

# Russian folk legends on Noah and the Flood<sup>1</sup>

JEANMARIE ROUHIER-WILLOUGHBY  
*University of Kentucky*

VERA KUZNETSOVA  
*Institute of Philology, Novosibirsk, Russia*

## **The legend as a folk genre**

Before we can begin our examination of Russian folk legends about the Flood, we must discuss the differences in the use of the term “legend” itself within Russian folkloristics and in the Western European and American scholarly traditions. The nature of the genre termed legend and its classification has been the source of extensive dispute within the Western tradition of folkloristics. Dégh, in her seminal study *Legend and Belief*, argues that the legend, unlike the tale, does not possess formal characteristics or motifs that may be readily used to define it (2001:99). The classification of the legend has undoubtedly been complicated by the variety of texts that have been designated under this rubric, including: mythological or demonological stories, historical stories, etiological stories, superstitions, belief stories, horror stories, urban or contemporary legends, anecdotes, memorates and non-canonical biblical retellings or stories about saints and their miracles. While there have been many attempts to classify legend subtypes or define the genre as a whole, including the Grimm Brothers (1816/1981), Von Sydow (1934), Baughman (1966), Bausinger (1980) and Honko (1989), to name but a few, none have been able to cope with the variety characteristic of this elusive genre. As a result, Dégh concludes that:

If within the categories the essential differences are greater than the similarities, it would be better to drop the term *legend* from the vocabulary of folkloristics as a misleading concept. If, on the

other hand, we find that the essential similarities are greater than the differences, we do not have to eliminate the term but instead should rely on it even more. (2001:97; see also 51 for a discussion of this issue within western scholarship).

Thus, much of the debate about the literary source for legends with Biblical content has been dismissed as inconsequential. Dégh herself endorses the use of the term legend for all varieties and subcategories commonly called legend (including the memorate), not because of their structure, which includes, she says, “an introduction, one or more episodes, and a conclusion” (2001:102). This general description, of course, could refer to nearly any story, which highlights the formlessness of the legend as a narrative type. Rather, she asserts, the key to defining the legend lies in its function, not in its form. As Dégh writes:

The legend is a legend once it entertains debate about belief. Short or long, complete or rudimentary, local or global, supernatural, horrible, mysterious, or grotesque, about one’s own or someone else’s experience, the sounding of contrary opinions is what makes a legend a legend (2001:97).

Thus creativity in performance is not the main object of the legend telling, but rather, Dégh argues, a presentation of “a concrete case that exemplifies, illustrates, documents the crucial point for reflection and deliberation, appealing to the listeners, and inviting them to comment” (2001:218). Whether the teller or audience actually endorses the belief is not relevant; the legend highlights the fact that this belief has been established as common knowledge and thus results in debate about essential questions of an unknowable nature, e.g., life after death and interaction with the supernatural world (Dégh 2001:140, 312, 314).

While the legend in the Western tradition has been broadly defined and thus has promoted confusion about the nature of the genre, specialists in Russia have avoided much of the conflict by viewing various subcategories as distinct genres, namely: *legenda* “legend,” *predanie* “heroic legend” and *bylichka* “memorate.” Folk stories from these three genres are distinguished by the nature of their temporal and spatial localization. Their characters and plot lines also differ.<sup>2</sup>

In contrast to the Western European tradition, where the legend is more broadly defined, in Russian folkloristics oral prose stories whose content directly or obliquely is tied to the Christian religion are traditionally termed legends. Typically personages from the Old or New Testaments, such as Adam, Eve, Noah, Solomon, Elijah and Christ and his apostles are the main characters in these narratives. It is also common for Christian saints, often in the form of indigent strangers who punish evil, reward goodness and mete out justice, to be featured as legend characters.

The traditional view of the legend as an oral prose story with content related to the Christian religion, spirituality and morality and instruction arose in the first collection of Russian folk legends collected and published by A. N. Afana'sev (1859), the well-known researcher and publisher of Russian folklore. The renowned historian of Russian literature A. N. Pypin (1990[1860]) uses the term in this sense in his review article of this collection. According to Pypin:

...the legend has this special feature that it centers only on subjects belonging to the area of Christian belief and religious morality [...]. From its very content the legend gains a serious tone, which only subsequently/later sometimes shifts to humor [...]. Legends were an educational diversion, and telling them was a devout affair (1990: 181).

Researchers from E. V. Anichkov (1908:107-33) to V. Ia. Propp (1998: 269-300) maintained this understanding of the term in future works dedicated to the study of oral folk legends (in contrast to the literary legend).

Researchers on this genre always noted that folk legends, although they were directly tied with the Christian religious tradition, almost never are simply exact retellings of literary Christian sources. The folk consciousness makes the literary religious source "one's own" by explaining, adding to and adapting it. A. N. Afanase'v alluded to this fact in the foreword of his collection of Russian folk legends:

[...] these borrowings of events and characters from Biblical history, the same view on the everyday world, developed under the influence of religious books and which is partially reflected in folk works, gave the latter a more significant spiritual interest;

[...] in verses as well as in legends the borrowed material is not conveyed in its pure form; on the contrary, it more or less submits to folk notions, is totally modified in compliance with its demands and even is connected with those traditions and beliefs, which survived intact from the prehistoric period and which, apparently, are opposed to the beginnings of Christian teachings. History proceeds along a gradual path... not only does the old coexist a long time with the new, but they also penetrate each other... Many apocryphal works from the middle ages came about in this way, and thus also did folk legends about the creation of the world, the flood, the last judgment come to exist.... (1859:VII).

Note that this “disparity” between folk legends and their canonical examples at one time also served as the basis for the authorities’ prohibition on the publication of Afanas’ev’s legend collection (for more information on this, see Barag and Novikov 1984:391-92). The collection was only republished 54 years later (Afanas’ev 1914a); Afanas’ev’s collection of legends has since been reissued several times (1914b, 1916, 1990; selections from Afanas’ev’s collection may be found in English in Haney 2001a; 2001b; 2003; 2006).

As noted above, the Bible was not actually the source for the folk legend: while the names and geographical locations may correspond, the plot lines of the Bible and folk stories do not (see Propp 1998: 279-80). It is precisely this “lack of convergence,” itself the result of folk adaptation of literary Christian teachings, that makes the legend a valuable source for the study of Slavic mythology, the peasant world view, folk Christianity and folk culture.

It is significant that folk texts (both legends and associated superstitions) of the “biblical” cycle, that is those associated with people and plots from the books of the Bible, were long thought to be limited in number in the Russian folk tradition. However, Haney notes that Russia is distinctive in the variety of its recorded legend types as classified in the A-T index 750-849: “This number is far greater than that of any other European tradition” (2003:xviii). It is possible that this erroneous conception arose because of the lack of available material; publications of folk texts with Christian religious plots were always rare. As a result, materials related to the study of the “Folk Bible” have only comparatively recently become a subject of particular interest to the researcher (see, for example, Shevarenkova

1998; Kuznetsova 1998a; Kuznetsova 1998b; Tolstaia 1998; Belova 2001a; Belova 2004; Shevarenkova 2004).

### **Russian legends about Noah and the Flood**

The Russian folk legends about Noah and the Flood under consideration here belong to the cycle of “Biblical folklore” as well. Our article examines these legends as they are defined within the Russian tradition. Our aim is to demonstrate that this subtype merits consideration as a true folk genre and functions, as Dégh argues, to present beliefs open to dispute and to explain the nature of physical, cultural and social reality. We will illustrate features of the Russian folk legend on the basis of a small corpus (13 texts) of Russian folk narratives (legends and related beliefs) about the Great Flood, which are all included in an appendix to this article. The texts we have chosen represent various territories of Russia, including European Russia (Kuznetsova et al. 2005 [*Legends 1861*], Afanas’ev 1859 and Shevarenkova 1998) and western and eastern Siberia (Potanin 1864, Matveeva 2005, Ivanovskii 1892, Yermolev 1905, Klements 1890, Azbelev and Meshcherskii 1986). The materials under consideration here range in time from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Within this time frame, the materials are spread fairly evenly from the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Kuznetsova et al. 2005 [*Legends 1861*], Afanas’ev 1859, and Potanin 1864), the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Ivanovskii 1892, Klements 1890, and Yermolov 1905), the middle and end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Azbelev and Meshcherskii 1986 and Shevarenkova 1998), and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century (Matveeva 2005).

A portion of the motifs in the Russian folk narratives about the Flood, including the reasons God called forth the Flood and the rescue of Noah’s family and specimens of all living beings from this disaster on the ark built by Noah at God’s command, go back to the Biblical story of the Flood (Genesis 6-8, 9:1). However, despite this canonical content, one of the most striking features of the legends is the conflation of various biblical stories. For example, in the Afanas’ev legend *On Noah the Righteous*, the story of the flood is combined with the Adam and Eve story and with the creation of the Earth. The legend begins with God’s creation of Noah, in lieu of Adam, “Дай жа я сделаю Ноя Правидныва, штоб у маем у

свети была правда.” (“Let me make Noah the Righteous, so that my world will have righteousness.”) He then «из Ноевыя рибра сделал Гасподь жину Евгу. “Ну, Ной с Евгаю Правидный! Усе плады ештя; аднаво плада ни трогайтя, вот с той та яблынки.”» (From Noah’s rib the Lord made his wife Evga. “Well, Noah the Righteous and Evga! Eat of all the fruits; but don’t touch one of the fruits, from that apple tree.”)<sup>3</sup> Similarly, a second creation of the earth follows the flood in this legend. The process of creation is described as follows: «Взял Господь перехрестилси, кинул землю на три стораны: сделались по взморью луга, леса, рощи...рожна!» (The Lord up and crossed himself and threw the dirt in three directions: across the sea, meadows, forests, groves appeared...all perfectly flat!)<sup>4</sup> What is notable about this passage is that God crossed himself before creating the world, suggesting that the notion of the Trinity and Christ’s death on the cross are essential beliefs within folk Christianity, even though this is an Old Testament text. However, even if the symbolism of crossing oneself eludes the average person, the act of doing so before beginning any kind of work, especially holy work, was ingrained within the Russian peasant belief system. For example, in descriptions of charms and cures performed by Russian peasants, crossing oneself before the incantation is performed is essential. As a result, such minor spells typically began with the phrase “Встану благословясь, выйду перекрестясь.” (“I stand up having blessed myself, I go out having crossed myself.”) (Peskov 1996:13).

