referred to as the old cemetery. The new cemetery is located approximately 200 yards northwest of the Assumption church.

Figure 4.09.1. Schematic plan of Kenai church complex.

Figure 4.09.2. Orientation of Assumption Church.
BRIEF HISTORY (Hoagland 1990f, Smith 1985b)

The first chapel was built in 1841 as part of the Nikolaevskii Redoubt. In 1849, a church was constructed at the site, which was described in 1867 (at the time of the sale of the United States to Alaska) as located inside the northwest corner of the palisade. A house for the priest was in the immediate vicinity. In 1881 additional work was done on the church under the direction of Hegumen Nikita Marchenko, who was the Kenai priest at the time. Also in 1881 construction began on the rectory as part of a project for clergy housing initiated by Bishop Nestor (Zass). In 1895-96 today’s Assumption church was constructed (Figure 4.09.5), and a bell tower was added in 1900 (Figure 4.09.6).

In 1897 materials from the old church were used to expand a cabin previously used as an orphanage to construct a school. The location of the school was chosen to be close to the rectory, the church, and the house of the parish psalm leader, who was often also the teacher.

In 1906 the St. Nicholas Chapel was built over the grave of Hegumen Nikolai Militov, the first priest assigned to Kenai, of his assistant the church reader Makarii Ivanov, and of an additional unnamed monk. It does not appear that this chapel marks the altar area of the earlier churches, but its orientation may have been taken from them, or, if the graves maintained the orientation of the church, from the graves.

An aerial overview from the beginning of the twentieth century (Figure 4.09.3) shows the relationship between the elements of the ecclesiastical landscape. The orientation of the church determined the orientation of the grid of streets and lot lines in this area of Kenai. A road runs between the rectory and the church, but only a footpath runs to the west of the church. Fences surround the church, chapel, rectory and school. A plowed field is seen to the south of the church (Figure 4.09.6). After 1913, a mixture of mature deciduous and evergreen trees is seen around the church and rectory, but the area around the St. Nicholas chapel and the old cemetery was clear of trees (Figure 4.09.3). The arch holding the sign above the gate to the church yard does not appear in photos until after 1959 (Figure 4.09.12).

A historic photo from 1940 (Figure 4.09.10) shows a cemetery with a range of burial styles, including grave fences and spirit houses. The orientation of all the graves is identical, which suggests that they follow tradition and face east. At some point during the middle of the twentieth century these memorials or their remnants were cleared by prison labor (Gray July 2015) without permission or knowledge of the church. A second historic photo shows a single grave, near a rail fence, suggesting a location in the old cemetery (compare to Figure 4.09.11). The crosses are the traditional Russian Orthodox three bar set on an orb; the cross in Figure 4.09.11 has a weather roof.
In 1972 the church, chapel, rectory and new cemetery were listed as a National Historic Landmark.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.09.14).

![Figure 4.09.3. Arial overview of Kenai church complex, looking south, 1919.](image)

![Figure 4.09.4. Assumption church (left) and school (right) with rectory behind, facing west, 1949.](image)
Figure 4.09.5. Assumption church, facing east, before the addition of the bell tower in 1900.

Figure 4.09.6. Assumption church with bell tower, looking north across a plowed field, 1896-1913.
Figure 4.09.7. The rectory (left) and Assumption church, looking northeast, 1939-1959.

Figure 4.09.8. The St. Nicholas chapel, looking southwest, 1949.
Figure 4.09.9. The rectory, looking northwest, May 2, 1963.

Figure 4.09.10. Cemetery, looking south, May 21, 1940.
Figure 4.09.11. Single grave, looking northeast, 1867-1913.

Figure 4.09.12. Kenai church, looking southwest, after 1959.
Figure 4.09.13. St. Nicholas chapel, looking northwest, 1952.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.09.3</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Betty Lande</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>70000898</td>
<td><a href="http://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp/GetAsset?assetID=f7e391f9-89b5-47de-a250-daee88986a6d4">http://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp/GetAsset?assetID=f7e391f9-89b5-47de-a250-daee88986a6d4</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.09.4</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1905/10</td>
<td>Mary Ford</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>70000898</td>
<td><a href="http://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp/GetAsset?assetID=f7e391f9-89b5-47de-a250-daee88986a6d4">http://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp/GetAsset?assetID=f7e391f9-89b5-47de-a250-daee88986a6d4</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.09.5</td>
<td>Church &amp; school in winter</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Allen L. Peterson</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>70000898</td>
<td><a href="http://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp/GetAsset?assetID=f7e391f9-89b5-47de-a250-daee88986a6d4">http://npgallery.nps.gov/nrhp/GetAsset?assetID=f7e391f9-89b5-47de-a250-daee88986a6d4</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.09.6</td>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>Before 1900</td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokourowf Photograph Collection, ca. 1880's-1970's. PC243. ASL</td>
<td>ASL-P243-2-013</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5155/rec18">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5155/rec18</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.09.7 Church with field to south 1896-1913 Cordelia L.M. Noble Collection UAF-1973-203-21 http://vilda.alaska.edu/ cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm11/id/31/rec/6

Figure 4.09.8 St. Nicholas 1939-1959 Steve McCutcheon AMRC. Steve McCutcheon Collection AMRC-B1990-014-5-TV-090-15 http://vilda.alaska.edu/ cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm2/id/7969/rec/11

Figure 4.09.9 Rectory May 2, 1963 Steve McCutcheon AMRC. Steve McCutcheon Collection AMRC-B1990-014-5-TV-090-10 http://vilda.alaska.edu/ cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm2/id/7967/rec/16

Figure 4.09.10 Cemetery May 21, 1940 AMRC. Howard Hansen Collection AMRC-b82-181-1 http://vilda.alaska.edu/ cdm/singleitem/ collection/cdm2/id/204/rec/1

Figure 4.09.11 Single grave 1867-1913 Kate R. Gompertz Photograph Collection, 1895-1903. ASL-PCA-16 ASL-P-16-21 http://vilda.alaska.edu/ cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/16198/rec/27


Figure 4.09.13 St. Nicholas Chapel 1952 Ann Chandonnet AMRC. Kempton Collection AMRC-b74-4-8 http://vilda.alaska.edu/ cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm2/id/432/rec/1

Figure 4.09.14 Sources of historic photographs.

APRIL 2015, AUGUST 2015 AND SEPTEMBER 2016 FIELD VISITS SUMMARY

A 2015 aerial view of much of the ecclesiastical landscape of Kenai reveals how the elements of the church complex are related to one another (Figure 4.09.15).

The original trading post was placed on a high bluff above the Cook Inlet, and a chapel was built into its wall. Today, the St. Nicholas chapel, which was constructed above the graves of Abbot Nicholas and his assistants to the north of the fort, is just visible from the beach below (Figure 4.09.16). In the valley to the west, a freshwater stream flows down to the beach (Figures 4.09.20 and 21). Today the chapel is fenced in by private property on two sides and accessed by a fenced alleyway. A landlocked house, seen in a historic photo (Figure 4.09.8), sits to the north of the chapel. Currently a restaurant, this
house (Figure 4.09.22) takes advantage of the church’s parking area off Spruce Street, without which it could not remain in business.

The ecclesiastical buildings constructed at the turn of the twentieth century – Assumption church, rectory and school - maintain what is presumed to be the orientation of the original church and cemetery. This orientation in turn impacted the property and street grid of the area. All elements – old cemetery, chapel, church, rectory, school site and new cemetery - are visually linked to at least one other element in the group (Figures 4.09.20, 23, 24, 27, 28 and 29).

A gift shop was built to the west of the church in 2013. An ADA path links it to the Assumption church (Figure 4.09.25).

The churchyard fence was being repaired during the 2015 site visit; this was completed by the time of the 2016 visit. In traditional practice this fence does not indicate a property boundary, but rather a secondary liturgical space surrounding the church. As can be seen from historic photographs, the style of the fence has changed over time (Figures 4.09.6 and 7), but its location has remained constant. An arch with signage above (Figures 4.09.12 and 26) spans the entrance gate at the west end of the church yard. This decorative arch does not appear in photographs before the 1950s.

During the 2015 site visit, it was observed that the large cottonwoods in the churchyard had been severely pruned; by September 2016 they had been removed. As can be seen from historic photographs, from an early date the church had trees nearby – often along the fence line (Figures 4.09.3, 4 and 7).

The paved walk between the rectory and the church likely marks a will path, created as the priest and his family walked back and forth for liturgical services. A gate in the church fence provides a direct entrance into the churchyard from the rectory (Figure 4.09.24).

The former site of the school is now occupied by a reconstruction of Fort Kenay. While it is difficult to assess fully the impact of this building’s presence without more information about the historic school building, it does support the sense of a larger Russian Orthodox presence in the landscape (Figure 4.09.23).

There is no visual indication that graves are present in the area of the old cemetery, but, in addition to the retained nomenclature, the presence of the chapel built above the graves of Abbot Nicholas and his assistants suggests that other graves are located in the immediate area (Figures 4.09.18 and 19).

The new cemetery is reached by a road serving area residences, while the platted road itself is now an overgrown footpath. If this road were to be relocated, there would be a strong visual connection between the cemetery and the Assumption church. At this
point, however, the view is limited due to intervening vegetation (Figures 4.09.29 and 30).

The cemetery itself covers a large area, but graves appear to be concentrated in an area of approximately an acre near the entrance road (Figure 4.09.31). To the west, along the stream valley, there are large mature spruce trees, and spruces and deciduous trees have volunteered in some places between the graves (Figures 4.09.32 and 33). Traditionally the cemetery is not mowed, and in summer it is filled with wild flowers (Figure 4.09.33), with pathways trodden by visitors to the graves (Figures 4.09.34 and 35). During the August 2015 field visit it was noted that some of these will paths had been traced by a lawn mower. One section of the cemetery – for veterans – is kept mowed in the manner usually found in western cemeteries. Here are found both headstones and foot crosses (Figure 4.09.36).

Graves are invariably oriented to the east; i.e., the foot is at the east end. Most of the graves are marked by a cross set at the east, but some also have headstones (Figure 4.09.37). Shells are associated with some of the graves, but the symbolism of this has not been studied. Flowering crosses and traditional three bar crosses are found here.

Some graves or groups of graves (Figure 4.09.36) are fenced in the Russian manner. Some repairs have been made to restore deteriorated crosses, but others graves are in poor condition (Figure 4.09.39). Some graves are decorated with artificial flowers or with other personalizing objects (Figure 4.09.38).
Figure 4.09.15. Aerial view of Kenai church complex, facing east, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.16. Bluff where the earliest Kenai church and cemetery were built, looking northwest, September 2016.
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Figure 4.09.19. The St. Nicholas chapel, looking northwest from the site of the Russian fort, August 2016.

Figure 4.09.20. Assumption Church in background, looking across fenced lots and parking lot from the southeast corner of the St. Nicholas chapel, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.21. St. Nicholas Chapel, looking southwest across fenced lot, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.22. Landlocked restaurant north of St. Nicholas chapel, looking northwest, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.23. Assumption church with rectory (left) and reconstructed Fort Kenay at former school site (right), looking northeast, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.24. Paved path to rectory from Assumption church, looking north, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.25. ADA path from gift shop to Assumption church, looking north, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.26. Arch with sign above west gate into churchyard, looking southeast, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.27. View through west gate of churchyard to St. Nicholas chapel, looking southwest, September 2016.
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Figure 4.09.28. Rectory with overgrown road to cemetery in background, looking northwest, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.29. View of Assumption church along overgrown path to cemetery, facing south, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.30. View of Assumption church from overgrown path to new cemetery, looking southeast, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.31. Sign identifying the new cemetery, facing north, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.32. Grave crosses with unmown meadow in foreground and spruce trees in background, facing west, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.33. Grave markers with unmown meadow in foreground and spruces in background, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.34. Pathway trod through unmown meadow by visitors to graves, facing east, September 2016.
Figure 4.09.35. Pathway mown in meadow following pathways to graves, looking southeast, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.36. Single and double graves surrounded by fences, looking east, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.37. Military area of cemetery with headstones and foot crosses, looking northwest, August 2015.

Figure 4.09.38. Recent graves ornamented with flowers, looking southwest, August 2015.
Figure 4.09.39. Grave fence in need of repair, looking southwest, August 2015.
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HOLY RESURRECTION CHURCH, KODIAK
(APRIL 2015)

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Kodiak is located on a strip of land protected by an outer island (Figure 4.10.1). Behind the town the mountains rise sharply. The church, as was the case with an earlier church, is set on a high point, clearly visible from the water. Several freshwater lagoons dotted the landscape, but these were filled in after the Katmai eruption of 1912.

A cluster of buildings serving church functions were constructed along the line of the channel that separates Kodiak from Near Island (Figure 4.10.2). These included the church, a rectory and an orphanage. An earlier church had been sited nearer to the town center, also along the channel. The old cemetery was located on a slope to the west of the town (Figure 4.10.13), in an area no doubt considered impractical for

Figure 4.10. 1. Schematic plan of the location of the Sitka church complex.

Figure 4.10. 2. Schematic diagram of ecclesiastical resources in Sitka.
construction. This cemetery was essentially removed during urban renewal, perhaps even before the 1964 earthquake. A new cemetery was developed further inland on another sloping site before the Katmai eruption of 1912 (Figures 4.10.4, 5 and 6). Today St. Herman’s Seminary – a cluster including dormitories, offices, refectory, classrooms and a chapel – is located just to the northeast of the former orphanage (Figure 4.10.26).

From the beginning, the Church of the Resurrection, at an elevation of ~ 40’, dominated the Kodiak skyline. The church is oriented ~ 60° northeast (Figure 4.10.3), the most northerly altar orientation of the sites visited.

Figure 4.10.3. Orientation of Sitka church.


The first church in Kodiak was consecrated in 1796, some twelve years after the first Russian settlement in Alaska was established 150 miles to the southwest at Three Saints Bay and four years after Kodiak (called Pavlovsk or St. Paul’s Harbor by the Russians) was established at this location. The first church was located closer to the bay, but a map made at the time of the 1867 Cession shows a church in today’s location. The existing structure dates from 1945, following a fire in 1943 that completely destroyed the church. Reconstructed, it was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1979.

Originally the church had an enclosed bell tower (Figure 4.10.9), but at some point after 1920 the impact of Alaska’s weather on the church as a whole led to the construction of a separate bell tower to the south (Figure 4.10.10). The bells were reinstalled in the integrated church bell tower later in the twentieth century (Figure 4.10.18).

An orphanage (Figure 4.10.12) was founded in 1894 (Luehrmann 2008). The rectory (Figure 4.10.7) was similar in plan to those constructed in Kenai and Kodiak under Bishop Nestor in the 1880s, but much less grand than the “bishop’s house” in Unalaska.

Of these buildings, only the church remains, being rebuilt in 1945 in the same location as the original church, which was destroyed by fire in 1943. The former old cemetery site (Figure 4.10.13) now contains an inn and shops, although a small portion on the slope to the north may remain unimpacted. A new cemetery established further from the center of town contains burials dating from at least the beginning of the twentieth

---

1 The copy of the National Register form found online at the National Register Digital Assets website is incomplete. A complete draft copy was found at the Baranov Museum in Kodiak.

2 A number of churches in this study have moved their bells into a separate structure for this reason.
century (Figures 4.10.13, 14 and 15). Another Kodiak cemetery dates from the Civil War and contains a few Orthodox graves among many others.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.10.16).

Figure 4.10. 4. Aerial view of Kodiak, looking southeast, April 1913.

Figure 4.10. 5. Detail of aerial view with orphanage at left, church in center and rectory at right.
Figure 4.10. 6. The schooner "Hunter" at dock in the Near Island Channel with rectory, church and orphanage in the background, looking south, 1912.

Figure 4.10. 7. Road with rectory on left and church on right, looking east, before 1913.
Figure 4.10. 8. Holy Friday procession entering the church, looking southeast, early twentieth century.
Figure 4.10.9. Church with bells in tower, looking east, 1917.

Figure 4.10.10. Church with separate bell tower to right, looking east, after 1945.
Figure 4.10.11. Church with oil tanks to left, looking west, during World War II.
Figure 4.10. 12. The mission house or orphanage, looking south, 1919.

Figure 4.10. 13. Old cemetery, looking southeast across Kodiak, likely before 1912.
Figure 4.10. 14. The new cemetery after the Katmai eruption, looking east, 1913.

Figure 4.10. 15. The new cemetery, looking west, 1915.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.5</td>
<td>Detail from Kodiak aerial</td>
<td>April 1903</td>
<td>Cordelia L. M. Noble</td>
<td>UAF-1973-203-27</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm11/id/48/rec/1">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.6</td>
<td>Schooner “Hunter” lying at anchor</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Alaska State Library</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>Baranov Museum (Kodiak) Notebooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.7</td>
<td>Road to the church</td>
<td>1896-1913</td>
<td>AMRC. Fred Henton</td>
<td>AMRC-b65-18-495</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm12/id/517/rec/1">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.8</td>
<td>Holy Friday procession</td>
<td>Before 1943</td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokouroff</td>
<td>ASL-P243-2-059</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5211/rec/31">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.9</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Paul Rarey Hagelbarger</td>
<td>UAA-hmc-0186-volume3-930</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm13/id/1122/rec/22">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.10</td>
<td>Church and oil tanks</td>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>H. Marion Thornton</td>
<td>ASL-P338-0626</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/2538/rec/27">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.11</td>
<td>Mission house and church</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>William Lewis Henning</td>
<td>UAA-hmc-0186-volume6-H404</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm13/id/1441/rec/3">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 07.10.12</td>
<td>Old cemetery</td>
<td>Before 1943</td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokouroff</td>
<td>ASL-P243-2-040</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5188/rec/1">Link</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 4.10.16. Sources of historic photographs.**

**APRIL 2015 FIELD VISIT SUMMARY**

A brisk walk up Mission Road leads to a fenced churchyard and a flight of steps up to the church entrance (Figure 4.10.18). Surrounding the church is a paved walkway (Figure 4.10.19) to accommodate the liturgical processions that take place at certain times of year (such as the Holy Friday procession in Figure 4.10.8). To the right the former external bell tower serves as storage. A row of trees to the south is largely intact, but stumps and indentations in front of the church and to the north indicate a number of missing trees. A stump to the left of the entrance stair marks the location of a former tree (Figure 4.10.19), perhaps that seen in Figure 4.10.8. Early 20th century photos show poplars surrounding the church (Figures 4.10.7, 8, 9, and 10), but now, aside from one on the east side of the church, the trees are spruces. It may be that evergreens were planted to screen the fuel tanks immediately to the south (Figure 4.10.11), which were installed during World War II.

Today there is a significant difference in grade between the narrow sidewalk along Mission Avenue to the left of the church and the churchyard. Comparison with historic photographs (Figures 4.10.7, 11 and 18) confirm that this is the result of 20th century street construction. Today a picket fence surrounds the churchyard (Figure 4.10.18), but fences in other styles have marked the same area in the past (Figures 4.10. 9, 11 and 18). Graves to the east of the church are visible in historic photographs by the time of World War II (Figure 4.10.11). Today graves can be seen in this area, some dating from the mid-nineteenth century (Figure 4.10.20), but there is no indication that there were graves located anywhere else in the churchyard. The most recent graves are those of clergy (Figure 4.10.21), buried according to tradition outside the east end of the church.
At the beginning of the twentieth century two Russian Orthodox cemeteries were located on sloping land away from the center of town (Figure 4.10.17). A Civil War era cemetery includes several Orthodox graves, as indicated by the characteristic three bar cross. In addition, there are a number of smaller cemeteries in Kodiak, such as that on Madsen Street off Maple Street (Figure 4.10.25). These are distinguished by the presence three bar crosses, but none of them were fully documented during this field study. The old cemetery near the intersection of Rezanof Way and Alder Drive (Figure 4.10.13) has been subsumed by development. It may have suffered significant damage in the 1964 tsunami, or, as in so many places may have fallen a victim to urban renewal. The upper edge of this cemetery, to the north, may still contain graves.

The new cemetery is located along Mill Bay Road north of Erskine Avenue (Figures 4.10.14, 15, 22, 23 and 24). The graves in this cemetery are traditionally oriented to the northeast or liturgical east as set by the orientation of the church. Graves are marked by three bar crosses, capped crosses, and flowering crosses. Similar to what was seen in Napaskiak (Chapter 4.03) in this field study, some of the crosses are painted colors other than white. Some graves are surrounded by fences in the Russian style; some are marked with stone monuments. There are both headstones and footstones. There is no defining boundary between the cemetery and the adjacent areas of housing. Where the ground falls off sharply to the northwest, some graves are being lost to erosion. The excavation required to build housing below the cemetery on Lower Mill Bay Road may have initiated or contributed to this problem.

To the east of the church is located St. Herman's Seminary, which was moved here in 1974 from temporary quarters at Wildwood Station. The Seminary includes a chapel (Figure 4.10.26), classroom buildings, offices, and housing for students and faculty.
Figure 4.10. 18. Holy Resurrection Church, looking southeast, April 2015.

Figure 4.10. 19. North side of processional path, looking east, April 2015.
Figure 4.10. 21. Nineteenth century grave east of church, looking east, April 2015.

Figure 4.10. 20. Grave of Father and Matushka King, looking east, April 2015.
Figure 4.10. 22. New cemetery, looking east, April 2015.

Figure 4.10. 23. Fenced family plot with stone monuments in new cemetery, looking east, April 2015.
Figure 4.10. 24. Erosion of the northern slope of the new cemetery, looking west, April 2015.

Figure 4.10. 25. A small cemetery on Madsen Street off Maple Street, containing both marked and unmarked graves, looking east, April 2015.
Figure 4.10. 26. The chapel at St. Herman’s Seminary, looking northeast from the administration building, April 2015.
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RUSSIAN ORTHODOX SITES IN SITKA, ALASKA  
(SEPTEMBER 2014, APRIL 2015 AND SEPTEMBER 2016)

When the Russians established a post near Sitka in 1799, they dedicated it to the Archangel Michael. An older Russian city – Arkhangelsk or Archangel – was an important seaport, and so Sitka became known as Novo-Arkhangelsk, or New Archangel. Given this dedication, the two initial churches and the present cathedral were dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel. The name Sitka is taken from the Tlingit language. For convenience in this report, the name Sitka is used for the city, and St. Michael is used to denote the churches and the cathedral.

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Sitka is located on Baranof Island in the Alexander Archipelago (Figure 4.11.1). Some protection from the open ocean is afforded by Japonski Island (directly to the west) and by Kruzof Island (approximately ten miles to the west). Sitka is the southernmost urban center of the Russian expansion into Alaska.

The distribution of Sitka’s historic Russian Orthodox resources throughout the urban matrix (Figure 4.11.2) is similar to the pattern found in Kodiak, Unalaska and (to some extent) Kenai, where historic resources are separated from one another by non-ecclesiastical buildings and structures. St. Michael’s Cathedral, the Russian Bishop’s House and the Schoolhouse have been perceived as part of an ecclesiastical ensemble, but the site of the earlier St. Michael’s, the site of the former Trinity Church, and the Russian Cemetery should be included in the group. Diverse land ownership (Figures 4.11.3 and 4) has been an obstacle in developing a cohesive group interpretive program for these sites.
The Orthodox Church in America (OCA) owns the cemetery tract and the Trinity Church site (Figure 4.11.3), both of which have been considerably impacted by road projects and property intrusions along Marine Street. A small section of the cemetery is owned by the Lutheran Church (the area of Princess Maksutov’s grave). The far southwest corner of the stockade/memorial adjacent to the Trinity Church site is owned by the City of Sitka, but its historic interpretation is managed by the Alaska Bureau of Land Management. The Russian Bishop’s House is owned by the National Park Service. The site of the earlier St. Michael’s Churches may possibly be considered an intertidal zone and/or be made up of residential lots in the area (Figure 4.11.3).

The orientation of St. Michael’s Cathedral is ~ 60° northeast (Figure 4.11.5). This, along with the orientation of Holy Resurrection in Kodiak (~ 59°) is the most northerly orientation of all the churches visited during this field study. If the orientation of the former Trinity Church is correctly indicated by the orientation of the shrine now at that site and by the Cession map (Figure 4.11.6), its orientation would have been essentially identical to that of the cathedral. Annunciation Church in the Russian Bishop’s House is
~ 80° east, well within the range of visited sites, although this orientation appears to have been determined by the relationship of the building to the shoreline rather than by liturgical orientation. At the same time, icon corners in the Bishop’s house are oriented ~ 125° east (~ 30° south of east), i.e., determined by reference to true east.

The cathedral is on a slight rise to the southwest above the lower town at ~ 31’ above sea level. The slope continues to rise beyond the north side of the Cathedral. The Bishop’s House is at a lower elevation of ~ 19’. The cemetery slopes upward into the hills to the north, rising to ~ 100’ at its highest point. The former site of the Trinity Church is at an ~ 40’ elevation.

**BRIEF HISTORY** (Hoagland 1989f, Smith 1986, Welzenbach 2012)

The earliest St. Michael Church probably dates from 1816 or shortly thereafter, when the first Orthodox priest – Fr. Aleksei Sokolov – arrived in Sitka.¹ It was a two-story octagonal building located some 300 feet to the south of the present site of St. Michael’s Cathedral (Figure 4.11.2). In 1831 Governor Wrangell ordered a second church to be built on the same site (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 52). This second church was replaced by the cathedral in 1848 and then torn down because of its deteriorated condition.

In 1840 Sitka became the seat of an Orthodox diocese which governed all of the Russian Orthodox churches in North America and parts of eastern Siberia. Under the direction of Bishop Innocent Veniaminov a new church – built to be a cathedral - was constructed at the present site. This building burned in 1966 but was subsequently reconstructed by 1978 following the measured drawings created by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) in 1961. Like the original church building, the reconstructed building contains two side chapels in addition to the main altar.

The Russian Bishop’s House was constructed between 1841 and 1843 to serve as a residence and administrative headquarters, and also as a school. The on-going tensions between of the needs of the Russian-American Company and the Russian Orthodox Church are reflected in the development of what was essentially a suburban church compound, located at a distance across the Malyshevka River which marked the outer limits of the town. In 1846 a seminary building was completed to the east of the Russian Bishop’s House. In 1858 this building was transferred to the Russian-American Company for use as a hospital, and after the Cession it continued to be used as a hospital and for

¹ An earlier prayer house or chapel dedicated to St. Michael was constructed ca. 1808 nearer Castle Hill (Black 2004, 241).
An additional Russian Orthodox church – no longer extant - was built in Sitka during the nineteenth century to serve the Tlingit population. The story of this church is less well-documented than that of the cathedral. Trinity Church, also called the ‘native’ or Kolosh church, was built into the wall of the stockade in 1849 and consecrated by Bishop Innocent. On March 11, 1855, a dispute between the Tlingit and the Russians over firewood led to the desecration of the church, which was severely damaged both by the Tlingit and by Russian cannon fire. It was repaired and reconsecrated on February 2, 1857, with blessing of Bishop Innocent (Kan 1999a, 129). Over time the building deteriorated, and in 1875 on orders given earlier by Bishop John Mitropol’skii (Kliment 2009, 402) it was taken apart, and its lumber was used for repairs of St. Michael’s Cathedral (Kan 1999a, 192). A shrine was built over the altar area in the traditional manner. In December 6, 1908, the St. Nicholas Brotherhood built a new ‘chapel’ or shrine to replace the former shrine on the site (Chubarov 1908). This is not the shrine on the site today.
The Cession map (Figure 4.11.6) introduces an element of confusion with regard to the name of the Trinity Church by identifying it as the Church of the Resurrection. This appears to be the only instance of this error in early historic records.

Reference Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Russian Ecclesiastical Buildings and Sites in Sitka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Russian fort established at Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>First St. Michael’s Church constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Second St. Michael’s Church constructed (Wrangell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Russian Bishop’s House completed (Etholen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Seminary Building east of Russian Bishop’s House completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral consecrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Trinity Church consecrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 1850</td>
<td>Second St. Michael’s Church taken down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Trinity Church desecrated during Tlingit insurrection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Trinity Church reconsecrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Seminary building becomes Russian-American Company Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Alaska purchased by U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Former seminary building/RAC Hospital becomes U.S. property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Trinity Church taken down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Former seminary building destroyed by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Schoolhouse built east of the Russian Bishop’s House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Building No. 105 moved to present location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>HABS documentation of St. Michael’s Cathedral completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral destroyed by fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Russian Bishop’s House purchased by NPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Reconstructed St. Michael’s Cathedral reconsecrated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.11.7. Chronology of significant dates in Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical history in Sitka.

SEPTEMBER 2014, APRIL 2015, AND SEPTEMBER 2016 FIELD VISITS SUMMARY

Organization of the Sitka Field Visits Summary

Because of the diverse character and geographic separation of the elements that compose the Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical resources of Sitka, and because Sitka provides the immediate interpretive context of the Russian Bishop’s House, each site is examined in a separate section. Unlike the organization of material from other visited sites, the field analysis is divided into five individual sections. The five sites are:

1. Cathedral of St. Michael the Archangel
2. The site of two former St. Michael’s Churches
3. The site of the Trinity or Kolosh church

There were also a number of additional schools located around Sitka, mostly RAC, but also at least one church school for Tlingit students on church land near the Trinity cemetery (Kan 1999a, 189). More study is needed to determine the locations of these resources, providing information not included here.
4. The cemeteries
5. The Russian Bishop’s House

The Russian Bishop’s House will be discussed separately in Chapter 8.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of each section (Figures 4.11.24, 35, 57 and 68). All other photographs were taken by Helen Erickson.

Schematic diagrams for Sitka (unlike other visited sites) are based on maps from City & Borough of Sitka, Alaska, Web GIS Maps and Online Property Information (http://www.mainstreetmaps.com/ak/sitka/public.asp).

Cathedral of St. Michael the Archangel

St. Michael’s Cathedral stands in the middle of the city (Figure 4.11.2), at the head of the main street (Lincoln Street), on a small rise, surrounded by streets and framed by other buildings (Figures 4.11.9, 10, 11 and 12). Early photographs reveal dirt streets and boardwalks (Figures 4.11.11 and 20). In contrast to the fenced churchyards seen in the majority of field sites visited in this study, here there is no distinction made here between churchyard and street (Figures 4.11.11 and 13), except for an entrance fence (Figures 4.11.11 and 13) – which may serve as protection for the porch of the side chapel. Adjacent properties are fenced (Figures 4.11.13 and 15), but not the area immediately surrounding the cathedral. St. Michael’s processional path makes use of the public street (Figures 4.11.11, 13 and 16). No graves are visible around the church in the historic photos examined. Since the reconstruction of the cathedral, however, the grave of Sergei Kostromitinov (+1915), long-time church warden and later cathedral archpriest, who had been buried beneath the floor of the cathedral porch, was relocated to the southwest corner of the cathedral. His grave is marked by a cross. Today rolled curbing sets off a small area for decorative plantings around the south, east and north sides of the Cathedral (Figures 4.11.16 and 18).

Lincoln Street – the main street of Sitka – leads upward from the harbor to the high point of the cathedral (Figures 4.11.11 and 12). Here the street splits to right and left around the building, and descends downwards to the

Figure 4.11.8. Processional routes in Sitka.
water on the other side (Figures 4.11.17 and 18). The cathedral is built on a slope running north/south (Figures 4.11.12 and 13), which falls rather sharply southwards towards the water and ascends steeply northwards towards the cemetery, which is slightly less than half a mile distant by means of city streets.

Processions through the streets (Figures 4.11.19 and 20) linked St. Michael’s Cathedral and the Annunciation house church to the cemeteries, the Trinity Church and the harbor (Figure 4.11.8). Banners with icons of Annunciation and St. Nicholas Day (Figure 4.11.21) in the cathedral and in the Russian Bishop’s House suggest that these feasts were processional occasions. Processions provided a way to link disparate geographic elements of the town to the church.

