

Гольцеву вернуть долг позже, после получения отцовского наследства, а в качестве залога предложил икону Смоленской Божьей Матери, преподнесённую М.И. Кутузову. Пока неясно, как «Кутузовская» икона попала к М.Ф. Кашталинскому [Тимофеев, 2015, 282–283].

Исследователи отмечают, что «Кутузовская» икона представляет несомненный интерес и с иконографической точки зрения. В частности, Я.Р. Бибарцева указывает, что данная икона является «настоящей революцией в истории иконописи» [Тайна, <http://www.smolnews.ru/news/182299>]. В.Г. Пуцко называет «Кутузовскую» икону «исключением», исследователь отмечает, что икона представляет собой «иконописную вариацию гравюрной композиции» XVIII века. В.Г. Пуцко приводит несколько примеров похожих произведений, например, икона Нила Столбенского (1774 год). Художественный стиль иконы исследователь сравнивает со стилем В.Л. Боровиковского (1757–1825 гг.), который в академической живописной манере писал иконы и портреты. В.Г. Пуцко отмечает, что смоленский иконописец «находился под явным воздействием В.Л. Боровиковского и, может быть, даже отчасти использовал его произведения в качестве моделей». В.Г. Пуцко усматривает сходство даже в позах и жестах персонажей, изображённых на иконах [Пуцко, 2000]. Сотрудники Смоленского государственного музея-заповедника также обращают наше внимание на точность прорисовки деталей в нижней части иконы. Мы можем увидеть такие смоленские достопримечательности как Вознесенский монастырь, Нижне-Никольскую церковь, Успенский собор, надвратную церковь Богоматери. Подробно изображена и крепостная стена, окружающая город, а также проломы в ней, появившиеся в 1812 году в результате боя за Смоленск [«Кутузовская икона», http://www.smolensk-museum.ru/novosti/muzeynaya_zhizn/k-130-letiyu-smolenskogo-gosudarstvennogo-muzeya-zapovednika-art-i-e-fakty-130-let-predmetnoj-istorii/].



Илл. 1. Кутузовская икона.
Смоленский государственный
музей-заповедник.
Фото С. Захарова.

Таким образом, «Кутузовская икона» была создана в Смоленске зимой 1812–1813 годов по заказу местных жителей в благодарность М.И. Кутузову за освобождение Смоленска. В качестве основы была взята почитаемая икона Смоленской Божьей Матери и, скорее всего, гравюры с изображением Смоленска. Подарить икону М.И. Кутузову смоляне не успели вследствие его скоропостижной кончины. К нашему времени сохранилось четыре списка «Кутузовской» иконы – в Смоленске, Санкт-Петербурге, Гомеле и Москве. Местонахождение ещё одного списка, вологодского (который, скорее всего, и был оригиналом иконы), неизвестно. Первые три из перечисленных списков практически полностью идентичны, московский список отличается и размером, и примитивной манерой письма. Московский список однозначно не является оригиналом «Кутузовской» иконы, но оставшиеся три списка могут претендовать на это «звание». Подчеркнём, что лишь при помощи специальной экспертизы возможно установить какой из имеющихся экземпляров иконы является оригиналом. Тем не менее, все списки

«Кутузовской» иконы, несомненно, были созданы более двухсот лет назад и представляют собой уникальный памятник отечественной иконописи первой половины XIX века.