We should state that the legend about the devil and Noah’s ark is not limited only to Russian folklore, but also exists in the Russian manuscript tradition. The Biblical story about the flood in combination with the legend about the devil and Noah’s ark occurs in old Russian manuscripts containing apocryphal compilations, including the *Abbreviated Palei (Russian Edition)* (see Popov 1881), the *Illuminated Bible* (see Buslaev 1861:440-41), and *The Legend of Methodius Patarskii*. (The corresponding fragment from *The Legend of Methodius Patarskii* (Pypin 1990) is included below in the appendix.) Some have suggested that the basis for folk legends lies in this apocryphal material (Belova 2004:267), but researchers of the plot in the manuscript tradition also do not exclude the possibility of its origin in the oral tradition. Thus, the occurrence of the

legend about the devil in Noah's ark in the *Palei* and in *The Legend of Methodius Patarskii* indicate that it could have existed before the 15<sup>th</sup> century as an independent work, either written or oral, and that it was included on the basis of manuscript contamination, possibly even on Russian soil. It is noteworthy, for example, that the legend is found only among the components of *The Legend of Methodius Patarskii* in the original fifteenth-century Russian edition (Kagan-Tarkovskaia 1987:106-10).

We also find the motif of how, with the help of Noah's wife, the devil uncovers the secret construction of the ark in these legends. In this portion of the stories, tellers focus on human relationships, namely that between husband and wife. In these legends, the weak link, as in the creation story, is consistently the woman. In the Afanas'ev legend discussed above, it is Noah's wife who results in the expulsion from the garden, although this is not always true (e.g., in Azbelev and Meshcherskii's legend no. 68, Eve does not tempt Adam; they both eat of the berries and are punished, seemingly without any prohibition on that particular event; it is possible that this is an omission of the teller or that simply the berries themselves held some power that resulted in Adam and Eve's knowledge of shame). However, in most of the legends under consideration, the relationship between Noah and his wife is highlighted. It is through her that the devil receives the information necessary to either destroy the ark or to survive the flood by sneaking onto the boat. For example, in the Matveeva legend, the devil deceives Noah's wife by coming to her in human form. In this legend, we see the teller's perspective on her own sex when she says, "А мы жены, вечные мы трепачи. Вот бабы: 'Он где у тебе есть-то? Он же, неверно, крутить ещо с ком-нибудь, ты че думаешь-то?' А бес-то, он очень силен, бес-то. Он пришел к ей не рогатым, а простым человеком и говорит: 'Скажи мне, как же ты не знаешь, где у тебя муж находится?'" (And us wives, we have always gossiped. So the women go: "Where is he, your husband? He is probably running around with someone else, whaddya think?") And the devil, he is very strong, the devil. He came to see her without horns, as a simple person, and says, "Tell me, how is it that you don't know where your husband is?") In this case, Noah's wife responds to the social norms about a wife, who should know her husband's business, who should determine whether he is having an affair to protect herself. She is not a willing accomplice,

since the devil is in human form, but she is susceptible to the social norms of village life. The teller empathizes with Noah's wife, who was fooled by a cunning adversary—she notes «а откуда она знает, что это бес-то, она его не знает» (and how could she know that that this is the devil, she doesn't recognize him)—while also criticizing her fellow women for their fallibility.

Other tellers are less kind to Noah's wife. For example, both the Klements and Afanas'ev legends make it clear that Noah's wife is overly curious and nags her husband. These storytellers reflect an entirely different view of women, particularly of wives.<sup>5</sup> Rather than commenting on the social situation that prompted the woman to respond in this way, they highlight the stereotype of the woman as a nag, whose husband must control her. In Afanas'ev, Noah's wife is in clear collusion with the devil from the time he appears. In fact, a more damning fact about her problematic character is that in the Garden of Eden, she was not tempted by the devil to eat the apple, but did it of her own volition. She later ensures that the devil gets onto the ark and is not at all deceived about whom she is aiding.

The Klements legend at first glance is slightly less critical, although he depicts Noah's wife as a nag and a nosy busybody. However, the wife does not so openly aid the devil, but is defending her husband when the devil questions his honor: “а я так знаю,” - говорит чорт, - “он худыми делами занимается.” - “Врешь ты,” -отвечает жена, - “мой муж, Ной прежедний, никакими худыми делами не занимается; ему Бог велел сал строить, потому что скоро потоп будет.” (“But I know,” the devil says, “he is doing bad things.” “You are lying,” says the wife, “my husband, Noah the Righteous, isn't doing bad things; God commanded him to build an ark, because there will be a flood soon.”) However, it is possible that such boastfulness is also socially unacceptable, even in defense of one's spouse. Certainly, it is clear that the narrator feels little sympathy for this woman when she jumps onto the ark first. As a result, it begins to sink, since she had put herself before her husband. God tells Noah that she has overstepped her bounds and that he, as the husband, should proceed first, indicating that male dominance within the family was the norm. In both these legends, Noah's wife is to some degree Satan's willing accomplice, which produces much hardship for her husband, and indeed for God, since the devil survives the flood. While the devil seems to be necessary

to God (discussed in more detail below), his survival also creates a situation that complicates life for humanity. And he achieves his successes through a woman's insatiable curiosity and desire for power, both of which must be controlled (from the male perspective at least). Thus, these legends do not just convey religious beliefs, but also feature the tellers' attitudes toward established gender norms and social structure. An additional factor, of course, may be the age of the legends; Klements and Afanas'ev's legends were recorded in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, while the woman teller was recorded in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Additional evidence that shifting social norms may play a role may be found in a legend recorded in 1969 (originally printed in Soboleva 1992) found in Haney's collection of Russian legends (2003:68-69). In the legend "Why Women Lost Their Rights (A-T791(2)),<sup>5</sup>" the teller describes how Christ and St. Peter visited the Russian peasantry when women were in charge and were displeased with their treatment by the wife. As a result, Peter asked Christ to remove control from women, and the teller concludes her story by saying: "only in these years of the Revolution has woman won her rights, neither above nor below her husband, but as his equal." This statement represents a striking blend of Soviet ideology and Christian belief from the point of view of a 20<sup>th</sup>-century woman, a type of syncretism not of two religious belief systems, but of two seemingly radically opposed ideologies.

Once safely on the ark, the devil turns into a mouse (or, in some variants, a rat), goes below, and tries to sink the boat (by chewing through the bottom); the cat eats the rodent and saves the ark. In some instances, the adder, who plugs the hole in the bottom of the ark with its head, serves as the savior of the ark, as a result of which it has a mark on its head in the form of a small wreath. These motifs are the province of the folk additions to the Biblical story. In the oral tradition of the motifs *the devil and Noah's Ark* and *the mouse on Noah's Ark*, the plots may combine (the devil turns into a mouse), or they may not (the mouse is simply a mouse; see, for example, Kuznetsova et al. 2005, Potanin 1864, Shevarenkova 1998). We hypothesize that the layering of the image of the devil was secondary and is the result of the literary Christian tradition.

We find similar notions associated with the events of the Great Flood in beliefs about the cat, mouse and adder;<sup>6</sup> for example, "... the rat, while on Noah's Ark during the Great Flood, chewed a hole

in it and the adder plugged that hole with its head, so the first is hated, but the second is loved” (Kuznetsova et al. 2005, № 14a). Additional folk “augmentations” about the mouse and cat (*the mouse* chews the bottom of the ark; the cat/adder saves Noah’s Ark) are widespread in the area of actual beliefs which make reference to social expectations as reflected in the animals’ behavior. Animals, like humans, are rewarded or punished for their association with the forces of good and evil. *The cat* is possessed of a dual nature in folk notions: the cat ate the mouse, who had chewed a hole in the bottom of Noah’s Ark: it saved the Ark, but fouled its mouth, having eaten an unclean animal. Another belief which derives from this plot is that “the mouse is terribly unclean. If it falls into a dish, then they throw the dish away,” but “the cat can be kept in a church. First it stuck her tail into the hole, but it [the mouse] chewed through again. It killed the mouse” (Matveeva 2005). Similarly, “They say that cats are clean, but that their mouth is unclean, because they eat mice” (Kuznetsova et al. 2005, № 14f); or the belief that the Lord rewarded the adder with a wreath on its head for saving the Ark, but since then, anyone who kills a mouse is forgiven forty sins (Shevarenkova 1998, № 1). On occasion the lion may also serve to save the Ark;<sup>7</sup> it “sneezed out” the cat, so that it could eat the mouse, who was chewing the bottom of the Ark. The mouse had been “sneezed out” for this purpose by another unclean animal, the dog (Belova 2004, № 574).<sup>8</sup>

This group of motifs (the devil discovers the secret construction of the Ark with the help of Noah’s wife, turns into a mouse, goes below and tries to sink it by chewing a hole in the bottom, only to have the cat thwart his plans) is often united into a single plot, called *The Devil in Noah’s Ark*, and is noted as such in the East Slavic Tale Type Index (SUS 825; Barag, et al. 1979). We find this plot in two examples from our corpus, Kuznetsova 2005, № 14 and Matveeva 2005. However, this plot about the Devil and Noah’s Ark is not only limited to the Russian or East Slavic tradition. The plot is indicated as A-T 825, and variants have been recorded in Turkey, Estonia, Finland, Sweden, Hungary, Romania, the United States, Ireland and in the Jewish oral tradition (Utley 1954; 1959; 1960).