Bells are another way in which the presence of the church is broadcast to the wider world. St. Michael’s Cathedral has an outstanding set of bells, today rung by trained bellringer Ana Dittmar (Figures 4.11.22 and 23).
Figure 4.11.11. St. Michael's Cathedral, looking east, 1890.

Figure 4.11.12. St. Michael's Cathedral, looking east, September 2016.
Figure 4.11.13. St. Michael's Cathedral, looking south, 1886.

Figure 4.11.14. St. Michael's Cathedral, looking south, 1897.
Historic Ecclesiastical Landscapes Study – Sitka National Historical Park

Figure 4.11.15. St. Michael’s Cathedral, looking southwest, before 1896.

Figure 4.11.16. St. Michael’s Cathedral, looking southwest, September 2016.
Figure 4.11.17. St. Michael's Cathedral, looking west, 1898.

Figure 4.11.18. St. Michael's Cathedral, looking west, September 2016.
Figure 4.11.19. Annunciation Day procession, facing west, ca. 1890s.

Figure 4.11.20. Religious procession, ca. 1886-1890.
Figure 4.11.21. Processional banner of St. Nicholas, located in the Russian Bishop's House, September 2014.

Figure 4.11.22. St. Michael's Cathedral bells, September 2016.

Figure 4.11.23. St. Michael's Cathedral bells, September 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ca. 1890</td>
<td>Thomas Jackson and Anna Ruth Chandler</td>
<td>Early Prints of Alaska. Photograph, ca. 1870-1920. ASL-PCA-297</td>
<td>ASL-P297-028</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/21669/rec/49">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/21669/rec/49</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.11</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>William Howard Case</td>
<td>Photographs, ca. 1890-1920</td>
<td>ASL-P226-361</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/1021/rec/2">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/1021/rec/2</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.13</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ASL-P339-15</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/534/rec/53">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/534/rec/53</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.14</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Winter &amp; Pond</td>
<td>Photographer s in Alaska, ca. 1878-1919. ASL-PCA-341</td>
<td>ASL-P341-Alberstone-3</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/14867/rec/54">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/14867/rec/54</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.15</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral</td>
<td>1867-1896</td>
<td>Ruben Albertstone</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASL-P341-Alberstone-3</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/14867/rec/54">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/14867/rec/54</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.17</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Cook’s Inlet Exploring Expedition led by Edwin F. Glenn on behalf of the U.S. Army</td>
<td></td>
<td>UAA-hmc-0116</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/3625/rec/52">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/3625/rec/52</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site of Former St. Michael’s Churches

The first and second Russian Orthodox churches in Sitka, both dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel, were erected in the same location, some 200 yards from the Baranov Castle on the next high point to the east along the shoreline (Figures 4.11.25, 26, 27 and 29). The sketch of the first church at the site (Figure 4.11.28) suggests that it was raised, perhaps to avoid flooding at high tides. The raised walkway also would have provided a processional route around the building. The second church on the same site, built on orders of Governor Wrangell, was likewise raised (Figures 4.11.30 and 31). The churchyard was not surrounded by a fence, although there were graves nearby (note the cross in Figure 4.11.33).

After St. Michael’s Cathedral was consecrated in 1848, the old church was removed (Figure 4.11.32) and the altar area covered by a typical shrine (Figure 4.11.33). When this shrine was removed is unknown, but photographic evidence suggests that it or a subsequent replacement remained on site into the late 19th century.

St. Michael’s Cathedral was built approximately 100 yards to the north, a site easily visible from the older church (Figure 4.11.34). A survey of this study’s field visit sites reveals that new churches were usually built close to older ones, so the location of the Cathedral near the old St. Michael’s Church is a typical practice noted in Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical resources in Alaska as a whole.
Figure 4.11.26. View of the site of the St. Michael’s Churches from Castle Hill, looking east, September 2016.

Figure 4.11.27. View of the site of the St. Michael’s Churches, from Harbor Drive, looking east, September 2016.
Figure 4.11.28. Sketch of the first St. Michael’s Church, probably looking east, June or July 1827.

Figure 4.11.29. Plan of Sitka, ca. 1836.
Figure 4.11.30. View of Sitka with Castle at left and St. Michael’s Church at right, looking northwest, between 1833 and 1835.

Figure 4.11.31. View of Sitka, with St. Michael’s Church middle right and Castle far right, looking south, between 1843 and 1845.
Figure 4.11.32. View of Sitka with empty area where second St. Michael’s Church stood, Cathedral in background, looking north, no earlier than 1850.

Figure 4.11.33. Shrine at site of early St. Michael’s Churches, looking west/southwest towards the Castle, before 1894.
Figure 4.11.34. St. Michael’s Cathedral from the location of earlier St. Michael’s Churches, looking north, September 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.28</td>
<td>Sketch of first St. Michael’s Church</td>
<td>June or July 1827</td>
<td>Friedrich Heinrich von Kittlitz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arndt and Pierce 2003, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.29</td>
<td>Sitka plan</td>
<td>Ca.1836</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arndt and Pierce 2003, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.30</td>
<td>View of Sitka</td>
<td>Between 1833 and 1835</td>
<td>Unidentified Artist</td>
<td>Wrangell Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arndt and Pierce 2003, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.31</td>
<td>View of Sitka</td>
<td>Between 1843 and 1845</td>
<td>Possibly John Bartram</td>
<td>Etholen Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arndt and Pierce 2003, 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4.11.32</td>
<td>View of Sitka</td>
<td>No earlier than 1850</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Hudson’s Bay Company Archives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arndt and Pierce 2003, 139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site of Holy Trinity (Kolosh) Church

The church of the Holy Trinity was dedicated by Bishop Innocent in 1849 to accommodate Tlingit Orthodox, prudently avoiding large gatherings of potentially hostile natives in centrally located St. Michael’s Cathedral. Sited on the bluff behind the Tlingit village (Figures 4.11.2, 46, 47, 48, 49 and 50) the small church straddled the Russian palisade to the north of the town, so that the west door led into the Tlingit village, and the south door led into the fortified Russian town. After the reconsecration of the church in 1857, the western door leading to the Tlingit village was kept closed – at least for a time, presumably for security reasons - and all visitors entered from the south (Kan 1999a, 144). Following complaints about its condition, the church was removed in 1875.

Because the church was essentially built into the wall of the palisade, there could be no processional route around the church, and drawings (Figures 4.11.6, 38 and 39) indicate that in addition the churchyard was not set off by a fence, a typical practice noted at many other sites visited in this study. There is scattered evidence of a cemetery in this area antedating the church, and burials apparently continued to take place both inside and outside the walls.

Drawings and one photograph (Figures 4.11.38, 39, 40 and 41) reveal that the the small symmetrical church had a door to the west and an altar area to the east. It had at least two doors – one with a single panel to the west and one with a double panel to the south. There was a porch roof above the south door. To the northwest of the west door
was a freestanding bell tower. Historic photographs and drawings of the high bluff on which the church was sited (Figures 4.11.38 and 39) indicate a relatively gentle descent to south and east. Today these slopes fall off more sharply (Figures 4.11.45, 46, 47 and 48) due to excavation to provide level ground for the construction of a building and parking on Seward Street and the introduction and/or widening of a road (Marine Street). The remaining flat area on the top of the ridge provided a level location for the church (Figure 4.11.50).

When the church was taken down, the altar area was covered by a shrine (Chubarov 1908)\(^3\). This original shrine was replaced with a new one in 1907 by the St. Nikolai church brotherhood (Figure 4.11.43).

Then, in 1871[1872?], His Grace Ioann [John Mitropol’skii] had it taken apart due to its age and uselessness and used the lumber to renovate St. Michael the Archangel Cathedral, and where the altar of the dismantled church had stood, he placed a small chapel as a memorial and placed a cross [Figure 4.11.42] in it, which had been under the altar of the former church and which attested to the events of its second consecration. The inscription on it read: "This Holy Altar and Temple in the Name of the Most Holy and Living Trinity, by God’s Sufferance, was destroyed and desecrated by the Kolosh on March 11, 1855. With the Blessing of the Archpastor, His Eminence, Archbishop Innokentii, by God’s Grace, it was once more Consecrated on February 2, 1857, on the day of Presentation of our Lord at the Temple, on Saturday. Cathedral Protopriest Petr Litvintsev, Hieromonk Vonifatii, Priest Georgii Vinokouroff, Protodeacon Petr Berdennikov and Subdeacon Nikolai Chechentsev performed the Sacred Rite of Consecration." This past summer, the St. Nikolai Brotherhood took upon itself the labor of replacing the decrepit chapel with a new one (Chubarov 1908, tr. Nina Bogdan).

By the 1950s another shrine had been raised on the site, this one taking the form of a church (Figure 4.11.44). At some later point this third shrine was provided with a roof (Figures 4.11.50 and 51). Its orientation is identical to that of the Cathedral, suggesting that it may well mark the site of the 1907 shrine and hence the location of the former Trinity Church altar. The present shrine (Figure 4.11.51), however, does not appear to represent any of the former St. Michael’s Churches, the Trinity Church, or the Cathedral, and it is quite different from the usual cubic shrines designed to cover former altar areas. Further investigation of its provenance is needed.

A cemetery surrounded this church, probably stretching northwest and northeast across today’s Marine Street. The 1836 grave of Anna Netsvetov, wife of the Creole priest Jacob Netsvetov, is located some 140 yards northwest (Figure 4.11.56). To the east of the shrine is the 1862 grave of Nadezhda Vinokouroff (Figures 4.11.44 and 55), wife of Russian priest Fr. Georgii Vinokouroff, resident of the Russian Bishop’s House (Pierce 1990, 528-529). To the south is the 1848 grave of Aleksandr Gavrilov (Figures 4.11.53 and 54), a Russian navigator related through marriage to American naturalist John Bartram (Pierce 1990, 157-158). There is one other marked grave in this area with a

---

\(^3\) The two photographs included in this article (Figures 4.11.42 and 43) were taken by E.W. Merrill and published in the *Russian Orthodox American Messenger*. 

---
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faded inscription remaining to be deciphered, and another (Figure 4.11.52) in such poor condition as to be undecipherable. Other graves, marked by crosses, appear in the photograph of the 1907 shrine (Figure 4.11.43).

If Fr. Netsvetov was buried “at the entry to the church” (Netsvetov 1984, xx) in 1863, it was a mark of distinction. As we have noted at other field sites, clergy and others closely involved with the church are often buried near the entrance, or outside the east end of the building (nearest the altar area). Given the date, this would mean the south entrance. When more is learned about the construction and position of the shrine now on the site - in particular whether or not it was built on the location of the 1907 shrine - it will provide important information about the location of the Trinity Church altar, the church itself, and Netsvetov’s grave.

In 2015 an investigation of this area employed ground-penetrating radar was begun, but other than determining that there are burials present on this site, results were inconclusive (Urban 2015). If the shrine present on the site today does in fact mark the site of the altar of the Trinity Church, Netsvetov’s grave may lie to the south.

Figure 4.11.37. Facade design approved for the Trinity Church, looking north, 1846.
Figure 4.11.38. Voznesenski’s drawing of the Trinity Church, looking northeast, 1843-45.

Figure 4.11.39. The Trinity Church and palisade, looking north, 1868.
Figure 4.11.40. The Trinity Church in 1855 reproduced according to the memories of long-time residents (showing holes on the south side from Russian cannon balls), facing north, 1855.

Figure 4.11.41. Only known photo of Trinity Church, from BLM signage at Blockhouse site, facing north, 1868.
Figure 4.11.42. Wooden cross attesting to the restoration of the Trinity Church in 1857.

Figure 4.11.43. Shrine marking the altar location of Trinity Church, put in place by the St. Nikolai Brotherhood, looking southeast with Cathedral in background, 1907.
Figure 4.11.44. View of the grave of Nadezhda Vinokouroff (+1862) at the Trinity Church site with shrine at upper left, looking northwest, ca. 1950s.

Figure 4.11.45. View down Marine Street, past the site of Nadezhda Vinokouroff’s grave, looking north, September 2016.
Figure 4.11.46. View of Trinity Church site from Marine Street, looking northwest, September 2016.

Figure 4.11.47. View of Trinity Church site, looking north from Castle Hill, April 2015.
Figure 4.11.48. View of Trinity Church site, reconstructed blockhouse at upper left, looking north from Seward Street, April 2015.

Figure 4.11.49. View from Trinity Church site to harbor, reconstructed blockhouse on right, looking southwest, September 2016.
Figure 4.11.50. Trinity Church site with shrine in center, Cathedral in background right, looking east/southeast, September 2016.

Figure 4.11.51. Shrine at Trinity Church site, looking northwest, April 2015.
Figure 4.11.52. Damaged grave marker at Trinity Church site, looking west, April 2015.

Figure 4.11.53. Grave of Aleksandr Gavrilov (+1848) at the Trinity Church site, looking west, April 2015.

Figure 4.11.54. Fence surrounding Aleksandr Gavrilov's grave at the Trinity Church site, facing southwest, April 2015.
Figure 4.11.55. Grave of Nadezhda Vinokouroff (+1862), with Trinity site shrine in background, looking west, September 2016.

Figure 4.11.56. Grave of Anna Netsvetov (+1836) in old cemetery area north of the Trinity Church site, looking east, September 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Creator</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.11.37</td>
<td>Plan and facade for the construction of a wooden church in Novoarkhangelsk for the Kolosh [Tlingits], April 28, 1846. Oversize 5/12 Sitka, Alaskan Russian Church Archives, Manuscript Division (18)</td>
<td>Before April 28, 1846</td>
<td></td>
<td>Library of Congress: Alaska Russian Church Archives, Manuscript Division</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/russch3.html">https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/russch3.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.38</td>
<td>Kolosh church</td>
<td>1843-45</td>
<td>Voznesenskii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kan 1999a, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.40</td>
<td>Trinity Church</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chubarov 1908, 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.41</td>
<td>Trinity Church</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BLM Signage at Blockhouse Site, Sitka⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.42</td>
<td>Wooden cross</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>E.W. Merrill</td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chubarov 1908, 111; STIK 26160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.43</td>
<td>Shrine</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>E.W. Merrill</td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chubarov 1908, 112; STIK 25601</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ Attributed by BLM to Bancroft Library collection, but Bancroft Library staff report this is an error.
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The Cemeteries

Every church visited in this field study has an associated cemetery. Churches in urban locations eventually developed burial grounds away from the church, often in areas considered waste land because of the topography or otherwise outside the built-up area. The major part of Sitka’s Russian cemetery is located in a hilly area behind the old Tlingit Village along the water (Figures 4.11.58 and 59), and over time the more level and buildable areas - along Marine Street and Seward street, for example – were carved out for building lots. The history of properties initially owned by the Russian Orthodox Church in Sitka and their dispossession is complicated, ranging from questionable financial dealings to outright usurpation, an area for future study.

A photo from the early years of the 20th century reveals graves in the area of the former St. Michael’s Church (Figure 14.11.33). It seems likely that the Trinity Church (1849) was constructed in an area which already contained burials, including Anna Netsvetov’s 1836 grave (Figure 4.11.56). The recognizable graves to the south and east of the church postdate its construction (Figures 4.11.52, 53 and 54), but they follow the expected traditions of churchyard burials. These graves, like the majority of those in the larger area of the cemetery to the east of Marine Street, appear to be oriented more to accommodate the hilly topography rather than to face liturgical east as indicated by the cathedral.

A small area at the south end of the larger cemetery east of Marine Street was set aside for Lutherans, who dedicated it in 1841 (Harjunpaa 1968, 136). The grave of Princess Maksutov (Figure 4.11.60), the first wife of Alaska’s last Russian American governor, Dmitrii Maksutov, is located here.
The burials in the major section of the cemetery to the east (Figures 4.11.61 - 67) reflect a variety of religious practices. This is typical of urban cemeteries in places such as Sitka, Juneau and Kodiak, reflecting the greater diversity of an urban population. Orthodox and Roman crosses are common, and in addition to personalizing items such as flowers and teddy bears, there are clan insignias on a number of the graves (Figure 4.11.66 and 67). Some graves are surrounded by fences in the Russian manner, while others are not.

The upheaval of the ground caused by alternate freezing and thawing, along with the aggressive root growth of the enormous spruce trees that dominate the area, has toppled crosses and headstones and disrupted the concrete borders that surround many graves (Figure 4.11.65).

Figure 4.11.59. View of Tlingit village with wooded cemetery and Russian blockhouse in the hills behind (right), looking north, ca. 1880.
Figure 4.11.60. Grave of Princess Maksutov (+1881), looking west to blockhouse reconstruction across Marine Street, September 2016.

Figure 4.11.61. Cemetery with central path to right, facing north, September 2016.
Figure 4.11.62. Cemetery, looking northwest, September 2016.

Figure 4.11.63. Russian cross marking grave, September 2014.

Figure 4.11.64. Grave marker of a president of the St. Nicolas Brotherhood, Sitka, September 2014.
Figure 4.11.65. Condition of older graves in cemetery, September 2014.

Figure 4.11.66. Shells on grave, suggesting a clan association, September 2014.

Figure 4.11.67. Figurines of frogs on grave, suggesting a clan association, September 2014.
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Figure 4.11.68. Sources of historic photographs (Cemeteries).
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The ecclesiastical properties are located between the Illiliuk River and Illiliuk Bay on a narrow strip of land some few feet above sea level (Figure 4.11.1). Across the river to the southwest a hill rises sharply to 200’, to the northeast is the bay. The cathedral can be seen from every location in the immediately surrounding area. To the northwest of the former site of the school is a commercial property; to the southeast is a residential area (Figures 4.11.3, 4 and 5).

The cathedral is oriented to the southeast, following the geographic formation of the narrow strip of the land between the river and the bay (Figure 4.11.2). The graves in the churchyard follow the orientation of the church. Important graves are located near the porch (at the northeast corner of the entrance) and to the east of the building.
In addition to the cemetery surrounding the cathedral, there is a second cemetery on a hillside about a half mile to the east (Figure 4.11.4). This cemetery contains a significant number of graves marked with Orthodox crosses along with burial monuments from other traditions. Here topography appears to be the most important factor in the orientation of the graves, although a historic photograph (Figure 4.11.16) indicates that graves were more traditionally oriented to the east in the past.

**BRIEF HISTORY** (Hoagland 1989 and 1990, Smith 1984)

Fedor Burenin, manager of the Russian-American Company, constructed the first Unalaska church in 1808, on the east side of town. It is possible that this location is where the subsequent churches were built, but this is unknown. This early church was replaced in 1825-26 by a church designed by Ioann Veniaminov (later Bishop Innocent). Under the leadership of priest Innokentii Shaiashnikov, in 1858 the existing church was built, to the south of Veniaminov’s church (Figures 4.11.6 and 7). Photographs from this period show the burial monument of Bishop Nestor (Zass, +1882) in the corner where the church meets the porch.

With the construction of the Shaiashnikov church, the location of Veniaminov’s church was marked by an altar shrine to its north (Figure 7.11-6). When the church was later expanded to a cathedral with three altars in 1894-96, the altar of Veniaminov’s earlier church was incorporated into a side chapel dedicated to St. Innocent of Irkutsk (Figure 7.11.8).

By the mid nineteenth century Unalaska was an extensive parish with some seventeen associated chapels, a place of importance. During the 1880s Bishop Nestor (Zass) mounted a campaign for better clergy housing. Under his leadership the Alaska Commercial Company built both a rectory (also called the Bishop’s House) and a school in 1882 (Figures 7.11.9, 13, 14 and 15). Bishop Nestor died at sea later that year, and his body is buried north of the church entrance (Figures 4.11.6 and 7). Subsequently the school and rectory were joined to create a large complex which included an orphanage/schoolhouse, along with housing for teachers and the church reader (Figures 7.11.13 and 14). A 1908 survey map (Figure 4.11.3) – erroneously included in the National Register Nomination for the Kenai church (Smith 1985) – maps and identifies the structures present at that point in time.

Perhaps until World War II there was no road along the Illiliuk River, other than the road or boardwalks running in front of the rectory and school (Figures 7.11.9 and 10). Bank reinforcements suggest that erosion along the river was an ongoing problem. A boardwalk also linked the church to the road along Illiliuk Bay (Figure 4.11.12).

In 1960 a fire destroyed the school complex to the west of the rectory (Figure 4.11.15).
The churchyard also served as a cemetery, although at some point a larger cemetery was established a half mile away (Figures 7.11.15 and 16).

Beginning in 1893, Alaska consisted of two deaneries – Sitka and Unalaska. The parallels between the two sites are striking, including as they do a cathedral and a school intended as a seminary.

World War II was not kind to the cathedral. The Unalaska population was forcibly evacuated to Southeastern Alaska, and the church was considerably damaged during the war years.

In 1970 the church was designated a National Historic Landmark.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.11.17).

Figure 4.11. 3. Detail from U.S. Survey Map, 1908.
Figure 4.11. 4. Overview of site, looking north, 1983.

Figure 4.11. 5. Overview of site (detail), looking north, 1983.
Figure 4.11. 6. Shiashnikov church, looking southeast, ca. 1885.

Figure 4.11. 7. Shiashnikov church (left) and customs house (right), facing south, 1894.
Figure 4.11. 8. Cathedral, looking southeast, ca. 1910.

Figure 4.11. 9. Church complex, looking east, ca. 1910.
Figure 4.11. 10. Cathedral, looking northeast, ca. 1910.

Figure 4.11. 11. Cathedral, looking south, 1917.
Figure 4.11. 12. Cathedral with gate and boardwalk, looking east, 1923.

Figure 4.11. 13. Front of rectory and school, looking northwest, ca. 1907.
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Figure 4.11. 14. Back of shed, rectory and school, looking southwest, possibly 1892-1883.

Figure 4.11. 15. Rectory after 1960 fire which destroyed the school, looking southeast, 1961.
Figure 4.11.6. Cemetery, facing east, 1939.
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<td>4.11.3</td>
<td>Map detail</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>U.S. Survey Map</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
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<td>Smith 1985</td>
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<td>4.11.4</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Barbara S. Smith</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
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<td>Smith 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11.5</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Barbara S. Smith</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smith 1985</td>
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<td>4.11.8</td>
<td>Cathedral</td>
<td>Ca. 1910</td>
<td>Nowell Photo</td>
<td>Anchorage Historical and Fine Arts Museum</td>
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<td>Smith 1985</td>
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<tr>
<td>4.11.9</td>
<td>School, rectory, cathedral</td>
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<td>P.S. Hunt</td>
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The church complex is set on a low rise between the Illiliuk Bay to the northeast and the Illiliuk River to the south (Figures 4.11.18 and 19). Across the river a steep slope offers some protection from the weather, which is no doubt why the rectory and school turned their backs to the sea. Visible from most vantage points on the coast and on the adjacent island of Dutch Harbor, the setting is dramatic.

The churchyard rises sharply from the river on one side and the bay on the other. A parking lot separates the church from the rectory to the west, taking up the area formerly occupied by the customs house. On each side of the church property is a road; the road to the south was installed fairly recently – perhaps during World War II and certainly by the 1980s - although an exact date has not been determined. The installation of the road required a retaining wall that runs along the south side of the churchyard (Figures 7.11.26 and 27). Even before the construction of the road, the river appears to have eroded its bank, causing concerns about the stability of the church site (Figures 7.11.9 and 10). Although the road has narrowed the churchyard to the south of the cathedral, there is sufficient room to maintain the processional pathway around the church.

The churchyard is surrounded by a picket fence and arched entrance gate (Figures 7.11.20 and 27), which has been moved west by some 70 feet within the last few years to increase the churchyard area (the older fence line ran along the row of spruces planted across the entrance to the churchyard; see Figure 4.11.18). Originally the churchyard was not fenced (Figures 7.11.6 and 7), but by 1910 photographs (Figure 7.11.9) show a fence and an arched gate. A boardwalk leads up to the church from Bayview Avenue (Figure 4.11.12 and 13). Today the church is entered from the north and south sides of the porch. To the right are steps and to the left is an ADA ramp (Figure 4.11.21).

Spruces line the fence on the north side of the property (4.11.31). The area surrounding the graves is mowed, and mown pathways make it possible to walk between them (Figures 7.11.28, 29 and 30). The graves themselves are overgrown with wild rose and salmon berry; and a small marguerite daisy, originally planted at one grave by Kathy Gregory (Gregory July 25, 2015), has naturalized and spread throughout the churchyard.
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(Figure 4.11.32). Some graves are fenced, but others are not. A photograph from 1894 shows fenced graves (Figure 4.11.8). Crosses are the typical three bar and the flowering varieties. No capped crosses were seen here. The burials in this churchyard have been carefully documented by Marti Murray (Murray 1997).

The graves of important figures in the history of the church are situated in places of honor near the church. The grave of Bishop Nestor (Zass) is marked by a stone monument at the inside corner of the north side of the bell tower (Figure 4.11.34). Fr. Innokentii Shaiaishnikov’s grave is at the east end of the churchyard, outside the main altar of the church (4.11.33). Near the former entrance gate (before the fence was moved to the west) is a 2005 monument commemorating Fr. Peter Bourdukofsky – a monument, not a grave marker (Figure 4.11.35). Fr. Peter, who was much loved by this parish, is buried on St. Paul Island.

Figure 4.11. 18. Schematic plan of ecclesiastical resources in Unalaska (Google Earth 2005)
Spruces growing in a line approximate 70 feet east of today’s western fence line indicate that the churchyard was recently expanded in that direction (Figure 4.11.18). This was confirmed by several of the parishioners.

Across the parking lot to the west is the rectory. Like the church, it is set on the elevated isthmus above the beach (Figures 4.11.23, 24 and 25). Beyond the rectory is an empty lot where the school formerly stood.

Approximately a half mile to the east of the cathedral is a cemetery that contains a significant number of graves marked by Orthodox crosses (Figure 4.11.36). As is typical of the Russian Orthodox cemeteries outside churchyards visited during this study, it is set on a fairly steep hillside. Today the orientation of the graves varies – apparently determined by topography - although many are oriented to the east. A historic photograph suggests that this cemetery is much larger than it appears to be today, and that the majority of crosses at that time were oriented in the traditional manner (Figure 4.11.16). There may be a significant number of unmarked graves in this area. The cemetery and the cathedral are visually linked (Figures 7.11.19 and 37).

Near the end of Summer Bay Road is a solitary grave with a large boulder and cross (Figure 4.11.38).

Another resource in this area that helps to tell the Unalaska story is the Sitka Spruce Plantation, a National Historic Landmark located across the bridge in Dutch Harbor (Figure 4.11.39). Wood is a scare commodity on Unalaska, and efforts to create a reserve of Sitka spruce trees was typical of the Russian efforts to make the Alaska venture more sustainable. This project would have been of great interest to Veniaminov, who almost certainly had a hand in it.
Figure 4.11. 19. Ecclesiastical complex, with rectory left, cathedral right and cemetery in right background, looking east, July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 20. Cathedral and churchyard, looking east, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 21. West cathedral entrance with ADA ramp left and stairs right, looking east, April 2015.

Figure 4.11. 22. View of cathedral from beach, looking southeast, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 23. Rectory from Bayview Road, looking southwest, July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 24. View of cathedral and rectory, looking east down Bayview Road, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 25. View of cathedral and rectory from Summer Bay Road, looking south, July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 26. View of rectory (left) and cathedral (right) with Illiliuk River in foreground, looking northwest, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 27. View of cathedral and churchyard with Illiliuk Bay in the background, looking northeast, July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 28. Expanded churchyard area, looking northeast, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 29. Churchyard cemetery, looking southeast, July 2016.

Figure 4.11. 30. Churchyard cemetery, looking northeast, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 31. Spruces lining the north side of the churchyard, looking northeast, July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 32. Churchyard vegetation, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 33. Grave marker for Fr. Inokentii Shiashnikov (+1883), July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 34. Grave marker for Bishop Nestor (Zass, +1882), July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 35. Memorial for Fr. Peter Bourdukovsky (+2005), July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 36. Cemetery, looking southeast, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 37. Cemetery, looking west towards the cathedral, July 2015.

Figure 4.11. 38. Solitary grave, looking west, near the end of Summer Bay Road, July 2015.
Figure 4.11. 39. Sitka spruce plantation, looking southwest, July 2015.
GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The hermitage and Sts. Sergius and Herman of Valaam Chapel are located in the woods about a half mile above a beach. Located southwest of Ouzinkie, it is almost due north of Kodiak (Figure 4.13.1). Unlike other ecclesiastical landscapes described in this study, this site is a focus of pilgrimage rather than a parish church. A pilgrim may reach the chapel by water from either Kodiak or Ouzinkie, or by foot (~ 7 miles) along a trail from Ouzinkie. In either case the journey is a significant factor in the perception of this landscape.

BRIEF HISTORY (Hoagland 1989e, Korsun 2012, Kreta and Mongin 1979, Oleksa 1992))

One of the earliest missionaries to Alaska, Fr. Herman came to Kodiak in 1794 with nine other monks from the Valaam monastery in Russia to begin missionary work with the native population. After ten years of active service, he withdrew to Spruce Island, which he called “New Valaam” (Oleksa 1987, 305), to found an orphanage and live a monastic life. He died in 1836. He was canonized by the Orthodox Church as America’s first Orthodox saint in 1970.

Several chapels have been constructed here. In 1857 a chapel was built by the Russian-American Company, but by 1895 it was in ruins. In 1898 Bishop Tikhon (Bellavin) ordered today’s chapel to be built over the graves of Fr. Herman and another monk (Hieromonk Ioasaf). In ruins at the turn of the century, it was later rebuilt by Archimandrite Gerasim Schmaltz (Figures 7.12-2 and 3).
Born in Russia in 1888, Fr. Gerasim served at Sitka, Kodiak and Afognak before moving to Spruce Island in 1935 to devote his life to the memory of Fr. Herman and maintain his grave. He renovated the chapel and built a small house and a smaller private chapel. In addition, from 1935 to 1967 he was the priest at the Church of the Nativity at Ouzinkie, on the other side of Spruce Island, leaving only in 1967, when his health failed. Fr. Gerasim died in 1969.

When Fr. Herman was canonized, his remains were moved to Holy Resurrection Church in Kodiak.

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this section (Figure 4.13.11).

Figure 4.13.2. Chapel at Spruce Island, south side.
Figure 4.13.3. Early photograph of chapel attached to photograph of remodeled chapel.
Figure 4.13.4. Fr. Gerasim’s chapel (left) and cell (right).

Figure 4.13.5. Fr. Gerasim standing on the beach at Monks Lagoon.
Figure 4.13.6. Fr. Gerasim's chapel, 1989.

Figure 4.13.7. Fr. Gerasim's cell, 1989.
Figure 4.13.8. Fr. Gerasim’s cell and grave.

Figure 4.13.9. Well house, 1989.
Figure 4.13.10. Chapel before 2004 renovation.
| Figure 4.13.2 | Chapel at Spruce Island |  |  | Michael Z. Vinokouroff Photograph Collection, ca. 1880’s-1970’s. PCA 243. | PCA 243. | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5364/rec/3 |
| Figure 4.13.3 | Chapel at Spruce Island |  |  | Michael Z. Vinokouroff Photograph Collection, ca. 1880’s-1970’s. PCA 243 | ASL-P243-2-208 and asl-p243-2-208a | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5368/rec/15 |
| Figure 4.13.4 | Fr. Gerasim’s cell and chapel |  |  | Michael Z. Vinokouroff Photograph Collection, ca. 1880’s-1970’s. PCA 243 | ASL-P243-2-191 | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5346/rec/10 |
| Figure 4.13.5 | Fr. Gerasim on Spruce Island beach |  |  | Michael Z. Vinokouroff Photograph Collection, ca. 1880’s-1970’s. PCA 243 | ASL-P243-2-204 | http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdm21/id/5362/rec/18 |
| Figure 4.13.6 | Fr. Gerasim’s chapel | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-52 | https://www.loc.gov/item/ak0275/ |
| Figure 4.13.7 | Fr. Gerasim’s cell | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-52 | https://www.loc.gov/item/ak0275/ |
| Figure 4.13.8 | Fr. Gerasim’s cell and grave | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-52 | https://www.loc.gov/item/ak0275/ |
| Figure 4.13.9 | Well house | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-52 | https://www.loc.gov/item/ak0275/ |
| Figure 4.13.10 | Chapel before 2004 renovation | 1989 | Jet Lowe | Library of Congress | HABS AK-52 | https://www.loc.gov/item/ak0275/ |

Figure 4.13.11. Sources of historic photographs.
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Travel to the site was by skiff from Kodiak, but a subsequent brief exploration of the trail to Ouzinkie suggested that it is a viable alternate route (Figure 4.13.26). The journey, either by sea or by land, is an important aspect of pilgrimage, for there is no immediate access to this site. This sets it apart from the village or urban sites visited in the course of this study. Hermitages, like monasteries, are not a common feature of Russian Orthodoxy in Alaska during the study period, despite considerable effort expended towards their establishment by ecclesiastical authorities.