Библиографический список

1. 1812: война и мир: материалы всероссийской научной конференции / М.Б. Деверилина, С.А. Кремень. – Смоленск: Свиток, 2009. – 257 с.
2. Барклай-де-Толли, М.Б. Изображение военных действий 1812 года / М.Б. Барклай-де-Толли. – СПб.: Типография П.П. Сойкина, 1912. – 107 с.
3. Б-вь. Кутузовская икона Божией Матеря / Б-вь // Русский паломник. – 1912. – № 41. – С. 637.
4. Бибарцева, Я.Р. Икона Богоматери Смоленской-Кутузовской / Я.Р. Бибарцева // Музейный вестник. – Смоленск, 2013. – Вып. 7. – С. 5–13.
5. Виноградов, Л. Храм, открывающий объятия / Л. Виноградов // Казанский собор. – 2011. – № 1 (61). – С. 4.
6. Вороновский, В.М. Отечественная война 1812 г. в пределах Смоленской губернии / В.М. Вороновский. – СПб., 1912. – 428 с.
7. Глинка Ф.Н. Письма русского офицера. М.: Правда, 1990. 448 с.
8. Идрисова, Р. О принесении иконы Смоленской Божьей Матери в Казань / Р. Идрисова // Гасырлар авазы. – 2012. – № 3–4. – С. 32–40.
9. Пуцко, В.Г. Кутузовская икона в Смоленске / В.Г. Пуцко // Отечественная война 1812 года в Калужской губернии и российской провинции. – Малоярославец, 2000. – С. 107–112.
10. Русский инвалид. – 1815. – № 72. – С. 287.
11. Смоленский вестник. – 1898. – № 81. – С. 3.
12. Смоленские епархиальные ведомости. – 1913. – № 5. – С. 272–273.
13. «Кутузовская икона». Смоленские сюжеты войны 1812 года // Смоленский государственный музей-заповедник [Электронный ресурс]. – URL: http://www.smolensk-museum.ru/novosti/muzeynaya_zhizn/k-130-letiyu-smolenskogo-gosudarstvennogo-muzeya-zapovednika-art-i-e-fakty-130-let-predmetnoj-istorii/ (дата обращения 22.07.2019).
14. Смирнов, А. Священной памяти Двенадцатого года // Наше наследие. – 2012. – № 103 [Электронный ресурс]. – URL: <http://www.nasledie-rus.ru/podshivka/10305.php>. (дата обращения 21.07.2019).
15. Тайна «Кутузовской» иконы раскрыта в Смоленске // Смоленские новости. – 2013. – 11 декабря [Электронный ресурс]. – URL: <http://www.smolnews.ru/news/182299> (дата обращения 20.07.2019).
16. Тимофеев, Л.В. Факты и домыслы о происхождении Алексея Николаевича Оленина / Л.В. Тимофеев // Петербургский исторический журнал: исследования по российской и всеобщей истории. – 2015. – № 4 (8). – С. 268–285.
17. Шода, Т. Посвящение князю Кутузову // Гомельская правда. – 2012. – 16 июня [Электронный ресурс]. – URL: <https://gp.by/regionsfact/special/news20556.html>. (дата обращения 21.07.2019).

Текст поступил в редакцию 05.06.2019.

References

1. *Smolensk State Museum-Preserve*. Rare Book Storage, file 28 (in Russian).
2. "Kutuzovskaya ikona". *Smolenskiesyuzhetyvojny1812goda* [Kutuzov Icon. Smolensk Plots of the War of 1812]. Available at: http://www.smolensk-museum.ru/novosti/muzeynaya_zhizn/k-130-letiyu-smolenskogo-gosudarstvennogo-muzeya-zapovednika-art-i-e-fakty-130-let-predmetnoj-istorii/ (accessed: July 22, 2019) (in Russian).
3. Deverilina M.B., Kremen' S.A. *1812: vojna i mir: materialy vserossijskoj nauchnoj konferencii* [1812: The War and Peace: Proc. of All Russia Science Conference]. Smolensk: Svitok, 2009, 257 p. (in Russian).
4. Barclay de Tolly M.A. *Isobrazhenie voennykh dejstvij 1812 goda* [The Picture of Military Actions in 1812]. St. Petersburg: Tipografiya P.P. Sojkina, 1912, 107 p. (in Russian).
5. *Russkij palomnik* [Russian Pilgrim]. 1912, no. 41, p. 637 (in Russian).
6. Bibarceva Ya.R. *Muzejnyj vestnik* [Museum Bulletin]. Smolensk, 2013, vol. 7, pp. 5–13 (in Russian).
7. Vinogradov L. *Kazanskij sobor* [Kazan Cathedral]. 2011, no. 1 (61), p. 4 (in Russian).
8. Voronovskij V.M. *Otechestvennaya vojna 1812 g. v predelah Smolenskoj gubernii* [The Civil War of 1812 in Smolensk Governorate]. St. Petersburg, 1912, 428 p. (in Russian).
9. Glinka F.N. *Pis'ma russkogo officera* [A Russian Officer's Letters]. Moscow: Pravda, 1990, 448 p. (in Russian).
10. Idrisova R. *Gasyrlyar avazy* [Echo of Centuries]. 2012, no. 3–4, pp. 32–40 (in Russian).
11. Pucko V.G. *Otechestvennaya vojna 1812 goda v Kaluzhskoj gubernii i rossijskoj provincii* [The Civil War of 1812 in Kaluga Governorate and Russian Province]. Maloyaroslavets, 2000, pp. 107–112 (in Russian).