Other folk additions to the Biblical story of the Flood that commonly occur in folk legends include the disappearance of particular animals from the face of the earth. Numbering among them are the

mythical unicorn and the Kuk bird, a huge vulture which they did not take onboard the Ark (see Belova 2004:190, 276-77, № 406, № 585, № 586). Siberian Russian legends connected to the Flood do not mention these animals, but they tell of the mammoth. The mammoth refuses to get onto Noah's Ark, instead relying on his strength ("And I will swim through"). As a result, he perishes in the flood (Yermolov 1905; Azbelev and Meshcherskii 1986, № 70; Matveeva 2005:105). God cursed him because he did not agree to come onboard "in pairs," and "this beast has vanished, we only find its tusks" (Azbelev and Meshcherskii, № 70). The plot about the mammoth who dies in the Flood, we find in our recorded texts or in the form of independent narratives about the fate of the mammoth in connection with the Flood (Azbelev and Meshcherskii, № 70; Yermolov 1905) or as part of more detailed narratives on the Flood. In such texts, additional episodes of the story are provided, for example, the reasons the Ark was built, the mouse's attempt to sink it and how the cat saved it (Matveeva 2005:105).

All known variants of legends containing the story of the mammoth dying in the Flood have been recorded in Siberia (see Kuznetsova 2008). This fact allows us to conclude that the formation and "acquisition" of this new plot line about the mammoth's demise in the Flood in these legends, in all likelihood, occurred on Siberian soil.

In Siberia, where they have not infrequently discovered mammoth remains, at times even whole skeletons with pelts, stories and beliefs about mammoths are well-known: "Siberians think,' as scholars have noted, 'that mammoths are alive even now, like moles under the earth and when they are dying, they come up to the surface, therefore, they have never found a living mammoth, only bones'" (Yermolov 1905:286). According to these beliefs, the mammoth is a huge animal who fears sunlight, who lives and moves under the earth, and his movement is often the reason that river banks collapse or the cause of earthquakes. Additional examples of these Siberian beliefs and stories associated with the mammoth include: "Mammoths lived only at the beginning of time, not very long. The rivers and streams came from them. Wherever a mammoth walks, rivers sprung up in his wake, wherever his glance falls, little streams and springs started to flow" (Aref'ev 1902: 92, № 1); or "The mammoth is a

beast that walks underground, like a fish in the river, if it comes out into a ravine, then it dies. One person tied his horse to a tusk thinking that it was a stump coming up out of the ground; when he returned, his horse was in a different place, it was led away by the horn” (Potanin 1864:123). A similar variant to this belief is the story about how the mammoth, who lives underground, can take another living animal underground as well: “They tell the story about this time in Siberia. One person tied his horse to a mammoth tusk sticking up out of the ground, thinking it was a stump, but it was the tusk of a living mammoth; // when he came back, the horse was gone, it was taken underground along with the tusks” (Yermolov 1905:286-87).

It should be noted that the ideas about the mammoth we have discussed are close to the description of the unicorn in the Russian religious verse *Golubinaia kniga*: “The unicorn is the king of beasts./ [...] The unicorn lives in the Holy mountain, / he has a path underground; / he cleanses all the springs. When the unicorn turns, all the underground springs bubble up:/ therefore the unicorn is the king of beasts” (Varentsov 1860:26); compare with the Unicorn Indrik as a huge beast, with a horn; “this beast passes along underground with its horn, like the sun in the sky” (Bessonov 2:372). As noted above, legends about the demise of the unicorn during the Great Flood have been attested in East Slavic folklore. For example, a variant recorded in Ukraine (*Malaia Rossiia* “Little Russia or Eastern Ukraine,” in the village of Litinskiy, Podol’skoy gub.) follows:

When Noah gathered all the birds onto the Ark, the *unicorn* said that it could swim for forty days and nights and so did not want to get onto the Ark. They believe that it would have survived, if the other *birds, who took refuge from the flood on his back*, had not drowned it (Chubinskii 1872:211, cited in Belova 2004, № 585).

This might be compared with the story recorded among Russian settlers in the Baikal region about the *mammoth* who drowned during the Flood when *birds sat on its tusks* (Yermolov 3:287).

We can hypothesize that the conflation of the attributes of these two characters, the unicorn and the mammoth, namely huge animals who are afraid of sunlight, who live and move under the earth, whose movements cause river banks to collapse, served as the basis for the fact that ideas about how the unicorn died during the Flood were

also transferred to the mammoth.<sup>9</sup> Thus, the mammoth, a figure who played a much more actual role in the beliefs of the Siberian people, “replaced” the unicorn in stories about the Flood.

### **Conclusion**

The range of additions we have cited clearly illustrates the folk nature of these texts, which may have been based on a written source but were learned and disseminated orally and feature significant variation based on native folk elements. People did not simply retell Bible stories. Rather, they created legends based on their view of reality, both physical and cultural. This process includes intermixing various mythic systems and indeed, various Biblical stories, into a living oral genre, peopled by the objects these people interacted with on a daily basis. It is important to note that while many legends may be considered retellings of biblical events, others are not based on biblical events at all (e.g., the cycle of stories about how Christ and a saint travel around Russia punishing or rewarding the peasantry). Thus much of the debate about the literary source for legends with Biblical content is inconsequential from our point of view (see Dégh 51 for a discussion of this issue within western scholarship).

We can see folk creativity at work in the insertion of both native flora and fauna into the biblical stories of these legends. For example, in a legend collected in Yakutia (Azbelev and Meshcherskii 1986, no. 68), we see how berries take the place of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil. Similarly, this legend describes how a teal duck, not a dove, brings back earth to the ark. Geographical place names also occur, such that the ark is supposed to have landed on the mountain “Chzhilan-Karagai, near Tashtysh,” according to the Klement’s legend. In the same legend, Noah’s sons are said to be the forefathers of various ethnic groups, that is Sim’s line produced the Russians, Ham, the Yakuts and Japhet, the Yukagirs. These insertions, like others noted above, support our claim that these legends should be classified as a folk genre, despite their “literary” sources.

In addition, the legends depict the folk understanding of the Christian mythic system. We have already observed that the legends were censored by the authorities, suggesting that they contain content which the church found objectionable. These non-canonical elements feature both religious precepts and prescriptions for social behavior.

Religiously, for example, the mammoth erred by not subjecting himself to God's will and was punished with extinction. On the other hand, Noah also disobeyed God, but was still saved, suggesting that God respects the wiles of his "little brother" Satan, as he is referred to in the Afana'sev (Kuznetsova et al. 2005) legend. After the Flood has ended, the devil emerges from the ark and boasts to God: "Lord, you wanted to drown me; but I am Satan! I am your great enemy!" God replies, "Even though you are my great enemy, take me by the hand!" When Satan does so, he cries out in pain and promises fealty to the Lord, saying he will be "as a little brother" to God. This phrase often occurs in other Russian folk genres. For example, one hero claims a relationship to another that is based on a blood oath that makes them "kin." However, this relationship is also strictly hierarchical, so that the "elder" brother is dominant, but in which they both figure prominently in each other's fates—see, for example, the epic song *Svyatagor* in which Svyatagor is the big brother to his "little" brother Ilya Muromets (Bailey and Ivanova 1998:19). The Afanas'ev Flood legend concludes with a version of the Earth Diver myth, in which God requires the devil to dive into the water and bring back dirt to create a new world for the people and animals he has saved from the Flood.<sup>10</sup> The content of this legend also suggests God's comprehension of the fact that women are weaker vessels. They are prone to temptation by the devil, a concept that is likely based on biblical events (namely the expulsion from the Garden of Eden), but is certainly not part of the Noah story. And yet storytellers consider this plot line to be an essential part of the understanding of the Flood myth.<sup>11</sup> Finally, these legends illustrate the intersection between various mythic systems and how a folk understanding of Russian Orthodoxy emerged from this process. The intricate relationship between God and Satan suggests a dualism found in native belief systems as reflected in Earth Diver myths, but certainly not in Christian doctrine. Similarly, legend no. 68 in Azbelev and Meshcherskii (1986) mentions that God made two people from stone before he made Adam and Eve, a detail possibly derived from local myths which suggests God's fallibility. Researchers have noted the existence of myths describing the creation of people from clay and stone among the Siberian Evenks, for example (Vasilevich 1936:5, 31). Such confluences between mythic systems illustrate how even those who are not members of a given culture (e.g., Russians living among native Siberian peoples)

might adopt an alien mythic system into their own without realizing that they are doing so. This adoption, in turn, reflects their understanding of their own religious faith and variance from canonical belief. This conflation helps to explain a simple fact about the world and reconcile a problem within the belief system. That is, God wanted to create a place for his beloved humans to live. One might then wonder why he created places that were so difficult for them to survive. A possible explanation, of course, is that God wants to test people's faith and endurance. However, legends provide an alternate explanation. God is indeed good and wants the best for us, but his enemy Satan tries to undermine his actions, which explains why the world is sometimes inimical to human life. In addition, it presents a rather sophisticated philosophy, that good (and God) cannot exist without their opposites, evil (and the devil). Just as God depended on the devil to provide him with the raw material to create the earth after the flood, humans must rely on both sides of their nature to thrive within the world. These reinterpretations and additions to Orthodox doctrine illustrate the complexity of folk Christianity and provide us with significant insight into the development of a folk genre.

These stories also serve to reinforce social norms, not only about one's attitude toward God, but also within society as a whole. These legends are conservative in nature, like most examples of this genre. Male narrators relate plots showing that women should submit to their husbands for the common good. At the same time, a female narrator tries to excuse Noah's wife's failings, because she could not know that she was betraying her husband to the devil in disguise, but still condemns women for their gossiping natures. Similarly, people should avoid alcohol abuse, because it is the devil's creation and nearly resulted in the destruction of humanity. Excessive pride and deceit will be punished. It is difficult to separate the mythic content of the legends from the social mores (e.g., is it a social or religious prescription that the mouse is unclean, but the cat is not?). However, it is clear that the religious nature of these texts and their association with mythic power makes the social prescriptions all the more powerful than those in genres such as the tale, lyric song or memorate. Thus, it is particularly important for specialists interested in folk religion, the development of folk genres and the socio-cultural functions of folklore to study the legend.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>This article was supported under the auspices of the Division of the History of Philological Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences “Russian Culture in World History” grant for the project “The Russian Folk ‘Bible’ in Siberia” and by an NEH Digital Humanities Start-Up Grant, a Fulbright-Hayes grant and a University of Kentucky research grant for the project “The Russian Folk Religious Imagination” ([www.rch.uky.edu/](http://www.rch.uky.edu/) RFRI).