This site differs from other sites visited in that its two main units are visually separated by the tall trees that surround them (Fr. Gerasim’s cell, private chapel and well, and the main chapel). In addition, unlike village or urban sites, this complex bears the imprint of two individuals who chose to withdraw from the secular world.

Landing was on a beach scattered with driftwood at the high tide line (Figure 4.13.13). Outcrops from the mainland and a small islet protect this curving cove or lagoon (Figure 4.13.12) from the open sea. Our navigator, Fr. Innocent Dresdow, Rector of Holy Resurrection Church in Kodiak, was concerned about incoming weather and remained on the beach with the skiff while we visited the site. His dog, obviously familiar with the trail, accompanied us inland.

The buildings are approximately a quarter mile up from the beach, along a trail surrounded by tall spruce trees. Moss is everywhere. The visitor first reaches a clearing containing a small chapel and Fr. Gerasim’s cell or small house (Figure 4.13.13 and 14). This chapel was intended for Fr. Gerasim’s private use and is located adjacent to his cell. A short walk away is a well house (Figure 4.13.18) that covers the flow from the creek. Boardwalks link the house, the small chapel and the spring, a cluster of three buildings/structures (Figures 4.13.18-20).

Outside Fr. Gerasim’s cell is a small fenced area that was likely a garden (Figures 4.13.16 and 17). A circular metal ring outside the domestic chapel served as a bell (Figure 4.13.20).

Fr. Gerasim’s grave is located east¹ of the house, marked by a cross and a monument stone (Figure 4.13.17 and 21). To the right of his grave is that of Fr. Peter Kreta, son of Fr. Joseph Kreta,² marked in a similar fashion.

A short walk further into the forest leads to the chapel, which is set on a high point in a clearing in the woods (Figures 4.13.22 and 24). Due to lack of foresight on the part of

¹ East in this case means liturgical east, since we had no working compass with us.
² Fr. Joseph Kreta, along with Alfred Mongin, prepared the original survey of the Russian Orthodox Churches of Alaska in 1977-79.
the study team – forgetting to bring a magnetic compass – it was not possible to determine orientation or even specific lat/long data here. The chapel was built above the grave of Fr. Herman, although subsequently his remains were removed to Kodiak (Figure 4.13.23). Aside from renovations to the main chapel and the installation of the exterior bell platform (Figure 4.13.25), little appears to have changed since the 1989 HABS photographs were taken.

Figure 4.13.12. Approach to Spruce Island by water, April 2015.

Figure 4.13.13. Looking towards the water from the beach of Spruce Island, April 2015.
Figure 4.13.14. Trail from the beach to Fr. Gerasim’s chapel (left) and cell (right), April 2015.

Figure 4.13.15. Fr. Gerasim's chapel (left) and cell (right), April 2015.
Figure 4.13.16. Fr. Gerasim’s cell, with fenced area in front (likely a garden), April 2015.

Figure 4.13.17. Fenced enclosure attached to Fr. Gerasim’s cell, with Fr. Gerasim’s grave (left) and Fr. Peter Kreta’s grave (right), April 2015.
Figure 4.13.18. Creek and well house, April 2015.

Figure 4.13.19. Boardwalk linking Fr. Gerasim’s chapel and cell, April 2015.
Figure 4.13.20. Boardwalk outside Fr. Gerasim’s chapel with metal ring, April 2015.
Figure 4.13.21. Fr. Gerasim's grave, April 2015.
Figure 4.13.22. The trail to the Chapel of Saints Sergius and Herman of Valaam with renovated porch, April 2015.
Figure 4.13.23. Crawl space under the chapel where St. Herman was buried.

Figure 4.13.24. East end of the chapel with bell tower at right, April 2015.
Figure 4.13.25. Bells attached to renovated porch, April 2015.
Figure 4.13.26. The trail overland to Ouzinkie, April 2015.
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THE RUSSIAN BISHOP’S HOUSE
HISTORIC CONTEXT

References for all historic images contained in this chapter are listed in Figure 5.00. 15. No reproduction rights have been acquired for these materials, which are included here for reference only.

5.0 BACKGROUND

Acquisition of the Russian Bishop’s House in 1973 provided the National Park Service with an invaluable opportunity to interpret the long Russian presence in North America for a public largely unaware of it. As “the last surviving intact relic of Imperial Russia’s American empire,” the Bishop’s House had the potential to give visitors “a step back in time, to the imperial colonial capital of Russian America, into the quarters of one of the most powerful individuals in the colony, the Bishop of Kamchatka, the Kuriles and the Aleutian Islands” (Suazo 1990, 455). The house, once restored, could “illustrate the special role of the Russian Orthodox Church, state religion of Imperial Russia, in the colonies, and in Russian society.” It could “describe why, on the farthest edge of empire, great detail and expense was lavished on the ‘Bishop’s Palace’” (Suazo 1990, 456).

Given the approach to historic preservation in fashion in the 1970s, it is understandable why the National Park Service opted for restoration of the building to a period – indeed to a year – of particular significance: 1853, the year in which the building, begun in late 1842, was completed as intended and necessary repairs made (Carper 1990, 461). (Ironically, this was also the year in which the building’s most famous resident, Bishop Innocent Veniaminov left for his new home in Yakutsk, Siberia.) As restored, the building – or, more specifically, its main floor – suggests its role as a seat of authority, projecting power after the fashion of Williamsburg’s reconstructed Governor’s Palace.

But in the course its history, the Bishop’s House has been both more and less than a seat of authority. The building itself was intended as a multi-use facility. Over the decades it has served a variety of purposes – some simultaneously, some sequentially. At times it has been the official residence – though not necessarily the dwelling-place – of a bishop. At times it has housed parochial clergy and provided meeting space for parish and community functions. At times it has housed an orphanage or pastoral school or seminary. At times its spare rooms have been rented out for a variety of purposes.

The historic functions of the Bishop’s House connect it to a wider landscape – “landscape” here understood in terms not only topographical but also institutional and metaphorical. The house reflects the development of Orthodox church life on multiple
scales, from the vast expanse of the Russian Empire, to the United States, to Alaska, to the city of Sitka.

5.1 BISHOP INNOCENT VENIAMINOV AND THE BISHOP’S HOUSE

The first and by far the most famous bishop to occupy the Bishop’s House was Innocent Veniaminov. Ordained as bishop of the newly created Diocese of Kamchatka, the Kurile and Aleutian Islands in St. Petersburg in December 1840, he arrived in Sitka at the end of September 1841, after traveling from European Russia overland via Irkutsk to Okhotsk and thence by ship to Alaska. He and his entourage of eleven were initially accommodated in Russian-American Company (RAC) housing while the Chief Manager and Governor Arvid Etholen undertook a construction task that he had not anticipated when he took office in May 1840 (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 98).

Upon the appointment of Bishop Innocent, the RAC’s Main Office in St. Petersburg instructed Etholen to build the new bishop a small house with room for a household church (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 99, 109, 110). Etholen began construction of a significantly larger structure. Perhaps he did so because of his personal esteem for the new bishop, whom he had known since the latter’s years as priest in Sitka (1834-38) and his own as assistant to Chief Manager and Governor Wrangel (1830-35). Perhaps he assumed that a larger structure would accommodate all diocesan functions and personnel (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 99). If so, he was mistaken.

By December 1843 the new house was ready for occupancy, save for exterior sheathing and interior finishing. Bishop Innocent moved in, along with his administrative assistant, or cell-attendant (kellenik), sixteen of the twenty-five students enrolled in the ecclesiastical school (the others lived with relatives in Sitka), the dean of clergy (who doubled as supervisor of the school), the house steward, a lay brother, and four servants – twenty-five persons in all (Arndt 2004, 4; Arndt and Pierce 2003, 123-124). A few days later, on the anniversary of his episcopal ordination (December 15), Bishop Innocent consecrated the household (krestovaia, or stavropegial) Church of the Annunciation. The house, in Bishop Innocent’s estimation, was “in its architecture and in the convenience of the premises.... one of the best, soudest, and most beautiful structures in Novo-Arkhangelsk” (No. 101, January 20, 1844, letter to Overprokurator Protasov, Arndt 2004, 4). His first months in it were perhaps his happiest. Writing to Metropolitan Filaret Drozdov in Moscow, he expressed his joy at having a House of God in his own house, and he described one of his uses for the household church: he had begun to give religious instruction to boys and girls not otherwise enrolled in Sitka schools, girls on Tuesdays, boys on Wednesdays (No. 44, April 5, 1844, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 144; Arndt 2004, 109).
5.2 NEW PROJECTS IN SITKA

The house, though magnificent for its time and place, would not suffice for all of Bishop Innocent’s needs. In October 1844, he informed Etholen of orders from the Holy Synod to establish a full-fledged seminary in Sitka that would consolidate operations of the ecclesiastical school in Petropavlovsk, Kamchatka, with those of the ecclesiastical school operating in the Bishop’s House (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 99-100). With flagging enthusiasm for ecclesiastical projects, Etholen initiated construction of the seminary building on a site just to the east of the Bishop’s House (where the Baranof Elementary School now stands – see Figure 6.8). In a letter to the home office of the RAC, Etholen was already expressing concern about provisioning difficulties that the seminary’s presence in Sitka would create (No. 416, May 15, 1845, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 144). He left completion of the construction project to his successor, Mikhail D. Teben’kov, who took over as Chief Manager and Governor in August 1845. Teben’kov was even less enthusiastic about the project than Etholen had been. Construction dragged on for over a year. Until completion of the new seminary building in October 1846, students and staff from Kamchatka joined students and other personnel in the Bishop’s House. This brought the total number of students to 55, of whom 22 were Russians and 33 were creoles or natives (Arndt 2004, 151). For nearly a year the entire ground floor and one room of the main floor were used for seminary purposes.

Chief Manager Teben’kov faced a number of problems, and the presence of the diocesan see in Sitka was one of them. In addition to the seminary building, Bishop Innocent was requesting a new cathedral (even though, as Teben’kov complained, the present one had been constructed only in 1831); a new church specifically for the Tlingit; and a house for some of the local clergy. The church would be paying for these construction projects, not the RAC, but the church projects would inevitably divert materials and workers from company projects (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 136). Teben’kov was alarmed. Sitka’s population was growing, not with able-bodied company employees but rather with the infirm and disabled, with pensioners, with widows and their children, and – now – with equally unproductive ecclesiastics (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 136-137).

Provisioning also was becoming more difficult and more expensive for Sitka residents, as even Bishop Innocent attested: “At our least obstinacy at the market there immediately may arise, if not a quarrel, then an argument over a piece of venison; and therefore many of our people, and especially the seminarians, receive fresh food only when it is abundant or when there are no buyers” (No. 67, May 1, 1848, letter to Protasov, Arndt 2004, 111). Loss of garden plots on the outskirts of town to ecclesiastical buildings was one of several grievances that Teben’kov communicated to the Main Office (No. 256, May 5, 1846, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 153). A first step to remedying this, he suggested, would be “to get rid of the seminary being established here and the multiplication of the clergy, of whom there are now already about a hundred in the colonies, while one must
expect several more for the seminary and for the staff the bishop proposes for the cathedral” (No. 396, May 5, 1846, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 157). Along the same lines, Teben’kov urged the Main Office
to petition the proper quarter to move the bishopric, due to a shortage of provisions, from Novo-Arkhangel’sk [Sitka] to some other very convenient place which could correspond to its demands... and to leave in Novo-Arkhangel’sk no more than two priests, one strictly for Novo-Arkhangel’sk and the other for the unforeseen circumstance that replacement of a priest should be needed somewhere in the colonies. Entrust missionizing, too, to these priests, but move the bishopric to Yakutsk, as one of the best and closest places for its convenient existence, because neither the colonies nor Kamchatka is in a position to furnish it such conveniences as it needs (No. 424, May 5, 1846, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 162-163).

5.3 RELATIONS WITH THE RUSSIAN-AMERICAN COMPANY

As Teben’kov’s letters suggest, relations between Bishop Innocent and the Russian American Company, as represented by its Chief Manager, were not always harmonious. As a priest in Sitka, Innocent had very amiable relations with Chief Manager and Governor Wrangel, with whom he shared scientific and ethnographic interests. He also had very cordial relations with Etholen, who among other things was supportive of his early plans for educating a cadre of creole and native boys for church service (No. 244, May 9, 1842, Etholen to Veniaminov, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 114). But when Etholen invited Bishop Innocent to move into his new house in 1843, certain questions were not addressed – among them questions concerning ownership and maintenance of the house. Innocent assumed that the house was intended as a donation by the RAC to the church (No. 185, November 15, 1845, letter to Protasov, Arndt 2004, 11; and No.359, September 28, 1845, letter to Teben’kov, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 148-149). That, however, was not the case. As Teben’kov curtly explained to the bishop two years later, the Main Office had transferred the house to him for use only; ownership was retained by the company (Arndt, 2004, 10; Arndt and Pierce 2003, 148). Subsequent correspondence between Innocent and Teben’kov on this matter was polite, but just barely. Especially annoying was determination of financial responsibility for repairs and maintenance.

The disaccord between these two men was symptomatic of an underlying issue. The interests of the Russian-American Company and of the Russian Orthodox Church did not always coincide. The company was a state-chartered monopoly with exclusive rights to the fur trade and other resources in Alaska and adjacent maritime regions. Like the Dutch East Indies Company, the Hudson’s Bay Company and comparable entities, it exercised quasi-governmental power. But as a joint-stock company - Russia’s first – its
shareholders and board of directors expected it to turn a profit and avoid unnecessary expenses. On the other hand, although it was a state institution the Russian Orthodox Church had its own distinct mission that reached beyond the horizons of shareholders in the RAC and even the horizons of the Russian state. As articulated by Bishop Innocent and his associates, this mission included, as its highest priority, evangelization of the native populations, not just service of the religious needs of company personnel or promotion of imperial Russian interests.

5.4 THE BISHOP’S TRAVELS

Although the Bishop’s House in Sitka was Bishop Innocent’s official residence, he spent much of his time traveling around his far-flung diocese. This is what an Orthodox bishop was expected to do. In 1842 he took an unexpectedly arduous trip to Kodiak (February 11 - April 5); because of adverse weather the outbound voyage took 35 days. A month later (May 4), he left Sitka for an inspection tour of his diocese that would take him to Unga, Unalaska, the Pribilofs, Atka, the Commander and Kurile islands, and Kamchatka, where he wintered before returning to Sitka (September 6, 1843). His second tour, from fall 1844 to summer 1845, again took him to Kamchatka, where he arranged for the transfer of the ecclesiastical school at Petropavlovsk to Sitka. His third tour, devoted largely to the Siberian portion of his diocese, stretched from July 1846 to August 1847.

On May 22, 1848, Bishop Innocent began a leisurely voyage on a company supply ship that took him to Unalaska, the Pribilofs, and Mikhailovskii Redoubt (Saint Michael) on Norton Sound. There he raised his old friend Fr. Jacob Netsvetov to the rank of archpriest and ordained one of his assistants, Innokentii Shaiaashnikov, to the priesthood for assignment to Unalaska. After a return trip that took him to the Chukchi Peninsula and Kodiak, Bishop Innocent arrived back in Sitka on September 26. He was there long enough to consecrate the new Cathedral of St. Michael the Archangel on November 20, 1848 (the feast day of St. Michael and All Angels), and the Tlingit Church of the Holy Trinity, also sometimes called the Church of the Holy Resurrection, on April 24, 1849 (the second Tuesday after Easter, celebrated by the Russian Orthodox as “Radonitsa,” or Day of Rejoicing, and devoted to the remembrance of the departed).

The bishop left for yet another Siberian tour on May 15, 1849, sailing first to Aian, Russia’s new port on the Sea of Okhotsk. From there he toured an enlarged diocese in Eastern Siberia. On returning to Aian, he learned that on April 30, 1850, the Holy Synod had raised him to the rank of archbishop and that his diocese had been enlarged still more to include Yakutia. After traveling to Yakutsk, where the Monastery of the Savior would become his new home, he returned to Sitka in fall 1852, for what would be his last sojourn there.1

---

1 Innocent had perhaps intended to visit Alaska for one last time in 1861, but after suffering shipwreck he made his way to Japan, where he celebrated services with the gifted missionary Nicholas Kasatkin, now canonized as St. Nicholas Equal-to-the-Apostles, Archbishop of Japan (Black 1997, 28).
5.5 THE CONSISTORY

During Bishop Innocent’s long absences from Sitka, much of the day-to-day work of the diocese fell to the consistory – a body comprised of senior diocesan clergy serving in assignments in or near the bishop’s cathedral and residence. In the Russian Orthodox Church in the 19th century, the consistory played a major role in actual administration of the diocese, maintaining its records, managing legal and financial affairs, running the office in the bishop’s absence on pastoral visitations, and – in emergency situations – communicating directly with the Overprocurator and other representatives of the Russian state (e.g., following the Alaska Cession, the Russian consulate) (Freeze 1983, 27 et passim).

Archimandrite Misael, dean of clergy, initially headed the Sitka consistory, but for reasons of health he was sent back to Russia in 1845. His successor, Archpriest Peter Litvintsev, was already well acquainted with Alaska, having served on Kodiak for five years before being transferred to Sitka in 1846. In addition to his administrative work, the energetic Litvintsev served as dean of the theological seminary and missionary to the Tlingit until his departure in 1858, when the seminary was transferred to Yakutsk. An 1867 inventory of materials in the consistory office of the Bishop’s House - the many-volume Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire and supplements, the Zertsalo, a portrait of the reigning Emperor Alexander II, filing cabinets, seals and stamps and writing materials – suggests the specialized nature of much of the consistory’s work (Arndt 2004, 79-80). For the ecclesiastical culture of the Russian Orthodox Church in the 19th century, a smoothly running consistory could be as important as a dedicated and caring bishop.

In the Diocese of Kamchatka, the Kurile and Aleutian Islands, the consistory’s responsibilities included various matters relating to the Bishop’s House. Among other things, correspondence for the bishop had either to be held for his arrival or forwarded to him as expeditiously as possible, because his approval was necessary before proceeding on almost any issue. This correspondence included not only requests and reports from clergy but also invoices and memoranda from the RAC concerning such matters as capital repairs (split between charges for material and charges for labor (Arndt 2004, 23), utility expenses (firewood, Arndt 2004, 70-74; candles, Arndt 2004, 70), and shipping costs (Arndt 2004, 66-69).

Bishop Innocent’s annotations on correspondence relating to such financial matters reveal his willingness – perhaps even his eagerness - to dispute charges (Arndt 2004, 23-26, 68-69, et passim). Here again, some tension is evident in relations between the

---

2 The Zertsalo - a three-sided stand surmounted by the imperial eagle and bearing three major decrees of Emperor Peter the Great – was a standard feature in every Russian government office (Arndt 2004, 80 n. 27).
Russian Orthodox Church (as represented by Bishop Innocent and his consistory) and the Russian American Company (as represented by its General Manager and his office staff). The bishop’s annotations also reveal his concern for careful separation of accounts. Consistory expenses, seminary expenses, clergy staffing, salaries, housing and maintenance: All had to fit within the categories and limits set by the Holy Synod on the basis of recommendations by the Overprocurator and as interpreted and communicated by the finance office (Freeze 1983, passim).

The Russian Orthodox Church’s bureaucratic practices were intended to insure accountability at all levels. This they may have done, but they were inefficient. This is hardly surprising given difficulties in communication with distant outposts like Alaska. The turn-around time for official requests and petitions could be several years. For example, in a letter dated September 22, 1847, Bishop Innocent petitioned for reimbursement for various expenses related to the Bishop’s House, including furniture he purchased out of his own funds in St. Petersburg around the time of his ordination as bishop in 1840. The Holy Synod considered the request and, with ample detail, approved specific amounts for reimbursement. The Synod’s decision was then confirmed by imperial decree (ukaz) and transmitted by the Holy Synod to Bishop Innocent in official form on August 14, 1848. The bishop’s office in Sitka marked this decree “received” on September 17, 1849. Meanwhile the Overprocurator communicated with the Minister of Finance concerning details of the financial transfers authorized by the decree. The state treasury’s approval of the financial transfers was officially confirmed by an imperial decree, with a copy transmitted by the Holy Synod to Bishop Innocent on June 30, 1849. The bishop’s office in Sitka dutifully marked this copy “received” on June 30, 1850 (Arndt 2004, 16-17; cf. 14 and 65).

5.6 CAPITAL REPAIRS AND SPATIAL REORGANIZATION

Bishop Innocent’s earliest plans for the Bishop’s House seem to have envisioned it as a small monastery, with its own church and an ecclesiastical school/seminary on the premises – an arrangement that would not have been at all unusual in Siberia or even parts of European Russia in the early 19th century. Its church staffing level, proposed by him in 1842 and subsequently approved by the Holy Synod, called for two monastic priests, one monastic deacon, and three novices (Arndt 2004, 65). Maps thereafter refer to the house as “the monastery” or “cloister in the name of the Annunciation” (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 29, 194). Of course the house had never been exclusively monastic, nor was it intended to be. It did, however, constitute a single extended household, following a pattern common throughout Europe in medieval and early modern times. Students at the ecclesiastical school, or thereafter at the seminary, attended classes, but they also engaged in what might be called vocational training (e.g., reading and singing in the house church) and in practical tasks that built real-world skills and benefited the household as a whole (e.g., gardening, small craft navigation, fishing, gathering wood).
When Bishop Innocent was elevated to the rank of archbishop and soon thereafter given new responsibilities stretching over Eastern Siberia, it was clear that he – the head of the ecclesiastical household - would be spending even less time in Sitka than heretofore. This made inevitable certain changes in the allocation of space within the Bishop’s House.

In a September 4, 1850, letter probably sent from Aian, now-Archbishop Innocent presented Archpriest Peter Litvintsev with a long list of capital repairs needed on the Bishop’s House. These included re-roofing; adjustment of floors, doors and windows to accommodate settling of the structure; laying of new stoves; re-siding; and refurbishment of interior wallpaper and paint. The list also requested reconfiguration of space on both floors, though “the upper floor can remain as it is” if workers are in short supply. “The Administration [consistory] can be moved upstairs and for it two windows can be partitioned off from the living room [reception room]; downstairs there remains for the Archbishop a small place for a kitchen and pantry, but otherwise all [rooms] are for the quarters of the priests, [just] so that there is no sleeping room under the altar and so that the entrances to my rooms will be separated, where possible, from the priests” (Arndt 2004, 20).

Fr. Litvintsev reported this letter to the full consistory on February 13, 1851, and its substance was communicated to Chief Manager Rozenberg on March 28 (Arndt 2004, 20-21). Delays in completing these capital repairs were only to be expected, but Rozenberg, writing to the home office, declared his intention to have the Bishop’s House repairs done so that “it would be possible to live in it by the time of His Grace’s arrival from Kamchatka” (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 208). In the end, the upper floor remained unchanged, save that the consistory moved into the room formerly occupied by the bishop’s secretary/personal assistant (kellenik). This spared the living room from partition while still allowing, with minimal alteration, more space for accommodation of clergy on the lower level.

But before His Grace arrived (a year later than previously anticipated), and before the clergy families could move in, the lower level of the house was temporarily occupied by surprise guests. The Russian naval corvette Olivutsa wintered in Sitka November 1851 – April 1852. Because of the scarcity of housing in Sitka, the commanding officer, his second-in-command and their three servants were lodged on the lower floor of the Bishop’s House. One hundred ten of his crew were put up in space otherwise occupied by company’s school for boys, and the displaced schoolboys, along with their supervisor and his family, forty-four persons in all, were shifted to the remaining lower floor rooms of the Bishop’s House (Arndt 2004, 22). It is not surprising that, after the departure of the Olivutsa, the whole lower floor had to be repainted before the clergy and their families could move in (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 225).
5.7 TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY TO THE RUSSIAN-AMERICAN COMPANY

During his final months in Sitka, Archbishop Innocent bade farewell to his clergy and faithful and prepared for departure to his new home in Yakutsk. In a May 15, 1853, letter to Acting Chief Manager Rudakov, he transferred the Bishop’s House – and responsibility for its further maintenance – to the RAC. In the letter he explains how, in view of the housing shortage in Sitka, he sought and received the Holy Synod’s permission to give lodging in the house to some members of the cathedral clergy who are married and have families. “In consequence,” he continues, “three families are now housed in it and on my departure more can be accommodated. Intending to leave now for Aian for an undetermined period and perhaps for a very long time, I consider it for the best and fair to transfer to the authority and full disposal of the colonial authorities the house I now occupy, as the company’s property, until my possible return, and then not beyond 1855. (I do not mention the church, which undoubtedly will remain inviolable).” (No. 604, May 15, 1853, Arndt and Pierce 2003, 229-230)

Later the same day, Innocent departed for Aian on the Nikolai I, newest of Russia’s round-the-world steamers. An inventory drawn up soon after his departure describes the house, its fittings and content in some detail, distinguishing clearly – as the archbishop had insisted – between items that were procured with church funds and items that were in the house when he moved in and hence company property (Arndt 2004, 26-29). For now at least, allotment of space within the house remained as it was when the archbishop left for Yakutsk: on the upper floor, seven rooms, with the church in one of them, the consistory office in another, and the remaining five left for occupation by the archbishop; on the lower floor, eight rooms, one of them the kitchen and the others for clergy housing (Arndt 2004, 26).

For now also, the seminary remained in Sitka, in its nearly new building just north of the Bishop’s House. That changed in 1858, when – at last - the archdiocesan see was officially transferred to Yakutsk. The seminary was relocated there at the same time, and the former seminary building in Sitka was converted into the company hospital (Blee 1990, 407-408; Fortuine 1989, 129-130). After the Alaska Cession the building remained a hospital until the withdrawal of the U.S. Army in 1877. Abandoned for two years, it was taken over by the Navy in 1879 and rehabilitated sufficiently to turn over to the Presbyterians for use as a school. It burned down in 1882 (Fortuine 1989, 141-147; Nestor 1993, 341).

5.8 THE NOVO-ARKHANGEL’SK VICARIATE

Upon Archbishop Innocent’s departure in 1853, the consistory in Sitka was authorized to open and pass on reports of Alaskan priests in his absence, but this was intended simply as a temporary measure. Following the official transfer of the diocesan see and
seminary to Siberia in 1858, Archbishop Innocent petitioned the Holy Synod for appointment of auxiliary, or vicar bishops, to help him care for his vast diocese, one for Alaska and one for Yakutia. Chosen for the Alaska vicariate was Archimandrite Peter (Petr) Lysakov, or Ekaterinovksii, who had been in charge of the move of the seminary from Sitka to Yakutsk (ordained to the episcopate March 1859). Chosen for the Yakutsk vicariate was a widowed priest, Peter Popov, who took Paul (Pavel) as his monastic and episcopal name (ordained to the episcopate March 1860).

Bishop Peter proved a disappointment to Archbishop Innocent. During his time in Alaska he showed none of the zeal for mission and pastoral flexibility that the position demanded. In late 1866 he was recalled to Yakutsk to replace Bishop Paul as vicar bishop of Yakutsk, a post that he held but briefly before withdrawing to a monastery. At the same time Bishop Paul was sent to Alaska as vicar bishop of Novo-Arkhangel’sk/Sitka. Given both his background and his subsequent ecclesiastical career as a mission-minded archbishop in Siberia, Bishop Paul would have been temperamentally well suited for service in Alaska. But he arrived to face a radically different political and cultural context than he had anticipated, as Alaska was being sold to the United States (treaty March 18/30, 1867, formal transfer October 18, 1867). The demographics of Alaska, and especially of Sitka, were changing rapidly (Kan 1999, 176-181).

With the transfer of sovereignty, Sitka was overrun by Americans to a degree not experienced elsewhere in Alaska – by the occupying U.S. army, by merchants, by gold-seekers and soldiers of fortune. For the resident Russian and creole population, this was a time of dislocation and insecurity. In the Bishop’s House, for example, there were debates over how best to safeguard the strongbox containing diocesan cash on hand (Arndt 2004, 49 and following). Many Russians – including many of the clergy – chose repatriation to Russia. The three northern mission stations established by Bishop Innocent were left without priests. Hieromonk Nikolai Militov (Kenai) has been transferred to Sitka in 1865, but was reassigned to Kenai in 1866, where he died in 1867. Hieromonks Feofil Uspenskii (Nushagak) and Ilarion Peremezhko (Ikogmiut/Russian Mission) were recalled to Sitka in 1868 in anticipation of their return to Russia. Bishop Paul departed for Russia the following year. His dean of clergy, Archpriest Paul (Pavel) Kedrolivanskii, left Alaska also, but for San Francisco, which would become the new diocesan see de facto in 1870 (See Figure 5.00.1).
After departure of the last priest assigned to the Annunciation Church in the Bishop’s House in 1867, staffing there fell to one reader and one sacristan (Arndt 2004, 101), who were provisionally aggregated to the cathedral staff. In 1874 this change in staffing became official (ibid.). Henceforth staff clergy from the cathedral would serve at Annunciation – but for over a decade they did so only infrequently, “in the wintertime,” or “once or twice per year,” or “several times per year” (Arndt 2004, 101-103).

5.9 THE DIOCESE OF THE ALEUTIANS AND ALASKA

In the interval from Archbishop Innocent’s departure in 1853 through the Alaska Cession, spatial organization of the Bishop’s House remained basically unchanged, with clergy and their families occupying the lower floor (Arndt 2004, 98-100). Litvintsev’s successor as dean of clergy and chief member of the consistory was Georgii (Egor) Vinokurov. His wife and growing family lived with him in the Bishop’s House until her death in childbirth there in 1863; she was buried with the infant near the Trinity Church (Pierce 1990, 528). After her death, Fr. Vinokurov and two surviving sons returned to Yakutsk, and Fr. Paul Kedrolivanskii was assigned to replace him. In January 1864, he arrived in Sitka with his young wife and two little children and moved into the apartment formerly occupied by the Vinokurov family (Pierce 1990, 225). He would continue in the same important position following the Alaska Cession, moving along with the diocesan see from Sitka to San Francisco.

In the wake of the Cession, spatial arrangements in the Bishop’s House changed, as the ecclesiastical status of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska also changed. Bishop Paul, like Bishop Peter before him, had been a vicar bishop subordinate to a ruling diocesan archbishop in Siberia – an awkward arrangement after the transfer of sovereignty to the United States. To accommodate this new situation, the Holy Synod created a separate new Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska. Bishop Paul was recalled to Russia, and a new bishop, John (Ioann) Mitropol’skii, was assigned to the new diocese, arriving in the United States in August 1870.

