

## About Genesis of Nart Democracy and the Old Testament Pastoralism\*

Aslan Shazzo\*\*

### Abstract

The article compares some plots of the Old Testament and separate episodes from the works of the Nart epic of Circassians. The subject of the research is what agricultural work inhabitants of the ancient Canaan – the Narts/Attas and the ancestors of Jews – were engaged in, what their idea of God was, what type of society they built, what ideology drove them, and what level of morality they supported.

**Keywords:** Anatha, God, Tha, Canaan, Circassians, Adygs, Jews, Semites, Hettes, Hettian, Hittite, Hatts, Attas, nomads, Adam, Eve, Abel, Cain, İbrahim, Sarah, pharaoh, patriarch.

### Nart Demokrasinin Kökenleri ve Eski Ahit Pastoralizmi

#### Özet

Makalede Eski Ahit'in ve Çerkes Nart Destanı'nın bazı konuları karşılaştırılıyor. Antik Kenan sakinlerinin - Nartlar/Attalar ve Yahudilerin ataları – hangi tarım işleriyle uğraştıkları, Tanrı hakkındaki tasavvurları, nasıl bir toplum inşa ettikleri, onları hangi ideolojinin yönlendirdiği ve maneviyat dereceleri bu araştırmanın konusunu oluşturuyor.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Anatha, Tanrı, Tha, Kenan, Çerkesler, Adigeler, Yahudiler, Samiler, Hattiler, Hititler, Attalar, göçebeler, Adem, Havva, Habil, Kabil, Abraham, Sarah, firavun, patrik.

---

\* «К генезису нартского демократизма и ветхозаветного пасторализма». Гуманитар ушэтынхэмкIэ Адыгэ республикэ институтым и «ШIэныгъэгъуаз» / «Вестник науки» Адыгейского республиканского института гуманитарных исследований. / “Vestnik Nauki” of the Adyghe Republican Institute for Humanitarian Studies, Issue 29 (53), ARİGi Maikop, 2021, pp. 144-151. Translate by Oleg Nesheretov.

\*\* Aslan Shazzo - Post-graduate student, researcher of the Information and Publishing Department of the Adyghe Republican Institute for Humanitarian Studies. E-mail: a.shazzo@mail.ru

### **Introduction**

It is known that in the ancient times some peoples of the Near East worshiped the goddess Anatkha whose name is etymologized in the Circassian (Adyge) language: the word "ane" means "mother", "Ткхе (Тхьэ)" – "God". Anatkha as Anath ("Anath"), in particular, was recorded as one of the most revered West Semitic (Canaanite) goddesses. The name "Anatkha" as a borrowing should speak of the presence in ancient Canaan – a region inhabited mainly by the ancestors of Jews – of influential Pra-Circassian communities. And this, in turn, allows us to make comparisons between the early works of Circassian Nart epic and the subjects of the Old Testament. The leading point of comparison is the correlation of the levels of those two peoples' involvement in the agricultural production. After all, the level of prosperity that it brings to a person, ultimately, is reflected in the cognitive, moral, spiritual ideas, and socio-cultural characteristics of peoples. "Zimí'am yani fehachezhirep (Зимылэм яни фэхьаклэжьырэн)" – "Who does not have (the means), even cannot meet the mother as a guest," Circassians say, even though a guest is an exceptional phenomenon for them. In Russian the word "good" conveys two meanings: "property" and "good" as a moral category not by chance – one is conditioned by the other.

### **Main Section**

"Anatha is the Mother Goddess, (the goddess of hunting and war)", writes in her article "The Nature of Theonym "Tha" ("God"): Basic Hypotheses" candidate of philosophical degree, religious scholar E.A. Akhokhova, ranking the goddess among the ancient Semitic deities (Akhokhova, 115). And although her name is not found in the pantheon of the Circassian pagan gods, she offers the only interpretation etymologizing the theonym "Anatha" as "Mother Goddess". And the additions she put in brackets ("the goddess of the hunt and war"), obviously, was the way she was perceived by the peoples who lived in Canaan and contacted the local pra-Circassians.