12. *Russkij invalid* [Russian Invalid]. 1815, no. 72, p. 287 (in Russian).
13. Smirnov A. *Nashe nasledie* [Our Heritage]. 2012, no. 103. Available at: <http://www.nasledie-rus.ru/podshivka/10305.php> (accessed: July 21, 2019) (in Russian).
14. *Smolenskie eparhial'nye vedomosti* [Smolensk Eparchial Bulletin]. 1913, no. 5, pp. 272–273 (in Russian).
15. *Smolenskie novosti* [Smolensk News]. December 11, 2013. Available at: <http://www.smolnews.ru/news/182299> (accessed: July 20, 2019) (in Russian).
16. Timofeev L.V. *Peterburgskij istoricheskij zhurnal: issledovaniya po rossijskoj i vseobshchej istorii* [St. Petersburg Historical Journal: Studies in Russian and World History]. 2015, no 4 (8), pp. 268–285 (in Russian).
17. Shoda T. *Gomel'skaya Pravda* [Gomel Truth]. June 16, 2012. Available at: <https://gp.by/regionsfact/special/news20556.html> (accessed: July 21, 2019) (in Russian).

Submitted for publication on June 5, 2019.



Религиоведение. 2019. № 4
Religiovedenie [Study of Religion]. 2019. No. 4

DOI: 10.22250/2072-8662.2019.4.121-127

Ekaterina A. Teryukova

*State Museum of the History of Religion
14 Pochtamtskaya St., St. Petersburg, Russia, 190000
eateriukova@mail.ru*



Central Anti-Religious Museum in Moscow: Historical Landmarks (1929–1947)

Abstract. The study focuses on the activities of the Central Anti-Religious Museum (CAM) in Moscow – an issue previously overlooked by historians. The article considers different aspects of its work during the brief period from 1929 to 1947 relating to the establishment and closure of the museum as well as provides an overview of the key areas of its collection, expedition, research and exhibition work. The article also follows the development of the CAM's highly skilled research team that investigated rudimentary religious practices of ethnicities inhabiting the USSR and the gradual disappearance of these practices. The growing research potential of the CAM and the museum's evolution from a propagandist institution into a history museum led to the renaming of the CAM to the Central Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism in 1942, upon which the museum passed from the auspices of the League of Militant Atheists into the charge of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Key words: Central Anti-Religious Museum, League of Militant Atheists, study of religious beliefs, religious survivals

Терюкова Е.А.

*Государственный музей истории религии
190000, Россия, г. Санкт-Петербург, Почтамтская, 14
eateriukova@mail.ru*

Центральный антирелигиозный музей в Москве: вехи истории (1929–1947)

Аннотация. Статья посвящена ранее недостаточно изученному вопросу из истории отечественного музейного дела и науки о религии – деятельности Центрального антирелигиозного музея в Москве. В статье рассматриваются различные аспекты его непродолжительного функционирования с 1929 по 1947 гг., связанные как с историей создания и закрытия музея, так и основными направлениями собирательской, экспедиционной, научной и выставочной работы его сотрудников. В статье показано, что постепенно в музее сформировался коллектив компетентных ученых-религиоведов, в центре внимания которых было изучение религиозных верований народов СССР и их преодоления как формы пережитков. Рост научного потенциала музея, его эволюция от музея пропагандистского толка к музею исторического типа привела к переименованию Центрального антирелигиозного музея в Москве в 1942 г. в Центральный музей истории религии и атеизма и его передаче из Союза воинствующих безбожников в ведение АН СССР.

Ключевые слова: Центральный антирелигиозный музей, Союз воинствующих безбожников, изучение религиозных верований, религиозные пережитки

The Central Anti-Religious Museum (CAM) was established by a resolution of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (VKPb) in spring 1926. The resolution was passed in the wake of the hugely successful Baumansky anti-religious exhibition mounted in 1925 at the Moscow School of Military Engineering and curated by historian of religion Boris Kandidov, who contributed the exhibits. Much support to the exhibition came from the military engineering students – they “did a good job as carpenters, artists, guides, and lecturers” [Kandidov, 2012, 271]. The name of the exhibition derives from the Baumansky District in Moscow where it was held, although the official title of the event was “The Church and the Revolution”. Later, at the end of the 1930s, Kandidov mentioned this project in his book “The Journey of Struggle. (Reminiscences about the Setting-up of the Central Anti-religious Museum)”. The exhibition was described as an important “stage in the struggle to create the anti-religious museum” – an institution conceived and initiated by Kandidov himself [Kandidov, 2012, 270]. His experience of teaching and public anti-religious campaigning over 1922 and 1923 convinced him that a consistent use of visual presentation was crucial: “Lectures, reports, talks, and all manner of performances had their effect; however, it was also necessary to use documents, pictures and a broad variety of art exhibits to make the workers and peasants appreciate the rightness of our position” [Kandidov, 2012, 264].