Bishop John did not plan take up permanent residence in the Bishop’s House in Sitka. His plan – and no doubt that of his superiors in Russia - was relocation of the diocesan headquarters to San Francisco. That burgeoning center of commerce and finance was home to a growing Orthodox community of Russians, Greeks and Serbs. With the support of the resident Russian consul-general, an Orthodox Church had been established there in 1868, its clergy sent from Sitka. In addition, San Francisco was a major transportation hub, linking Pacific rim ports with the eastern United States. With completion of the first transcontinental telegraph line in 1861, the first successful transatlantic cable in 1866, and the first transcontinental railroad in 1869, communication with St. Petersburg and other global capitals was incomparably easier and faster from San Francisco than from Sitka.
Soon after his arrival in Sitka in late summer 1870, Bishop John sent Fr. Kedrolivanskii to San Francisco with two creole assistants and several trunks of consistory baggage, to begin reorganizing diocesan administration (Kapalin 2009, 304 n. 1203). In January 1871 he petitioned the Holy Synod for a change of the diocesan see to that city (Kapalin 2009, 304 n. 1205). And on April 28, 1873, he himself took ship for San Francisco (Arndt 2004, 50). Joining his extended household were students from the erstwhile Sitka ecclesiastical school. Bishop John’s subsequent visits to Alaska were seasonal and generally of short duration. He enjoyed life in San Francisco.

Unfortunately Bishop John’s tenure was marked scandals so serious that, when they were brought to the attention of the Holy Synod, a special investigative committee was formed. Bishop John was recalled to Russia in 1876. His official transfer to an insignificant desk job became official the following year. Also singled out for return to Russia were two prominent members of the consistory, Priest Nicholas Kovrigin (for flagrant adultery) and Archpriest Paul Kedrolivanskii (for dealing in contraband and suspected financial misconduct) (Imperial Decree/Ukaz, April 20, 1877, English translation http://www.holy-trinity.org/history/1877/05.27-Synod.html ). Before action against the latter could proceed, however, he died under mysterious circumstances, apparently black-jacked on a San Francisco street, in 1878 (Emmons 1997, 7-8).

5.10 A NEW BISHOP FOR THE DIOCESE

The bishop-less “widowed” Diocese of the Aleutian Islands and Alaska was not abolished, though that possibility appears to have been discussed by the Holy Synod. It was, however, placed temporarily under the supervision of the metropolitan of St. Petersburg until a new bishop could be chosen. Sent to straighten out affairs in the diocese, as dean of clergy and ranking member of the Alaska consistory, was Archpriest Vladimir Vechtomov. From his arrival in 1878 to his departure in August 1888, he provided an element of stability in a diocese very much in need of a firm guiding hand. This was not an easy task. The next bishop, Nestor Zass, or Zakkis, though altogether different from his predecessor in priorities and character, would be equally difficult to manage.

The background of Bishop Nestor was unusual for a Russian bishop of this period. His family background was gentry, not clergy, and he lacked the usual educational preparation of career ecclesiastics. His early professional career was in the navy, and after he was tonsured as a monk and ordained to the priesthood, he returned to naval service as a chaplain. Along the way he became fluent in several languages (French, English, German) and developed an interest in linguistics and ethnology, which may account for his appointment to the vacant see of the Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska. Ordained as a bishop in December 1878, he arrived in in San Francisco the following spring. During his brief administration, the diocese acquired a permanent home – a three-story house in San Francisco that provided sufficient space for a church,
of offices, a residence for the bishop, and — in the basement level — an ecclesiastical school or seminary. Unfortunately the new bishop had little aptitude for personnel management, ecclesiastical office procedure, or business and finance. Even acquisition of the new bishop’s house — possibly at an inflated price (Nestor 1993, 240) — was facilitated by the Russian Vice-Consul, Gustave Niebaum, a former employee of the Russian American Company but now an American citizen and one of the directors of the powerful Alaska Commercial Company (ACC).

Niebaum and the ACC were also instrumental in another of Bishop Nestor’s building projects: Construction of new clergy houses and other church facilities in Alaska. Following his pastoral visit in summer 1880, Bishop Nestor wrote to the Holy Synod about the urgent need for repairs to clergy housing in Ikogmiut/Russian Mission and Sitka and for new construction in Nushagak, Kenai, Kodiak and Unalaska. He singled out Unalaska for special attention. Because of its convenient location on major shipping lanes between San Francisco and Alaskan ports of call, premises for the bishop should be built there to serve as his base of operations during pastoral visits. (See Figure 5.00.2, which illustrates the central position occupied by Unalaska in late 19th-century maritime traffic.) Bishop Nestor also presented detailed plans for establishment of a new ecclesiastical school in Unalaska specifically for Alaska natives and contracted — again through Niebaum — for the construction of a suitable building. Accompanying his letters to the Holy Synod was a copy of a contract that he entered into with Niebaum, who was to arrange with the ACC for materials, shipping and construction. The Holy Synod, perhaps reluctantly, agreed after the fact to what turned out to be an expensive deal. Like the Russian-American Company before it, the ACC was not operating a charity. Niebaum and his associates cultivated good relations with prominent churchmen, and many prominent churchmen cultivated good relations with them, but one should not assume that altruism motivated either party.

Bishop Nestor’s efforts to strengthen the Russian Orthodox mission among the native peoples continued during his second pastoral visit to Alaska. This took him to the Yup’ik regions of the Yukon and Kuskokwim. There — in a desire to share in the life of the people — he decided to winter at Ikogmiut/Russian Mission. Alerted to this intention, Fr. Vechtomov notified the Russian consulate. But then, Bishop Nestor suddenly decided to return to San Francisco. Around this time, personnel at Saint Michael and onboard ship noted changes in his demeanor. His complaints of neuralgia became more insistent. On the morning of June 30, 1882, according to multiple testimonies, he apparently threw himself from the ship outward bound from Saint Michael and perished — though persistent rumors attributed his death to the ACC. His body was recovered some days later and eventually interred, as he had desired, in Unalaska. It was left largely to Fr. Vechtomov in San Francisco to sort out all the ramifications of the bishop’s demise.
Eventually the various bills were settled, and construction of the bishop’s house and school building in Unalaska and the clergy houses in Nushagak, Kodiak and Kenai was completed over the next few years. (See Figures 4.09.9 24 and 28 and Figures 4.11.13, 16, 18, 23 and 24.) Of these, the bishop’s house in Unalaska and the clergy house in Kenai are still standing and listed on the National Register. Although Bishop Nestor did not live to occupy the house in Unalaska, his interest in western Alaska and the Aleutians is reflected in institutional developments within the Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska during the late 19th and early 20th century. In 1893 Alaska was divided into two deaneries (administrative districts within a diocese under the supervision of a district dean), one based in Sitka and the other in Unalaska. The history of these two churches, henceforth nominally equal in status, will be very similar for over a decade.
5.11 FROM BISHOP’S HOUSE TO SITKA ARCHPRIEST’S RESIDENCE (Kan 1999 and Kan 2013a)

During the decades that followed transfer of the diocesan see to San Francisco, the fate of the Bishop’s House in Sitka remained closely linked to institutional developments throughout the Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska for several reasons. One was the rise of Unalaska as a regional ecclesiastical center. Another was continuing instability in Sitka.

Among the personnel accompanying Bishop John Mitropol’skii to the United States was his younger brother, Nicholas (Nikolai) Egorovich Mitropol’skii. Like his brother, as the son of a clergy household he was marked from childhood for an ecclesiastical career. In Russia he had graduated with honors from seminary, and once in America, after marriage to Maria Kashevarov, daughter of a Kodiak priest, he was ordained deacon and priest. In 1875, as his brother’s recall to Russia was looming, he was transferred from San Francisco to St. Michael’s Cathedral in Sitka.

In Sitka, which was still adjusting to American rule, Fr. Mitropol’skii devoted himself to gaining respectability for the Russian and creole element, initially giving little attention to further evangelization of the Tlingit. He was active in politics and elected to the city council. He and his wife enjoyed an active social life, gave masquerades and balls in the reception room of the Bishop’s House, and transformed its unkempt front yard into a croquet court (Stepan Ushin’s Diary for July 18, 1884, 30). Mitropol’skii eventually ran into financial difficulties. His letters to Bishop Nestor are filled with excuses for various reporting errors (Nestor 1993, 263-264) and with evasions about personal debts that he had rung up with the local Northwest Trading Company agent, L. Kaplan (Nestor 1993, 306, 309, 312, 330-331). Bishop Nestor initially had been favorably disposed toward Mitropol’skii, among other things serving as godfather for his youngest son, but by the end of 1881 even he had to put his foot down. He turned the issue of Mitropol’skii’s debts over to the consistory in San Francisco for further investigation (Nestor 1993, 329).

Meanwhile civil procedure was moving forward. The Northwest Trading Company brought court proceedings against Mitropol’skii in March 1885. The errant priest had used St. Michael’s Cathedral as security for his personal line of credit with the company, and later that year the cathedral was sequestered and closed until Mitropol’skii’s large debt was paid off. This financial scandal marked the end of Mitropol’skii’s tenure in Sitka. On September 15, 1885, he and his family took ship for San Francisco. Subsequently he was demoted to the position of Kenai missionary priest (1888-1892), but through his good service in that position he redeemed his tattered reputation (Znamenski 2003, 19-20) and eventually gained appointment to Belkovski (1892-1894), then at the height of its prosperity.
That Fr. Mitropol’skii – and the cathedral – were bailed out was largely due to a rising young creole businessman, Sergei Ionovich Kostromitinov (1854-1915, see Figure 5.00. 3). Kostromitinov – as Sergei Kan puts it – used “his cultural capital—that is, special types of knowledge and a unique position within the community—to play an indispensable role as a cultural broker on the multiethnic/multicultural American/Russian/Native Alaskan frontier” (Kan 2013a, 388). In 1885 Kostromitinov was already on his way to becoming Alaska’s most distinguished Russian American citizen. His wife Natalia also happened to be a sister of Fr. Mitropol’skii’s wife Maria – both part of Alaska’s most prominent creole ecclesiastical family, the Kashevarovs. Kostromitinov would be a lifelong benefactor of St. Michael’s Cathedral, becoming also its priest in 1910.

Following the removal of Fr. Mitropol’skii, Fr. Vladimir Vechtomov was sent from San Francisco to serve in Sitka on an interim basis and to assess all aspects of the church situation there. He arrived in March 1886 and stayed scarcely one month, but he accomplished a great deal. One of his first acts was to appoint Sergei Kostromitinov as church warden (starosta), a position that Kostromitinov would hold until his ordination in 1910.

During his spring 1886 sojourn in Sitka, Fr. Vechtomov addressed two major issues: (1) The condition of the Bishop’s House and other church properties. (2) The state of the church’s mission to the Tlingit.

5.12 THE 1887 RENOVATION PROJECT

When Fr. Vechtomov arrived, the Sitka church owned four houses, all in a state of disrepair, of which the Bishop’s House was by far the largest and most significant. Already in 1880 Fr. Mitropol’skii had reported to the consistory on its ruinous state. At the time he recommended converting it to a single story building, and he enclosed his own proposed plans and estimates – none very precise (Arndt 2004, 34). Mitropol’skii’s report provoked a series a queries from the consistory and eventually orders from St. Petersburg that mandated a thorough inspection of all church housing in Sitka before any action could be approved (Arndt 2004, 35). The condition of the house deteriorated further following severe rainstorms in October 1884. These – as Fr. Mitropol’skii

3 On the youngest of the Kashevarov siblings, Fr. Andrew Kashevarov, see above, Chapter 3.11.5.
reported - resulted in serious water damage on both floors of the building, particularly in the altar area of the Annunciation house church, rendering it unusable (Arndt 2004, 37).

After a complete examination of the building, Fr. Vechtomov and the church committee consulted with a local builder, W.J. Prout, and got a detailed estimate for necessary repairs and renovation, including a new shingle roof to replace the leaky iron one; replacement of rotted logs as necessary; reconstruction of the galleries on both sides of the house; repair or replacement of windows; new weatherboarding; installation of gutters and downspouts leading to drainage ditching; construction of two privies behind the house; altered placement of doors to the chapel and to one of the kitchens; repair of ceilings, doors, fireplaces, etc.; and painting of the exterior and of second-story floors (Arndt 2004, 39).

What ensued suggests some of the frustrations that faced conscientious bureaucrats like Fr. Vechtomov in the 19th-century Russian Orthodox Church. On returning to San Francisco in April, Vechtomov submitted a request to St. Petersburg for authorization to proceed with repairs on the Bishop’s House, attaching Prout’s detailed estimate of costs. In reply St. Petersburg complained that the construction specs and estimate were not submitted in Russian and that the fairness of the quoted prices had not been verified by a government official. In his response, Vechtomov explained that the builder did not know Russian, that no one could be found who could translate his technical construction terms into Russian, and that in Sitka no such officials exist (Arndt 2004, 42). But before further official action could be taken, the Sitka clergy informed Vechtomov and the consistory in San Francisco of more damage because of roof leaks throughout the house. Vechtomov undertook the extreme measure of sending a telegram to Overprokurator Constantine Pobedonostsev on the subject (October 22), to which Pobedonostsev replied immediately: “repair cathedral house instantly yourself Sitka November” (Arndt 2004, 42). By the time Vechtomov arrived back in Sitka, Mr. Prout was no longer available for the job, but fortunately Vechtomov found a replacement, Mr. Peter Callsen (Arndt 2004, 44).

More negotiations ensued. These were complicated by a January 1887 petition of the Sitka cathedral clergy to the Holy Synod for closure of the Annunciation house church in order to utilize the space for a school. With the opening of a school for the Tlingit in March 1886 - they argued - there is no room on the lower floor of the house large enough to accommodate its enrollment, nor is there really a need for the church given the proximity of the cathedral. Inasmuch as the anticipated renovation of the house will require moving the church altar anyway, would this not be an opportune time to make this additional change in plans? (Arndt 2004, 46) A favorable response from the Holy Synod eventually reached Sitka in early September 1887 (Arndt 2004, 48), but by then new arrangements for school space had been made. The wall dividing two of the lower-floor rooms was removed to create a space large enough for the school.
By the end of the 1887 renovation project, the Bishop’s House had assumed the form and layout that it would retain, with only minor changes until the NPS restoration of the 1970s. The Annunciation Church was left in place, perhaps because some important people in the Sitka community had not favored its closure. Beginning in 1888, annual Sitka parish records begin to report services being held there “often” or “rather often” (Arndt 2004, 103), and in the 1891 record we learn that “this church was put into splendid condition by the elder [starosta] of the Sitka church Sergei Ionovich Kostromitinov at his personal expense” (Arndt 2004, 104).

**5.13 MASSIVE CONVERSION OF THE TLINGIT TO ORTHODOXY** (Kan 1999, 245-248)

The second major issue facing Fr. Vladimir Vechtomov in Sitka was the state of the Tlingit mission. Already declining under Vicar Bishop Peter during the last years of Russian rule, efforts to evangelize the Tlingit were practically abandoned following the Cession, although there had been a slight resurgence during the final years of Fr. Nicholas Mitropol’skii’s tenure in Sitka. This was due partly to the challenge posed by the new Presbyterian boarding school in Sitka, which for a brief time was located next door to the Bishop’s House, and partly to the appointment of a new reader for the cathedral parish, Jovan Dabovich, who began conducting Sunday afternoon religious instruction classes for the Tlingit in 1885 – the first such classes in nearly two decades. With the arrival Fr. Vechtomov, Tlingit conversion accelerated. In his brief time in Sitka, in addition to negotiating the reopening of the parish school, he baptized 52 persons, including two heads of major clans. Sergei Kan explains the simple but profound reason for Vechtomov’s success: “For the first time since the days of the RAC [Russian-American Company], an Orthodox clergyman ‘showed respect’ to the Tlingit by visiting their homes and taking time to speak with them” (Kan 1999, 247). Kan also explains one of the reasons why leading members of the Tlingit community chose to join the Orthodox Church rather than the politically more powerful Presbyterians: “…from their point of view, the benefits of such an alliance were not ‘political’ in the Western sense but did bring the neophytes spiritual power and blessing…. Thus during the celebration of the feast day of the Annunciation, which in 1886 took place soon after the two clan leaders converted, the Indian village was symbolically linked with the ‘Russian Town’ when a traditional religious procession included the former in its route” (Kan 1999, 248). (See Figure 4.11.19.)

Following Fr. Vechtomov’s departure from Sitka, the consistory in San Francisco sent an energetic young priest from Russia, Fr. Vladimir Donskoi. Educated at the Irkutsk

---

4 Jovan Dabovich, a young Serbian American within the Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska, later would assume the monastic name of Sebastian and go on to a distinguished ecclesiastical career in the diocese and subsequently in Serbia. He was, among other things, the founder of St. Sava church in Douglas AK and for a time dean of the Sitka deanery. In 2007 he was canonized by the Serbian Orthodox Church as “St. Sebastian of San Francisco and Jackson” – Jackson CA being the site of the first of his many church foundations in the western United States.
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5.14 TRANSFORMATION OF LIFE IN AND AROUND THE BISHOP’S HOUSE

Under Fr. Donskoi the parish Tlingit day school continued, with some success at least in the teaching of English, thanks to young Andrew Kashevarov (see above, Chapter 3.11.5). A Tlingit choir and a Tlingit children’s choir were organized at the cathedral. Fr. Donskoi

Fr. Donskoi also firmly resisted efforts on the part of some of his creole parishioners to have separate cemeteries for the Tlingit and to partition off a separate space for them in St. Michael’s Cathedral. Unlike the local Presbyterians, who maintained separate churches for their white and Tlingit members, the Orthodox remained a single, integrated community. This no doubt was made easier by the nature of Orthodox worship, in which shared ritual behavior helped transcend linguistic differences.

From the start Fr. Donskoi devoted most of his attention to the Tlingit community, to the chagrin of some of his creole parishioners, and in the process he transformed the religious make-up of Sitka. During his first two weeks in Sitka he baptized 57 Tlingit; by the end of 1886 Tlingits outnumbered creoles on the parish rolls; within three years of his arrival, between two-thirds and three-quarters of the Sitka’s native population had joined the Orthodox Church (Kan 1999, 252). The key to Fr. Donskoi’s success with the Tlingits, in Sergei Kan’s estimation, was his willingness “to show them respect,” above all in his willingness to participate in their post-funeral memorial feasts in honor of the departed (ibid.) But in many ways Fr. Donskoi’s expressions of “respect” simply represented traditional Orthodox ritual. Carefully organized funeral processions, with tolling of bells; meals with speeches following the funeral; memorial services for the departed, especially on the fortieth day and the anniversary of death, again often with meals and gifts; little memorial booklets for recording names of living and departed loved ones for commemoration in church; exchanges of visits with special foods and gifts on major holidays like Easter and Christmas; home blessings at Epiphany; blessing of fishing boats and fishing gear; blessing of a new house; translation of prayers and hymns into the native language: Such traditional Orthodox practices resonated with Tlingit culture in multiple ways (Kan 1999, 252-256). They also helped reshape patterns of movement in and through Sitka, as cultural and physical boundaries between the native “Ranche” and the “Russian town” lost much of their old power to divide.

Fr. Donskoi also had a personal bond to the Tlingit community and having served as a priest and teacher in Kamchatka, he was accustomed to the kind of conditions that he would face in Alaska. He also was representative of a new type of clergy who had been trained following the reforms in ecclesiastical education introduced during the Overprocuracy of Dmitrii Tolstoi, which emphasized the importance pastoral care, educational programs, and community engagement. Fr. Donskoi arrived in fall 1886 with his wife and growing family and moved into the Bishop’s House. Plopping into a chair in the nearly barren reception room on his first day there, he is reported to have said, “Thank God, not all the chairs have been plundered” (Stepan Ushin’s Diary for October 28, 1886, 79).
continued to give Sunday afternoon lectures in the cathedral and hold less formal discussion sessions in Tlingit lineage houses. These became especially popular after he introduced the use of slides to illustrate his talks (Kan 1999, 262). One of the more notable developments during Fr. Donskoï’s tenure in Sitka was the establishment of an orphanage/boarding school in the lower floor of the Bishop’s House in 1893. He and his wife were already familiar with orphans. By 1893 they were raising six of them in the Bishop’s House in addition to their own children. But the establishment of the new Sitka orphanage/boarding school was not simply an extension of Fr. Donskoï’s pastoral efforts. It was part of a larger development within the Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska.

Not long after returning to San Francisco, Fr. Vechtomov – advancing in years and declining in health – retired to Russia as a new bishop at last was appointed for the diocese. Bishop Vladimir Sokolovskii-Avtonomov was not quite 35 years old when he was ordained to the episcopacy in St. Petersburg in December 1887 and assigned to America. He arrived in San Francisco in mid-April of 1888, along with an entourage of eight clergy and eleven youthful seminarians, with the intention of revitalizing church life in his diocese. Unfortunately his short tenure was “punctuated by a series of scandals and lawsuits, an excommunication, a duel (unconsummated), and various ‘criminations and recriminations’, as one reporter put it” (Emmons 1997, 4). The Russian consulate in San Francisco and the Overprocurator’s office in St. Petersburg worked overtime to minimize the damage caused by the bishop’s impetuous behavior and, when those efforts failed, to have him recalled to Russia as quickly as possible. This took some time. A new bishop, Nicholas (Nikolai) Adoratskii, was appointed to fill the see in June 1891, but because of ill health he was unable to take up the position and was transferred to another see in Russia instead. The man finally appointed, Nicholas (Nikolai) Ziorov, was made of sterner stuff. He was consecrated as Bishop of the Aleutians and Alaska on September 29, 1891, and arrived in San Francisco in December of that year, a month after Bishop Vladimir finally conceded defeat and departed for Russia to take up a lesser position.

After a pastoral visit to Alaska in summer 1892, Bishop Nicholas mandated a reorganization of the administrative structure of his diocese, which at this point covered all of North America. Alaska was divided into two deaneries, which were nominally equal in status and comparable in their assets, programs and range of activities. The Unalaska deanery included the Aleutians, most of the Alaska peninsula, the Pribilofs and western Alaska. The Sitka deanery included southeastern Alaska, the Kenai peninsula and nearby coastal regions, the Kodiak archipelago, and at times even Seattle. The history of the Sitka and Unalaska churches – of their principal buildings, ecclesiastical schools, clergy, and activities within the wider community – will be very similar for over a decade. The priorities of the diocesan administration in San Francisco, and later New York, will be expressed, almost simultaneously in both places, in the form of building programs and other institutional developments.
In summer 1893 an orphanage/boarding school opened in the lower floor of the Sitka Bishop’s House (Kan 1999, 270), which had been adapted for this purpose in the course of the previous year (Arndt 2004, 104). Simultaneously, an orphanage/boarding school opened in Unalaska in the building originally commissioned for that purpose by Bishop Nestor in 1880. In both Sitka and Unalaska, the schools were intended for native as well as creole students from all over Alaska, and initially they operated along the lines of a two-class parish school in Russia, that is, they offered secondary as well as primary instruction. Both schools began with ten students and gradually expanded, in part by accepting more boarding students, in part by adding day students, including girls. Eventually both schools expanded physically: In Sitka a two-story building, now known as the Old School, was constructed in 1897 to accommodate more students and an additional teacher. Around the same time in Unalaska, in response to suggestions made by Bishop Nicholas Ziorov during an 1895 visit, the school building was expanded into the space between the original school building and the Unalaska bishop’s house.

In 1897 the curriculum in both schools expanded as well, and the program was lengthened by one year in order to include more courses of a practical nature (Kan 1999, 291). In the same year, as part of celebrations to honor the centenary of the birth of Innocent Veniaminov, both schools were designated as Innokentii Schools, or Innokentii Missionary Schools (Arndt 2004, 105; ROAM 1 [1896-97] 518-519, ROAM 2 [1897-1898] 76-78, 78-82). By that time the Sitka school had two full-time teachers plus the priest, with an enrollment of fifteen boys from the orphanage and nine day students. The Unalaska school was somewhat larger both in enrollment and in staffing (ROAM 1 [1896-1897] 527-533). But also in the same year, reflecting demographic developments within the diocese, a third missionary school, operating at the same level and with a similar curriculum, opened in Minneapolis MN (Tarasar 1975, 77, 79). In 1905, as its enrollment reached 122, it was reorganized and upgraded to become the North American Ecclesiastical Seminary.

5.15 THE BISHOP’S HOUSE AND THE WIDER COMMUNITY

Fr. Donskoï returned to Russia in 1895. His immediate successors - as cathedral priests, deans of the Sitka deanery, and superintendents of the Innokentii School - differed from him in background, but they continued and expanded upon his work. Fr. Anatolii Kamenskii (1895-1898) was a widowed priest who subsequently graduated from the prestigious St. Petersburg Theological Academy and became a hieromonk (priest-monk). In America he would also serve as superintendent of the Minneapolis Missionary School. He was succeeded by another well-educated hieromonk, Fr. Antonii

5 After returning to Russia Fr. Kamenskii served as Rector of the Odessa Theological Academy, as Bishop of Tomsk and Altai, and – in the midst of the Revolution – as Archbishop of Irkutsk. Although the precise circumstances of his death are uncertain, the Russian Orthodox Church has canonized him as one of its New Martyrs and Confessors.
Dashkevich (1898-1905). Comparable to their activities in Sitka and the Sitka deanery are those of their counterpart in Unalaska, Fr. Nicholas Kedrovskii (1894-1904). In both regions of Alaska, the Orthodox church gained a measure of stability and vitality that had been sorely lacking in the decades immediately following the Alaska Cession. The church began to adjust to its new American context, and along the way it learned how to communicate more effectively. Of critical importance here was the collaborative relationship that existed between deanery leadership in Alaska and the diocesan bishops of this period, Nicholas Ziorov (1891-1898) and Tikhon Bellavin (1898-1907). Working together, they gradually reached a modus vivendi with government officials and with at least some of their Protestant rivals.

From the 1870s onward, one of the most troublesome problems faced by the Orthodox church in Alaska had centered on education. Parish churches in Alaska and as well as many of their dependent chapels continued to maintain schools, despite diminished resources in the wake of the Cession, but these schools got little recognition and no financial support from the United States government. On the other hand, Protestant mission groups, while funded in part by their denominational sponsors in the United States, gained additional financial support from the federal government by serving as “contract schools.” That is, the federal government contracted with the denominational mission groups to operate orphanages and schools whose goal, in fact, was to turn native students into English-speaking American citizens imbued with the principles of (Protestant) Christianity. This, as multiple Orthodox critics pointed out, compromised the principles of separation of church and state and free exercise of religion enshrined in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and reflected in the Treaty of Cession (e.g., ROAM 1 [1896-97] 111-115, 196-204, 224-226, 240-242, 242-246).

A chief proponent of acculturation through Protestant mission education was Dr. Sheldon Jackson, a prominent Presbyterian missionary whose social and political connections in Washington gained him appointment as General Agent of Education in the Alaska Territory (1885-1906). The story of the Orthodox Church in Sitka and of the Bishop’s House during the later 19th and early 20th century would be incomplete without some reference to the school that eventually was renamed in Sheldon Jackson’s honor. The Sitka Industrial Training School was founded in 1878 by Presbyterian missionaries Fannie Kellogg and future governor of Alaska John G. Brady to provide vocational training for Tlingit children. Ironically, their school’s first permanent home was located just east of the Bishop’s House in the two-story building originally built in 1846 to house Bishop Innocent Veniaminov’s seminary (see above, 5.7).

After that building burned to the ground in 1882, Sheldon Jackson came to the school’s rescue. He launched a nation-wide fund raising effort. Together with Brady he acquired land farther east along Crescent Bay, where two new buildings and fencing soon went

---

6 Fr. Dashkevich would go on to important positions in Russia (e.g., chaplain on the imperial yacht) and eventually be ordained as bishop in the post-revolutionary Russian emigration.
up. This led to court proceedings against the two men in June 1885. They were charged with illegal seizure of the land in question and construction that blocked a public roadway leading to Indian River (Stepan Ushin’s Diary for June 2, 1885, 56). Eventually, however, after a change in administrations in Washington, these and other charges were dropped.

Orthodox animosity toward Sheldon Jackson and his Presbyterians allies continued for over a decade, waning only toward the end of the century. Church periodicals published articles denouncing abuses; concerned churchmen and ordinary parishioners sent petitions to federal officials in Washington. In 1898, shortly before his return to Russia, Bishop Nicholas Ziorov addressed a sharply worded letter letter to President McKinley, in which he appealed for protection against officials who were “sent to Alaska without any discrimination and exclusively on the recommendation of Alaska’s immovable guardian, Sheldon Jackson.... Alaska must be delivered from that man” (ROAM 3 [1899] 6-9).

Bishop Nicholas’s successor, Bishop Tikhon Bellavin, took a more conciliatory approach. In an exchange of letters with Sheldon Jackson in 1899, he tried to correct certain misconceptions about Orthodox schools in Alaska, noting - among other things - that in these schools English was part of the curriculum (ROAM 4 [1900] 81-85). He also directed Fr. Antonii Dashkevich to prepare a detailed report on the Russian Orthodox schools in Alaska, which was published in English as well as Russian (ROAM 4 [1900] 114-122, 139-146, 156-163). For his part, Jackson requested the appointment of Fr. Dashkevich to the Alaska Public School Board (ROAM 4 [1900] 88). Relations between the two men reached the point that the Sitka Chronicle could report on a cordial visit of Jackson to the Bishop’s House (ROAM 4 [1900] 270-271).

Calling for special attention are relations between the Orthodox and the Episcopalians. From the mid-19th century onward, personal friendships, official exchanges of visits and extensive theological discussions had brought Orthodox and Anglicans (or, in the United States, Episcopalians) close to full unity (Erickson 2012, 264-266). In Sitka this special ecumenical relationship was expressed in multiple ways, including a visit of Bishop Peter T. Rowe, first Episcopalian bishop of Alaska, and Bishop William Walker of Washington to St. Michael’s Cathedral (ROAM 3 [1899] 362-363) and the presence of Fr. Antonii Dashkevich and other Orthodox dignitaries at the founding of St. Peter’s-by-the Sea Episcopal Church in 1899 (ROAM 3 [1899] 398-99).

5.16 A BISHOP RETURNS TO THE BISHOP’S HOUSE

By the turn of the 20th century, the Russian Orthodox Archdiocese of North America and the Aleutian Islands (as it was renamed in 1900) had grown prodigiously in numbers, to 45 parishes. It also had acquired a new demographic composition (Eastern European immigrant) and new geographic orientation (northeastern United States, with its
diocesan see transferred from San Francisco to New York City in 1905). At the insistence of Archbishop Tikhon Bellavin, the Holy Synod approved his plan for the appointment of vicar bishops to assist him. The first of these, Innocent Pustinskii, was a well-educated archimandrite who in the 1890s had ministered for a few years in the United States. In December 2003, he was ordained in St. Petersburg as Bishop of Sitka, with responsibility for Alaska.

Bishop Innocent was extraordinarily active. His travels in Alaska took him to regions never before reached by an Orthodox bishop, particularly in the upper reaches of the Yukon and Kuskokwim river systems. He also made several extended visits to Russia’s Chukchi Peninsula, which – since there was now a bishop near at hand – the Holy Synod entrusted to his care. A vigorous outdoorsman, on such trips he often carried more than his share of the baggage while portaging from one waterway to another, bearing adversities with equanimity and wry humor. (See, for example, the extended account by Archimandrite Amfilokhii Vakulskii of the bishop’s visit to the Yukon-Kuskokwim region, ROAM 9 [1905] 378-382, 395-402, 416-423, 435-438.) Bishop Innocent’s travels also took him to the lower United States. In spring 2006 he was in Washington DC, where the Russian ambassador arranged for him to meet with the Secretary of Education, President Theodore Roosevelt, and the General Agent of Public Education in Alaska himself, Dr. Sheldon Jackson (ROAM 11 [1907] 136-149). During the first five months 2007 he was in New York, serving as temporary administrator of the archdiocese during the interval between the departure of Archbishop Tikhon and the arrival of his successor, Archbishop Platon Rozhdestvenskii.