<sup>2</sup>If the events in the *legenda* occur in mythological time or on the border between mythological and historical time, then the events in the *predanie* occur in historical time, while those in the *bylichka* occur in the recent past (at most a few generations ago). The space referred to in the *legenda* is the entire world, while in the *predanie* the space is limited to one country or city or the territory of a single ethnic group; those in a *bylichka* occur in one’s own town or in a neighboring town. The *legenda* features plot lines containing biblical figures or saints; the *predanie* tells of heroic feats and buried treasures, featuring human characters who may perform superhuman acts; the *bylichka* tells of average people and their interactions with the supernatural world, such as place spirits or saints (see Ivanits 1989 for more on place spirits in the Russian tradition). For a definition and short description of the genres and relevant literature, see Bartashevich and Kabashnikov 1993:22-23, 26-27 (*bylichka/byval’shchina*); 128-29 (*legenda*); 275-79 (*predanie*); and Belova et al. 2004.3: 89-91 (*legendy*).

<sup>3</sup>The reference to the apple as the forbidden fruit is not consistent in all Russian legends about the expulsion from the Garden of Eden. In a Yakutian legend, published in Azbelev and Meshcherskii’s *Folk’lor Russikogo Ust’ia (FRU)* (1986:212), Adam and Eve eat berries, not apples. It would seem likely that western folk Christianity had an influence on this legend from European Russia. However, other Russian legends incorporate local flora and fauna; see below for more discussion of this issue.

<sup>4</sup>The entire text of the legend is not given in the appendix in the interests of space. The complete version referred to here can be seen in Kuznetsova (1998a).

<sup>5</sup>This may be due to the fact that the narrators are men, rather than women. A man certainly told the legend in the Klements’ collection, but Afana’sev provided no information on the tellers, so that we cannot make any definitive conclusions on this point.

<sup>6</sup>For more details on folk ideas associated with the cat, see “*Koshka* (Cat),” Gura 1999:637-39; for more on folk ideas connected to the mouse, see “*Mysh’* (Mouse),” Gura 2002:309-10; Sumtsov 1891:49-93; for more on variants of the motif of the “Adder as the savior of the Ark,” see Belova 2004:269-72.

<sup>7</sup>For more on the lion as the savior of the Ark, see Ostrovskii 1995.

<sup>8</sup>For more on Slavic legends on the Flood, see Belova 1998.

<sup>9</sup>For more on folk notions associated with the unicorn as a mythical animal and a character in literary and oral Slavic legends and with the mammoth, see Belova 1999:178-79; Belova 1994:11-15; Belova 2004:276; Durnovo 1902:81; Toporov 1988:96-97; Belova 2001:285-86.

<sup>10</sup>For more on Slavic dualistic legends associated with the Earth Diver motif and on the creation of the world by God and Satan, see Kuznetsova 1998a; a list of texts with the motif of “brotherhood” between God and Satan may be found on pp. 140-41 of that volume. In some cases, Satan imitates God and spits out dirt as well, resulting in hazardous terrain, where it is difficult to live.

<sup>11</sup>Haney includes a legend entitled “The Soldier and the Devil,” in which Satan is depicted as a female (2003:97-101). The Russian word, *Satana*, ends in the vowel *-a*, which grammatically is typically indicative of a feminine noun. Thus, in this legend, the dualism we see between God and Satan includes a gender opposition as well. While this personification is not universal (Satan may be male), it is telling that the female is the source of evil and temptation with Russian folk religion.

## References

- Aarne A., and S. Thompson. 1964. *The Types of the Folktale. A classification and bibliography. Antti Aarne's "Verzeichnis der Märchentypen."* Trans. and ed. by Stith Thompson. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- Afanas'ev, A. N. 1859. *Narodnye russkie legendy, sobrannye A. N. Afanas'evym*. Moscow: s.n. (on the cover of the Moscow edition, it states the year of publication as 1860, but on the title page, it has 1859).
- . 1914a. *Narodnye russkie legendy*. I. P. Kochergin, ed. Kazan: s.n.
- . 1914b. *Narodnye russkie legendy A. N. Afana'seva*. S. K. Shambinago, ed. and foreward. Moscow: s.n.
- . 1916. *Narodnye russkie legendy A. N. Afanas'eva*. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Moscow: Sovremennye Problemy.
- . 1990. *Narodnye russkie legendy A. N. Afanas'eva*. V. S. Kuznetsova, foreward, compilation and commentary (based on the 1859 edition). Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Anichkov, E. V., A. K. Borozdin, and D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, eds. 1908. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*. Vol. 1. *Narodnaia slovesnost'*. Moscow: T-va N.D. Sytina i T-va “Mir.”
- Anichkov, E. V. 1908. “Khristsianskie legendy v narodnoi peredache.” In *Istoriia russkoi literatury*. Vol. 1. *Narodnaia slovesnost'*. E. V. Anichkov, A. K. Borozdin and D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, eds., 107-33. Moscow: T-va N.D. Sytina i T-va “Mir.”
- Aref'ev, V. S. 1902. *Materialy po etnografii Eniseiskogo uezda Eniseiskoi gubernii*. *Izvestiia VSORGO*, Vol. 32, No. 1-2. Irkutsk: s.n.

- Azbelev, S. N., and N. A. Meshcherskii, eds. 1986. *Fol'klor russkogo ust'ia [FRU]*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Bailey, James, and Tatiana Ivanova. 1998. *An Anthology of Russian Folk Epics*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Barag, L. G., I. P. Berezovskii, K. P. Kabashnikov and N. V. Novikov, compilers. 1979. *Sravnitel'nyi ukazatel' siuzhetov: Vostochnoslavianskaia skazka*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Barag, L. G., and N. V. Novikov. 1984. "A. N. Afanas'ev i ego sobranie narodnykh skazok." In *Narodnye russkie skazki A.N. Afanas'eva* Vol. 1, L. G. Barag and N.V. Novikov, eds., 377-426. Moscow: Nauka.
- Barag, L. G., and N. V. Novikov, eds. 1984. *Narodnye russkie skazki A.N. Afanas'eva*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka.
- Bartashevich, G. A., and Kanstantsin K. P. 1993 *Vostochnoslavianskii fol'klor. Slovar' nauchnoi i narodnoi terminologii*. Minsk: Navuka i tekhnika.
- Baughman, Ernest W. 1966. *Type and Motif Index of the Folktales of England and North America*. Indiana University Folklore Series, no. 20. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bausinger, Hermann. 1980. *Formen der "Volks poesie"*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Belova, O. V. 1994. "Edinorog v narodnykh predstavleniakh i knizhnoi traditsii slavian." *Zhivaia starina* 4:11-15.
- . 1998. "Legendy o potope v slavianskoi i evreiskoi fol'klornoj traditsii." In *Ot Bytiia k Iskhodu. Otrazhenie bibleiskikh siuzhetov v slavianskoi i evreiskoi narodnoi kul'ture*, V. Ia. Petrukhin, ed., 163-75. Moscow: Geos.
- . 1999. "Edinorog." In *Slavianskie drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskii slovar' v piati tomakh*, Vol. 2, S. M. Tolstaia, ed., 178-79. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
- . 2001a. *Slavianskii bestiarii. Slovar' nazvanii i simboliki*. Moscow: Indrik.
- . 2001b. "Bibleiskie siuzhety v vostochnoslavianskikh narodnykh legendakh." In *Vostochnoslavianskii etnolingvisticheskii sbornik: Issledovaniia i materialy*, Belova, et al., eds., 118-50. Moscow: Indrik.
- . 2004. "*Narodnaia Bibliia*": *Vostochnoslavianskie etnologicheskie legendy*. Moscow: Indrik.
- Belova, O. V., et al., eds. 2001. *Vostochnoslavianskii etnolingvisticheskii sbornik: Issledovaniia i materialy*. Moscow: Indrik.
- . 2004. "Legendy." *Slavianskie drevnosti* 3:89-91.
- Bessonov, K. P. 1861. *Kaleki perekhozhie. Sbornik stikhov i issledovanie*. Moscow: A. Semen.
- Buslaev, F. 1861. *Istoricheskie ocherki russkoi narodnoi slovesnosti i iskusstva*. Vol. 1. *Russkaia narodnaia poeziia*. St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za.

- Chubinskii, P. P. 1872. *Trudy etnograficheskoi-statisticheskoi ekspeditsii v Zapadno-Russkii krai, snariazhennoi Imperatorskim Russkim Geograficheskim obshchestvom. Iugo-Zapadniy otdel. Materialy i issledovaniia, sobrannye d. Chl. P.P. Chubinskim*. Vol. 1: *Verovaniia i sueverii*. St. Petersburg: s.n.
- Dégh, Linda. 2001. *Legend and Belief: Dialectics of a Folklore Genre*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Durnovo, N. N. 1902. "K istorii skazanii o zhivotnykh v starinnoi russkoi literature." In *Drevnosti. Trudy Slavianskoi Komissii Imperatorskogo Moskovskogo Arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, Vol. 3, M. I. Sokolov, ed., 45-118. Moscow: Lissner and Geshele'.
- Grimm, die Brueder. 1816. *Deutsche Sagen*. Munich: Wilhelm Goldmann.
- Gura, A. V. 1999. "Koshka [Cat]." In *Slavianski drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskii slovar' v piati tomakh* Vol. 2, S. M. Tolstaia, ed., 637-39. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
- . "Mysh' [Mouse]." 2002. In *Slavianskaia mifologiya. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, S. M. Tolstaia, ed., 309-10. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia. Tolstaia.
- Haney, Jack V. 2001a. *Russian Wondertales: I. Tales of Heroes and Villains*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- . 2001b. *Russian Wondertales: II. Tales of Magic and Supernatural*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- . 2003. *Russian Legends*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- . 2006. *Russian Tales of Clever Fools*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Honko, Lauri. 1989. "Folkloristic Theories of a Genre." *Studia Fennica* 33: 13-28.
- Ivanits, Linda. 1989. *Russian Folk Belief*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.
- Ivanovskii, A. O. 1892. *K kosmogonicheskim legendam dualisticheskogo tipa. Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, No. 2-3 (books 13-14).
- Kagan-Tarkovskaia, M. D. 1987. "Legenda o d'ia vole v Noevom kovchege po drevnerusskim rukopisnym sbornikam." In *Issledovaniia po drevnei i novoi literature*, M. B. Khrapchenko, Dmitriev and D. S. Likhachev, eds, 106-10. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Klements, G. 1890. *Zapiski VSORGO po otdeleniiu etnografii*. Vol. 1. Irkutsk: s.n.
- Khrapchenko, M. B., L. A. Dmitriev and D. S. Likhachev, eds. 1987. *Issledovaniia po drevnei i novoi literature*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Kuznetsova, V. S. 1998a. *Dualisticheskie legendy o sotvorenii mira v vostochnoslavianskoi fol'klornoj traditsii*. Novosibirsk: SO RAN.
- . 1998b. "Sotvorenie mira v vostochnoslavianskikh dualisticheskikh legendakh i apokrificheskoi knizhnosti." In *Ot Byt'ia k Iskhodu. Otrazhenie bibleiskikh siuzhetov v slavianskoi i evreiskoi narodnoi kul'ture*, V. Ia Petrukhin, ed., 59-78. Moscow: Geos.