In general, the West Semitic version of the name "Anath" gives its later analogue – "Anat". The sound (t) in it, apparently, was not

initially accompanied by a full-fledged sound (h), but only aspiration (Anath) which was a characteristic of the Circassian theonym "Tkhe (Тхьэ)" and its original version "T<sup>h</sup>e" – "Giver", as well as the borrowed names of gods into other ancient languages. For example, it is found in the Egyptian language of the era of the pharaohs: **pth** – Ptah, **sth** (**swth**) – Set, **hthr** – Hathor, **nbtht** – Nebethet (Akhokhova, 115). Obviously, the sound (t<sup>h</sup>), which was borrowed by the ancestors of Jews together with the theonym "Anath", at a later time became simpler – the aspiration disappeared in it. Changes also affected its semantics, as a theonym it went further and further into the past, but nevertheless remained in the memory: now "Anat" is one of the most popular female names in Israel. Speaking about the probable presence of pra-Circassian communities in ancient Canaan, one cannot ignore the biblical name Het, that one of Noah's great-grandsons bore (Bible, 9). That name is repeated in the ethnonyms "Hettites" (Bible Encyclopedia ..., 14) and the Hittites (Bible Encyclopedia ..., 21, 22), the names of peoples, which, on the one hand, can be identified as a Semitic tribe – the descendants of Het, however, on the other hand, following the Hittological scholars, as the ancient name of the Indo-European people – Nesites. Hittites, according to the Brockhaus Biblical Encyclopedia, "neither in language nor in origin ... did constitute a single whole," and their history "can be traced back to approximately since 3000 BC" (Bible Encyclopedia ...). In other words, in the name Het, in the ethnonyms "Hettites" and "Hittites", one can see quite a definite confirmation of the history of the stay of the people "Khatu, Hatti or Athi" on the territory of the Fertile Crescent (One of the ..., 9), who returned to their ancestral home from the North Caucasus to become the ruling class in it and to organize a united agricultural state. According to the Circassian historian and archaeologist N.G. Lovpache, the Indo-European element (Aryans – A.Sh.) originally was a part of the people of "Khatu, Hatti or Athi" (Lovpache, 20, 21). At the same time, the ethnonyms "Hittites" and "Hatties" the author of that article proposes to consider as derived from the ethnonym "Atkhi" or "Atta", which translated from Pra-Circassian means "fathers" (Shazzo, 29-34).

That is, it can be assumed that the proper name Het was given to Noah's great-grandson in honor of the multiethnic people-ruler and farmer of Biblical Egypt, Canaan, etc., in which, apparently, the Pra-Circassians ruled, as evidence to which the name of the goddess Anatha found in the mythologies of local peoples, can serve. About the return from the North Caucasus to the Middle East about 5800 years ago of a certain people, called "North Caucasians", is also written by a specialist in the ancient Anatolian cuneiform languages, Doctor of Philology A.S. Kasian (Kasian, 174).

From the very first pages of the Bible we learn that Adam was expelled from the "garden of Eden" "to cultivate the land from which he had been taken" (Bible, 3). His sons Abel and Cain were engaged in different types of the agricultural labor: "Abel was a shepherd of sheep, and Cain was a farmer" (Bible Encyclopedia ...). And when each of them brought the Creator a gift from their labors, then "the Lord looked upon (blessed – *A.Sh.*) Abel and his gift", "but upon Cain and his gift he did not look" (Bible, 4).

The above quotes indicate that the Garden of Eden is the creation of God (or gods), it appeared before the potential earthly creators – Adam and Eve. It is about the same with sheep breeding and farming. At the same time, however, the Creator gives preference not to sedentary agriculture, that provides a higher standard of living, but with it the possibility of successful development of animal husbandry in general, but to sheep breeding, which gives a limited amount of benefits and implies a less equipped – nomadic or, more precisely, shepherd way of life. Nevertheless, here we see the beginnings of the emergence of the pastoral nomadism as an ideology that substantiates the supremacy of nomads over farmers.

It is also interesting that the gifts from the agricultural labor were presented to God not by Adam, the man-plowman, but by his sons. For Adam the cultivation of soil was not a gift at all, it was assigned to him because he had eaten the forbidden fruit – the heavenly apple. The Lord reproaches him: "... you listened to the voice of your wife and ate from the tree about which I had commanded you, saying: "do not eat of it," the land is cursed for you; with sorrow you will eat of it all the days of your life; thorns

and thistles it will grow for you; and you will eat the grass of the field; in the sweat of your face you will eat bread, until you return to the ground from which you were taken, for dust you are and to dust you will return” (Bible, 3). That is, as we see, agriculture for Adam and his early descendants was unambiguously a harsh and even humiliating punishment.