Bishop Innocent did not neglect his responsibilities in Alaska, however. His annual reports on the state of the Alaskan church and many articles on education and related subjects provide a comprehensive picture of church life and institutions during what certainly was the most thriving period of its history since the days of Bishop Innocent Veniaminov. Thus in the report for 1906 we learn that there were 15 parishes in the diocese, with 18 churches and 74 chapels, having a total of 10,422 members, of whom 33 were Russians, 326 Serbs and other Slavs, 2408 Creoles, 1878 Indians (mostly Tlingit and Dena’ina), 2119 Aleuts (Unangax), 3646 Yup’ik, and 12 people of other ethnicities. There were 28 brotherhoods (including three in Sitka alone), with a total of 1684 members; and 35 temperance societies, with 3019 members. Most parishes had schools offering at least primary education. Four orphanages took care of 47 boys and 12 girls (ROAM 11 [1907] 156-169). At a higher level were the Innokentii schools in Unalaska and Sitka. Personnel for the latter included the bishop as its head and six teachers. Courses included Scripture, general theology, English, native languages, arithmetic, hygiene, world history, U.S. and Alaskan history, literature and liturgical music. The academic program was close to that in Russian seminaries except that the study of native languages replaced Latin and Greek. As in seminaries in the days of Bishop Innocent Veniaminov, students also engaged in practical activities like gardening, carpentry, fishing and bookbinding. They also chopped and hauled firewood from the
nearest forest (approximately three miles from the school) – a task in which Bishop Innocent Pustinskii joined them when he was in Sitka (*ibid*). A heavy travel schedule notwithstanding, Bishop Innocent Pustinskii did reside in the Bishop’s House and use it as his base of operations for all but a few months of his tenure. This resulted in some slight changes in the apportionment of space. Bishop Innocent and his successors were housed on the upper floor, supplanting the cathedral archpriests, who instead were accommodated in one or another of the nearby houses owned by the church. (Fr. Andrew Kashevarov’s family, however, because of its large size, occupied two of these houses during his tenure in Sitka, Building 105 – then across Monastery Street from its present location – and the house next to it, shown to the rear of the Bishop’s house in figure 5.00. 4.) With some regularity, however, the reception room of the upper floor continued to be used for church meetings and religious discussion groups (Arndt 2004, 64).

**Figure 5.00. 4.** St. Michael’s Brotherhood, men and women wearing ribbons, men wearing ribbons and sashes, officers wearing also a gold star, with Bishop Innocent Pustinskii (center with staff), Fr. Andrew Kashevarov (immediately to the bishop’s right) and other clergy.

### 5.17 Subsequent Developments

Bishop Innocent Pustinskii’s immediate successor, Bishop Alexander Nemolovskii (1909-1916), also had the Bishop’s House as his official residence, but he spent relatively little time there. He previously had served large immigrant parishes on the East Coast of the United States and was actively involved in the Russian Immigrants’ Home in New York City. As Bishop of Sitka, he of course toured his diocese, but he spent less time in...
remote regions of the western Alaska than did his predecessor. More interested in ministry to new immigrants than in mission to native peoples, he instead traveled extensively in the prairie provinces of Canada, new home to a flood of immigrants from Russia and Ukraine, even before he was named Bishop of Winnipeg in 1916.

The next vicar bishop of Sitka, Bishop Philip Stavitskii (1916-1919), arrived in his new see as World War I was nearing its end, on the eve of the Russian Revolution. On his arrival in Sitka he announced great plans for the future: to reopen an orphanage/boarding school, to renovate the cathedral, to begin publishing a diocesan magazine, to embark on pastoral visits throughout Alaska, and to start a new parish in Anchorage (ROAM 21 [1917] 55-57, 472-473). Very little came of these plans. In 1917 Bishop Philip traveled to Russia, never to return, although he nominally remained Bishop of Sitka until 1919. In the administrative chaos that followed the Russian Revolution, the Alaskan see remained effectively vacant until the appointment of Bishop Amfilokii Vakulskii (1924-1930), long-time Alaska missionary priest. In the inter-war period he would be followed by Bishop Antonin Vasiliev (1930-34) and Bishop Alexis Panteleev (1934-44), another long-serving Alaska priest.

During this post-revolutionary period, uses of the lower floor of the Bishop’s House and the “Old School” changed more often than those of the upper floor. Besides providing kitchen space, it housed the orphanage (gradually shrinking away), school space, quarters for one or two teachers, and by the late ‘teens a print shop and book-bindery. The “Old Schoolhouse” continued to be identified as an Innokentii School as late as 1912, but by 1917 it was merely a schoolhouse, identified as the former seminary (Arndt 2004, 107-108). By 1921 the “Old Schoolhouse” was being rented out (Arndt 2004, 108); in the following year it was leased to the Sitka Board of Education and its entrance switched to the opposite side of the building. Around the same time, part of the lower floor of the Bishop’s House was also being rented out to Sitka newspapers, which took over rooms formerly used as the diocesan print shop and bindery. In the 1930s much of the lower floor was turned into three rental apartments. Most subject to change was the large double room on the southwest corner of the lower floor, which was used in turn as a meeting space, a community library (from 1936), and a gift shop (from 1949, when one of its windows was enlarged as a door) (Estus 1983, §7, 2).

By the mid-20th century, the dilapidated Bishop’s House showed few signs of its previous importance, though it continued to be the residence of the Orthodox Church in America’s bishops of Alaska until 1969. “In 1973, after one hundred and thirty years of continuous use of the site by the Russian Orthodox Church, the National Park Service took possession of it” (Estus 1983, §7, 3). Its meticulous restoration, to its ca. 1853 form, proceeded over the next decade and a half, until 1988. Its pristine appearance today offers a clue – but certainly not the whole story – of the building’s significance not only for the Russian period in Alaskan history but also for the ensuing history of the Orthodoxy in America.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00. 2</td>
<td>Shipping routes</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>ROAM</td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokoureff</td>
<td>Photograph Collection, ca. 1880's-1970's. PCA 243</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/4990/rec/3">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/4990/rec/3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00. 3</td>
<td>Kostromitinov portrait</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokoureff</td>
<td>Photograph Collection, ca. 1880's-1970's. PCA 243</td>
<td>ASL-P243-1-027</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5015/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5015/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00. 4</td>
<td>St. Michael's Brotherhood at Russian Bishop's House</td>
<td>ca. 1905</td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokoureff</td>
<td>Photograph Collection, ca. 1880's-1970's. PCA 243</td>
<td>ASL-P243-1-047</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5015/rec/1">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5015/rec/1</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.00. 5. Sources of historic photographs.
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THE RUSSIAN BISHOP’S HOUSE
FIELD NOTES
(SEPTEMBER 2014, APRIL 2015 AND SEPTEMBER 2016)

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The Russian Bishop’s House National Historic Landmark (NHL) is located at 501 Lincoln Street in Sitka, Alaska. The 0.5 acre site on the shores of Crescent Bay consists of the Bishop’s House, the Old School, a yard and a garden. In 1843-1844 the Russian-American Company constructed the Bishop’s House for Bishop Innokentii (Veniaminov), the first bishop of the diocese of Kamchatka, the Kuril, and the Aleutian Islands. When the house was completed in 1843, twenty-five people including Bishop Innocent, the diocesan court, pupils, and servants moved in (Arndt 2004, 3). In addition to being a home for the Bishop, the two-story hewn log building contained a small chapel, housed church employees, and served as a school, seminary, and orphanage. The building was utilized by the Russian Orthodox Church until 1973. In 1897, the Old School building [Innokentii School] was constructed to the east of the Bishop’s House. This building served as a church school until 1921.

The period of significance for the property extends from 1842 when the Russian-American Company laid the stone foundation for the building until 1921 when the floundering Russian Orthodox Church—devastated by the Russian Revolution—was no longer able to provide financial support to its diocese in America. The Bishop’s House property possesses historical significance for its associative value as well as its design and construction value. National Register Criteria for Evaluation of historic significance A, B, and C apply to the property. Criterion A addresses properties which are associated with historic events; Criterion C applies to properties linked with historical figures; and Criterion C relates to properties with architectural significance. In addition to the Criteria for Evaluation, Criteria Consideration A which addresses religious properties, pertains to the site due to its association with the Russian Orthodox Church.

In 1962, under the provisions of the 1935 Historic Sites Act, the Russian Bishop’s House was designated a National Historic Landmark. With the passage of the National Historic Preservation Act in 1966, the Russian Bishop’s House, known at the time as the Russian Mission Orphanage, was placed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Russian Bishop’s House was purchased by the National Park Service in 1973. At this time the property became a unit of Sitka National Historical Park. The restoration of the building began directly thereafter and continued through 1988. Restoration efforts focused primarily on the building; successfully restoring the structure, recreating the living spaces and chapel on the second floor and providing interpretive exhibits on the first floor (Welzenbach 2012, 4).

6.2 GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION AND LOCATION MAP

State & County: State: Alaska

County: Borough of Sitka

Size (Acres): 0.5
Boundary Description:
The urban lot associated with the Russian Bishop’s House is located to the northeast of the intersection of Lincoln and Monastery Streets. Lincoln Street borders the property to the south and Monastery Street to the west. The historic boundary for the Russian Bishop’s House landscape encompasses all extant historic resources associated with the property that fall within Lot TK G Block 12 and does not include the property owned by the National Park Service to the west of Monastery Street. This property (Lot PTK Block 11) contains historic House 105 which was moved to its current location and lacks integrity.

The site boundary is a simple polygon. Boundary point A (479896, 6323133) is located at the southwest corner of the property. From this point the boundary strikes northwest for 137 feet along Monastery Street to point B (479887, 6323174). From point B the boundary strikes northeast for 151 feet to point C (479931, 6323184), the northeastern corner of the property. From point C the boundary continues to the southeast for 149 feet to meet point D (479941, 6323140). Finally, from point D the boundary strikes southwest, parallel to Lincoln Street, for 148 feet returning to point A. All coordinates are in NAD 83, UTM Zone 8 (Welzenbach 2012, 9-10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOUNDARY UTM SOURCE</th>
<th>UTM DATUM</th>
<th>UTM ZONE</th>
<th>UTM EASTING</th>
<th>UTM NORTHING</th>
<th>Site Map Boundary Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPS- Differentially Corrected</td>
<td>NAD 83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>479896</td>
<td>6323133</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS- Differentially Corrected</td>
<td>NAD 83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>479887</td>
<td>6323174</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS- Differentially Corrected</td>
<td>NAD 83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>479931</td>
<td>6323184</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS- Differentially Corrected</td>
<td>NAD 83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>479941</td>
<td>6323140</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1. Boundary UTMs of Russian Bishop’s House Landscape (Welzenbach 2012, 10).

Figure 6.2. Boundary of the Russian Bishop’s House Cultural Landscape (Welzenbach 2012, 9).
6.3 STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The Russian Bishop’s House serves as an important focal point in the larger Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscape of Alaska, a landscape with a more extended geographic range and a longer period of significance than the period defined for the Russian Bishop’s House. Yet the Russian Bishop’s House, as a component of Sitka National Historical Park, is in a unique position to provide an interpretive context for not only a larger geographic and cultural landscape but also a longer period of significance. Even before the arrival of the first Russian Orthodox missionaries at Kodiak in 1794 a relationship between the peoples of Alaska and Russian Orthodoxy had been initiated. In Sitka, this intercultural relationship began soon after the 1804 return of the Russians, with the construction of a small chapel or prayer house (Black 2004, 241) located near the Castle. The relationship was formalized with the arrival of Fr. Alexei Sokolov in 1816 and the construction of the first St. Michael’s church.

The Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical components of the Sitka landscape are significant because they demonstrate the unique relationship of the Russian Orthodox Church to a multi-ethnic urban population composed not only of native Alaskans and Russians, but also to a wide range of other ethnicities and religions, including Lutherans (who were especially prominent during the Russian period as well as later periods), Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Catholics and many others.

6.4 PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE BISHOP’S HOUSE AND GROUNDS

The period of significance for the purposes of the Cultural Landscape Inventory extends from 1842 when the Russian-American Company laid the stone foundation for the building until 1921 when the floundering Russian Orthodox Church was no longer able to provide financial support to its diocese in America (Welzenbach 2012, 16).

6.5 CHRONOLOGY

A chronology of events specific to the Bishop’s House and Old Schoolhouse is laid out in the Cultural Landscape Inventory (Welzenbach 2012, 21-15).

6.6 LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS

Landscape characteristics are the “tangible and intangible characteristics of a landscape that individually and collectively give a landscape character and aid in understanding its cultural value” ([Curry et al. 1988], 4). Landscape characteristics provide a structure for the discussion of character-defining features of a specific landscape resource.

The Cultural Landscape Inventory has identified landscapes characteristics that impact site integrity (Welzenbach 2012, 87).
Landscape characteristics of the Russian Bishop’s House include the spatial organization of the lot, land use, cultural traditions and practices, cluster arrangement, circulation, vegetation, buildings and structures, views and vistas and archeological sites. The archeological sites, on the whole, remain to be investigated (Welzenbach 2012, 54-55).

Figure 6.3. Landscape characteristics and aspects of integrity of the Russian Bishop's House landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Characteristic</th>
<th>Aspects of Integrity</th>
<th>Associated Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archeological sites</td>
<td>Location, Feeling, Association</td>
<td>Locations throughout site (see Welzenbach 2012, 54-56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Feeling, Association</td>
<td>Boardwalks (see Welzenbach 2012, 59-60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Traditions</td>
<td>Feeling, Association</td>
<td>(see Welzenbach 2012, 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Vegetable garden (see Welzenbach 2012 60-61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Systems and Features</td>
<td>Location, Feeling, Setting</td>
<td>Surrounding ecological systems (see Welzenbach 2012, 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Scale Features</td>
<td>Design, Materials</td>
<td>Fence (see Welzenbach 2012, 61-62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial Organization</td>
<td>Location, Design, Materials, Feeling, Association</td>
<td>Relationship between site features (see Welzenbach 2012, 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Location, Setting</td>
<td>Grade of the site (see Welzenbach 2012, 62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>Design, Materials, Feeling, Association</td>
<td>Trees in the front yard, vegetable garden (see Welzenbach 2012 62-63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views and Vistas</td>
<td>Location, Feeling, Setting, and Association</td>
<td>Views across Crescent Bay (see Welzenbach 2012, 63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Characteristic</th>
<th>Character-Defining Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Systems &amp; Features</td>
<td>Topography, ecology, climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setback from the street; relationship to the bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position of buildings on the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships to structures on east, north and west of the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical position of site in relationship to other Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical resources and other resources in Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Arrangement</td>
<td>Relationship to other contributing buildings and the non-contributing Building 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>Historic circulation ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>Trees, lawn (contributing vegetation only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Structures</td>
<td>Relationship between buildings and structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of buildings and structures on vegetation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 6.4.** Character-defining features of the Russian Bishop's House landscape, grouped by landscape characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Characteristic</th>
<th>Character-Defining Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Views and Vistas</td>
<td>Views to, through and from site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Scale Features</td>
<td>Fencing and board walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archeological Sites</td>
<td>As remaining on site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.7 EXISTING CONDITIONS

**Photographs and Figures**

Sources for all historic photographs are listed in a table at the end of this chapter (Figure 6.36). All other photographs were taken by Helen Erickson during field visits in 2014, 2015 and 2016, as noted in the captions.

Historic photographs may be under copyright; permission for reproduction has not been obtained. They are included here for reference only.

**Site**

The Russian Bishop’s House was constructed east of the Malyshevka River in one of the agricultural areas intended to supply the Russian fort, where fresh water and a gentle slope running down to the bay offered a good location for growing food (Figure 6.5). At the time the house was constructed, it was intentionally located outside of town (Arndt and Pierce 2003, 129).
The Russian Bishop’s House was built above the high tide line of the well-named Crescent Bay (Figure 6.6). The intertidal zone was used as a road, and fencing defined
the boundaries of shoreline properties. The shoreline has been considerably modified since the period of significance, with the construction in 1964-65 of a marina and a linear park across Lincoln Street (Welzenbach 2012, 61).

The location of the Russian Bishop’s House on Crescent Bay no doubt facilitated the water delivery of goods, but it may also have exposed the building to the impacts of tides or storms. Two historic photos (Figures 6.9 and 12) indicate that the southwest corner of the lot was terraced in 1885 and that a breakwater was installed in front of the lot around 1900. With the installation of the linear park along the water, the risk of tidal flooding was reduced.

Views and Vistas

Even at an early stage a number of other buildings surrounded the Russian Bishop’s House. Among these was the Seminary, constructed in 1846 (Figure 6.8); after the former seminary building burned in 1882, the Old Schoolhouse was constructed in 1897 (Figures 6.10, 11 and 12). To the west across Monastery Street, the town grew up. Therefore, from the beginning views from the site included other buildings, and views to the site were to some extent constrained by them.

Although buildings were constructed on both sides of the Russian Bishop’s House, and several small houses are said to have been located to the north (Welzenbach 2012, 34), a historic photograph suggests that an area of uncultivated land, lawn or a garden remained here into the 20th century (Figure 6.7).

Today the Baranof School playground immediately to the north provides a sense of open space reminiscent of the past spatial character (Figures 6.13, 19, 22 and 23). And although the area between the property and Crescent Bay has been considerably modified (Welzenbach 2012, 42), the visual link to the water remains (Figures 6.15 and 17).

Monastery Street, although paved, remains a narrow thoroughfare (Figure 6.17 and 18).

Lincoln Street, which runs in front of the Russian Bishop’s House, ends at the headquarters of the Sitka National Historical Park. This has preserved the property from a location on a major traffic corridor. Overall today’s site location and context away from the urban center contributes to an appropriate historic interpretation of the Russian Bishop’s House.
Figure 6.7. Beekeeping behind the Russian Bishop’s House, looking south, ca. 1900.
Figure 6.8. View of Seminary building in foreground with the Russian Bishop’s House in the background, looking northwest, before 1882.

Figure 6.9. The Russian Bishop’s House, looking northeast, 1885.
Figure 6.10. The Russian Bishop’s House, looking northeast, 1890.

Figure 6.11. The Russian Bishop’s House, looking northeast, ca. 1900.
Figure 6.12. The Russian Bishop's house, looking northwest from the beach, ca. 1900.

Figure 6.13. The Russian Bishop's House, looking north from the former beach (now park), September 2016.
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Figure 6.14. The Russian Bishop’s House, looking northwest, September 2016.

Figure 6.15. View from the front yard of the Russian Bishop’s House, looking south, September 2016.
Figure 6.16. View from the front yard of the Russian Bishop's House, looking southwest, September 2016.

Figure 6.17. View from the west side of the Russian Bishop's House (along Monastery Street), looking south, September 2016.
Figure 6.18. View from the west side of the Russian Bishop’s House (along Monastery Street), looking north, September 2016.
Property Boundary

The property boundaries of the Russian Bishop’s house have changed over time, reducing the original property to its present size of half an acre. At one time the associated property stretched north towards Swan Lake and east to Baranof Street, using the house as the western boundary, but beginning shortly after 1858 the property began to shrink. By 1936 when the Orthodox Church sold the property north of the Bishop’s House to the City of Sitka, encroachments and sales of land had resulted in the present property size. Today the Baranof Elementary school uses the section of the former property immediately to the north as a playground (Welzenbach 2012, 33-34).

Buildings and Structures

For the purposes of the Cultural Landscape Inventory the Russian Bishop’s House property includes the Russian Bishop’s House and the Old School. House No. 105 is within the legal boundary of the property but is not included within the boundary of the cultural landscape because it was moved to its current location after the period of significance. A brief description of the old seminary building which burnt down in 1882 is also included to provide additional information about the associated properties (Welzenbach 2012, 32).

The buildings retain their historic character, with the exception of the seminary building which burned during the historic period.
Secondary structures such as privies, a bathhouse, a water tower, a shed and additional fencing are noted in the records (Welzenbach 2012, 21-15), but information about their specific locations is lacking. Until further information is available, the role of the secondary structures is conjectural and thus cannot provide support for any appropriate historic reconstruction in the Russian Bishop’s House landscape.

Fencing

A cursory examination of historic photos reveal that many - if not most - of Sitka buildings were fenced (Figures 6.6 and 6.10, 12 and 17), and the Russian Bishop’s House was no exception. Historic photographs (Figures 6.7, 8, 9, 10, 1 and 12) reveal a range of fencing styles, and the fence line to the west and south appears to remain more or less consistent. On the north side of the property, the fence line appears to have changed over time.

The question of a historically appropriate fence of the property has been carefully evaluated.

As indicated earlier, a fence was constructed around the Bishop’s House garden in 1844 (Arndt 2004: 8,9,15). Russian Orthodox Church records from 1853 state that the garden was attached to the house and bounded by “a fence of upright slabs with one gate on iron hooks” (Arndt 2004: 28). An 1867 photograph of the Russian Hospital with the Bishop’s House in the background depicts a rough log slab fence to the east of the hospital (catalog no. SITK 15718). A similar fence is visible in the back of the picture extending from the southeast corner of the Bishop’s House towards Crescent Bay. This fence could be the fence around the Bishop’s House garden (which may have still existed at that time) or a larger fence around the front yard. In an 1885 photograph, a fence is located around the whole front yard of the Bishop’s House (catalog no. SITK 15714). This fence appears to be made of standard milled boards as opposed to rough slabs. As mentioned earlier, church administration requested a new fence around the church land in 1886 to prevent encroachment by neighboring property owners (Arndt 2004: 47). A circa 1890 photograph (catalog no. SITK 15713) depicts a picket fence around the yard which could have been constructed as a result of the request. Further evidence of the fence was presented in the 1894 inventory of church properties which describes a fence around the house (Arndt 2004: 104). A picket fence was located in the front yard for the majority of the 1900s until the house was purchased by the National Park Service. However, for a period in the 1930s and 40s only the fence posts were present along south section of the property bordering Lincoln Street.

During the restoration a new rough slab fence based on the 1867 photograph was constructed on the south, west and east edges of the property. Three gates are located in the fence on the west side of the property opening to Monastery Street, at the main entrance on the southwest side of the property, and to the south of the Old School where the former driveway connected to Lincoln Street (Welzenbach 2012, 41).

Because of stylistic changes in fencing during the historic period, a carefully researched recreated fencing contributes to an appropriate historic interpretation of the Russian Bishop’s House as it appeared in approximately 1867.
A tall metal pole and wire fence separates the property from the playground of the Baranof School to the north. The fence is noncontributing, but serves as a non-intrusive and appropriate property boundary. Its permeability contributes to the sense of open space behind the Russian Bishop’s House, reflecting the spatial character of historic photographs. Burgeoning spruce trees at the east and west end of the fence help to conceal its utilitarian character (Figures 6.21 and 22).
Bell

The bell (Figure 6.23), located on the west side of the Russian Bishop’s House, was installed after the renovation of 1987, between 1887 and 1889 (Figures 6.9 and 10). Most likely it was used in conjunction with the school rather than specifically for the Annunciation Church. The bell is an important intangible landscape element because it extends an aural presence of the Russian Bishop’s House beyond its geographical boundary.
Boardwalks

Like fencing, boardwalks are seen in numerous historic photos of Sitka (see, for example, Figures 6.8 and 17).

Reconstruction of the boardwalk in the 1980s was based on the 1843-4 drawings of the building. The reconstructed boardwalk extends around the house, to the old school building and to the entrances at the west and southwest sides of the property (Welzenbach 2012, 41).

Another interesting possibility with regard to a boardwalk circling the Russian Bishop’s House is suggested in Vectomov’s 1886 list of required repairs: “a ditch dug around the house not less than three feet deep and four and a half feet wide with its outlet on the beach. The whole of the ditch covered with a pavement of boards that will serve as a path” (Arndt 2004, 39).

The findings of the Cultural Landscape Report (Welzenbach 2012, 81) do not find the present boardwalks (Figures 6.16, 17, 18, 19, 21 and 26) to be sufficiently documented as a reconstruction and not sufficiently differentiated as to be distinguishable from historic materials. While the presence of boardwalks on this site is beyond question, more documentation is desirable to support the existing reconstruction, or, alternatively, to redefine it as a modification required for public use.

Circulation

The Cultural Landscape Inventory provides information about circulation patterns at a number of different scales, providing valuable information not only about movement on the site itself, but linking it to other ecclesiastical resources in Sitka. The “will way” used on a regular basis between the Russian Bishop’s House and the Schoolhouse (Figure 6.24) suggests that such a path might reflect historic usage.
Figure 6.24. Path worn in the turf demonstrates the circulation pattern between the Russian Bishop’s House and the Schoolhouse, looking north, September 2016.

Garden

In 1843, the year the Russian Bishop’s House was completed, seeds were ordered from Irkutsk by the Russian American Company, including turnips, carrot, beet, radish, cabbage, red cabbage, savoy cabbage, cauliflower, onions, leek, rutabaga, kohlrabi, various lettuces, garden cress, parsley, celery, spinach, parsnip, cucumber, marjoram, dill, various sugar peas and green peas (Arndt 2003, 119), and the following year a garden with a fence was constructed at the Bishop’s House (Arndt 2003, 8-9 and 15). The 1845 map indicates a garden in the front yard.

A garden existed in the front yard of the Russian Bishop’s House from 1844 through 1854. From 1854 to 1888, a garden is not mentioned in church records. In 1888, a garden is indicated in the church records. This garden was likely located behind the Bishop’s House and existed at least through 1894. The latest evidence of gardening on the site is from 1921 (Welzenbach 2012, 39).

Given the Alaskan climate, obtaining food supplies was always a challenge. Agricultural labor was certainly expected of those who were part of the Bishop’s House community. As one of several possible interpretative solutions, the garden (Figure 6.25) contributes to an appropriate historic interpretation of the Russian Bishop’s House.
Other Vegetation

One of the most noticeable features of the yard surrounding the Russian Bishop’s House are the two mature Sitka spruce trees (Figures 6.6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 16) in the front yard.

While vegetable gardens constituted the majority of planted vegetation on the site, several historic photographs of the Bishop’s House, the earliest from 1890, contain two large evergreen trees in the front yard. According to an 1897 issue of the Russian Orthodox Messenger these trees were planted in front of the house by Bishop Innokentii (Cloyd 1982: 41). While these trees were present within the period of significance, the year they were planted is unknown. In addition, the issue of the Messenger was printed over forty years after Innokentii occupied the house and the statement that he planted the trees is uncorroborated. The trees were referred to as “mighty cedars” but were most likely Sitka spruce because of their growth habit, location in full sun, and the limited variety of evergreen trees native to southeast Alaska. The trees were present on site through the end of the period of significance. A historic photograph of the Bishop’s House from 1927 (catalog no: SITK 15730) depicts the tall trees in front of the house. In another photograph from 1943 no trees were present. Thus, the trees were removed between 1927 and 1943. During the restoration, two young Sitka spruce trees were planted in a similar location in the front yard of the Bishop’s House (Welzenbach 2012, 40).
The Sitka spruce trees contribute to an appropriate historic interpretation of the Russian Bishop’s House.

The lawn may not be reflective of the earliest historic practice, but a lawn appears in the front yard by the turn of the century (Figure 6.26). This may reflect the rolled grass croquet field that Stephan M. Ushin, a Russian-American Company clerk in Sitka before 1867, describes in his diary (Ushin 1936, Vol. 1:30). Depending on the choice of interpretive focus, a lawn could be as valid as a garden in front of the Russian Bishop’s House.

Figure 6.26. Rolled or mowed lawn and boardwalk in front of the Russian Bishop’s House, looking northeast, ca. 1900.

An arborvitae hedge grows to the west of the steps and ADA ramp leading to the schoolhouse (Figure 6.30). This was most likely introduced as a safety feature when the schoolhouse was rehabilitated in 1999. It is noncontributing, but should be retained for practical safety reasons.

Signage

Park signage is suitably placed and does not detract from the historic resource (Figures 6.27 and 28).
Lighting

Lighting is appropriately placed and does not detract from the historic resource (Figure 6.29). While clearly not historic, it provides twenty-first century illumination in a sensitive way.
Figure 6.29. Example of lighting for the Russian Bishop’s House in the northeast corner of the property, looking north, September 2016.

ADA Access

Appropriate ADA access is achieved by the use of wooden ramps which do not negatively impact the historic resource (Figures 6.30 and 31).

Figure 6.30. ADA access on the west side of the Schoolhouse, looking southeast, September 2016.
Non-Contributing Structures

A storage shed and other utilities have been placed the north of the Schoolhouse in an unobtrusive location (Figure 6.32).

Figure 6.31. ADA access on the west side of the Russian Bishop's House, looking south, September 2016.

Figure 6.32. Noncontributing storage shed and utilities in the northeast corner of the Russian Bishop's House property, looking northeast, September 2016.
6.8 EVALUATION OF INTEGRITY

The elements of the Russian Bishop’s House property have been altered several times since it was constructed in 1843. The detailed information about each element provided above serves as a record of the activities on the site. Alterations to the landscape over time represent the cultural practices of the residents (gardening, bathhouses), the adaptation to the local climate (boardwalks), and the pressures of urban development (boundary changes). The availability of historical information about each element of the landscape varies. The landscape has been associated with the Russian Bishop’s House for 170 years. Thus, while this report is thorough in its examination of historic material, gaps in information related to all of the site elements remain. The landscape of the Bishop’s House is a piece of the historic urban fabric connecting the Bishop’s House to the town of Sitka as a whole and the history of the landscape reveals additional information about the unique history of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska (Welzenbach 2012, 42).

6.9 CONDITION ASSESSMENT

The National Park Service has created a standard whereby condition is expressed as a rating of good, fair, or poor.

Good: Indicates the inventory unit shows no clear evidence of major negative disturbance and deterioration by natural and/or human forces. The inventory unit’s cultural and natural values are as well preserved as can be expected under the given environmental conditions. No immediate corrective action is required to maintain its current condition.

Fair: Indicates the inventory unit shows clear evidence of minor disturbances and deterioration by natural and/or human forces, and some degree of corrective action is needed within 3-5 years to prevent further harm to its cultural and/or natural values. If left to continue without the appropriate corrective action, the cumulative effect of the deterioration of many of the landscape characteristics will cause the inventory unit to degrade to a poor condition.

Poor: Indicates the inventory unit shows clear evidence of major disturbance and rapid deterioration by natural and/or human forces. Immediate corrective action is required to protect and preserve the remaining historical and natural values (Page et al. 2009, §8.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and Structures</td>
<td>Russian Bishop’s House</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schoolhouse</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storage Shed</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanical Units</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardscape</td>
<td>Wooden Fencing</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wire and pole fencing (north side)</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boardwalks</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADA Accessibility Features</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>Two Sitka Spruce Trees</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arborvitae hedge</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Fenceline Vegetation</td>
<td>Noncontributing</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.33. Condition assessment of contributing and noncontributing features at the Russian Bishop’s House.

All of the individual contributing and noncontributing features of the landscape have been rated as good. However, this report agrees with the 2011 finding of the Cultural Landscape Inventory that the overall condition assessment is Fair, largely because of the documentation of the boardwalks. The Condition Assessment Narrative (Welzenbach 2012, 81) states:

The current landscape at the Russian Bishop’s House property is not entirely historically accurate, but maintains its historic integrity due to the significance and integrity of its primary landscape feature, the Russian Bishop’s House. The ‘fair’ landscape condition assessment is a result of urban development around the property and the erosion of the property’s original historic boundaries, but also due to the fact that the principal focus of past restoration efforts has been on the building and not the landscape and associated features. Specifically, several landscape features have been reconstructed on the site (the fence, the boardwalks and the garden), but these reconstructions are not aligned with current NPS reconstruction policies for landscapes.

Some questions to ask about the reconstruction of these landscape elements might be: Were these reconstructions based on documentary or physical evidence? Did they occur in the same location as the original elements? Was there no alternative to these actions that could accomplish the park’s interpretive mission?

It will be important to continue to evaluate whether reconstructed landscape features pose issues of authenticity or are practical solutions to contemporary interpretive issues. Perhaps the garden could be seen as an on-going exhibit to be replaced on occasion by a croquet lawn? The boardwalks could be reevaluated as suggested in the Cultural Landscape Report (Welzenbach 2012) in the course of ongoing maintenance.