- . 2008. “Legendy o Riabchike i Mamonte v russkoi fol’klornoj ‘Biblii.’” *Sibirskii filologicheskii zhurnal*, No. 3: in press.
- Kuznetsova, V. S., O. N. Laguta and A. M. Lavrent’ev, eds. 2005. *Russkie prostonarodnye legendy i rasskazy. Sbornik 1861*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Matveeva, R. P. 2005. *Narodno-poeticheskoe tvorchestvo starobriadtsev Zabaikal’ia (semeiskikh)*. Ulan-Ude: BNTS.
- Ostrovskii, A. B. 1995. “Lev-spasitel’ Noeva kovchega.” In *Sotvorenie mira i nachalo istorii v aprokrificheskoi i fol’klornoj traditsii (na materiale slavianskikh i evreiskikh tekstov). Tezisy dokladov Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii*. Petrukhin, et al., eds., 48-51. Moscow: Institut slavianovedeniia i balkanistiki
- Peskov, A. M. 1996a. “Mezhdou angelom i domovym.” In *Oberegi i zaklinaniia russkogo naroda*, M. I. Peskov and A. M. Peskov, eds., 3-20. Moscow: Krone-Press.
- Peskov, M. I., and A. M. Peskov 1996b. *Oberegi i zaklinaniia russkogo naroda*. 1996. Moscow: Kron-Press.
- Petrukhin, V. Ia. 1998. *Ot Bytiia k Iskhodu. Otrazhenie bibleiskikh siuzhetov v slavianskoi i evreiskoi narodnoi kul’ture*. Moscow: Geos.
- Petrukhin, V. Ia., O. A. Belova and A. A. Turilov, eds. 1995. *Sotvorenie mira i nachalo istorii v aprokrificheskoi i fol’klornoj traditsii (na materiale slavianskikh i evreiskikh tekstov). Tezisy dokladov Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii*. Moscow: Institut slavianovedeniia i balkanistiki.
- Popov, Andrei. 1881. *Kniga bytiia nebesi i zemli (Paleia istoricheskaiia) s prilozheniem sokrashchennoi Palei russkoi redaktsii*. Moscow: Izdatel’stvo imperatorskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete.
- Potanin, G. N. 1864. “Iugo-zapadnaia chast’ Tomskoi gubernii v etnograficheskom otnoshenii.” *Etnograficheskii sbornik* 6:1-154.
- Propp, V. Ia. 1998b. *Poetika fol’klora (Sobranie trudov V. Ia. Proppa)*. Moscow: Labirint.
- Pypin, A. N. 1990 [1860/1859]. “Predislovie.” In *Narodnye russkie legendy, sobrannye A. N. Afanas’evym*, A. N. Afanas’ev, collector, 180-202. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.
- . 1862. *Lozhnye i otrechennye knigi russkoi stariny, sobrannye A.N. Pypinym. Pamiatniki starinnoi russkoi literatury, izdavaemye gr. Kushelevym-Bezborodko*. St. Petersburg: A. Kulis.
- Savel’ev A. A. folio, document 26. Archives of the Gosudarstvenyi literaturnyi muzei (State Literary Museum), Moscow.
- Shevarenkova, Iu. M. 1998. *Nizhegorodskie khristianskie legendy*. Nizhnii Novgorod: KiTizdat.
- . 2004. *Issledovaniia v oblasti russkoi fol’klornoj legendy*. Nizhnii Novgorod: KiTizdat.

- Soboleva, N. V. 1992. *Russkie skazki Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka: legendarnye i bytovye*. Novosibirsk: Nauka.
- Sumtsov, N. F. 1891. "Mysh' v narodnoi slovesnosti." *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, No. 1-2 (books 8-9). 49-93
- Tolstaia, S. M. 1998. "O neskol'kikh vetkhovzetnykh motivakh v slavianskoi narodnoi traditsii." In *Ot Byt'ia k Iskhodu. Otrazhenie bibleiskikh siuzhetov v slavianskoi i evreiskoi narodnoi kul'ture*, V. Ia Petrukhin, ed., 21-37. Moscow: Geos.
- , ed. 1999. *Slavianskie drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskii slovar' v piati tomakh*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
- , ed. 2002. *Slavianskaia mifologiia. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
- Tolstoi, N. I., ed. 1995. *Slavianskie drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskii slovar' v piati tomakh*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
- . 2004. *Slavianskie drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskii slovar' v piati tomakh*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniia.
- Toporov, V. N. 1988. "Mamont." In *Mify narodov mira*. Vol. 2, S. A. Tokarev, ed., 96-97. Moscow: Rossiiskaia entsiklopediia.
- Tokarev, S. A., ed. 1998. *Mify narodov mira*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Rossiiskaia entsiklopediia.
- Utley, Francis L. 1954. *Noah, His Wife and the Devil*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- . 1959. *The Devil in the Ark, consisting of "some sample texts of the Noah story" now being compiled*. Folk Publications. New series, no. 32. Chillicothe, OH: Ohio Valley Folk Research Project, the Ross County Historical Society.
- . 1960. *Some Noah Tales from Sweden*. Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin.
- Varentsov, V. 1860. *Sbornik russkikh dukhovnykh stikhov, sostavlennyi V. Varentsovym*. St. Petersburg: D. E. Kozhanchikov.
- Vasilevich, G. M. 1936. *Materialy po evenkiiskomu (tungusskomu) fol'kloru, sost. G. M. Vasilevich*. Ia. P. Al'kor, ed. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo instituta narodov severa.
- von Sydow, Carl Wilhelm. 1934. "Kategorien der Prosa-Volksdichtung." In *Volksskundliche Gaben John Meier dargebraucht*. Berlin: Reprinted in *Carl Wilhelm von Sydow, Selected Papers on Folklore*, 60-85. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagge, 1948.
- Ward, Donald, trans. and ed. 1981. *The German Legends of the Brothers Grimm*, 2 vols. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.
- Yermolov, A. 1905. *Narodnaia sel'skokhoziaistvennaia mudrost' v poslovitsakh, pogovorkakh i primetakh*. Vol. 3. *Zhivotnyi mir v vozzreniakh naroda*. St. Petersburg: A. S. Suvorin.

## Appendix

The appendix contains the legends referred to in this study. In the case of shorter texts, we have included the entire legend. In the case of longer texts, we have included relevant excerpts. Each legend is listed with title, if one was provided in the original publication, along with a bibliographical reference to the collector and volume in which they appear. They are cited first in the Russian original and then in English translation. All translations are by Jeanmarie Rouhier-Willoughby.

### 1. *О Ное Праведном* (Афанасьев, № 14, фрагмент)

<...> Выслымши из саду Ноя Правидныва, умилился Гасподь: «Ной Правидный, - гаварит, - у нас будить чириз три года патопа; штобы ты в три года кавшег выстраил. Ной Правидный! кавшег строй, да жине ни сказывай, што строишь!» Пашол Ной Правидный у рошу строить кавшег; строит год, строит два. Дьявыл приходит: «Ной Правидный, што делаишь?» - «Разве ты слипой? ты видишь, што я делаю!» - «Я вижу, что ты строишь, ды ни знаю!» - «И ни велана тебе знать!» Дьявыл удалился из роши в Ноивый жине, к Евги: «Евга, упраси ты у мужа, што он делаить?» А Ной Правидный жине атказываить: «Я так па рощи хажу, на деревья сматрю, сам себе забавляю!» - «Ён ни па рощи гуляить, ён штой-та рубит!» - «Я ни знаю». - «Сделай жа ты квасу, налади хмелю!» Усхвалил сам себе Ной: «Слава тебе, Госпыди, састроил себе судно за палгода патопы». Приходить, стал кушать: «Евга, нет ли чаво пакушамши напитца?» - «Напилси квасу, лёг атдыхать. «Ной Правидный! два года ходишь, да мне правды ни скажишь, штой-та такая ты рабатаишь?» - «Экая ты! Вот асталась палгода да первыва мая; у май мёсицы, у первым числе, будить патопа!» А тдахнумши, приходит Ной к кавшегу: увесь кавшег дьявыл разметал. «Экая!.. пригрязил я дли(я) тебе!» Шесть месицыв ён живо сыбирал ни пимши, ни емши, и дамой ни хадил. Приходит жа Гасподь: «Ной Правидный, сабирай жа всяких звирьёв у кавшег па паре, и дичи, пладов всяких». Сабрал жа ён звирьёв всяких, и ужов, и пладов всяких. «Будить, - гаварить Гасподь,

- затопа: затопить и леса, и луга, и балота, и дамá! Будить патопа на двинатцать сутык». Ной забрал всё.