The success of the exhibition, which prompted the VKPb Central Committee to endorse the opening of a new anti-religious museum, also inspired Kandidov to liaise with Emelyan Yaroslavsky, head of the voluntary public organization named the League of Militant Atheists (1925–1947), and to draft a proposal for the museum in autumn 1926 jointly with M. Sheynman, F. Kovalev and M. Pokrovsky. A few months later, in December 1926, Kandidov’s proposal was published in the journal “Antireligioznik” (“Anti-religious”) [Kandidov, 1926]. Although commitment to “anti-religious struggle and promotion of atheism” was seen as the core part of the museum’s mission, much of its functions centred around research and acquisition. To achieve this goal, the new museum had to create its own archive and library, build a collection (“amass valuable materials”) and recruit qualified staff. According to Kandidov, a combination of these factors would enable the CAM to develop into “a major research institution working comprehensively towards spiritual emancipation of the labourers; a place for lively creative activity” [Kandidov, 1926, 49].

The Central Anti-Religious Museum opened doors on 10 June 1929 in the former Monastery of Christ’s Passions in Moscow. The event was held in celebration of the 2nd National Congress of the League of Militant Atheists, the museum’s patron institution. The CAM became the first-ever anti-religious museum in the USSR and the only facility of this type in the world; however, just several years later, “over a hundred similar museums were operating across the Soviet Union” [Tri goda, 1932, 14]. In 1934 the CAM was recognized as a research institution of national importance by the Council of People’s Commissars (Sovnarkom). The museum performed a variety of important functions and was expected “to aggregate data about the work of provincial museums, to develop guidelines on methodologies and techniques of anti-religious museum work”, “to organize research work which would inform acquisition and museumification as well as translate into profound research publications by the CAM” [Kogan, 1934, 36]. In autumn 1934, the Museum formed a research group specializing in religious practices of the ethnicities populating the USSR.

The research group functioned as the Moscow branch of the Leningrad Section for Investigation of Religious Practices of the Peoples of the USSR, headed by ethnographer N.M. Matorin. Over several years the Section compiled religious membership maps of different areas; it also conducted research into religious syncretism jointly with both established and aspiring religious historians, ethnographers, archaeologists and specialists in folklore, resulting in an extensive network of research correspondents in national republics and regions. By 1934 it had local branches in Kalinin, Voronezh and Cheboksary [Shakhnovich, 2013, 216]. The Section was created as a result of transformations undergone by the research group specializing in popular religious activities or, shortly, “the historical study of religious cults”; established in Leningrad in autumn 1928, the Section changed its name and headquarters several times. From February 1934 onwards, the Section operated

under the auspices of the Museum of the History of Religion (USSR Academy of Sciences), bringing together students, university lecturers, museum workers, researchers, experts in regional studies and members of the local branches of the League of Militant Atheists in Leningrad and Leningrad Region [Shakhnovich, 2013, 200]. The Section focused on the study of “vestigial religious cults”, which had “originated in clan-based and feudal societies”, as well as explored the “decline of such religious cults with the elimination of multilayered economy in the USSR, owing to socialist construction and cultural revolution” [Nevskii, 1934, 106]. In his report “On the study of religious practices of the peoples of the USSR”, delivered on 13 June 1934 at the Research Conference for Anti-Religious Work, N.M. Matorin, the thought leader of the Section, set forth “the key goals of Marxian religious studies” [Shakhnovich, 2016, 30] and offered an analysis of “the disappearing religious cults that originated during the period of clan-based society and its disintegration” [Matorin, 2016, 314]. He emphasized that research into the decline of religion in the USSR would be quite impossible without serious “study of religious survivals among the peoples of the USSR” [Matorin, 2016, 314–315]. “In-depth knowledge of the study content, of the religious beliefs which continue in some areas as survivals” was regarded by Matorin as the key prerequisite for evidence-based “anti-religious work” and for bringing about “the elimination of religious prejudice as such”. The “in-depth knowledge”, according to Matorin, was to be obtained by “efforts of militant atheists such as ethnographers, historians, and students of folklore” [Matorin, 2016, 331–332]. The term “survival” was broadly applied in Soviet humanities of that period to denote a variety of social and cultural phenomena, including religious practices, which represented the legacy of the past and were expected to disappear with the transition to the new social system. The term was coined by the British anthropologist Edward Tylor, who suggested considering “certain cultural forms as living ‘proofs and examples of an older condition of culture’ which remain in a newer culture due to habit or tradition” [Shakhnovich, 2016, 31].