### 6.10 ANALYSIS OF INTERPRETIVE POTENTIAL

The historic landscape of the Russian Bishop’s House offers interpretive possibilities at a number of different scales, suitable for a wide range of visitors. Identification and analysis of these target populations is essential in determining appropriate activities and exhibits and in determining how to invite additional interest groups to take advantage of the opportunities provided by the Russian Bishop’s House.
On Site

Direct links to the immediate settings of the Russian Bishop’s House should be exploited. On-site activities and demonstrations could potentially add beekeeping practices to gardening. Beekeeping was not particularly successful in Sitka, but it was an important ecclesiastical initiative not only because of the honey produced but also because of the commercial and symbolic value of beeswax. Likewise, the link between Siberian and Alaskan agriculture could be further developed.

Citywide

St. Michael’s Cathedral and the Sitka Historical Society are potential partners in enhancing a local interest in the Russian Bishop’s House. At this scale, appropriate seasonal events are important.

The feast of Annunciation is an important date for the Russian Bishop’s House, a feast celebrated with processions through the streets. St. Nicholas is one of the most popular saints in Alaska, given the relationship of Alaskans to the ocean. St. Nicholas Day (popular in maritime communities) and the feast of St. Michael the Archangel (patronal feast of the Cathedral) also offer occasions for celebration.

The wider ecclesiastical landscape of the history of the Russian Orthodox mission in Sitka should be integrated into the interpretation of the Russian Bishop’s House.

The Russian Bishop’s House landscape possesses multi-dimensional historical and contemporary significance. The Russian Bishop’s House is a rare example of Russian period architecture in America. The sturdy building designed for the first bishop of the Alaskan and Far Eastern Russian diocese was utilized for one hundred and twenty six years by the Russian Orthodox Church. The property expresses the Russian American period when Novo-Arkhangelsk served as the colonial headquarters in Alaska and the early American years when the Russian Orthodox Church continued to conduct missionary work and provide important educational services to Native communities in Alaska. As a physical component of the continued presence of Orthodox spiritual community in Sitka and an expression of the revitalization of the Russian American period, the Russian Bishop’s House property is representative of a historic district with contemporary cultural meaning (Welzenbach 2012, 19).

The Russian Bishop’s House complex is one of five Russian Orthodox historic ecclesiastical sites in Sitka. The others are St. Michael’s Cathedral, the former site of the first and second St. Michael’s churches, the former site of the Trinity church, and the Russian Cemetery. Each of these sites presents a unique aspect of Sitka history, at the same time that common elements demonstrate links to Russian Orthodox historic sites throughout Alaska. Because of its location in Sitka, the historic capital of Alaska, as well as because of the stewardship of the National Park Service, the Russian Bishop’s House is well situated to serve as the interpretive center for related Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical sites in Sitka (Figure 7K-2).
Statewide, National and International

The Russian Bishop’s House is likewise in an excellent position to facilitate a collaboration between the many constituencies of a larger Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscape in Alaska. In Anchorage, Eklutna, Kenai, Kodiak, and Unalaska, there are a number of private and public museums, churches and schools interested and able to serve as active partners in such an undertaking. Sites visited during the course of this study provide a point of departure. Additional priority sites to be included in future studies are Russian Mission (because of its historic importance and its link to Jacob Netsvetov), Angoon (because of its adjacency to Sitka) and Funter Bay (as part of the story of War in the Pacific National Historic Park).

The interest in practical sciences, especially but not only agriculture, displayed by both the ecclesiastical and the secular Russian missions in Alaska, provides another area of focus. Such projects as the Sitka Spruce Plantation at Unalaska have direct relevance to Sitka.

INTERPRETIVE ALLIANCE

The Russian Bishop’s House is well-situated to coordinate a state-wide interpretive alliance of historic Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscapes. Numerous public and private organizations offer resources in this area and have expressed interest in collaboration. See Figure 4-2 for a map of the geographic scope of this study alone.

Three parks in the National Park system have ecclesiastical resources: Aniakchak National Monument and Preserve (King Salmon), Katmai National Park and Preserve (Katmai), and War in the Pacific National Historic Park (Guam).

Just in the course of this study, a significant number of private and public museums, libraries and foundations have expressed interest in such a coalition. Among these are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROSSIA (Russian Orthodox Sacred Sites in Alaska)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.rossialaska.org">https://www.rossialaska.org</a></td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAA/APU Consortium Library</td>
<td><a href="https://consortiumlibrary.org">https://consortiumlibrary.org</a></td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna Historical Park</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eklutnahistoricalpark.org">http://www.eklutnahistoricalpark.org</a></td>
<td>Eklutna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska State Library</td>
<td><a href="http://library.alaska.gov">http://library.alaska.gov</a></td>
<td>Juneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sealaska Corporation</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sealaska.com">http://www.sealaska.com</a></td>
<td>Juneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alutiq Museum</td>
<td><a href="https://alutiiqmuseum.org">https://alutiiqmuseum.org</a></td>
<td>Kodiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baranof Museum</td>
<td><a href="http://baranovmuseum.org">http://baranovmuseum.org</a></td>
<td>Kodiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Herman’s Theological Seminary</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sthermanseminary.org">http://www.sthermanseminary.org</a></td>
<td>Kodiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldovia Village Tribe Museum</td>
<td><a href="http://www.svt.org/museum_visitor_center.html">http://www.svt.org/museum_visitor_center.html</a></td>
<td>Seldovia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.4. Potential public and private partners for collaborative interpretive work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Web Address</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage Museum at Rasmussen Center</td>
<td><a href="https://www.anchoragemuseum.org">https://www.anchoragemuseum.org</a></td>
<td>Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon Jackson Museum</td>
<td><a href="http://museums.alaska.gov/sheldon_jackson/sjhome.html">http://museums.alaska.gov/sheldon_jackson/sjhome.html</a></td>
<td>Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka History Museum</td>
<td><a href="http://sitkahistory.com">http://sitkahistory.com</a></td>
<td>Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of the Aleutians</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aleutians.org">http://www.aleutians.org</a></td>
<td>Unalaska</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.34. Potential public and private partners for collaborative interpretive work.

Bishop David (Mahaffey) of the Orthodox Church in America Diocese of Alaska has voiced support for a collaborative interpretive effort for Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscapes in Alaska, and a number of individual Orthodox parishes in Alaska have expressed interest. Among these are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dedication of Church</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angoon</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>St. Sophia Orthodox Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoonah</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>Holy Assumption of the Virgin Mary Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Orthodox Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwethluk</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napaskiak</td>
<td>St. James Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninilchik</td>
<td>Transfiguration of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Harbor</td>
<td>Three Saints Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouzinkie</td>
<td>Nativity of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Mission</td>
<td>Elevation of the Holy Cross Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldovia</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Orthodox Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Island</td>
<td>SS. Sergius and Herman of Valaam Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>St. George Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>SS. Peter and Paul Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>Holy Ascension of Our Lord Cathedral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.35. Potential collaborating partners - selected parishes of the Alaskan Diocese of the Orthodox Church in America.

6.12 MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

The recommended treatment for the landscape of the Russian Bishop’s House is Rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is defined as the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural or architectural values (Birnbaum and Peters 1996, 48).

Change and Continuity

There is a balance between change and continuity in all cultural resources. Change is inherent in cultural landscapes; it results from both natural processes and human activities. Sometimes that change is subtle, barely perceptible as with the
geomorphological effects on landform. At other times, it is strikingly obvious, as with vegetation, either in the cyclical changes of growth and reproduction or the progressive changes of plant competition and succession. This dynamic quality of all cultural landscapes is balanced by the continuity of distinctive characteristics retained over time. For, in spite of a landscape’s constant change (or perhaps because of it), a property can still exhibit continuity of form, order, use, features, or materials. Preservation and rehabilitation treatments seek to secure and emphasize continuity while acknowledging change (Birnbaum and Peters 1996, 6).

Cultural landscape management objectives must be considered at several scales. At the finest grain, defining characteristics of the landscape of the Russian Bishop’s House must be given equal importance to those of the buildings on the site. The changing character of landscapes indicates a greater responsiveness to the historic context than is possible with more static resources such as buildings. A landscape should be adapted in the present to reflect specific points in its past, rather than to present a generic and homogenized interpretation of its appearance over time. Because of the defined period of significance of the Russian Bishop’s House, a range of interpretations will be compatible. A specific case in point is whether to devote the front yard to lawn or garden.

- Further research, both documentary and archeological, is required in order to provide appropriate historic landscape guidance. The feature inventory listed above is not extensive, but some features clearly require more investigation. Circulation patterns should be of particular consideration here.

Considering elements beyond the lot lines is essential to a fuller understanding of the landscape of the Russian Bishop’s House.

- Historic clusters should be respected, including non-historic construction to the east and west of the House. Inclusion of Building 105 as part of the cluster should be considered.
- The view to the north should not be screened. The open space of the Baranof playground is more in keeping with the historic character of the landscape than a screen of evergreens would be. Another advantage of this open space is acoustic, maintaining a more natural soundscape on the site. The young spruces at the east and west ends of the wire fence are valuable in obscuring the utilitarian nature of the fence, which by comparison appears almost translucent.

Interpretation of the Russian Bishop’s House should not be restricted to the physical space of the buildings or lot, or even to the wider landscape of Sitka, but rather to the entire geographic extent of the Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical resources of Alaska. By developing interpretive resources at a number of different scales, the interpretation of the Bishop’s House can be appropriately expanded to include:
• The landscape elements present on the site in relationship to the changing uses of the Bishop’s House.
• The Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscape of Sitka in relationship to the Bishop’s House.
• The Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscape of Alaska in relationship to the changing role of the Bishop’s House over its period of significance.
• An enhanced understanding of the Russian Orthodox landscape perspective, which saw its mission in Alaska as ranging from west to southeast, in opposition to more typical American view of Alaska as being in the far north.
• Collaborative effort to link to and share the numerous resources of public and private constituencies who value the Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscape heritage in Alaska.

6.13 TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Treatment recommendations are specific to the landscape of the Russian Bishop’s House.

• Views and vistas should be maintained in support of management objectives (above).

• Historic circulation patterns should be reviewed. Over time routine maintenance may provide the occasion for more appropriate historically documented alternatives.

• Because vegetation varied during the period of significance of the Bishop’s House, the selection of a specific point in the continuum is appropriate, but inappropriate mixing of temporal features should be avoided.

• Trees impact a landscape for a longer period of time than other vegetation. If the two spruce trees were present for all but a short time during the period of significance, they should be retained and replaced as necessary. The trees should be inspected yearly and fertilization and remedial care should be provided as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.5</td>
<td>Plan of Sitka</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arndt and Pierce 2003, 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Caption</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Identifier</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.7</td>
<td>North of the Russian Bishop’s House</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>E.W. Merrill</td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td>SITK 26313</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/common/uploads/photogallery/akr/park/sitk/749BB3F8-1DD8-B71B-0BBF67F70436D6C1/749BB3F8-1DD8-B71B-0BBF67F70436D6C1.jpg">https://www.nps.gov/common/uploads/photogallery/akr/park/sitk/749BB3F8-1DD8-B71B-0BBF67F70436D6C1/749BB3F8-1DD8-B71B-0BBF67F70436D6C1.jpg</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.8</td>
<td>Seminary, looking west towards the Russian Bishop’s House</td>
<td>Before 1882</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td>SITK 15718</td>
<td>Welzenbach 2012, 50¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.9</td>
<td>The Russian Bishop’s House, looking northeast</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td>SITK 15714</td>
<td>Welzenbach 2012, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.10</td>
<td>The Russian Bishop’s House, looking northeast</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>E.W. Merrill</td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td>SITK 25631</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/common/uploads/photogallery/akr/park/sitk/741039BE-1DD8-B71B-0BF32CB5191BE7E/741039BE-1DD8-B71B-0BF32CB5191BE7E.jpg">https://www.nps.gov/common/uploads/photogallery/akr/park/sitk/741039BE-1DD8-B71B-0BF32CB5191BE7E/741039BE-1DD8-B71B-0BF32CB5191BE7E.jpg</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.11</td>
<td>The Russian Bishop’s House, looking northeast</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Z. Vinokourov Photograph Collection, ca. 1880’s-1970’s. PCA 243</td>
<td>ASL-P243-2-096</td>
<td><a href="http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5261/rec/3">http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/5261/rec/3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.12</td>
<td>The Russian Bishop’s House, looking north from the beach</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>E.W. Merrill</td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td>Not cited</td>
<td>Welzenbach 2012, 51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ A typographical error dates this photo to 1967.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Photographer</th>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.26</td>
<td>Front lawn at the Russian Bishop’s House</td>
<td>Ca. 1900</td>
<td>E.W. Merrill</td>
<td>Sitka National Historical Park</td>
<td>SITK 26316</td>
<td><a href="https://www.nps.gov/media/photo/gallery.htm?hiderightrail=true&amp;tagid=0&amp;showrawlisting=false&amp;id=730A11F4%2D1DD8%2DB71B%2DD0B3B4E35AE4A0099&amp;maxrows=20&amp;startrow=61">https://www.nps.gov/media/photo/gallery.htm?hiderightrail=true&amp;tagid=0&amp;showrawlisting=false&amp;id=730A11F4%2D1DD8%2DB71B%2DD0B3B4E35AE4A0099&amp;maxrows=20&amp;startrow=61</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.26. Sources of historic photographs.
NATIONAL REGISTER LISTED ECCLESIASTICAL BUILDINGS IN ALASKA

NR – National Register Listing
NL – National Landmark Listing
TS page – 1980 Thematic Study (Mongin and Kreta 1979)

Shaded rows group listings by date. The 1980s listings are the result of Kreta and Mongin’s work in 1979. While their accomplishment is impressive in its scope, today this group nomination requires revision and expansion. Two of the listed churched – Afognak and Balkovski – no longer exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>TS page</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Cathedral</td>
<td>19661015</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>Russian Bishop’s House</td>
<td>19661015</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>St. George the Great Martyr Church</td>
<td>66000156</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul Island</td>
<td>Sts. Peter and Paul Church</td>
<td>66000156</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>Holy Asumption Church</td>
<td>19700510</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>Holy Ascension Cathedral</td>
<td>19700415</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church (old)</td>
<td>72000189</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Church</td>
<td>19771212</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninilchik</td>
<td>Holy Transfiguration Chapel</td>
<td>19780522</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afognak</td>
<td>Nativity of the Holy Theotokos</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhiok</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akutan</td>
<td>St. Alexander Nevsky Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoon</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belkofski</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuathbaluk</td>
<td>St. Sergius Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekuk</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Bay</td>
<td>Sts. Sergius and Herman of Valaam</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igiugig</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic Ecclesiastical Landscapes Study – Sitka National Historical Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>TS page</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lime Village</td>
<td>Sts. Constantine and Helen Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Kalskag</td>
<td>St. Seraphim Chapel (old church)</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk's Lagoon</td>
<td>Sts. Sergius and Herman of Valaam Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naknek</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napaskiak</td>
<td>St. Jaoob's Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolai</td>
<td>Presentation of Our Lord Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolski</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondalton</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nushagak</td>
<td>Transfiguration of Our Lord Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouzinkie</td>
<td>Nativity of Our Lord Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Bay</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>St. John the Theologian Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Point</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Point</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldovia</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Naknek</td>
<td>Elevation of the Holy Cross Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George Island</td>
<td>St. George the Great Martyr Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul Island</td>
<td>Sts. Peter and Paul Church</td>
<td>19800606</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwethluk</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
<td>91000385</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historic American Buildings Surveys of Russian Orthodox Churches in Alaska

*No longer in existence.
National Landmarks are indicated in bold type.
Alaskan villages may have several different names; alternatives to currently used names are included in the Location column for reference. Information on Russian names for Sitka, Kodiak and Unalaska is included in field notes for these places.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>HABS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afognak*</td>
<td>Nativity of the Holy Theotokos</td>
<td>AK-55A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhiok</td>
<td>Protection of the the Theotokos Chapel</td>
<td>AK-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akutan</td>
<td>St. Alexander Nevsky Chapel</td>
<td>AK-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoon</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Church</td>
<td>AK-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belkofski*</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Church</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuathbaluk / Little Russian Mission</td>
<td>St. Sergius of Radonezh Chapel</td>
<td>AK-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Church</td>
<td>AK-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church (old)</td>
<td>AK-94-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church (new)</td>
<td>AK-94-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekuk (Ekwok)</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>AK-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Bay / Nanwalek /Alexandrovsk / Port Graham</td>
<td>Sts Sergius and Herman of Valaam Church (old)</td>
<td>AK-91A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igiugig</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>AK-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karluk</td>
<td>Ascension of Our Lord Chapel</td>
<td>AK-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>Holy Assumption Church</td>
<td>AK-39A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cove</td>
<td>St. Herman Church</td>
<td>AK-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Church</td>
<td>AK-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwethluk</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Village</td>
<td>Sts. Constantine and Helen</td>
<td>AK-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Kalskag</td>
<td>St. Seraphim Chapel (old)</td>
<td>AK-92-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Kalskag</td>
<td>St. Seraphim Chapel (new)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk's Lagoon</td>
<td>Sts Sergius and Herman of Valaam Chapel</td>
<td>AK-52A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naknek</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Chapel</td>
<td>AK-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naknek</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Chapel</td>
<td>AK-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napaskiak</td>
<td>St. Jacob's Church</td>
<td>AK-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolai</td>
<td>Presentation of Our Lord Chapel</td>
<td>AK-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolski</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
<td>AK-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninilchik</td>
<td>Holy Transfiguration Chapel</td>
<td>AK-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>HABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondalton</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>AK-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouzinkie</td>
<td>Nativity of Our Lord Chapel</td>
<td>AK-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Bay</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>AK-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>St. John the Theologian Church</td>
<td>AK-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Point</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
<td>AK-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Station¹</td>
<td>Transfiguration of Our Lord Church</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Mission / Ikogmiut / Kvikhpak</td>
<td>Elevation of the Holy Cross Church</td>
<td>AK-65A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Point</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>AK-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldovia</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
<td>AK-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>Annunciation Chapel</td>
<td>AK-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sitka</strong></td>
<td><strong>St. Michael's Cathedral</strong></td>
<td>AK-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Naknek</td>
<td>Elevation of the Holy Cross Church</td>
<td>AK-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>St. George</strong></td>
<td><strong>St. George the Great Martyr Church</strong></td>
<td>AK-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul Island</td>
<td>Sts. Peter and Paul Church</td>
<td>AK-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>Holy Ascension Cathedral</td>
<td>AK-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Pilot Station is not listed in the National Register; it may be confused with Pilot Point.
**ORTHODOX CHURCH IN AMERICA PARISHES IN ALASKA (2016)**

The Orthodox Church in America is the successor to the Alaska Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Church.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adak</td>
<td>St. Innocent Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhiok</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akutan</td>
<td>St. Alexander Nevsky Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleknagik</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>St. Innocent Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoon</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniak</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atka</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmartluaq</td>
<td>St. Herman of Alaska Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>St. Sophia Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenega Bay</td>
<td>Nativity of the Theotokos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chignik Lake</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuathbaluk</td>
<td>St. Sergius Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crooked Creek</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham</td>
<td>St. Seraphim of Sarov Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eek</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egegik</td>
<td>Transfiguration of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekuk</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekwok</td>
<td>St. John Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td>St. Herman Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False Pass</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoonah</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igiugig</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karluk</td>
<td>Ascension of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasigluk</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasigluk</td>
<td>Holy Trinity Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>Holy Assumption of the Virgin Mary Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Cove</td>
<td>St. Herman Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokhanok</td>
<td>Sts. Peter and Paul Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koliganek</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongiganak</td>
<td>St. Gabriel Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwethluk</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwigillingok</td>
<td>St. Michael Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen Bay</td>
<td>St. Herman Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levelock</td>
<td>Protection of the Virgin Mary Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Village</td>
<td>Sts. Constantine and Helen Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Karskag</td>
<td>St. Seraphim Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>St. Michael Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Village</td>
<td>St. Peter the Aleut Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naknek</td>
<td>St. Anna the Mother of the Theotokos Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanwalek</td>
<td>Sts. Sergius and Herman of Valaam Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napaskiak</td>
<td>St. James Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Stuyahok</td>
<td>St. Sergius Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newwhalen</td>
<td>Transfiguration of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolai</td>
<td>St. Peter the Apostle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolski</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninilichik</td>
<td>Transfiguration of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondalton</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunapitchuk</td>
<td>Presentation of the Theotokos Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohagamuit</td>
<td>St. Vladimir Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Harbor</td>
<td>Three Saints Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouzinkie</td>
<td>Nativity of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>St. John the Theologian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Point</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Station</td>
<td>Transfiguration of Our Lord Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkas Point</td>
<td>St. Peter and Paul Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Graham</td>
<td>St. Herman of Alaska Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Heiden</td>
<td>St. Matrona Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Lions</td>
<td>Nativity of the Theotokos Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Creek</td>
<td>St. Basil Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Mission</td>
<td>Elevation of the Holy Cross Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Point</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldovia</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>Annunciation of the Theotokos Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleetmute</td>
<td>Sts. Peter and Paul Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Naknek</td>
<td>Elevation of the Holy Cross Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Island</td>
<td>Sts. Sergius and Herman of Valaam Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George Island</td>
<td>St. George Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul Island</td>
<td>Sts. Peter and Paul Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony River</td>
<td>St. Herman Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatitlek</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telida</td>
<td>St. Basil Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuntutuliak</td>
<td>St. Agaphia Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyonek</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>Holy Ascension of Our Lord Cathedral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ROSSIA

(RUSSIAN ORTHODOX SACRED SITES IN ALASKA)

More information on this not-for-profit organization, whose goal is to stabilize and protect Russian Orthodox historic resources in Alaska, can be found at http://www.rossialaska.org/churches/.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCHES IN ALASKA LISTED IN THE NATIONAL REGISTER, as listed by ROSSIA

National Historic Landmarks
- Chapel of St. Nicholas, Kenai
- Holy Ascension Cathedral, Unalaska
- Holy Assumption Church, Kenai
- St. George the Great Martyr Church, St. George
- Sts. Peter and Paul Church, St. Paul
- St. Michael’s Cathedral, Sitka

National Register of Historic Places
- Ascension of Our Lord Chapel, Karluk
- Elevation of the Holy Cross, Naknek
- Holy Resurrection Churh, Kodiak
- Holy Transfiguration of our Lord Chapel, Ninilchik
- Nativity of Holy Theotokos Church, Afognak
- Nativity of our Lord Chapel, Ouzinkie
- Old St. Nicholas Church, Eklutna
- Presentation of Our Lord Chapel, Nikolai
- Protection of the Theotokos Chapel, Akhiok
- Russian Orthodox Church Rectory, Kodiak
- St. Alexander Nevsky Chapel Akutan
- St. Jacob’s Church, Napaskiak
- St. John the Baptist Chapel, Naknek
- St. John the Baptist Church, Angoon
- St. John the Theologian Church, Perryville
- St. Michael the Archangel Church, Cordova
- St. Nicholas Chapel, Ikuk
- St. Nicholas Chapel, Igiugig
- St. Nicholas Chapel, Nondalton
- St. Nicholas Chapel, Pedro Bay
• St. Nicholas Chapel, Sand Point
• St. Nicholas Chapel, Seldovia
• St. Nicholas Church, Kwethluk
• St. Nicholas Church, Nikolski
• St. Nicholas Church, Pilot Point
• St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church, Juneau
• St. Sergius of Radonezh, Chuathbaluk
• Sts. Constantine and Helen Chapel, Lime Village
• Transfiguration of Our Lord Church, Pilot Station¹

¹ This church is listed in error; it may be confused with Pilot Point.
DEDICATIONS OF RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCHES
IN ALASKA

The names of Orthodox churches are taken from feast days or named for saints of the Church. In the past it was traditional to consecrate a church on the feast or the celebration of a saint. Churches dedicated to St. Nicholas, patron of seafarers, are common in Alaska for obvious reasons.

HOLY RESURRECTION (= Easter)

TWELVE GREAT FEASTS
Nativity of the Theotokos (Virgin Mary)
Exaltation of the Holy Cross (= Elevation)
Presentation of the Theotokos in the Temple (= Virgin Mary)
Nativity of Christ (= Christmas)
Theophany (= Epiphany)
Presentation of Jesus in the Temple
Annunciation of the Theotokos
Entry into Jerusalem (= Palm Sunday)
Ascension of Our Lord
Pentecost (= Trinity)
Transfiguration of Our Lord
Dormition (Falling Asleep) of the Theotokos (= Assumption)

SAINTS
St. Nicholas (of Myra) - by far the most common dedication
St. John the Baptist
Sts. Sergius and Herman of Valaam
St. Michael (Archangel)
Sts. Peter and Paul the Apostles
Sts. Constantine and Helen
St. Sergius of Radonezh
St. Seraphim of Sarov
St. Jacob (= James, brother of the Lord)
St. Alexander Nevsky
St. Innocent Enlightener of Alaska (= Veniaminov)
St. Herman of Alaska
St. Tikhon of Moscow
St. Anna, the Mother of the Theotokos
Protecting Veil of the Theotokos (= Pokrov or Protection / Virgin Mary)
St. John the Theologian
St. Peter the Apostle
St. Basil
St. Matrona
St. Agaphia
St. Gabriel
St. Sophia
Three Saints (= Three Hierarchs, Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom)
Helen Erickson undertook work on the development of a documentation procedure for ecclesiastical resources at remote locations in Alaska. At St. Herman’s (April 2015), a text and photograph format was presented to the seminary students, who are drawn from villages across Alaska. A similar presentation was made for clergy wives at the annual Kuskokwim Deanery conference, held in Napaskiak, Alaska (July 2015). After these presentations, it was determined that video (phone) documentation rather than written documentation would be a far more effective medium for this crowd-sourced project.
DOCUMENTATION OF THE LANDSCAPES OF RUSSIAN ORTHODOX ECCLESIASTICAL SITES

Many Russian Orthodox Churches in Alaska have been documented by the National Park Service using forms created for the National Register of Historic Places or by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS). However, most of these documents include little or nothing about the site itself or the relationships between the historic buildings on these sites. Current efforts by the National Park Service hope to overcome this gap.

Documenting these neglected but important aspects of heritage is crucial to preservation. Undocumented features tend to be invisible when their continued existence is at stake. Without recognition, they are considered to have no value. Numerous cemeteries and important views and visual connections have been lost because no one created a record of their significance or even of their existence.

The following format for collecting this information is intended to be usable by any concerned person who sees a need to document landscape information. Information will be archived at St. Herman's Seminary in Kodiak for future use.

A site is often made up of component features – for example, a church, a cemetery, or a rectory. How these features are oriented, connected, and related to each other is important, as is the overall location of the church or group of church-related features within the larger landscape. The location of no longer extant features such as a school or former church is also important in understanding the historical context of the site.

NOTES ON SPECIFIC ITEMS ON THE FORM

All pages can be duplicated. Just be sure to put the name of the site on the top of each page, and, when you are finished, number your pages.

COORDINATES

These can be listed as either decimal degrees or hours/minutes/seconds. Most phones can give you this information. If you are describing a church, give a location at a corner or at the front door, and indicate where you took the coordinates. Use the same approach for other buildings or for the entrance or corner of a cemetery.

A shrine – often marking a specific event or the location of a former church or important building – may be a simple cross or a monument.

Graves may be found around older churches. Their presence can often be identified by the unevenness of the ground. Often clergy, their wives, church readers or church wardens are buried near the church.
Because of the tradition of marking graves by a simple wooden cross, which may deteriorate in a short time, former cemeteries may be better identified by unevenness of the ground or by oral history and tradition than by other means.

If you are able to determine the bearing of a church, either by phone or compass, please include that information as well.

GENERAL INFORMATION
This is the place to give a synopsis of what you know about the site. Who planted the trees, or did they just grow up in a previously clear site? Who built the fence? Who added rocks to bound walkways or roadways? When was this done?

INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT FEATURE
This section is designed to be repeated as needed to describe individual features. Bear in mind that access may have changed over time, or that pathways may have been paved. What materials are used? Look carefully at vegetation: Is it native, or was it brought from elsewhere to ornament the site.

BIRDSEYE VIEW OF THE SITE
This is an opportunity to look at how the individual component features are linked and how the church sites as a whole fit into the larger landscape.

Many church sites have been impacted by natural events such as volcanic eruptions or earthquakes. Others have suffered from urban renewal projects or the construction of adjacent buildings. Most Russian Orthodox churches were sited to be visible from a distance or to be a central feature. Is this still true of your site? What has changed?

Where is the site? Is it (or was it) on a river, near the ocean, adjacent to an obvious trade route, in a village? How did people get to it in the past? How is it reached today?

How are the various component features related to one another? Is there a visual connection, or a former visual connection?

How are the buildings oriented? Most often churches were built so that the altar area was to the east (from east to southeast in Alaska, depending on the time of year) and the entrance to the west. Is this true of the site you are inventorying? Once orientation has been established by the position of a church, do adjacent graves or those in the cemetery share that orientation? Do surrounding streets form a grid based on the position of the church, or does the position of the church depend on a prior alignment of streets? (If your phone or compass will give you additional information, add it here.)
What aspects of the landscape are most important to the site’s ‘sense of place’? Is it the views, or the sound/lack of sound, or the surrounding vegetation? What makes this site special?

SITE SKETCH
You do not have to be an artist or a draftsman to draw a site plan. Do not be concerned about specific measurements or small-scale features such as individual grave markers (unless you just happen to be skilled in such things). The most important thing is to show connections or the lack of connections – how things lie on the ground. Mark slopes or big hills. Add rivers, bays or nearby roads. If you know which direction is north, show that with an arrow.

Here is an example of what a site sketch could look like (apologies for doing this on my computer).
PHOTOS
Take photos that show what you have written about in this form. Identify the photo by number or title (if you use a digital file, put the information in the file name). On the photo log page, list the title, the subject of the photo, the direction you are facing, and the date you took the photo.

Finally, add information about how someone could get in touch with you if they want to know more – and also to get some credit for your important work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SITE</th>
<th>PAGE 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS or LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town/Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinates of Church and/or Other Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The site includes the following component features:

- [ ] Bells  How many? ______  [ ] Bell Tower
- [ ] Church
- [ ] Former Church or Earlier Church
- [ ] Chapel
- [ ] Shrine
- [ ] Rectory or Clergy Housing
- [ ] Church Hall
- [ ] School
- [ ] Brotherhood Building
- [ ] Cemetery 1
- [ ] Cemetery 2
- [ ] Former Cemetery
- [ ] Graves adjacent to Church
- [ ] Memorial other than Grave Marker

---

Form 07_30_15
Do you know the dates of any of these major features? Do you know who designed them? Installed them? (Copy this page if you need more room.)
For each component feature of the site, tell us more. Briefly describe any of the items below that are on the site. Use extra pages for additional component features and feel free to use extra pages if there is not enough room on these pages.

NAME OF FEATURE

Does this feature have a boundary fence?

A gate or gateway?

An entrance marker or sign?

Are there pathways or walkways?

Are there steps or stairs?

Is there nearby parking (formal or informal)? If not, how do people get to this feature?

Questions about this component feature are continued on Page 2...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF FEATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind. Component Feature: PAGE 2 (continued from page 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SITE</th>
<th>NAME OF FEATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL COMPONENT FEATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What materials are used in any constructed parts of the component feature (wood, stone, concrete)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS THERE ANY LIGHTING?</th>
<th>ARE THERE TREES OR SHRUBS? ARE THEY THERE FOR A PRACTICAL REASON, OR ARE THEY MERELY DECORATIVE? DO YOU KNOW WHEN THEY WERE PLANTED OR WHO PLANTED THEM?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO YOUR KNOWLEDGE, ARE THERE ANY LARGE TREES OR IMPORTANT SHAPES THAT WERE RECENTLY REMOVED?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAS THE SURROUNDING AREA BEEN MAINTAINED AS A LAWN OR NATURAL VEGETATION? HAS VEGETATION GROWN UP AROUND THE FEATURE(S)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Page 9**

*Chapter 7.06 – Draft Landscape Inventory Form*
BIRDSEYE VIEW OF THE SITE

Have major environmental (such as an earthquake or tsunami) or social changes (urban renewal, people moved away) impacted this site? Briefly explain any important impacts. ____________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Is this site or part of it visible from the surrounding area? Why (is it on a hill, for example, or in the end of a street)? __________
________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Was the site more visible in the past than now (trees have grown up, new buildings have been built)? __________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Is the site near the ocean, bay or river? ________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

How does someone get to the site today (by car, on foot, by water)? __________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________

Form 07-30-15
NAME OF SITE

How might the site have been reached differently in the past?