Дьявыл гаварить: «Евга, как жа мне с табою у кавшег залесть?» - «Я ни знаю». – «Разуй леваю ногу, да глянь скрозь ноги на мине; а патыль (до тех пор) ты ни лезь у кашег, пакыль страшная патопа ни настанить, пакыль вада ни разальётси увизде; ён на тибе закричить: «Лезь ка мне, акаянная, а то утопнишь! Как ён тибе акаянной назавёт – и я с табой улезу. А датыль не лазий». Евга глянула скрозь ноги, Ной закричал: «Лезь жа ты ка мне! Лезь жа скарея, акаянная!» Как сказал Ной, дьявыл как сингнет (прыгнет) у кавшег и паплыл; скинулси (обратился) мышью – кавшег пратачил. Уж узьял эту дыру галавой и заткнул, игде мышь пратачила. Плавыли ани адинатцать сутык па вазморью, па этай пы патопа. Паслал Ной Правидный ворана: «Палити жа ты, чорнай воран, узнай есть вада панижения, али нет?» Воран литал, литал, нашол падла и стал кливать на острави. «Идее ж ты был, воран?» - «Я, - гаварит, - аташол да падла кливал!» - «Как жа ты ни паслушил? мы тибе пасылали пысмастреть вады; ведь всякая душа да хвалит Госпыда! Будь жа ты, воран, как пень гарелый; будь жа у тибе дети гадавыи: как дитей даждешьси – сам акалей!» Ведь как воран даждетца дитей, выходит, выкормить, - сам акалеить; ведь ани все калеют! «Лити ж ты, голубь; пысмастри ж ты патопы: спадаить ли, прибавляить ли?» Литал, литал голубь; патопа сбавила на три аршина, и нашол ён такая мёста, сухая, игде можна кавшегу вылести на край. Приплыли х(к) пристыни.

В сборнике Афанасьева легенда помечена: «доставлена П.В. Киреевским», без уточнения места записи.

1. *About Noah the Righteous* (Afnas'ev, Text No. 14 fragment, in Kuznetsova et al. 2005)

Having sent Noah the Righteous out of the garden, God thought, "Noah the Righteous," he says, "we will have a flood in three years, you need to make an ark within three years. Noah the Righteous, build an ark, but don't tell your wife, that you are building one!" Noah the Righteous went to the grove to build an ark; he builds for a year, he builds for two. The devil comes, "Noah the Righteous, what are you doing?" "Are you blind? You see what I am doing." "I see

that you are building, what I don't know." "You are not allowed to know." The devil left the grove and went to Noah's wife, to Evga, "Evga, ask your husband what he is doing." But Noah the Righteous refuses to tell his wife, "I am strolling in the grove, looking at the trees, I am amusing myself" "He isn't going to the grove to walk, he is cutting something!" "I don't know!" "Make some *kvas* (fermented, lightly alcoholic beer), make some alcohol!" Noah boasted, "Glory to you, Lord, I built a ship for you six months before the flood." He comes home, begins to eat, "Evga, isn't there something to drink after eating?" He drank too much *kvas*, laid down to rest. "Noah the Righteous! For two years you have been going and haven't been telling me the truth, what are you working on?" "Oh, you're a piece of work! There is six months until the first of May, in May on the first, there will be a flood." Once he rested, Noah goes to the ark, the devil tore apart the ark. "Oh! I have sinned against you!" For six months he gathered it, without drinking or eating, he didn't go home. The Lord comes, "Noah the Righteous, gather all the beasts in pairs in the ark, and livestock, food-bearing plants of all kinds." So he gathered beasts of all kinds, and snakes, and all kinds of plants. "There will be," God says, "a flood, the forests and the meadows will be flooded, and the swamp and the houses! There will be a flood for 12 days." Noah gathered up everything.

The devil says, "Evga, how can I get onto the ark with you?" "I don't know." "Raise your left leg and look through your legs at me, and until then don't get onto the ark, no matter how bad the flood gets, until the water is running/flowing everywhere; he will yell at you, 'Get on with me, accursed one, or you will drown!' When he calls you, accursed one, I will get on with you. But until then don't get on." Evga looked through her legs, Noah shouted, "Get on with me! Get on you filth, you accursed one!" As soon as Noah said this, the devil jumped on the ark and they set sail; he turned into a mouse and chewed through the ark. The snake stuck its head in the hole and blocked it, where the mouse had chewed through. They sailed for 18 days across the sea, on that flood. Noah the Righteous sent out a raven, "You fly, black raven, find out if the water has fallen or not?" The raven flew and flew, he found earth and started to peck at the island. "And where were you, raven?" "I," he says, "went and pecked at the earth!" "Why didn't you listen? We sent to you look at the water; after all not every soul praises the Lord! You will be, raven, like burned

ash; your children will be unclean: when you have children, you will die!” So when the raven raises children, he goes out, he feeds them, he himself dies; they really all die! “You fly, dove; look at the flood: has it fallen or gotten deeper?” The dove flew and flew; the flood had grown to three *arshins* (an old unit of measurement equivalent to 28 inches), and he found a dry place, where the ark could get up onto the edge. They sailed to the desert.

In the Afanas’ev collection the legend is appended with the following: “collected by P. V. Kireevskii,” without an indication of the location of the recording.

2. Белова 2004: № 574.

[Проникнув в ковчег с помощью жены Ноя,] окаянный вошел в собаку <...> собака чихнула и вычихнула мышь [которая стала грызть днище ковчега]; лев чихнул и вычихнул кошку [которая съела мышь. Поэтому собака – животное нечистое:] душа у ней поганая, в ней был нечистый бес, и ее в церковь Божию нельзя пускать. У кошки же душа чистая, а поэтому и в церковь Божию ее пускают.

Зап. В. Ефимьев в 1898 в Тотемском у. Вологодской губ.

2. Belova 2004, Text No. 574

[Having infiltrated the ark with the help of Noah’s wife.] the accursed one entered the dog [...] the dog sneezed and sneezed out a mouse [which began to chew the bottom of the ark]; the lion sneezed and sneezed out a cat [which ate the mouse. Therefore the dog is an unclean animal:] its soul is filthy, it held an unclean demon, and you cannot allow it to enter God’s church. But the cat has a clean soul and therefore they let it go into God’s church.

Recorded by V. Efim’ev in 1898 in the Totemsky *uezd*, Vologodsky *guberniia*.

3. *Про мышь и ужа*] (Легенды 1861, № 14а)

... крыса, будучи во время всемирного потопа в ковчеге Ноя, прогрызла в нем дыру, но уж заткнул эту дыру своею головою, поэтому первую ненавидят, а второго любят.

3. [*About the Mouse and the Adder*] (*Legends 1861*, No. 14a, in Kuznetsova et al. 2005)

[...] the rat, being on Noah's ark during the universal flood, chewed a hole in it, but the adder plugged that hole with its head, so that they hate the former, but love the latter.

4. *Когда начался потоп* (Шеваренкова 1998, № 1)

Когда начался потоп, Господь разрешил Ною спастись, а тот взял с собой всех животных по паре. Долго они плавали, уже потоп-то потихоньку стал спадать, а мышь возьми да и потихоньку прогрыз в стенке лодки (она Ковчег называлась) дыру. Лодка – тонуть, да Господь не дал: уж дыру-то своим тельцем и заткнул. За это его Господь и наградил желтым венчиком на голове. А мышь с тех пор кто убьет – сорок грехов ему спустится.

Зап. Анфимова С., Штутман Т. в 1989 г. в д. Мошкино Городецкого р-на от Ражевой А.А. 1911 г.р.

4. *When the Flood Began* (Shevarenkova 1998, Text No. 1)

When the flood began, God allowed Noah to be saved, and he took a pair of every animal along with him. They sailed for a long time, and the flood started to subside a little bit, but the mouse up and quietly chewed a hole in the side of the boat (it was called an ark). The boat is about to sink, but God didn't let that happen; the adder plugged the hole with its body. For that God rewarded it with a yellow crown on its head. And ever since then if a person kills a mouse, forty sins are forgiven him.

Recorded by S. Anfimova and T. Shtutman in 1989 in the village of Moshkino, Gorodetsky region from A. A. Razheva, d.o.b. 1911.

5. [*О Ное и о Потопе*] (Матвеева 2005:105)

Живем мы последнее время в беззаконии нашем Господнем. Вот как раз в Ноев потоп так и было. Народ ужасно стал беззаконие творить. Стали жаниться брат на сестре. Вот этот

Ной был очень справедливый. И Господь ему дал такой приказ, чтоб он сложил ковчег, чтоб на его поселить всех животных по паре. Потом потоп. И вот он всячески думал, ну как же, почему же так Господа Бога? Ну вот, а потом он сделал ковчег. Тайно делал, никто не знал. Такой ковчег, чтобы зашли все животные по паре, птицы по паре залятеля, все чтоб по паре зашли. Домой не появляется ковды. Неделю так дома не бывает. А мы, жены, вечные мы трепачи. Вот бабы: «Он где у тебе есть-то? Он же, наверно, крутить ешо с ком-нибудь, ты че думаешь-то?»

А бес-то, он очень силен, бес-то. Он пришел к ей не рогатым, а простым человеком и говорит: «Скажи мне, как же ты не знаешь, где у тебя муж находится?» Она говорит: «Никак он мне не говорит». А он ей: «Я тебе принесу хмельного, ты ему подашь, и он усе тебе скажет». Ну вот, принес, она ему подала, вон ей рассказал, вот так – вот так, что строит он ковчег-то. Приходит к ей черт, она ему все рассказала. Он ей и говорит: «Без мене не садись у ковчег». А она откуда знать, что это бес-то, она его не знает.

Ну вот, ковчег уже готов, а дож пошел, пошел и пошел. Он такой был добрый Ной, он бы запустил бы людей-то, но Господь запретил. А потом, он с ей стоять, никуда не отходить. Но и Ной сказал: «Да черт с тобой, заходи». Вот никогда нельзя говорить этого. Вот он зашел. И он превратился в мышь и проел ковчег. Вот давайте всем затыкать. А потом кошка-то. Кошку-то зато держать можно в церкви. Она сперва эту дырку-то хвостом заткнула, а он опеть там проел. Она мышку задавила. Мышь-то ужасная погань. Если она попала в посудину, тую посудину выбрасывают. А мамонт, он же сильный такой зверь, он не покорился Господу Богу и плавает.