Agriculture (together with the accompanying animal husbandry), as we know, is a time-consuming and physical investment, which, according to the Nart epic of Circassians, can only develop in a democratic system, well-coordinated work of a large community, division of labor among its members, determination of chiefs and subordinates (or like among Circassians – older and younger), etc. But to nomads who preferred to remain less busy, less attached to a certain place, it seemed, judging by the quotes above, to be a hopeless slavery.

On the whole, we have the following picture: God, having created Adam, having created a paradise for Himself and people, expelled them from paradise, because he feared that they would become equal to Him: “And the Lord God said: so Adam became like one of Us, knowing good and evil; and now no matter how he stretched out his hand, and also took from the tree of life, and taste, and begin living forever” (Bible, 3). Such a formulation of the question, let us agree, should generate in a person not only the desire for liberation from such excessive guardianship, but also to fight against God. On the other hand, the word "Us", used by the Lord God, says that He addresses his words to someone, even justifies himself before someone. Perhaps the interlocutor was the West Semitic supreme god El, but it is no less likely that that is the common Semitic agricultural god Baal / Vaal, who entered the pantheon directly under the influence of the Pra-Circassians' All-Creator "T<sup>h</sup>e".

In this relation, at the mythological level, some interesting confirmations can be found. “One of the most common misconceptions about the religion of the ancient Judeo-Israeli society was the widespread notion that it was immemorial monotheistic from time,” – the Soviet orientalist, Doctor of Historical Degree I.Sh. Shifman noted... – Numerous slips of the

tongue, reservations, and often direct evidence of the Old Testament show that the original religion of the ancient Israelites was polytheistic." According to his information given there, "Baal (translated into Russian as the owner)" was one of the main gods in the common Semitic pantheon – the god of agriculture (Shifman). And he figured, by the way, along with Anatha / Anat. "According to the 'Song of Baal' found in Ugarit, Anat was Baal's sister and mistress. After the Baal's abduction by the god of the Lower World Mot Anat and her friend, the sun goddess Shapash descended into the underworld, where Anat defeated Mot and set his brother free" (Anat). A parallel to the life of Baal / Vaal is observed in the fate of the ancient Egyptian god of "rebirth and the fertile forces of nature" Osiris, who was also rescued from the other world and in which you can see the strokes to the portrait of the permanent leader of the Nart Khase Orzamadz (Shazzo, 83-91), and, possibly, Uar-Khatu (Lovpache, 20, 21; One of the ...), the leader of the people of the "Hittites, Hatts or Athi", Uazirmes / Orzamadz, the hero of the Nart epic of Circassians, Osiris, the ruler and the god of the Ancient Egypt, Baal / Vaal – the "master" and the god of the Pra-Semites – are one and the same person.

In the Nart epos of Circassians a parallel to the heavenly apple exists in the form of two sorts of "golden apples" that grew on the same tree. But they belonged to the Narts – not the gods – and were not fruits forbidden for their owners, but rather a necessary help. If a childless woman bit off a part of the red half from the first sort of apple, she gave birth to a son, if she did from the white half, she gave life to a daughter (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. I, 96). And the thought conveyed through that image was simple: Narts (they were also "attas" / "fathers") were rather serious about childbirth, the harmonious growth of the number of members of their own kin, and the human community as a whole. The second sort of apple made a person more generous, responsive and younger (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. I, 102). That is, he was obliged to be on the side of good. After all, if he must be generous and responsive, then it means that he is addressed to the needs, including those of strangers towards him. If he must be young, then he must always be in a good shape. After all, farming, sharing knowledge and skills

with other people in the neighborhood of ambitious nomads is one of the most dangerous activities. And if nomadism was accompanied by its own ideology, then the Nart democracy should have had its analogue all the more. And it existed, for example, as an ancient version of the ideological concept "Adygage" / "Circassianness" that had come down to us, but also reversed in the old days, i.e. "Nartyge" / "Nartness", which is akin to humanity but higher than it.

The apple tree itself was shown as a result of the creative activity of Thagalidzh (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. I, 102), a Nart, who was endowed with the abilities by "Tkhe". How God rewards a person with a talent is shown in the Circassian epic on the example of the Nart-blacksmith Tlepsh. For him a woman asked – the wife of Tkhagalidzh, who passed the test of moral fortitude (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. I, 211-212). And at her request he really became a unique specialist. Then her husband Tkhagalidzh became talented.