In keeping with the goals and objectives outlined by Matorin, the research group specializing in religious practices of the ethnicities populating the USSR operating at the CAM presented a series of papers over 1934, including “Religious beliefs of the Western Circassians”, “Water and tree worship in Taldom District, Moscow Oblast”, “Veneration of St. Nicholas of Mozhaïsk in Kaluga District”, “Water worship in Kaluga District”, and “Sectarianism in Vesjegonsk District, Moscow Region”. Other papers explored pre-Christian beliefs of the Mordovians, the trade-related religious cult shared by the Murmansk fishers, and efforts to eliminate religious prejudice among collective farmers in Chuvashia and Uzbekistan [Kogan, 1934, 36].

The documentary materials on the history of the CAM available from the Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion (SMHR) indicate that the group offered membership to the museum staff as well as ethnographers and experts in regional studies who conducted field work to generate “in-depth knowledge”. N.M. Matorin’s report lists several “researchers that investigated into the culture of various ethnicities inhabiting the USSR” and made up a network of “highly competent experts despite being little known in the anti-religious environment” [Matorin, 2016, 328]. These included M.E. Sheremeteva, who worked in the Kaluga Local History Museum in 1921–1942, and M.I. Kostrova, CAM staff member. According to Matorin, both researchers undertook to map the sites of syncretic cults across Moscow Region [Matorin, 2016, 329]. This work may have informed M. E. Sheremeteva’s paper on the veneration of St. Nicholas of Mozhaïsk and water worship in Kaluga District as well as M.I. Kostrova’s report on tree and water worship in Taldom District, Moscow Region, which were presented to the Unit for Investigation of Religious Beliefs of the Peoples of the USSR at the CAM.

The subjects of the papers reflect much more than the impressive variety of content and the vast geography of field studies carried out by the CAM and its guest researchers. In Matorin’s opinion, they demonstrated “the controversial nature of religious decline and the distinctive features of this process that are specific to the local ethnic and cultural contexts as well as to the unique forms of ancient religious beliefs” [Matorin, 2016, 324]. The scholar stressed that anti-religious activity, if it is to remain “effective, fast, intense and flexible”, has to build on “the religious and cultural features specific to each individual area” as well as rely “on the findings of research on specific forms of religious decline” [Matorin, 2016, 324–325].

In 1936, the CAM designed “A tentative program for research on religious survivals and decline of mass religious worship” [SHA SMHR, fund 31, inv.1, file 122] – a document, which appears to have been inspired by, and stemmed from to need to order, field research. The closing sections of the program featured conclusions about “the extreme complexity of religious decline among the masses”, “multiplicity of forms that the religious decline takes” and “the varying degree of the hold of religious survivals on people”; these factors rendered impossible “any simplistic classification of people into believers and non-believers”. In view of the above, the program aimed to capture this “diversity through in-depth study”. “Particular attention” was to be paid to religion in everyday life: researchers were encouraged “to focus on the most dramatic cases of religious rites or traditions (funerals, festivals or other) being celebrated for reasons other than religious, and to provide explanations for these reasons”.

In 1937, the CAM had to relocate after the Monastery of Christ’s Passions was marked for demolition to make room for a large-scale reconstruction scheme affecting Gorky Street (now Tverskaya). The exhibits were moved to the former Church of Nicholas the Wonderworker in Kalyaevskaya Street (now Dolgorukovskaya), which had been closed in 1934. The church was repurposed as museum premises and had to undergo serious modification to fulfil its new function. The remodeling plan was developed by the Architectural and Design Studio №3 of the Urban Planning Department at the Moscow City Council under the supervision of Academician I.A. Fomin. According to the initial plan, the museum was to have 12 exhibition halls, a room on Science and Religion, a 100-seat cinema, and a reference library; the plan also provided for a large storage facility, a separate disinfection chamber, and a restoration workshop “to ensure better preservation of the museum collection, which has lately been enriched with new materials” [Ginsburg, 1936, 8]. The surviving documentary evidence shows that the plan was developed in close cooperation with E.M. Yaroslavsky, permanent head of the League of Militant Atheists, who personally reviewed and approved all designs. The total reconstruction costs exceeded 7 million roubles. In the course of remodeling, part of the quadrangular frame and the apse of the church were dismantled; the remaining part was converted into a two-storey building to which a five-story annex designed in the Stalinist “Empire” style was added. Most of the furniture, including specially designed shelves and cases, were mounted on the walls. As a result of the works (completed in 1940), the total area of the museum increased by 2.5 times compared to the premises the CAM occupied in the Monastery of Christ’s Passions; owing to this, the museum was expected to transform “into a prominent research center as well as an artistic and architectural landmark” [SHA SMHR, fund 31, inv.1, file 34, fol. 1].