А потоп сорок дней. Сорок дней жара такая, маленько стала видно ковчег-то. И послали два голубя. Один голубь прилетел пустой. Маленько прошло, они послали ешо одних, они прилетели с витьями. Значит земля. И вот этот ковчег. И стали люди по-новому семья.

Матвеева 2005: 105. Записано в 2002 г. в с. Бичура Бичурского р-на Республики Бурятия от Т.Ф. Ивановой, 1916 г.р.

5. *On Noah and the Flood* (Matveeva 2005:105)

In recent times we have not been living according to the laws of our Lord. It was as it happens the same way in Noah's flood. The people began to create terrible lawlessness. They started to marry brothers to sisters. But this Noah was very just. And the Lord gave him an order to build an ark, and to put on it all the animals in pairs. Then the flood. And then he thought long and hard, well how, why did the Lord God do this? Well then, then he made an ark. He did it secretly, no one knew. It was the kind of ark, so that all the animals could get on in pairs, the birds could fly on in pairs, so that everything could get on in pairs. He never comes home. He isn't home for a week. And us women, we have always gossiped. Then the women, "Just where is he, your husband? He is probably running around with someone else, whaddya think?"

And the devil, he is very strong, the devil. He came to see her without horns, as a simple person and says, "Tell me, how is it that you do not know where your husband is?" She says, "He won't tell me no matter what." And he says to her, "I will bring you some liquor, you give it to him, and he will tell you everything." So then, he brought it, she gave it to him, then he told her, so, so, that he is building an ark. The devil comes to see her, she told him everything. And he says to her, "Without me you won't get onto the ark." And how could she know that this is the devil, she doesn't recognize him.

So then, the ark is ready already, and rain began to fall, and fall, and fall. He was so good, Noah, that he would've let people on, but God forbade it. And then he's standing there with her, she's not going anywhere. But Noah said, "And the devil with you, get on!" So you can never say that. And he (the devil—translator's note) got on. And he turned into a mouse and chewed through the ark. There, let everyone plug it up. And then the cat. That's why you can keep a cat in a church. First she stuck her tail into the hole, and he chewed through again. She killed the mouse. The mouse is terribly unclean. If it falls into a dish, then they throw the dish away. But the mammoth, he is after all such a strong beast, but he didn't submit to the Lord God and swims.

And then forty days. For forty days there was such heat, the ark could be seen a little bit. And they sent out two doves. One dove returned with nothing. A little time passed, they sent out another

two, they came back with twigs. That means land. And there's this ark. And people started their family over once again.

Matveeva 2005:105. Recorded in 2002 from T. F. Ivanova, d.o.b. 1916, in the village of Bichura, Bichurskiy region, republic of Buriatia.

6. [*МЫШЬ В КОВЧЕГЕ*] (Потанин 1864:123)

Мышь поганая, она подгрызла ковчег Ноев; за это Бог создал на нее кошку.

Записал Г.Н. Потанин в г. Семипалатинске.

6. *The Mouse in the Ark* (Potanin 1864:123)

The mouse is unclean, she chewed through Noah's ark; for that God set the cat on her.

Recorded by G. N. Potanin in the city of Semipalatinsk.

7. *Про кошек* (Легенды 1861, № 14f)

Про кошек говорят, что они чистыя, а поган у них рот за то, что они едят мышей.

7. *About Cats (Legends 1861, No. 14f, in Kuznetsova et al. 2005)*

About cats they say that it is clean, but their mouths are filthy because they eat mice.

8. *О потопе* (Клеменц: 1890:140-41)

Ной праведный отправился в лес рубить сажень. Только принялся за работу, Бог кричит ему: «Ной праведный! тебе не нужно рубить сажень, через год будет потоп; руби лес и делай большой сал (плот), только никому об этом не сказывай!» Ной стал валить деревья и стал постоянно уходить в лес, так как работы за салом было много. Чорт подсматривал в лесу за работой Ноя праведнаго, но никак не мог понять, что тот делает. Он отправился к жене Ноя, когда последняго не было дома и спросил: «Где Ной?» - «В лесу», - говорит жена. - «Что он там делает? Зачем так часто в лес ездит?» - «Не знаю, -

говорит жена, - должно быть дрова рубит». – «Что-то уж больно часто. Спроси-ка его хорошенько, может, он так только сказывает, что в // лес ходит, а сам делает другое что!» - говорит чорт. На Ноеву жену напало подозрение, и она стала мужа спрашивать, куда он ходит. Ной сначала ничего не сказал. Жена стала приставать к нему. Ной сказал сначала, что Бог не велел ему сказывать, что он делает. Жена не верит Ную, сердится на него, подсматривать стала за ним.

Ной видит – делать нечего, и сказал жене, что скоро будет потоп, и Бог велел ему строить большой сал и на нем поставить весь свой скот и все свое семейство, но не велел никому сказывать, что скоро будет потоп. Жена успокоилась, Ной ушел на работу. Приходит чорт и спрашивает у Ноевой жены, знает ли она, куда ушел Ной. «Не знаю», - говорит жена. «А я так знаю, - говорит чорт, - он худыми делами занимается». – «Врешь ты, - отвечает жена, - мой муж, Ной праведный, никакими худыми делами не занимается; ему Бог велел сал строить, потому что скоро потоп будет». Чорт узнал, что ему нужно было, и ушел в лес, но дождал, пока Ной ушел домой, и разбросал и перепортил всю его работу. Ной пришел на другой день в лес и удивился, что вся работа испорчена, но принялся за дело сынова. Однако все, что Ной успевал за день сделать, чорт портил ночью. Ной наконец не вытерпел и сказал Богу: «Господи! Теперь уж скоро потоп будет, а я не могу окончить сала; зачем ты так сделал?» Бог говорит: «Это не я виноват, а ты! Я тебе не велел никому сказывать, что будет потоп, а ты сказал жене, жена чорту, а чорт всю твою работу портил всегда». – «Как же мне быть теперь?» - спрашивает Ной. – «Теперь уж поздно новый сал делать». – «Делать нечего, я уж тебя спасу, - говорит Бог, - Когда начнется потоп, ты собери вокруг себя весь скот и не бойся. К тебе подплывет железный сал, ты на нем и поставишь весь скот и всех зверей, и детей, и жену». Начался потоп, стало все заливать водой. Ноева жена испугалась, стала кричать: «Ной праведный, где твой сал? Видишь, мы все потонем скоро».

Подплыл вдруг большой железный сал. Ноева жена первая вскочила на него и сал начал тонуть. Бог закричал Ною:

«Сведи свою жену с салика! Что она лезет вперед всех? Стань сперва сам на сал, а потом пусть она идет». Ной так и сделал.

После потопа этот железный сал остановился на какой-то горе. Одни говорят, на Чжилан-Карагае, около Таштыша, но там его нет; другие называют иныя горы, но доподлинно об этом, как кажется, никто не знает.

Записал Клеменц на реке Нине от Попилата Михайлова  
Орешкова, сагайца второй половины сагайского рода.

#### 8. *On the Flood* (Klements 1890:140-41)

Noah the Righteous went to the forest to chop wood. He had only just started to work, and God screams at him, "Noah the Righteous! You do not need to chop wood, in a year there will be a flood; cut the forest and make a large raft, only don't tell anyone about this!" Noah began to fell trees and began to go to the forest all the time, since it was a lot of work to build an ark. The devil watched the work of Noah the Righteous in the forest, but couldn't figure out what he was doing. He set off to see Noah's wife, when he wasn't home and asked, "Where is Noah?" "In the forest," his wife says. "What is he doing there? Why does he go to the forest so often?" "I don't know," says his wife "it should be to cut wood." "Somehow just too often. Why don't you ask him, nice like, maybe he only says he's going to the forest, but really he's doing something else!" says the devil. Suspicion overcame Noah's wife and she began to ask her husband where he was going. At first Noah didn't say anything. His wife started to pester him. At first Noah said God ordered him not to say what he was doing. His wife did not believe Noah, she got mad at him and began to keep an eye on him.

Noah sees there was nothing to be done and told his wife that there would soon be a flood, and that God had commanded him to build a large raft and to put all his livestock and his entire family on it, but he had commanded him not to tell anyone that there would soon be a flood. His wife calmed down, Noah went to work. The devil arrives and asks Noah's wife whether she knows where Noah went. "Don't know," says the wife. "But I know," says the devil, "that he is doing something bad." "You are lying," answers the wife, "my husband, Noah the Righteous, is not doing anything bad at all; God commanded him to build a raft, because there will be a flood

soon.” The devil found out what he needed and went to the forest, but he waited until Noah went home, and scattered it around and ruined all his work. The next day Noah got there and was amazed to see all his work ruined, but he started up again from the beginning. Nevertheless everything that Noah was able to do in a day, the devil spoiled at night. Noah finally could not stand it and said to God, “Lord! The flood will be soon, and I cannot finish the raft; why did you do this?” God says, “It’s not me who’s guilty, but you! I commanded you not to tell anybody that there would be a flood, but you told your wife, your wife the devil, and the devil keeps on ruining your work.” “What is going to happen to me now?” asks Noah, “Now it’s too late to make a new ark.” “There is nothing to be done, I’ll save you,” says God, “When the flood begins, you gather up all your livestock and do not be afraid. An iron raft will float up, you put all your livestock and all the beasts, and children, and your wife on it.” The flood started, everything started to fill with water. Noah’s wife got scared and began to scream, “Noah the Righteous, where is your raft? See, we’ll drown soon.”

Suddenly a large iron raft floated up. Noah’s wife jumped onto it first, and the raft started to sink. God yelled at Noah, “Get your wife off of the raft! Why is she climbing on ahead of everyone else? You get on first, and then let her get on.” Noah did just that.

After the flood this iron raft stopped on some mountain. Some say that it is on Chzhilan-Karagai, near Tashtysh, but it isn’t there; others name other mountains, but it seems no one knows for sure.

Recorded by Klements on the river Nine from Popilat Mikhailov Oreshkov, a Sagaits of the second half of the Sagaits clan.