If the site has multiple components, is there a visual connection between them?

Was there a visual connection in the past that has now been lost (explain)?

Are there pathways connecting the site components?

Were there pathways in the past that are now lost?

Are the site components related to each other by their orientation (which way they face)?

If there is a church on the site, the altar is often located to the east. Are other site components oriented in this way? (If you have a compass or a phone with GIS, write down the bearing)

What aspects of the surrounding landscape do you believe contribute to this site’s ‘sense of place’?
SITE SKETCH

On this page, draw a simple sketch of the site. It doesn’t have to be measured or to any particular scale, because the important thing is to show how the site components are related to each other or indicate surrounding roads, rivers, etc. If you know which direction is north, put that information on your sketch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Photo</th>
<th>Month/Day/Year</th>
<th>Direction you are facing</th>
<th>Number or Name of Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NAME OF SITE**

Take some photos that will help to clarify what you have written in this form. You can print the photos or print them on a disk or send them by email.

Give each photograph a number and list it below.

What is the subject of the photograph?

What direction are you facing?

What month/day/year was the photo taken?

Use additional pages if required.
CONTACT INFORMATION

Thank you for helping to make a record of important historic church resources!

To help us keep track of who did this work and provided this information, please fill out the information below. Everything can be sent to me at:

Mat. Helen Erickson
P.O. Box 57249
Tucson
Arizona 85732

or emailed to erickson@terrascope@gmail.com

Your Name

Address

City / State / Zip

Email address

Phone

Date of your work
VIDEOGRAPHY: A DOCUMENTATION TOOL

While there is no substitute for documentation by trained historic landscape practitioners, the large number of important sites and the size of the State of Alaska indicate a need for crowd-sourced documentation, especially of those ecclesiastical landscapes that are difficult to access.

A preliminary draft of a text and photo format derived from that of the short-form Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) was eventually determined to be an ineffective tool. The draft form was presented to students from St. Herman’s Seminary, who are drawn from villages across Alaska, in April 2015, and subsequently presented to clergy wives at the annual Kuskokwim Deanery conference, held in Napaskiak in July 2015. Discussion revealed that the Alaskan Orthodox culture tends towards the aural and visual, making a text format a stumbling block rather than a useful guide. After these presentations, it was determined that video (phone) documentation (rather than written documentation) would be a far more effective medium for this crowd-sourced project.

The focus of this part of the project then shifted to developing guidance for video documentation of landscape resources through the creation of models. Two were created as part of this project – one in Kenai, with the assistance of Dorothy Gray, a parish volunteer, and one in Sitka, with the assistance of the Rt.Rev. Michael Oleksa of the Alaskan Diocese of the Orthodox Church in America. Both sites were deemed useful because of the range of character-defining features in these locations. The Sitka bells were rung by Ana Ditmar.

The September 2016 footage was shot in September 2016 with an iPad mounted on a tripod. Because these were to be models, a wireless mic was used for the narration, although this would not be a requirement for volunteers. Panoramic scans provided information on visual continuities. Robert Demers of the University of Arizona did the editing and production work.

The two videos can be accessed at http://capla.arizona.edu/project/russian-orthodox-church-alaska-historic. They are also available on the disk that accompanies this volume. St. Herman’s Seminary in Kodiak has agreed to provide an initial archive for future videos.

The ultimate success of this project will depend on providing encouragement and recognition for those who volunteer to undertake this kind of documentation.

The following is a document prepared by Robert Demers for the use of volunteer documentarians of Russian Orthodox ecclesiastical landscapes in Alaska.
BOB DEMERS’
GUIDE TO SMART PHONE VIDEOGRAPHY

A document for citizen documentarians of the Alaska Ecclesiastical Landscape.

Smart phones are everywhere, and with outstanding video capabilities high quality footage can be obtained as long as you know some basic videography techniques.

The videographer must tell a story yet shoot with the editing process in mind. You must provide a variety of shots for each scene, artfully composed and long enough to give the editor a multitude of choices in assembling the shots into an interesting and engaging video.

TRIPODS

A good tripod is necessary to steady the shot. Shaky camera work distracts the viewer from the intended message. You will need an adapter to attach your smart phone to the tripod. If you cannot find a tripod, a monopod will help to steady most shots. Make one yourself from a walking stick with a ¼-20 bolt attached to the top. Use the tripod as much as you can, save the handheld camera work for when it is absolutely necessary.

AUDIO

Research shows an audience will tolerate bad pictures more than bad sound. Pay as much if not more attention to the sound quality of your videos. The built-in microphone on many smart phones is quite good, the problem is that it is often too far from the subject to get good sound. If possible purchase a smart phone external lavaliere mic or adapter so you can place a mic directly on the subject. Some adapters have a volume control so you can adjust the microphone level. Follow the directions that come with the mic. If you have the budget, look into a wireless microphone system for your smart phone. When you arrive on location to shoot your subject, mic them up as soon as possible and start recording audio so you don't miss any good comments or observations. You can use this audio later in the editing process.
VIDEO SETTINGS
Record high definition video at the best possible quality. On many smartphones you can select the video settings. Choose 1080P HD at 30 fps if available.

THE INTERVIEW
Find a quiet place for the interview. You do not always need your subject standing in front of what they are speaking about. You can get that shot later and it can be edited into the video. These type of shots, those that will be edited over the interview audio, are called "B-Roll". In days of yore they were assembled on a second roll of film to be used over the interview footage, or "A-Roll". Try to shoot the interviews before shooting the B-Roll as the speaker will probably mention things that you will want to shoot. In addition to finding a quiet place to shoot the interview, find a place with good lighting; soft lighting, from the side of your subject. Choose a not-to-bright background yet interesting background. You want to focus the audience’s attention on what is being said, so keep it simple. You can shoot the B-roll video later to illustrate what the subject is talking about.

INTERVIEW TIPS
• Use a tripod
• Set the camera height to match the subject’s eye level.
• Make sure you are using your smartphone in landscape mode, not vertically.
• Don’t get too close to the subject. The smartphone lens is a wide-angle lens and will distort close-up subjects. Frame the subject from chest height up.
• Keep the light on the subject soft and from the side; skylight without direct sunlight looks good.
  • Use a clip-on (or lavaliere) mic instead of the built-in smartphone microphone.
  • Have the interviewer stand or sit as close to the camera as possible and have the subject look and respond to the interviewer. Do not try to have the subject talk to the camera. This is hard to do and rarely looks good.
  • “Lead” the subject in the camera frame; if she will be looking at the interviewer on the left side of camera, position her in the right side of the frame. If she will be looking at the interviewer on the right, position her in the left side of the frame.
• Focus on the subject, not the background. Many smartphones will allow you to lock
the Auto Focus on a specific part of the image by touching and holding a point on the screen.

- Write down and try to memorize your questions so you don't have to look at your notes too often. Look your subject in the eye when they speak, this helps them look at you instead of the camera.
- Let your subject speak uninterrupted and allow for a pause after they finish answering. This will give your subject a chance to follow up with additional comments and provide clean audio for editing purposes.
- At the end of the interview record ten seconds of "room tone" video; the quiet sound of the location the editor can use later to smooth transitions. Record this while the mic is still on the subject.

B-ROLL
Shoot a variety of shots to illustrate the location; wide shots, medium shots and close-ups. Try to shoot at least 3 different shots from each camera position you choose. Pick the most significant object in the frame and set the camera focus there. Shoot still shots and panoramas. Keep camera motion slow. Fast pans will stutter and look bad. If you later find that the motion is too slow, you can speed it up when you edit the video. Be sure to remain quiet when shooting the B-roll so you get clean audio, or natural sound you can mix under your narration or as a bridge in a transition.

Many smart phones will create a low-resolution, low quality file for email or texting. You will want to supply the best possible quality video to the editor, so use a cable and connect directly to a computer to download the video files. You can then use a cloud-based service such as Drop Box to share files with the editor.

Robert B. Demers
Manager, Video Communications
University of Arizona
Tucson Arizona
DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS TOOLS FOR THE DOCUMENTATION OF HISTORIC LANDSCAPES

Following innovative work by Robert Melnick (Melnick et al. 1982) in the early 1980s, a vocabulary was developed to discuss the specific features of historic landscapes. All of the subsequent work on designed landscapes, rural landscapes and traditional cultural properties required this appropriate inventory tool.

In the 1990s the National Park Service produced a series of informational bulletins – Landscape Lines - to provide technical information on cultural landscape research topics and techniques. The series includes a guide which presents a method and terminology for description of tangible and intangible characteristics of historically significant landscapes in Landscape Lines 3: Landscape Characteristics ([Curry et al. 1998]).

- “Landscape characteristic” is the recommended term associated with the classification system in this text. It refers to the processes and physical forms that characterize the appearance of a landscape and aid in understanding its cultural value.

- Landscape characteristics are defined as the tangible and intangible characteristics of a landscape that individually and collectively give landscape character and aid in understanding its cultural value.

- Landscape characteristic is applied to either culturally derived and naturally occurring processes or to cultural and natural physical forms that have influenced the historical development of a landscape or are the products of its development. The appearance of a cultural landscape, both historically and currently is a unique web of landscape characteristics that are the tangible evidence of the historic and current uses of the land.

- Landscape characteristics are categories under which individual features can be grouped. For example, the landscape characteristic “natural systems and features” may include such individual features as a ravine, valley, wetland, or cliff. The landscape characteristic “topography” may include such features as an earthwork, drainage ditch, or hill. The

---

1 Landscape Lines 3 was published without bibliographic information. Consultation with NPS staff led to an attribution to George Curry, Regina Bellavia, David Uschold, Charles A. Birnbaum, Timothy J. Kelley, Genevieve Keller, Robert A. Melnick, and Robert R. Page, with a presumed date of 1998.
landscape characteristic “vegetation” may include such individual features as a specimen tree, woodlot, or perennial bed.

- Many landscape characteristics are common among cultural landscapes; however, not all categories of landscape characteristics occur in every landscape. Determining which landscape characteristics exist or did exist within the unique development of each landscape must be made, and only the landscape characteristics that exist or have existed in a particular landscape are identified.

- Landscape characteristics are valuable in understanding the evolution of a landscape’s appearance over time. They may not have retained integrity (that is, existed in a relatively unchanged state since the established period(s) of significance), and therefore may or may not contribute to the significance of a landscape. Some landscape characteristics may be completely lost, some may be recent additions. Understanding what remains and what was lost can influence the treatment of the landscape.

- Landscape characteristics exist primarily within the boundaries of a cultural landscape; however, it is important to identify the natural, cultural, and political context for every landscape. The context provides an understanding of the relationship between the landscape characteristics and the broader environment within which they exist. The natural context includes the naturally occurring physical forms that have influenced the landscape’s development, such as dominant landforms, watersheds, native vegetation, water bodies, and wetlands. The cultural and political contexts include land use, zoning, legal restrictions, transportation, utilities, population, and political jurisdiction (state, county, city, village, or town (Curry et al. 1998), 4-6).

The following list of landscape characteristics form the basic tools for analyzing a historic landscape. They are not mutually exclusive, and some will be applicable to some landscapes and not to others. The relationships between the characteristics may be of equal or greater importance than the characteristics themselves ([Curry et al. 1998],6).

**LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS** ([Curry et al. 1998],7-11)

- *Natural systems and features*
  Natural aspects that have influenced the development and physical form of the landscape. Examples of features associated with natural systems and features include ravines, valleys, watersheds, and wetlands. Included here are
geomorphology, geology, hydrology, ecology, climate, native vegetation and other biotic cultural resources including animals.

- **Spatial organization**  
The three-dimensional organization of physical forms and visual associations in the landscape, including the articulation of ground, vertical, and overhead planes that define and create spaces. Examples of features associated with spatial organization include circulation systems, views and vistas, divisions of property, and topography. Included here are aspects of design intent, created boundaries, mounds and depressions in the ground.

- **Land use**  
The principal activities in the landscape that have formed, shaped, or organized the landscape as a result of human interaction. Examples of features associated with land use include agricultural fields, pastures, playing fields, and quarries.

- **Cultural traditions**  
The practices that have influenced the development of the landscape in terms of land use, patterns of land division, building forms, stylistic preferences, and the use of materials. Examples of features associated with cultural traditions include land use practices, buildings, patterns of land division, and use of vegetation.

- **Cluster arrangement**  
The location and pattern of buildings and structures in the landscape and associated outdoor spaces. Examples of features associated with cluster arrangement include village centers, mining, agricultural, and residential complexes of buildings and structures and the associated spaces they define.

- **Circulation**  
The spaces, features, and applied material finishes that constitute the systems of movement in a landscape. Examples of features associated with circulation include paths, sidewalks, roads, and canals.

- **Topography**  
The three-dimensional configuration of the landscape surface characterized by features (such as slope and articulation,) and orientation (such as elevation and solar aspect). Examples of features associated with topography include earthworks, drainage ditches, knolls, and terraces.

- **Vegetation**  
The individual and aggregate plant features of deciduous and evergreen trees, shrubs, vines, ground covers and herbaceous plants, and plant communities, whether indigenous or introduced. Examples of features associated with
vegetation include specimen trees, allées, woodlots, orchards, and perennial gardens.

- **Buildings and structures**
  The elements constructed primarily for sheltering any form of human activities are considered buildings. Elements constructed for functional purposes other than sheltering human activity are considered structures. Engineering systems are also structures, and mechanical engineering systems may be distinguished from structural engineering systems. Mechanical engineering systems conduct utilities within a landscape (power lines, hydrants, culverts). Structural engineering systems provide physical stabilization in the landscape (retaining walls, dikes, foundation).

- **Views and vistas**
  The prospect created by a range of vision in the cultural landscape, conferred by the composition of other landscape characteristics. **Views** are the expansive or panoramic prospect of a broad range of vision, which may be naturally occurring or deliberately contrived. **Vistas** are the controlled prospect of a discrete, linear range of vision, which is deliberately contrived.

- **Constructed water features**
  The built features and elements that use water for aesthetic or utilitarian functions in the landscape. Examples of features associated with constructed water features include fountains, canals, cascades, pools, and reservoirs.

- **Small-scale features**
  The elements providing detail and diversity for both functional needs and aesthetic concerns in the landscape. Examples of features associated with small-scale features include fences, benches, monuments, signs, and road markers.

- **Archeological sites**
  Any material remains or physical evidence of past human life or activities that are of archeological interest, including the record of the effects of human activities on the environment. They are capable of revealing scientific or humanistic information through archeological research.
SAM MCCLAIN WATERCOLORS

In the late 1960s and early 1970s Bruce Kendall of Anchorage commissioned artist Sam McClain to create watercolors of as many Alaskan RO Churches as possible. The series of over one hundred can be viewed at Alaska’s Digital Archives (http://vilda.alaska.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cdmg21/id/14503/rec/1). Few of these works include landscape except as artistic license.

Churches in highlighted rows are listed in the Orthodox Church in American Directory as of 2016, but this does not mean that the present church is the one recorded in the watercolors. In addition, there are several versions of a number of sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afognak</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Attu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afognak</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Nativity of the Theotokos, Afognak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akhiok</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos, Akhiok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akuk</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Chapel, Ekuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akutan</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>St. Alexander Nevsky Chapel, Akutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akutan</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Original St. Alexander Nevsky Chapel, Akutan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreafsky</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Andreasky [Andreafsy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoon</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist, Angoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniak</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos, Aniak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aniak</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos, Aniak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atka</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Atka Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Early Russian Orthodox Church, Attu Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attu</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Attu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>St. Sophia Church, Bethel (new church)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch River</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Branch River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenega</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Nativity of the Theotokos (destroyed 1964)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chignik</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Chignik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>St. Michael Chapel, Cordova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordova</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>St. Michael, Cordova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>St. Seraphim of Sarov Church, Dillingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>St. Sava Serbian Church burned 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Village</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Douglas Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Old Russian Church, dedicated to St. Nicholas, Eklutna Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Eklutna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekuk</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Ekuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekuk</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Ekuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekwok</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>St. John, Ekwok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Bay</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ss. Sergius and Herman of Valaam, English Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyak</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Eyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idenasky</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Idenasky [?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Church of St. Nicholas, Juneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaguyak</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Church, Kaguyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanatak</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Kanatak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karluk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Church of the Ascension of Our Lord, Karluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashega Village</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Holy Transfiguration Russian Orthodox Church, Kashega Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasigluk</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Church of the Holy Trinity, Kasigluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katmai</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, abandoned after 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Assumption of the Theotokos (old church), Kenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Original Dormition Church (Assumption), Kenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Dormition of the Theotokos (Assumption), Kenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killisnoo</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Killisnoo (Actually St. Andrew, burned 1928)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Holy Resurrection Church, Kodiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Old Russian Orthodox Church, Kodiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongiganak</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>New St. Gabriel, Kongignak [Kongiganak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongiganak</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>St. Gabriel, Kongignak [Kongiganak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kongiganak</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Old St. Gabriel, Kongignak [Kongiganak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwethluk</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Original St. Nicholas Church, Kwethluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwethluk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church, Kwethluk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levelock</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos, Levelock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makushin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Nativity of Our Lord, Makushin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>St. Michael Church, Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morshovoi</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel, Morzhovoi (destroyed by wind 1969)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naknek</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>St. John the Baptist, Naknek (St. Anna?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanapitchuk</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Protection of the Theotokos, Nunapitchuck [Nunapitchuk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhalen</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Holy Transfiguration Church, Newhalen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolai</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Presentation of Christ, Nikolai (St. Peter?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikolaki</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Nikolaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninilchik</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Holy Transfiguration, Ninilchik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondalton</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Nondalton (see #94 for copy image)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondalton</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Nondalton (Same as number 84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuchek</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Nuchek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nushagak</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ss. Peter and Paul Church, Nushagak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nushagak</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Nushagak (St. Seraphim of Sarov?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Harbor</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Three Saints, Old Harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouzinkie</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nativity of Our Lord Chapel, Ouzinkie [Ouzinkie]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Bay</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church, Pedro Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perryville</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>St. John the Theologian, Perryville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Point</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Church, Pilot Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Dedication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitkas Point</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ss. Peter and Paul Church, Pitkas Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage Creek</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>St. Basil’s, Portage Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Mission</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Elevation of the Cross, Russian Mission, Yukon River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Mission</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Elevation of the Cross, Russian Mission, Yukon River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Mission</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Kvlihak [Kvichak]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanak Island</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Sanak Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Point</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Russian Orthodox Chapel, Sand Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savonoski</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, New Savonski [Savonoski]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldovia</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>St. Nicholas Chapel, Seldovia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Cathedral, Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>St. Michael the Archangel Russian Orthodox Cathedral, Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Original St. Michael’s, Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>St. George Church, St. George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Original Church, St. Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, St. Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ss. Peter and Paul Church (second church), St. Paul Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Ss. Peter and Paul, St. Paul Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuyahok</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>St. Sergius Chapel, Stuyahok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatitlek</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Old St. Nicholas, Tatitlek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatitlek</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>New St. Nicholas, Tatitlek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Old Holy Ascension Church, Unalaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unalaska</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Original Holy Ascension, Unalaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unga</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Unga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unga</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>St. Nicholas, Unga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>St. Michael’s Orthodox Church; location unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody Island</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Russian Orthodox Church, Woody Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>First ecumenical council at Nicaea formulates creed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Roman Emperor Constantine the Great makes Constantinople his capital as New Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>863</td>
<td>Mission of Sts. Cyril and Methodius to the Slavs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>988</td>
<td>Conversion of Kievan Rus' to Christianity under Prince Vladimir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1054</td>
<td>Formal schism between Rome and Constantinople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1204</td>
<td>Knights of the Fourth Crusade sack Constantinople</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1240</td>
<td>Mongol invasion of Rus'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1379-1396</td>
<td>Missionary activity of St. Stephen of Perm, Enlightener of the Komi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Battle of Kulikovo. A Muscovite force scores a symbolic victory over a much larger Mongol army.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392</td>
<td>Death of St. Sergius of Radonezh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1453</td>
<td>Fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1462-1505</td>
<td>Ivan III, the Great, consolidates Moscow's authority over Russian principalities and Novgorod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Spanish expeditionary led by Christopher Columbus lands in the New World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1517</td>
<td>Martin Luther's 95 Theses signal beginnings of the Protestant Reformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519-1522</td>
<td>Ferdinand Magellan leads first circumnavigation of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521</td>
<td>Cortez conquers Mexico for Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1532</td>
<td>Francisco Pizarro begins conquest of Peru for Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1533-1584</td>
<td>Ivan IV, the Terrible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552</td>
<td>Muscovite conquest of Kazan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople elevates Metropolitan Job of Moscow to be Patriarch, a decision confirmed by all four eastern patriarchs in 1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>Union of Brest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598-1613</td>
<td>&quot;Time of Troubles&quot; in Muscovite Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Jamestown Colony established by the English in Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>A national assembly elects Michael Romanov as tsar of Muscovy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1616-1648</td>
<td>Thirty Years War devastates central Europe; concludes with Peace of Westphalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>Plymouth Colony established by the English in Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1646</td>
<td>Death of Peter Moghila, Metropolitan of Kiev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1653</td>
<td>Patriarch of Moscow Nikon reforms liturgical books to align with contemporary Greek practice, sparking the Old Believers' Schism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1666</td>
<td>Great Moscow Council endorses the liturgical &quot;reforms&quot; of Patriarch Nikon, effectively assuring perpetuation of the schism of the Old Believers, but deposes the patriarch himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1672</td>
<td>Accession of Peter the Great in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Incorporation of the Kiev metropolitanate into the patriarchate of Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1692</td>
<td>Witch trials in Salem Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703</td>
<td>Founding of St. Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1721</td>
<td>Treaty of Nystad ends Great Northern War, with Sweden ceding Estonia, Livonia and Ingria to Russia. Promulgation of <em>Spiritual Regulation</em>, followed by replacement of the office of patriarch by the Most Holy Governing Synod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td>Death of Peter the Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741</td>
<td>Captains Vitus Bering and Aleksei Chirikov discover the Alaska mainland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1752</td>
<td>Great Britain and its colonies adopt Gregorian calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>End of French and Indian War; France yields its American territory east of the Mississippi River to Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772</td>
<td>First partition of Poland, followed by further partitions in 1793 and 1795, divides Poland between Austria, Prussia and Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>James Watt invents an improved steam engine, stimulating Industrial Revolution in Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>Treaty of Paris ends American War of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1794</td>
<td>Arrival at Kodiak of first Orthodox missionary team, headed by Archimandrite Ioasaf Bolotov, from Valaam Monastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796</td>
<td>Death of Empress Catherine II, succeeded by her son Paul I. Construction of first church at Kodiak, dedicated to the Resurrection of Our Lord. Death of Hieromonk Iuvenalii at the hands of natives, probably near Quinhagak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1798</td>
<td>Ioasaf, head of the Kodiak mission team, consecrated in Irkutsk as Bishop of Kodiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Death at sea of Bishop Ioasaf and two other members of the original Kodiak mission team during their return from Irkutsk. Napoleon comes to power in France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1801</td>
<td>Headquarters of Russian-American Company transferred from Irkutsk to St. Petersburg. Emperor Paul I murdered in his bed, succeeded by his son Alexander I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Inspection mission of Hieromonk Gideon in Alaska on behalf of the Holy Synod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>U.S. Louisiana Purchase from France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>First Russian round-the-world voyage, linking the Baltic Sea and the North Pacific rim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Napoleonic wars end in final defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark Expedition explores the American Northwest from the Mississippi River to the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca.</td>
<td>Construction of first chapel at Sitka (Novo-Arkhangel'sk), dedicated to the Archangel Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1808</td>
<td>Sweden cedes Finland to Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811</td>
<td>John Jacob Astor establishes Fort Astoria as a fur trading post at the mouth of the Columbia River, the first American-owned settlement on the Pacific Coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>France, under Napoleon, invades Russia. Fort Ross, with a chapel dedicated to St. Helen, established near Russian River in northern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>War of 1812 between the United States and Great Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813</td>
<td>Russian Bible Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>Congress of Vienna settles European boundaries in the wake of the Napoleonic wars, with Russia receiving Grand Duchy of Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Arrival of first Orthodox priest, Fr. Aleksei Sokolov, in Sitka (Novo-Arkhangelsk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Alexander Baranov forced to retire as General Manager of the Russian-American Company. Virtually all his successors will be Russian naval officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>U.S. acquisition of Florida from Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>New (Second) Charter for the Russian American Company provides for greater company support of clergy, church construction, and transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>Fr. Frumentii Mordovskii appointed as priest at Kodiak, replacing Fr. Afanasii, one of the original Kodiak missionaries, who returned to Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>Arrival of Fr. Ioann Veniaminov as priest at Unalaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Death of Emperor Alexander I, succeeded by Nicholas I. Decembrist Revolt in favor of Nicholas I’s older brother, Grand Duke Constantine, suppressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>Arrival of Fr. Iakov Netsvetov, first Creole priest, trained at Irkutsk Seminary, to serve at Atkha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Oregon Trail draws U.S. settlers to the West. Indian Removal Act leads to the forced relocation of the Cherokee and other native nations from their ancestral homelands in the Southeast United States to &quot;Indian Territory&quot; in the West, leading to thousands of deaths along the &quot;Trail of Tears.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830-1831</td>
<td>Polish uprising put down with Russian victory in Battle of Warsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832-1838</td>
<td>Development of commercial electric telegraph in Europe and U.S. (by Samuel F.D. Morse).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Fr. Ioann Veniaminov transferred from Unalaska to Sitka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Fr. Veniaminov visits Fort Ross in Northern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Death of Father Herman at Spruce Island, last surviving member of the original Kodiak mission team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Veniaminov takes monastic name of Innocent and is ordained as Bishop of Kamchatka, the Kurile and Aleutian Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>Bishop Innocent moves into the newly-constructed Bishop's House in Sitka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>U.S. annexation of Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Oregon Treaty between the U.S. and Great Britain establishes what is now the international border between the U.S. and Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846-1848</td>
<td>Mexican-American War. By the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo the United States acquires much of what is now the American Southwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>California gold rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Beginning of the Crimean War, pitting the Ottoman Empire, France and Great Britain against Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>Death of Emperor Nicholas I, succeeded by his son Alexander II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Treaty of Paris officially ends the Crimean War, with significant loss of Russian influence in the Balkans, the Black Sea and Near East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>First successful transatlantic cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>Treaty of Aigun pushes Russian-Chinese border to the Amur River. Now-Archbishop Innocent Veniaminov's see officially transferred from Sitka to Yakutsk, along with the archdiocesan seminary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>Peter Lysakov, or Ekaterinovskii, ordained as vicar bishop for Alaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>Beginning of U.S. Civil War. In Russia Emperor Alexander II issues manifesto emancipating the serfs. Unification of Italy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>First of the Homestead Acts, which distributed over 270,000,000 acres of U.S. Federal land for private ownership and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>End of the U.S. Civil War. Assassination of Abraham Lincoln (April 15). Western Union begins projected telegraph line across Alaska and Siberia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>Steady consolidation of Russian accessions in Central Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>First commercially successful trans-Atlantic cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>Bishop Paul Popov replaces Bishop Peter Lysakov as vicar bishop for Alaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>United States purchases Alaska from Russia. Department of Alaska successively under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army (until 1877), Department of the Treasury (1877-79), and Navy (1879-1884).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Archbishop Innocent Veniaminov becomes Metropolitan of Moscow, highest-ranking churchman in the Russian Empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>&quot;Golden Spike&quot; marks completion of first transcontinental railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Ioann Mitropol'skii ordained as bishop of the new Diocese of the Aleutian Islands and Alaska. Transfer of diocesan see from Sitka to San Francisco. Bishop Ioann wil be recalled to Russia in 1876. Franco-Prussian War ends in humiliating defeat for France.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>Unification of Germany under Prussian leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>General Custer killed at the Battle of Little Big Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Nestor Zass, or Zakkis, ordained as Bishop of the Aleutian Islands and Alaska. He perishes at sea in 1882, leaving the diocese vacant for over five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Establishment of Carlisle Indian School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, followed in 1880 by Chemawa Indian School in Oregon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Emperor Alexander II assassinated, succeeded by his son Alexander III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Chinese Exclusion Act adopted in the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>First Organic Act makes provisions for a civilian government in what comes to be called the District of Alaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>In Sitka, major renovation of the Bishop's House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887 -1891</td>
<td>Vladimir Sokolovskii-Avtonomov, Bishop of the Aleutians and Alaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Wounded Knee Massacre of Lakota Sioux by the U.S. 7th Cavalry in South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891 -1898</td>
<td>Nicholas Ziorov, Bishop of the Aleutians and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Emperor Alexander III dies, succeeded by his son Nicholas II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>In Plessy v. Ferguson the U.S. Supreme Court affirms legality of &quot;separate but equal&quot; facilities. Gold rush to Canada's Yukon Territory, followed rushes to Nome, Fairbanks, Ruby, Juneau and elsewhere in Alaska.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>Tikhon Bellavin in America as Bishop - later Archbishop - of the Aleutians and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898 - 1907</td>
<td>Title of the diocese is changed to Diocese of the Aleutians and North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>Beginning of program of Russification in Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Wright brothers' first powered flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>Innocent Pustinskii, vicar bishop of Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Diocesan see transferred from San Francisco to New York City. San Francisco earthquake and fire destroy 80% of the city, leaving over 3400 dead. Unrest and strikes in Russia lead to Nicholas I's October Manifesto, which expanded civil liberties and established a state Duma (parliament).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Reform of theological seminaries initiated in Russia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907 - 1914</td>
<td>Platon Rozhdestvenskii in America as Archbishop of the Aleutians and North America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Robert Peary become first explorer to reach the North Pole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915 - 1919</td>
<td>Evdokim Meshcherskii in America as Archbishop of the Aleutians and North America; he will depart in 1917 to attend the All-Russian Council in Moscow but never returns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909 - 1916</td>
<td>Alexander Nemolovskii vicar bishop of Alaska; after 1916 vicar bishop of Canada; 1919-1922 Archbishop of the Aleutians and America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria leads to outbreak of World War I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>German offensive on eastern front takes Warsaw and Lithuania from Russia. Assassination of Rasputin, shadowy advisor to the royal family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Philip Stavitskii, vicar bishop of Alaska; returns to Russia in 1917.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>February Revolution in Russia leads to the abdication of Nicholas II and establishment of a Provisional Government. October Revolution brings Bolsheviks under Lenin to power. Beginnings of Russian Civil War. In the U.S., “Red Scare” marked by fear of Bolshevism and anarchism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Soviet Russia signs Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, ending its participation in World War I, relinquishing Finland, the Baltic states, Poland, Belarus and Ukraine (March 3). Execution of Nicholas II and family (July 17). Dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Ottoman Empire as well as the Russian Empire. Armistice ends World War I (November 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918 -1919</td>
<td>Global influenza epidemic leaves over 50 million dead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Treaty of Versailles imposes harsh peace terms on Germany.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Famine in Russia. Soviet government orders seizure of church valuables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922 -1934</td>
<td>Archbishop Platon (Rozdhestvenskii) returns as Metropolitan of All America and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>In the Soviet Union a council of the pro-government &quot;Living Church&quot; declares Patriarch Tikhon deposed and abolishes the Patriarchate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>In the Soviet Union, death of Lenin. In the U.S., a new immigration act establishes a national origins quota system, effectively closing immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924 -1931</td>
<td>Amfilohii Vakulskii, Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Death of Patriarch Tikhon; Soviet government refuses to let a new election take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Metropolitan Sergei Stragarodskii, Deputy Locum Tenens of the Patriarchal Throne of the Russian Orthodox Church, gives controversial pledge of loyalty to the Soviet government. Charles Lindberg flies solo across the Atlantic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Stock market crash leads to the Great Depression of the 1930s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Hitler and the Nazis come to power in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934 -1950</td>
<td>Theophlius Pashkovsky, Metropolitan of All America and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 -1941</td>
<td>Alexei (previously Fr. Aleksandr Panteleev, long-time Alaska priest) Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936 -1938</td>
<td>Show trials and purges in the Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Molotov-Ribbentrop non-aggression pact signed between the Soviet Union and Germany (August 23), agreeing to a division of much of eastern Europe between them. World War II begins as Nazi Germany invades Poland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chapter 7.10 - Timeline*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Germany launches massive Operation Barbarosa against the Soviet Union (June 22). Following Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor (December 7), U.S. enters World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Property seizure and internment of Japanese-Americans by Executive Order 9066 (February 19). Japan captures Aleutian Islands Attu and Kiska (June 3). Native population of entire Aleutian chain evacuated to internment camps elsewhere in Alaska and U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>Stalin allows a church council, which elects Sergei Stragarodskii as patriarch (d. 1944)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Anti-Discrimination Act in Alaska (February 16, date now named in honor of leading rights advocate Elizabeth Peratrovich). Allied victory over Germany and Japan. Establishment of Soviet-style communist governments throughout Eastern Europe in the wake of the war. Aleksei I Simanskii elected as Patriarch of Moscow to succeed Sergei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Berlin Blockade signals deepening of Cold War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1952</td>
<td>John Zlobin, Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1953</td>
<td>Korean War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1955</td>
<td>Leonty Turkevich, Metropolitan of All America and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Death of Stalin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Jonah Salk develops polio vaccine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1967</td>
<td>Amvrosii Merezhko, Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Hungarian uprising put down by Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Alaska admitted to Union as 49th state, followed later the same year by Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Escalation of war in Viet Nam. Cuban missile crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Good Friday earthquake in Alaska followed by massive tsunamis (March 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Immigration Act abolishes the national origins formula, opening the way for major new immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967-1972</td>
<td>Theodosius Lazor, Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Discovery of oil on Proudoe Bay, on Alaska's North Slope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Apollo manned space flight lands on the moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Moscow Patriarchate grants Tomos of Autocephaly to the Orthodox Church in America (OCA). Death of Patriarch Alexei I, succeeded by Patriarch Pimen Izvekov. Canonization of St. Herman of Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>St. Herman Seminary founded near Kenai, later relocated to Kodiak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>President Richard Nixon resigns in wake of Watergate scandal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>-1995 Gregory Afonsky, Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Completion of Trans-Alaska Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>-2002 Theodosius Lazor, Metropolitan of All America and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Public celebrations mark 1000th anniversary of Orthodoxy in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Exxon Valdez spills over 11 million gallons of crude oil in Gulf of Alaska. Fall of Berlin Wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Death of Patriarch Pimen, succeeded by Patriarch Alexei II Ridiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Dissolution of Soviet Union signals fall of communism in Eastern Europe. U.S. launches Operation Desert Storm in Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Consecration of the reconstructed Church of Christ the Savior in Moscow, the largest church in Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>-2008 Nikolai Soraich, Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-2008 Herman Swaiko, Metropolitan of All America and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Reconciliation of the Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia with the Russian Orthodox Church - Moscow Patriarchate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Death of Patriarch Alexei II, succeeded by Patriarch Kirill Gundiaiev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-2012 Jonah Paffhausen, Metropolitan of All America and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Tikhon Molland, Metropolitan of All America and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>David Mahaffey, Bishop of Sitka and Alaska</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GLOSSARY

Aleut
A term used by the Russians for the Unangax of the Aleutian Islands and at times also for the Alutiiq.