By the late 1930s, the Museum could boast just such “competent staff” as Kandidov had dreamed of; it was a team made up of “experts in religious studies, not just atheists” [Tarasova, Chenskaya, 2002, 27]. These included established and aspiring Soviet students of religion, notably M.M. Sheynman, N.A. Pupyshev, G.P. Snesev, A.B. Ranovich, V.S. Rozhnitsyn, S.A. Tokarev, V.M. Shokhor, I.A. Kryvelev, A.I. Pint, M.M. Persits, and B.I. Sharevskaya. To enhance its collections, the Museum engaged in interinstitutional exchanges, acquired exhibits from private owners, commissioned paintings and sculptures in anti-religious subjects as well as received some objects from religious institutions facing closure.

Field trips to remote areas of the Soviet Union such as Buryatia, Caucasus and Central Asia were another important source of exhibits. The Museum often relied on the services of guest experts, including the prominent Russian specialist in Caucasian culture E. M. Shilling, who was contracted to supplement the CAM collection with objects demonstrating religious practices in the Caucasus. Another extra-staff specialist, I. Muradov, was invited by the CAM director P.F. Fedorovich to travel to Uzbekistan (Tashkent and Samarkand) in search of materials relating to Muslim culture, and to organize their delivery to Moscow. Eventually, “between 1934 and 1941, the expeditions, research missions and acquisitions from private collections enabled the museum to amass valuable historical and art objects as well ca. 100,000 books, including many rarities” [SHA SMHR, fund 31, inv. 1, file 32, fol. 1]. With the fast growing collection, the CAM was able to regularly update its permanent exhibition, which was based on the historical

principle and “highlighted the origins of religious beliefs in pre-historic society, the evolution of religion in the ancient and antique world as well as the emergence and development of world religions: Christianity (including Roman Catholicism, Orthodoxy and Christian sects), Islam and Buddhism-Lamaism”.

With the beginning of the Great Patriotic War, the museum exhibition was dismantled; the objects were placed for storage and the exhibition space was used as a base for the air defense service. In October 1941, when the front line approached dangerously close to Moscow, many yet non conscripted male staff members joined the Red Army's Sverdlovsk Battalion as volunteers. The museum workers that stayed behind despite evacuation were involved in the museum's defense efforts: they worked in the local air raid control team, built defense facilities, organized travel exhibitions and delivered lectures as well as planned new exhibitions and conducted field studies into forms of religious worship at wartime. The field studies were conducted on request of the League of Militant Atheists. The surviving documents held in the Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion confirm that the field work was mainly carried out in the Moscow, Ryazan, Tambov, and Kirov districts as well as Udmurtia and Chuvashia.

On 20 February 1942, the CAM was renamed the Central Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism. According to contemporary documents, “the renaming logically flowed from the prior collection, research and exhibition work of the museum rather than simply representing the change of label” [SHA SMHR, fund 31, inv.1, file 32, fol. 1]. The new name also signalled that “the CAM had slowly but surely evolved from an anti-religious and propagandist institution into a historical museum” [Tarasova, Chenskaya, 2002, 27].

In October 1944, Sovnarkom issued a resolution to hand over the CAM building to the State Committee for Cinematography operating under the auspices of Sovnarkom. The resolution, signed by N.A. Voznesensky, suggested relocating the CAM to the former Church of Christ's Ascension in Nikitskie Vorota Square. In summer 1945 the USSR Academy of Sciences at the initiative of its Institute of Philosophy filed a petition to Sovnarkom urging to place the CAM under the charge of the Academy. S.I. Vavilov, President of the Academy, requested that the museum be handed over to the Academy together with its current premises. On 10 December 1945 Sovnarkom passed a resolution (signed by V.M. Molotov) which sealed the new status of the museum as part of the USSR Academy of Sciences; the document also confirmed the handover of the museum's building in Kalyaevskaya Street to the Committee of Cinematography, with the subsequent relocation of the CAM to the former Church of Christ's Ascension. Shortly after the document was issued, the CAM's building was taken over by the animated film studio Soyuzmultfilm. The museum was left without any alternative accommodation as a panel appointed by the Academy and incorporating members of Sovnarkom's Architectural Commission proposed to hand over the Church of Christ's Ascension to the Energy Institute of the Academy of Sciences. The panel members were of the opinion that the relocation would result in serious modification to the building of the church to the detriment of its interior, designed by such outstanding masters as M.D. Bykovsky and A.N. Grigoryev. The Academy's Administrative Service suggested that the CAM be housed in the former Church of St. Nicholas the Wonderworker on Yamy (Ulyanovskaya Street; now Nikoloyamskaya); the church had been closed in 1928 and was partly occupied by a warehouse which belonged to the Ministry of State Security. However, the museum staff resented the confined new quarters, which were four times smaller than the old CAM building in Kalyaevskaya Street; they believed that the relocation “would put paid to the museum as a national center, diminishing it to an institution of ‘regional’ importance” [SHA SMHR, fund 31, inv.1, file 34, fol. 6].

