

inflicted by the dwarfs on the brother of the hero, ʔstas, who appears here in the combined role of Noah and of Jehovah.

When the waters have subsided somewhat, the Biblical Noah sent out a raven "which went forth and did not return till the waters were dried up upon the earth¹." The Carrier Noah sends down the beaver and the muskrat, which do not return until one of them brings up a little mud.

Moses' Noah then sends forth a dove "to see if the waters had not ceased upon the face of the earth,"² which returns as a sign that the land is not yet fit for man to inhabit. Likewise the hero of the Carrier legend sends out the wolf to see if the island is inhabitable, with the result that it soon returns with the silent message that it is as yet unfit for him to dwell upon. It is not before a second trial, the equivalent of the second sending of the dove, that he is told by the howling of the wolf, as Noah was by the carrying of the bough of the olive tree, that the earth is henceforth fit again for habitation.

Nobody, disbelieving the autochthony of our Indians, will be astonished to find the remembrance of the deluge vivid among them. That tradition is universal throughout the old world. It is to be found, under one form or another, among the principal nations of antiquity no less than among the aborigines of the new world. Noah and his ark have their counterparts in most of the known mythologies. Everybody is acquainted with the Deucalion Sisyphe of the Greeks: now that personage has duplicates in the Xisuthrus of the Chaldeans, the Yima of the Iranians, the Khasisatra of the Babylonian inscriptions, the Manu of the Hindoos and the Fo-hi of the Chinese.

The universality of the tradition baffles all attempts at incredulity on the part of the most hardened sceptic. What is not quite so clear is the question as to the extent the catastrophe really prevailed. Three different views have been advanced on the subject. There is the opinion, now held by few well informed writers, that the deluge was universal both geographically and ethnographically. The second view, which is now very prevalent among competent critics of all creeds and nationalities, estimates that it was indeed universal ethnographically, but not geographically. Lastly a third opinion, which is held by authors of repute and undoubted orthodoxy, would have it that the catastrophe had no really universal effects, either as regards the earth, or relatively to its inhabitants.

These remarks may appear in the light of an unnecessary digression ;

¹ Gen. viii., 7.

² *Ibid.*