All-Night Vigil
Slavonic: vsenochnoe vdenie. Popular service in churches of the Russian Orthodox tradition in which Vespers and Matins are linked together on the eves of Sundays and major feasts to form one long vigil service. In ordinary parish practice the All-Night Vigil is about two hours in length.

Altar
The chancel, or altar area, in an Orthodox church, at the center of which the free-standing altar table is permanently placed.

Alutiiq (or Sugpiaq)
An Alaskan Native People with a significant Orthodox presence since the late 18th century, located principally in the Kodiak archipelago, the Alaska Peninsula, and the gulf coastal areas of the Kenai Peninsula and Prince William Sound.

Amvon
Ambo, or ambon. In Russian Orthodox churches the term refers to the raised area, often with a semi-circular projection, in front of the iconostasis.

Antidoron
Remains of the special loaves of bread (prosphora) left over after the elements for holy communion have been prepared. It is customarily distributed following communion and at the conclusion of the Divine Liturgy.

Antimension
Slavonic: antimins. A silken cloth bearing an image of Christ entombed, containing the relic of a saint and signed by the diocesan bishop, indicating his authority within the church. Without an antimension no Divine Liturgy (eucharist) may be served. Normally the antimension lies folded, beneath the Gospel book, on the altar table, but a priest may be issued a traveling antimension for use during visits to outlying chapels.

Archbishop
In the Russian Orthodox Church, a title of honor given to the bishop of a particularly large or important diocese. Occasionally the title may be awarded to a bishop simply for long and meritorious service. See also Metropolitan.

Archimandrite
A monastic superior, comparable to an abbot in the Latin west, who heads a particularly important monastery or grouping of lesser monastic houses. The term is also used as an honorary title for a particularly important priest-monk, or hieromonk, who exercises various administrative responsibilities in anticipation of being ordained as a bishop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archpriest</strong></td>
<td>Slavonic: <em>proterei</em>. A title of honor given to a priest distinguished by seniority and service, very often to one serving as the first priest of a major church or cathedral. In exceptional cases an archpriest may be made a mitred archpriest, that is, given the right to wear a miter, a liturgical &quot;crown&quot; normally reserved for a bishop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autocephalous / autocephaly</strong></td>
<td>A church is termed autocephalous (literally self-headed) if it is fully self-governing, possessing the capacity to elect all its own bishops, including the head of the church (primate). How autocephaly (the status of being autocephalous) is to be attained has been a subject of disagreement in contemporary Orthodoxy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Batushka</strong></td>
<td>Literally “little father,” an affectionate form of address for a priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bishop</strong></td>
<td>First-ranking of the three major orders of clergy (bishops, priests, deacons) who are responsible for service at the altar. As the archpastor of a diocese, with the assistance of priests and other diocesan clergy the bishop is responsible for its governance, liturgical life, and instruction in the Christian faith. Although bishops may be distinguished by titles relating to rank and status (metropolitan, archbishop, diocesan bishop, auxiliary or vicar bishop, retired bishop...), they share the same hierarchical/sacramental order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black clergy</strong></td>
<td>Russian: <em>chernoe dukhovenstvo</em>. Clergy drawn from the ranks of those who have taken monastic vows. Bishops are drawn exclusively from the &quot;black clergy&quot; although these may include widowed clergy who have taken monastic vows following the death of their spouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book of Needs</strong></td>
<td>In Greek, <em>Euchologion</em>, in Slavonic <em>Trebnik</em>, the <em>Book of Needs</em> provides texts for the various sacraments, liturgical offices, blessings, and intercessory prayers intended to fulfill the spiritual &quot;needs&quot; of a parish and its faithful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building</strong></td>
<td>An enclosed structure with walls and a roof, consciously created to serve some residential, industrial, commercial, agricultural, or other human use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character-Defining Feature</strong></td>
<td>A prominent or distinctive aspect, quality, or characteristic of a historic property that contributes significantly to physical character. Structures, objects, vegetation, spatial relationships, views, furnishings, decorative details, and materials may be such features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chasovnia</strong></td>
<td>Russian term for a chapel, as distinct from a consecrated church with a permanent antimension. The term derives from the Russian word for hour (chas), because in a chapel the daily cycle of worship, including the liturgical Hours of the day, may be read and sung in a community setting, led by a duly authorized reader or knowledgeable layperson even in the absence of a priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chrism, or myron</strong></td>
<td>An unguent composed of a complex mix of oils, wines, spices and various exotic ingredients, long simmered, which is used to anoint the newly baptized in the sacrament of chrismation (confirmation) and in several other church rites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Consistory**
An administrative body comprised of senior diocesan clergy typically serving in assignments in or near the bishop's cathedral and residence. In the 19th-century Russian Orthodox Church, the consistory played a major role in diocesan administration, maintenance of diocesan records, management of legal and financial affairs, and day-to-day office operations, particularly during a bishop's absence.

**Contributing Feature**
A biotic or abiotic feature associated with a landscape characteristic that contributes to the significance of the cultural landscape.

**Contributing Resource**
A building, site, structure, or object that adds to the historic significance of a property. A contributing building, site, structure, or object adds to the historic associations, historical architectural qualities, or archaeological values for which a property is significant because of the following: it was present during the period of significance; it relates to the documented significance of the property; it possesses historic integrity or is capable of revealing information about the period; or it independently meets the National Register criteria.

**Creole**
Used generically the term often refers to a person of mixed race, but in Alaska the term acquired a specific legal meaning that was only tangentially related to race. Creoles constituted a new social estate established specifically for Alaska, with rights and privileges comparable to those of the merchant/burgher estate in Russia. The creole estate was comprised of "those born of a European or Siberian and an American woman, or of a European or Siberian woman and an American, as well as their children..." and was hereditary, predominantly in the male line (Black 2004, 216).

**Cross Procession**
Russian: *krestnii khod*. An outdoor procession led by an altar server carrying a processional cross, followed by bearers of icons, banners and torches, clergy and singers, on a major feast day or other special occasion (e.g., for blessing of a body of water or fishing vessels or fields).

**Cultural Landscape Inventory (CLI)**
A computerized, evaluated inventory of all cultural landscapes for which the National Park Service has or plans to acquire any legal interest. The CLI includes a description of the location, historical development, landscape characteristics and associated features, and management of cultural landscapes in the national park system.

**Cultural Landscape Report (CLR)**
A report that serves as the primary guide to treatment and use of a cultural landscape, and that prescribes the treatment and management of the physical attributes and biotic systems of a landscape, and use when use contributes to historical significance.
Cultural Resource  A tangible entity or a cultural practice of a cultural system that is valued by or significantly representative of a culture or that contains significant information about a culture. Tangible cultural resources are categorized as districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects for the National Register of Historic Places and as archeological resources, cultural landscapes, structures, museum objects, and ethnographic resources for National Park Service management purposes. See also Cultural system.

Cultural System  A group’s interrelated set of learned behavioral, knowledge, and belief patterns in addition to social, economic, spiritual, and political arrangements for adapting to particular natural and social settings. Associated technology and expressive elements such as folklore and performing and graphic arts are included. Popular synonyms include lifeways, customs, and traditions. Cultural systems are parts of ecosystems.

Culture  A system of behaviors (economic, religious, and social), beliefs (values, ideologies), and social arrangements.

D'ik  An older term for psalomshchik, or reader.

Deacon  Slavonic: d'akon. The third of three major orders of the clergy, after bishop and priest, the deacon assists the bishop or priest in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy and other sacramental ministries. A senior deacon in a large church or cathedral may be designated as a protodeacon. A monastic deacon is called a hierodeacon.

Deanery, Dean  An administrative subdivision or district of a diocese, headed by a dean (blagochin), who most often is also the priest of a major parish within the deanery. The dean exercises a general supervisory role in relation to other diocesan priests and coordinates their activities with the diocesan administration.

Dena'ina  An Alaskan Native People with a significant Orthodox presence from the late 19th century, located principally in the Cook Inlet region; closely related to other Athabaskan Indian tribes of the upper Kuskokwim River and interior Alaska.

Diocese  The fundamental administrative unit of the church, headed by its diocesan bishop who, with the assistance of priests, deacons and other diocesan clergy, is responsible for its governance, liturgical life, and instruction in the Christian faith.

Divine Liturgy  The term used by the Orthodox for the eucharistic service, corresponding to the Roman Catholic Mass and the service of Holy Communion in Protestant churches.

Ethnographic Landscape  Areas containing a variety of natural and cultural resources that associated people define as heritage resources, including plant and animal communities, geographic features, and structures, each with their own special local names. See also Cultural landscape.
Ethnographic Resource  A site, structure, object, landscape, or natural resource feature assigned traditional, legendary, religious, subsistence, or other significance in the cultural system of a group traditionally associated with it.

Existing Condition  The present physical state of a cultural landscape.

Feature  A prominent or distinctive quality or characteristic of a cultural landscape. In a cultural landscape, individual features are grouped under broader categories of landscape characteristics. For example, such features as ravines, valleys, wetlands, and cliffs are grouped under the landscape characteristic, natural systems and features.

Feeling  A cultural landscape’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period.

Govenie  A period of strict fasting, frequent church attendance and spiritual preparation, often up to a week in length, that is followed by the sacrament of confession and reception of holy communion. No equivalent English term exists, though “retreat” comes close.

Gramota  A certificate honoring some form of meritorious service or achievement.

Hegumen, or igumen  A monastic superior, comparable to a prior in the Latin west, who heads a relatively small monastic house. The term is also used as an honorary title.

Hierodeacon  A monastic deacon.

Hierom monk  A monastic priest.

Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)  The American Institute of Architects (AIA), the National Park Service (NPS), the American Institute of Architects (AIA), and the Library of Congress re-signed the HABS Tripartite Agreement in 2003. First signed in 1933, the agreement created the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) to document America’s historic structures and to create work for architects, draftsmen, and photographers left jobless by the Great Depression. Now the oldest federal preservation program still in existence (and, in fact, the longest lasting official partnership between a private organization and the federal government), HABS has played a leading role in preserving America’s culture through documentation of important civic structures. Its mission has always been to create a lasting archive of America’s historic architecture.
In October 2000, the National Park Service in collaboration with the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) and the Library of Congress, established the Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS) to document historic landscapes in the United States and its territories to serve as tangible evidence of our nation’s heritage and development. In 2010 it became a permanent program. HALS is comparable to the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) and the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER).

**Historic Character**
The sum of all visual aspects, features, materials, and spaces associated with a cultural landscape’s history.

**Historic Designed Landscape**
A landscape significant as a design or work of art. Such a landscape was consciously designed and laid out either by a master gardener, landscape architect, architect, or horticulturist to a design principle, or by an owner or other amateur according to a recognized style or tradition. Historic designed landscapes have a historical association with a significant person, trend or movement in landscape gardening or architecture, or a significant relationship to the theory or practice of landscape architecture. See also Cultural landscape.

**Historic District**
A geographically definable area, urban or rural, possessing a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of sites, landscapes, structures, or objects, united by past events or aesthetically by plan or physical developments. A district may also be composed of individual elements separated geographically but linked by association or history.

**Historic Landscape**
1) A cultural landscape associated with events, persons, design styles, or ways of life that are significant in American history, landscape architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture. 2) A landscape listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

**Historic Property**
A district, site, structure, or landscape significant in American history, architecture, engineering, archeology, or culture. An umbrella term for all entries in the National Register of Historic Places.

**Historic Site**
The site of a significant event, prehistoric or historic occupation or activity, or structure or landscape (extant or vanished), where the site itself possesses historical, cultural, or archeological value apart from the value of any existing structure or landscape.

**Historic Vernacular Landscape**
A landscape whose use, construction, or physical layout reflects endemic traditions, customs, beliefs, or values. The expression of cultural values, social behavior, and individual actions over time is manifested in physical features and materials and their interrelationships, including patterns of spatial organization, land use, circulation, vegetation, structures, and objects. The physical, biological, and cultural features of the landscape reflect the customs and everyday lives of people. See also Cultural landscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Context</strong></td>
<td>An organizing structure created for planning purposes that groups information about historic properties based on common themes, time periods, and geographical areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Integrity</strong></td>
<td>(1) The authenticity of a cultural landscape’s historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during its historic or prehistoric period. (2) The extent to which a cultural landscape retains its historic appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historical Significance</strong></td>
<td>The meaning or value ascribed to a structure, landscape, object, or site based on the National Register criteria for evaluation. It normally stems from a combination of association and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Holy Governing Synod</strong></td>
<td>Supreme ecclesiastical authority in the Russian Orthodox Church following the abolition of the office of patriarch under Peter the Great in 1721 until its restoration in 1917. The Holy Synod’s composition varied from time to time but normally included the metropolitans of Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kiev as well as other bishops (and occasionally archpriests) appointed by the emperor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours</strong></td>
<td>Slavonic: <em>chasy</em>. Brief liturgical services consisting of psalms and select prayers appropriate to the time of day, appointed to be read at the First, Third, Sixth, and Ninth hours of the day (cf. the comparable services in the Latin west: Prime, Tierce, Sext, and None). In practice these are usually read in combination with other daily services rather than at dawn, mid-morning, noon, and mid-afternoon, as their names would suggest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Icon</strong></td>
<td>A religious image, usually painted, representing Christ, the Virgin Mary, or other saints, which serves as an important object of veneration among Orthodox Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Julian calendar</strong></td>
<td>So called because it was originally devised at the time of Julius Caesar in the first century B.C. Until the 20th century the Julian calendar was followed by all the Orthodox churches and by the predominantly Orthodox nations of eastern Europe for both civil and ecclesiastical purposes, notwithstanding the ever-increasing discrepancy between astronomical reckoning and calendar dates. (By the 19th century the Julian calendar lagged 12 days behind the Gregorian calendar, introduced by Pope Gregory XIII in the 16th century and subsequently adopted through much of the world; with the turn of the 20th century, the discrepancy became 13 days.) From 1923 onward, for the calculation of fixed-date observances like Christmas, some Orthodox churches adopted the Gregorian calendar, but for calculation of the date of Easter and moveable observances dependent on it, they retained the principles of the Julian calendar. Other churches - most notably the Russian Orthodox Church - did not accept this &quot;New Calendar&quot; and retained the Julian calendar without modification for all calendrical calculations. In Alaska, churches of the Orthodox Church America’s Diocese of Alaska and of the Serbian Orthodox Church follow the &quot;Old Calendar,&quot; while churches of the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese and the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese follow the &quot;New Calendar.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Kellenik**
Literally the "cell-attendant" of a bishop, who serves as his personal assistant and often as his secretary and administrative assistant.

**Khram**
Russian term for temple, a traditional Orthodox way of referring to a consecrated church.

**Kliros, or krios**
Raised area on the right and on the left of the amvon, often marked off by a low balustrade, where readers, cantors and church singers customarily stand.

**Landscape Characteristic**
The tangible evidence of the activities and habits of the people who occupied, developed, used, and shaped the land to serve human needs. The beliefs, attitudes, traditions, and values of the people and processes that have been instrumental in shaping the land, and the processes are evident as physical components on the land.

**Landscape Feature**
The smallest physical unit that contributes to the significance of a landscape that can be managed as an individual element.

**Landscape Unit**
A discrete portion of the landscape which can be further subdivided into individual features. The landscape unit may contribute to the significance of a National Register property, such as a farmstead in a rural historic district. In some cases the landscape unit may be individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, such as a rose garden in a large urban park.

**List of Classified Structures (LCS)**
A computerized, evaluated inventory of all historic and prehistoric structures having historical, architectural, or engineering significance for which the National Park Service has or plans to acquire any legal interest. Included in the LCS are structures that individually meet the criteria of the National Register or are contributing elements of sites and districts that meet the Register criteria, and structures—moved, reconstructed, and commemorative structures, and structures achieving significance within the last 50 years—that are managed as cultural resources because of decisions made in the planning process.

**Material**
The physical elements that were combined or deposited to form a cultural landscape. Historic material or historic fabric is that from a historically significant period, as opposed to material used to maintain or restore a cultural landscape following its historic period(s).

**Matins**
Greek: Orthros, Slavonic: Utrenia. The early morning office (daily worship service) of the Orthodox Church.

**Matushka**
Literally "little mother," a form of address used for the wife of a priest or deacon.

**Menaion**
Book (usually in a series of twelve volumes) containing liturgical texts, month by month, for fixed-date feasts and commemorations in the course of the liturgical year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>Term used originally for the bishop of the capital city, or metropolis, of a province in the Roman Empire. In Greek-background Orthodox churches, the term comes to be used for a ruling diocesan bishop, as distinct from an auxiliary or vicar bishop, and the term archbishop is used for the head of a wider grouping of dioceses. In the Russian Orthodox Church and several others, on the other hand, usage of the terms is practically reversed. The term archbishop comes to be used in much the way that the term metropolitan is used in the Greek-background world, and the term metropolitan is reserved for a more limited number of high-ranking bishops, specifically the metropolitans of Moscow, St. Petersburg and Kiev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moleben</td>
<td>A short prayer service of intercession, supplication or commemoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molitvenny dom</td>
<td>Meaning, in Russian, prayer house, a less formal term for chapel. Oratory would be the English equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Criteria</td>
<td>The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and: A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Historic Integrity</td>
<td>The authenticity of a property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's prehistoric or historic period. Historic integrity is the composite of seven qualities: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Nomination</td>
<td>Identifies and locates the historic property; explains how it meets one or more of the National Register criteria; and makes the case for historic significance and integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
<td>The official list of the nation's historic places worthy of preservation. Authorized by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the National Park Service's National Register of Historic Places is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect America's historic and archeological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Register Significance</td>
<td>The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and: A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or B. That are associated with the lives of significant persons in our past; or C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or D. That have yielded or may be likely to yield, information important in history or prehistory.

Nave
The central interior worship space of a church or chapel.

Non-Contributing Feature
A biotic or abiotic feature associated with a landscape characteristic that does not contribute to the significance of the cultural landscape.

Non-Contributing Resource
A non-contributing building, site, structure, or object that does not add to the historic architectural qualities, historic associations, or archaeological values for which a property is significant, because: it was not present during the period of significance or does not relate to the documented period of significance of the property; due to alterations, disturbances, additions or other changes, it no longer possesses historic integrity or is capable of yielding important information about the period; or it does not independently meet the National Register criteria.

Obednitsa
See Typika.

Odnochka
A one-man trading post of the Russian-American Company.

Old Believers
Adherents of groups that rejected liturgical changes introduced in the Russian Orthodox Church by Patriarch Nikon in the 17th century, hence referred to more accurately as Old Ritualists.

Orthodox Church in America (OCA)
Lineal successor of the Russian Orthodox Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska (1870), the Russian Orthodox Diocese of the Aleutians and North America (from 1900), and the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (from 1924, more often called simply the Metropolia), the Orthodox Church in America (OCA) was granted autocephaly (ecclesiastical independence) by its Russian Orthodox "mother church" in 1970.

Overprocurator
The lay liaison officer between emperor and the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, who often dominated church administrative life and policies during the period between Peter the Great and the Russian Revolution.

Panikhida
A brief memorial service for the departed.

Pantocrator
Image of Christ as ruler of the universe, frequently the focal point of a church’s central dome.

Pascha
The preferred Orthodox term for Easter, from the Greek word for Passover.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patriarch</td>
<td>The highest-ranking bishop, or primate, of certain autocephalous Orthodox churches, whether because of their antiquity or their particular importance in more recent times. These include the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Moscow and All Russia, Serbia, Romania and Bulgaria. The primates of newer or smaller churches usually have the title of archbishop or metropolitan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Significance</td>
<td>The span of time for which a historic resource attains historical significance and for which meets National Register criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponomar</td>
<td>Sacristan or sexton, charged with maintaining the church and its liturgical furnishings in proper order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyter</td>
<td>See Priest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestol'</td>
<td>Altar table, erected in the center of the altar area, on which the eucharist is celebrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>The usual English translation for presbyter, the second of the three major clerical orders in the Orthodox Church. The presbyter is ordained and assigned by the bishop to serve, on the parish level, in the priestly ministries of leading, sanctifying, and teaching. See also archpriest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promyshlennik, pl. promyshlenniki</td>
<td>Siberian and Russian trapper-traders and voyageurs. In Alaska these initially worked as independent contractors, with compensation based on shares in a given voyage or more extended enterprise. The term eventually comes to be applied to lower-level wage-earners in the employment of the Russian-American Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosphora</td>
<td>Specially marked round loaves of leavened bread from which portions are cut in preparation for the Divine Liturgy, or eucharist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalomshchik</td>
<td>Ecclesiastical reader, or psalmist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>Slavonic: <em>psalomshchik</em> or, earlier, <em>di'ak</em>. A minor clerical position with responsibilities for reading and intoning the psalms and many of the prayers and readings that comprise the daily cycle of services in the Orthodox Church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redoubt</td>
<td>A larger trading post of the Russian-American Company, often lightly fortified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Historic Landscape</td>
<td>A geographic area that historically has been used by people, or shaped or modified by human activity, occupancy, or intervention, and that possess a significant concentration, linkage, or continuity of areas of land use, vegetation, buildings and structures, roads and waterways, and natural features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Russian Orthodox Church (ROC)

Numerically by far the largest of the autocephalous Orthodox churches today, though by rank only fifth in order following the ancient eastern patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. *De facto* autocephalous from 1448, raised to patriarchal status in 1589, from 1721 to 1917 the Russian Orthodox Church was headed by a collective body, the Most Holy Governing Synod. In 1917 the office of patriarch was restored.

### Russian Orthodox Diocese of Alaska

The official name for the Orthodox Church in America's Diocese of Alaska.

### Schematic Drawings

Drawings that graphically illustrate a cultural landscape and the location of landscape characteristics and associated features. They depict more detailed information than simple sketches and diagrams, but do not include precise dimensions.

### Sketch Plan

A plan, generally not to exact scale although often drawn from measurements, in which the landscape characteristics and associated features of a cultural landscape are shown in proper relation and proportion to one another.

### Slaviq, or Selaviq

The traditional Yup’ik term, derived from the Slavonic/Russian word slava (glory), for the period celebrating the Nativity of Christ (Christmas), January 7 - 12. See Starring.

### Sobor

From the verb sobirat’, meaning to assemble or gather. (1) Sobor thus can refer to a church council, whence the Russian word sobornost’, meaning conciliarity. (2) Sobor can also refer to a major church, or cathedral, typically one having two side altars in addition to a main altar. If this church is the see of a bishop, it is designated as a kafedralny sobor, the location of the bishop's cathedra (seat of authority).

### Soslovie

Russian term for a social estate of the sort once common throughout Europe, each estate having certain duties and responsibilities and also certain expectations. In Russia these estates included the nobility, the clergy, the merchant/burgher, and the peasant class.

### Spirit house

A style of tomb common among the Orthodox Dena’ina of the Cook Inlet area, in appearance like small house, often personalized in colors and ornamentation.

### Spiritual Regulation

In Russian, Dukhovny Regament, a comprehensive degree governing the Russian Orthodox Church issued by Russian Emperor Peter the Great in 1721.

### Starosta

The warden, or elder, of a church, in charge of supervision of church or chapel monies.
**Starring**

*Slaviq, or selaviq*: Celebration of the Nativity of Christ on "Russian Christmas" (January 7) and the next several days by "following the star" in processions, led by a colorfully decorated star, that moves from house to house, enjoying refreshments and singing Orthodox liturgical hymns and folk carols at each stop. Starring is particularly popular among the Yup'ik but also practiced in Orthodox communities throughout Alaska.

**Statement of Significance**

An explanation of how a cultural resource meets the National Register criteria, drawing on facts about the history and the historic trends—local, state, national—that the property reflects.

**Stavropegial**

Slavonic: *krestovaia*. The term refers to the church of a monastery or comparable institution lying outside usual diocesan administrative structures, under the direct supervision of a superior ecclesiastical authority.

**Structure**

A constructed work, usually immovable by nature or design, consciously created to serve some human activity. Examples are buildings of various kinds, monuments, dams, roads, railroad tracks, canals, millraces, bridges, tunnels, locomotives, nautical vessels, stockades, forts and associated earthworks, Indian mounds, ruins, fences, and outdoor sculpture. In the National Register program, "structure" is limited to functional constructions other than buildings.

**Theotokos**

*Bogoroditsa*, or Birth-giver of God; the most common Orthodox designation for the Virgin Mary.

**Tlingit**

A Native People of southeastern Alaska, usually referred to by the Russians as Kolosh, with a significant Orthodox presence since the last quarter of the 19th century.

**Toion**

A Siberian term for headman, or chief, that comes to be applied to comparable native leaders in Alaska.

**Traditional**

Pertains to recognizable but not necessarily identical cultural patterns transmitted by a group across at least two successive generations. Also applies to sites, structures, objects, landscapes, and natural resources associated with those patterns. Popular synonyms include ancestral and customary.

**Traditional Cultural Property**

A property associated with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that are rooted in that community’s history or are important in maintaining its cultural identity. Traditional cultural properties are ethnographic resources eligible for listing in the National Register.

**Trezvon**

One of many Russian bell-peals, of a joyous, celebratory nature.

**Triodion**

Book (usually in two volumes) containing liturgical texts for movable feasts and commemorations, beginning ten weeks before Pascha (Easter) and ending eight weeks after Pascha, i.e. one week after Pentecost.
Typika  
Slavonic: obednitsa. A liturgical service consisting of psalms, hymns and readings appointed for a given day. In content it is similar to the non-eucharistic first half of the Divine Liturgy. The Typika sometimes is served when no priest is available or when a priest has no access to the bread and wine necessary for the full Divine Liturgy. Like the regular cycle of daily services (Vespers, Matins, Hours...), it may be led by a duly-authorized deacon, reader, cantor or knowledgeable layperson in the absence of a priest.

Ukaz  
A decree. The term most often refers to an imperial decree, though it may also refer to an administrative order issued by a competent governmental or ecclesiastical agency.

Unanagax /-an  
An Alaskan Native People, referred to by the Russians as Aleuts, with a major Orthodox presence since the early 19th century, located principally in the Aleutian Islands and the Pribilofs.

Uniate  
Term now regarded as pejorative for groups of Eastern Christians who entered into union, or unia, with the Roman Catholic Church, accepting papal authority while at the same time maintaining eastern forms of worship.

Vespers  
Greek: Hesperinos; Slavonic: Vecherniia. The evening office (daily worship service) of the Orthodox Church.

Vladyko  
Literally “master,” a common affectionate form of address for a bishop.

White clergy  
Russian: beloe dukhovenstvo. Married clergy, who serve in normal parish contexts from small villages to major cities, with the possibility of being raised to the rank of archpriest but ineligible for ordination to the episcopate.

Workmanship  
(1) The physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people.  
(2) The techniques and skills necessary to execute or construct a particular detail or feature.

Yup’ik  
An Alaskan Native People with a significant Orthodox presence from the mid 19th century, located principally in western Alaska, in the lower Yukon - Kuskokwim river system and the Nushagak - Mulchatna river system. Their Central Yup’ik language is part of the Eskimo-Alutiiq language family.
In addition to the print and electronic sources indicated below, the principal authors of this study consulted archival materials, including photographs, manuscripts, typescripts, personal papers and ephemera, at the Alaska State Library, Juneau AK (chiefly photographs); the Sealaska Heritage Institute, Juneau AK (William Wanamaker papers); the archives of the Orthodox Church in America, Syosset NY (chiefly photographs, memorabilia, and annual bishops’ reports and correspondence for the period of this report); the archives division of the Anchorage Museum, Anchorage AK (historic photographs and the Barbara Sweetland Smith collection); and the archives of St. Herman Seminary, Kodiak AK (chiefly materials related to Russian Mission and Amfilokhy Vakulskii). Records of the Russian Orthodox Church in Alaska now housed in the Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, were consulted on microfilm at the University of Alaska Anchorage / Alaska Pacific University Consortium Library. Throughout this study, reference is made to articles and notices, and sometimes to photographs, in the Amerikanskii pravoslavvnyi vestnik / Russian Orthodox American Messenger (abbreviated in references as ROAM). Published from 1896-1973, with occasional variations in title and periodicity and with several major gaps, the Messenger was the official organ of the Russian Orthodox Diocese of the Aleutians and Alaska (after 1900, Diocese of the Aleutians and America). It contains hundreds of articles and brief news releases relating to Alaska, especially during the first decades of its publication, some of which were printed in both English and Russian. Print copies of the complete series of this rare publication were consulted at the archives of the Orthodox Church in America. Microfilm copies of a partial series were also consulted at the University of Alaska Anchorage / Alaska Pacific University Consortium Library and at the University of Arizona Special Collections.
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