On 12 January 1946, the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences passed a resolution placing the Museum in charge of the Academy. The exhibits were handed over to the Academy, which established a Central Museum of the History of Religion in Moscow under its auspices. The Bureau of the Department of History and Philosophy was authorized by the Presidium to decide on the status of the new museum within the institutional framework of the Academy. Following the proposal of Academician V.P. Volgin, Vice-President of the Academy, the Bureau decreed: “So as there being no premises available for the Museum in Moscow..., the Museum should be relocated to the building of the former Kazan Cathedral

in Leningrad, currently housing the Leningrad Museum of the History of Religion, USSR Academy of Sciences” [SHA SMHR, fund 31, inv.1, file 34, fol. 6]. However, shortly after that S.P. Tolstov, director of the Academy’s Institute of Ethnography, made an inspectional trip to Leningrad and concluded that “the former Kazan Cathedral was currently unsuitable for being used as a museum” [HAS SMHR, fund 31, inv.1, file 34, fol. 6]. The Bureau submitted a proposal to the Presidium of the Academy that the Moscow and Leningrad museums of the history of religion be merged on the platform of the Moscow museum [Shakhnovich, 2007, 14].

While the debates unfolded in the Bureau, the museum, as his alarmed staff members noted bitterly, “was suspended in a vacuum”. Its books and exhibits were hastily packed for relocation by Soyuzmultfilm’s temporary workers, often in blithe indifference to safety rules. Repeated statements of protest by the museum’s Head for Research V.M. Shokhor and other members of the research team yielded no results. Not a single member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences or the Bureau of the History and Philosophy Department ever visited the museum [SHA SMHR, fund 31, inv.1, file 34, fol. 7]. The resolution by the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences “On Liquidation of the Museum of the History of Religion in Moscow”, issued on 20 March 1947, finally led to the closure of the CAM, whose collections were transferred to the Museum of the History of Religion in Leningrad [Shakhnovich, Chumakova, 2014, 58–59].

Acknowledgements

The study was supported by a grant of the Russian Scientific Foundation, project №16-18-10083.

Благодарность

Исследование поддержано грантом РНФ, проект №16-18-10083.

Библиографический список

1. Научно-исторический архив ГМИР. Ф. 31. Оп. 1. Д. 32.
2. Научно-исторический архив ГМИР. Ф. 31. Оп. 1. Д. 34.
3. Научно-исторический архив ГМИР. Ф. 31. Оп. 1. Д. 122.
4. Гинзбург, С. Центральный антирелигиозный музей / С. Гинзбург // Безбожник. – 1936. – № 11. – С. 8.
5. Кандидов, Б. К вопросу об организации Центрального антирелигиозного музея / Б.П. Кандидов // Антирелигиозник. – 1926. – № 12. – С. 48–52.
6. Кандидов, Б.П. Путь борьбы (воспоминания о работе по организации Центрального Антирелигиозного музея) / Б.П. Кандидов // Лучшев Е.М. Советское государство и религия. 1918–1938 гг. Документы из Архива Государственного музея истории религии. – СПб.: Каламос, 2012. – С. 263–315.
7. Ковалев, Ф. Антирелигиозная выставка «Церковь и революция» / Ф. Ковалев // Безбожник. – 1926. – № 2. – С. 15–16.
8. Коган, Ю. Новое в ЦАМе / Ю. Коган // Антирелигиозник. – 1934. – № 6. – С. 35–37.
9. Маторин, Н.М. Об изучении религиозных верований народов СССР / Н.М. Маторин // Шахнович М.М., Чумакова Т.В. Идеология и наука. Изучение религии в эпоху культурной революции в СССР. – СПб.: Наука, 2016. – С. 314–332.
10. Невский, А.А. Секция по изучению религиозных верований народов СССР при Музее истории религии Академии наук / А.А. Невский // Советская этнография. – 1934. – № 3. – С. 106–107.
11. Тарасова, И.В. Из истории музейного дела в России: музей церковно-археологический и антирелигиозный / И.В. Тарасова, Г.А. Ченская // Труды Государственного музея истории религии. – Вып. 2. – СПб.: «Акционер и К», 2002. – С. 17–30.
12. Три года существования Центрального антирелигиозного музея // Безбожник. – 1932. – № 10. – С. 14.
13. Шахнович, М.М. Как закрывали ленинградский Музей истории религии АН СССР. (1946–1947 годы) / М.М. Шахнович // История Петербурга. – 2007. – № 5. – С. 13–17.
14. Шахнович, М.М. Секция по изучению религий народов СССР при Музее истории религии Академии наук СССР (1934 г.) // М.М. Шахнович. Государство, религия и церковь в России и за рубежом. – 2013. – № 1. – С. 199–216.