#### 9. *Как произошли люди* (ФРУ, № 68)

<...> Когда закончился этот век, тогда остался один человек. По имени Ной. Он был богомольный. Однажды Ной спал. Ему приснился Бог. И говорит: «Я накажу народ. Они забыли всю веру. Перестали молиться Богу. Я накажу их потопом». Утром встал Ной и стал делать ковчег. Он со своими сыновьями делал сорок лет. Сыновей их звали Сим, Хам и

Иафет. Немного они пожилы. Собрались тучи. И пошел дождь. Шел он сорок дней и сорок ночей. Земля покрылась водой. До этого этот Ной собирал от каждой птицы и животных по одной паре. Только отказался один мамонт. «Я, - говорит, - проплаваю». Ковчуг его стало таскать. Однажды почувствовали, что ковчег остановился. Он тогда выпускает чирка. Чирок летал, летал, но ничего не нашел. Так немного поплыли, и Ной послал опять чирка. Чирок летал, летал и в носу принес кусок земли. Немного погодя Ной выпустил всех птиц. Сыновья были женатые. Бог смешал их языки. И они не стали понимать друг друга. От породы Сима произошли русские. От Хама – якуты. От Иафета – юкагиры. Сейчас находят мамонтовую кость и говорят, что его наказал Бог. И они вымерли.

Записал Н.М. Алексеев 21 апреля 1946 г. в Приморском от Н.Г. Чихачева, 21 года, грамотного. Рассказ исполнитель слышал от деда, Н.Г. Чихачева.

9. *How People Came About* (Azbelev and Meshcherskii 1986, Text No. 68)

[...] When that age ended, only one person was left. His name was Noah. He was a god-fearing man. Once Noah was sleeping. He dreamed about God. And he said, "I will punish the people. They have completely forgotten about faith. They stopped praying to God. I will punish them with a flood." In the morning Noah got up and began to build an ark. He and his sons did this for forty years. His sons were named Sim, Ham and Japhet. They lived for a while after that. Storm clouds gathered. And rain began to fall. It rained for forty days and for forty nights. The earth was covered in water. Before that Noah had been gathering a pair of every kind of bird and animal. Only one mammoth refused. "I," he said, "will swim through." His ark was carried away. Once they could feel that the ark had stopped. Then he released a teal. The teal flew and flew, but didn't find anything. So they sailed on a bit more, and Noah sent out another teal. The teal flew and flew and brought back a piece of earth in its nose?/ beak? A little while later Noah let all the birds go. His sons were married. God mixed up their languages. And they began not to understand each other. From Sim's line came the Russians. From Ham's

line-the Yakuts. From Japhet's line-the Yukagirs. Now when they find a mammoth bone, they say that God punished him. And they died.

Recorded by N. M. Alekseev on the 21<sup>st</sup> of April 1946 in Primorsky from N. G. Chikachev, 21 years of age, literate. The performer heard this story from his grandfather H. G. Chikhachev.

#### 10. *Про мамонта* (ФРУ, № 70)

Была потоп, значит. Щё стопило – така вода була. Христос шказал: «Сё погибает». «От каждой животной, - сказал Христос, - сохраню по паре и Ной со вшей семьей – достальной сё пропадет». Ше животные согласилишь – один звэр не соглашилс: этот звэр – мамонт. «Я, - говорит, - могу тры года воде проплавать». Его шилой не приглашали – не хотел пойти в пару. Ной построил ковчег: там спасал он свою семью и от каждой животной по жёночке, по мужичку – и так тры года плывал. А этот мамонт сам шебе плывал по воде. Стал третий год доходить – мамонт и пропал: не мог он проплавать тры года. Охто у Ноя ковчеги были, те расплодились, а этот звэр пропал шавшем, только рога находим маминта-то Бог его проклял, что не шоглашилс в пару у Ноя быть.

Записал Н.М. Алексеев и Т.Б. Шуб 26 апреля 1946 г. в Станчике от П.В. Кочевщикова.

#### 10. *About the Mammoth* (Azbelev and Meshcherskii 1986, Text No. 70)

There was a flood, that means. Everything drowned, there was so much water. Christ said, "Everything will perish." "From each animal," Christ said, "I'll save a pair and Noah with his whole family, everything else will fade away." All the animals will agree, but one beast did not agree, this beast is the mammoth. "I," he says, "can swim in the water for three years." They did not invite his strength?, he didn't want to get into the boat? Noah built the ark; there he saved his family and a female and male of every animal and they sailed for three years. But that mammoth swam in the water himself. The third year was approaching and the mammoth died; he couldn't swim for three years. Those that were on Noah's ark, they multiplied, but that beast

totally disappeared, we only find the mammoth's tusks, God cursed the mammoth, because he did not agree to go onto Noah's boat.

Recorded by N. M. Alekseev and T. B. Shub on the 26<sup>th</sup> of April 1946 in Stanchik from P.V. Kochevshchikov.

11. [*Мамонт и птицы*] (Ермолов 1905:287).

Когда Ной перед потопом по Божьему велению построил ковчег и взял в него представителей всех животных, и четвероногих, и птиц, и пресмыкающихся, один мамонт не захотел туда войти, понадеялся на свой рост да на силу, думал и так проплыть. Долго он плавал, наконец, когда потопили горы и леса, птицам негде было сидеть, стали оне садиться к нему на рога. Долго он плавал еще и с птицами, наконец, их стало садиться все больше и больше, силы мамонту изменили, и он не доплавав всего лишь несколько дней до спада вод, потонул. С тех пор и перевелись мамонты на земле.

Записано у русских поселенцев в Забайкалье.

11. *The Mammoth and the Birds* (Yermolov 1905:287)

When Noah, on God's order, built the ark before the flood and took representatives of all the animals onto it, both four-legged ones and birds and crawling ones, only the mammoth did not want to get on, he relied on his size and on his strength, he thought that he would swim through. He swam for a long time and finally, when the mountains and forests were under water, the birds had nowhere to go, and they started to land on his tusks. He swam for a long time with the birds as well, but more and more of them started to land, the strength of the mammoth gave out and he drowned, with only a few days to go until the flood subsided. Since then mammoths have disappeared from the earth.

Recorded from Russian residents in Zabaikal'e.

12. [*Радуга после Потопа*] (Ивановский 1892:251)

После потопа Бог сделал радугу, которая выпивает всю лишнюю воду.

Записано в с. Тунке, Иркутской губ.

12. [The Rainbow after the Flood] (Ivanovskii 1892:251)

After the flood, God made a rainbow, which drinks up all the extra water.

Recorded in the village of Tunok, Irkutsk guberniia.

13. *Сказание Мефодия Патарского* (фрагменты) (Пыпин 1862:17-18)

[...] Искони же ненавистник діавол поревна роду человекю и прикоснуса к жене Ноеве, и рече діавол: испытай, где хоидит муж твои. – Она же рече: крепок есть муж мои, не могу испытати его. – И рече діавол: над рекою растет трава, вьется около древа, и ты, взем травы тоя, скваси с мукою, да пои его – исповесь ти все. – Единою же прииде Ной по обычаю из горы пища ради; [...] сшедши же, рече жене своеи: даи же ми квасу, яко вждахся от дела своего. Она же наляша чашу и дасть ему. Ной же испив и рече: есть ли еще? Испив же 3 чаши, и возлеже опочити, якоже весел сотворися Ной. Она же нача ласковыми словесами вопрошати его, он же не исповеда ей, она же боле нача діавольским учение(м) и ласканием, около его лстивыми словесами. Он же рече ей ... [...] И се рек, иде на гору и виде ковчег разорен, и бысть яко прах. [...]

Тогда окаяныи діавол хотяше потопить весь род человекь и превратився мышью, и нача грысти дно ковчегу. Нои же помолися Богу... и прысни лютый зверь, и выскочиста из ноздри его кот и кошка, и скочиша и удавиша мышь, - и не избыв діаволе злохитрство. Стояше вода на земли 8 месяц. Тогда же Ной нача пытати, уже ли есть суша на земли, испусти голубя из ковчега; голубь же лета много и не обрете земли, и возвратися в ковчег. Посем испусти врана; вран же лете, обрете землю и не возвратися к Ноеви. Нои же проклял врана – не послушаше по(ве)ления его, и потом пусти третьяго голубя; голубь же лете, обрете сучец масличен, и уломив, и принесе во устех своих к Ноеви в ковчег.

13. *The Legend of Methodius Patarskii* (fragments) (Pypin 1862:17-18)

[...] From time immemorial the hater, the devil was envious of the family of man and he approached Noah's wife and the devil said to her, "Find out where your husband is going." And she said, "My husband is strong, I can't find out from him." And the devil said, "Above the river there grows a grass, it twines itself around the tree, and you, take some of that grass, ferment it with meal, and give it to him to drink - you will learn the truth." Once Noah came, as was his habit, down from the mountain to eat; [...] Once he had come down, he said to his wife, "Give me some *kvas* (fermented, lightly alcoholic beer), because I have become thirsty from my work." She poured him a bowl and gave it to him. Noah drank it all up and said, "Is there any more?" Having drunk three bowls, and he got up to go to sleep, because Noah had become drunk. She began to inquire of him, with affectionate words, but he would not confess to her, she tried even harder, using the devil's teachings and with caresses, with flattering words about him. And he told her... [...] And it was said that he went to the mountain and saw the ark destroyed and it was reduced to dust. [...]

Then the accursed devil wanted to drown all the family of man and turned into a mouse and began to gnaw the ark. Noah prayed to God... and a ferocious beast sneezed and out of his nostril jumped a cat and a tom (cat) and they killed and strangled the mouse - but they did not rid themselves of the devil's evil doings. The water stood on the earth for 8 months. Then Noah began to search for dry land on the earth, he released a dove from the ark; the dove flew a long ways and did not discover land, and returned to the ark. Then he released a raven; the raven flew, discovered earth and did not return to Noah. Noah cursed the raven for not heeding his command and then released a third dove; the dove flew, found an olive twig, and having broken it off, brought it in its mouth to Noah in the ark.