15. Шахнович, М.М. Культурная революция в СССР и наука о религии / М.М. Шахнович // Шахнович М.М., Чумакова Т.В. Идеология и наука. Изучение религии в эпоху культурной революции в СССР. – СПб.: Наука, 2016. – С. 5–34.
16. Шахнович, М.М. Музей истории религии Академии наук СССР и российское религиоведение (1932–1961) / М.М. Шахнович, Т.В. Чумакова. – СПб.: Наука, 2014. – 456 с.

Текст поступил в редакцию 27.04.2019.

References

1. *Bezbozhnik* [The Godless]. 1932, no. 10, pp. 14 (in Russian).
2. Ginzburg S. *Bezbozhnik* [The Godless]. 1936, no. 11, p. 8 (in Russian).
3. Kandidov B. *Antireligioznik* [The Anti-Religious]. 1926, no. 12, pp. 48–52 (in Russian).
4. Kandidov B.P. *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i religii. 1918–1938 gg.* [The Soviet State and the Church. 1918–1938]. Luchshev E.M. St. Petersburg: Kalamos, 2012, pp. 263–315 (in Russian).
5. Kogan Iu. *Antireligioznik* [The Anti-Religious]. 1934, no. 6, pp. 35–37 (in Russian).
6. Kovalev F. *Bezbozhnik* [The Godless]. 1926, no. 2, pp. 15–16 (in Russian).
7. Matorin N.M. *Ideologiya i nauka. Izuchenie religii v epokhu kulturnoi revoliutsii v SSSR* [Ideology and Science. The Study of Religion in the Age of Cultural Revolution in USSR]. Shakhnovich M.M., Chumakova T.V. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016, pp. 314–332 (in Russian).
8. *Nauchno-istoricheskii arkhiv Gosudarstvennogo muzeya istorii religii (SHA SMHR)* [Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion]. Fund 31. Inventory 1. File 32 (in Russian).
9. *Nauchno-istoricheskii arkhiv Gosudarstvennogo muzeya istorii religii (SHA SMHR)* [Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion]. Fund 31. Inventory 1. File 34 (in Russian).
10. *Nauchno-istoricheskii arkhiv Gosudarstvennogo muzeya istorii religii (SHA SMHR)* [Scientific and Historical Archive of the State Museum of the History of Religion]. Fund 31. Inventory 1. File 122 (in Russian).
11. Nevskii A.A. *Sovetskaya etnografiya* [The Soviet Ethnography]. 1934, no. 3, pp. 106–107 (in Russian).
12. Shakhnovich M.M. *Gosudarstvo, religiya i cerkov' v Rossii i za rubezhom* [State, Religion and Church in Russia and Abroad]. 2013, no. 1, pp. 199–216 (in Russian).
13. Shakhnovich M.M. *Ideologiya i nauka. Izuchenie religii v epokhu kulturnoi revoliutsii v SSSR* [Ideology and Science. The Study of Religion in the Age of Cultural Revolution in USSR]. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2016, pp. 5–34 (in Russian).
14. Shakhnovich M.M. *Istoriya Peterburga* [The History of St. Petersburg]. 2007, no. 5, pp. 13–17 (in Russian).
15. Shakhnovich M.M., Chumakova T.V. *Muзей istorii religii Akademii nauk SSSR i rossiyskoye religiovedeniye (1932–1961)* [The Museum of the History of Religion of the USSR Academy of Science and Russian Religious Studies (1931–1961)]. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2014, 456 p. (in Russian).
16. Tarasova I.V., Chenskaia G.A. *Trudy Gosudarstvennogo muzeia istorii religii* [Proceedings of the State Museum of the History of Religion]. 2002, iss. 2, pp. 17–30 (in Russian).

Submitted for publication on April 27, 2019.