In other words, all the work on domestication of both plants and animals, according to the Circassian epic, was carried out by Narts, i.e. the people which is much more believable than the version offered by the Bible.

The theonym "Tkhe" (God) among the Narts, sounding in ancient times as (t<sup>h</sup>e), meant "Giver". That meaning can be traced in the names of God and theophores of various peoples of antiquity. That is, He created a wonderful world, placed a perfect person in it – "Tkhe" could create only the ideal – and with the help of His next gift – talent, He provided him with the opportunity to improve the world, adapt himself to it, and it to himself, making it at the same time even more beautiful ... But most importantly, "Tkhe" was very warm, paternal towards his creation – a man: he built a democratic relationship between himself and him, did not bother him with excessive care, did not demand unconditional obedience, instead giving him freedom as one of the most expensive values. That is why a person, imitating "Tkhe", called himself "at<sup>h</sup>e > ate" – "father-Giver", which has come down to us today in such an ancient ethnonym as "atkhi" / "atty" (fathers), which became the oath of the atts / narts and then Adygs /

Circassians, brought by "Tkhe", to remain constantly improving His ideal creation.

However, antiheroes, for example, Emynezh (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. I, 102), of course, were also among the very first – perfect – Narts. But they, apparently, were not rewarded with a talent, and therefore, becoming lonely, uncompetitive, they got embittered, took hostile actions against their successful relatives and were punished then. But they were punished not even by Narts – heroes but representatives of their personal environment, like it happened to Emynezh. He was killed by his own horse (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. II, 45).

The punishment of God in the understanding of the Adyghe Nart epic's creators obviously existed still not being direct. It consisted in "psekod" (псэклод / псэкlyэд) – a sin, while the literal translation of that word is "disappearance, loss of soul." If a person, thanks to his soul, was initially equal to "Tkhe", including in the eternal life, then, putting up with evil in himself and, probably, in the people around him, he gradually lost it.

In the Bible Cain the farmer was cursed directly by the Lord, just as his land was: "... when you cultivate the land, it will no longer give its strength to you; you will be an exile and a wanderer on earth, – He said to the fratricide. – And Cain went from the presence of the Lord and settled in the land of Nod, east of Eden. And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived and bore Enoch. And he built a city; and he called the city after the name of his son Enoch." That is, the punishment for Cain, in the end, turned out to be not too harsh. And was it a punishment?... Further, we learn that Cain the farmer became a resident of the land of Nod, then the founder of the city and, possibly, its head, and Lamech, the great-great-grandson of his son Enoch – the ancestor of nomad nomads, as well as musicians and blacksmiths (forging all tools made of copper and iron) (Bible, 4).

But the quote we used contains also additional information that is thematically related to our research. First, attention is drawn to Cain's departure from "the face of the Lord." That is, Cain was made invisible to the Lord, unattainable, from which the conclusion follows: the God of the Old Testament was really local

– for a certain place and the people who inhabit it. Secondly, the phrase “Cain knew his wife,” says that in the land of Nod (and therefore in other places far from the Lord), before the appearance of the exile in it, people lived, and a woman from among them became his wife. And if that was so, then there is no reason to think that they were small in number (the city cannot be without a sufficient number of inhabitants) and did not belong to the Prasemites or Attas, Hatts and Hittites. Third, we know that the copper, referred to in the text, is not forged. However, the mention of it, along with iron, we consider not accidental. Therefore, the phrase “was a blacksmith of all tools made of copper and iron”, understanding almost literally, we used to date the analyzed events. Between "copper" and "iron", as you know, there is the Bronze Age. It includes the period when Egypt, the territory of the Fertile Crescent, which included Mesopotamia, where, apparently, the action took place, thanks to the efforts, first of all, of the Atts / Narts, a new agricultural boom swept over. Therefore, it is natural to assume that Cain settled in the land of Nod and founded the city of Enoch just then.

The fact that the Pra-Circassians in the Bronze Age controlled the territory including Mesopotamia, was stated, for example, in the article “Ethnonym “Kas” in the Eurasian Toponymy” written by Doctor of Historical Degree B.Kh. Bgazhnokov (Bgazhnokov).

We cannot but be interested in the moral side of the conflict between the brothers. Though we will have to talk exclusively about their relationship, but not about the moral consistency of the Lord God, who provoked the murder. Its definition, obviously, should be addressed to theologians. From the point of view of our research, of course, the guilt of Cain, who killed his brother only because of envy, is immeasurable. It will be even more aggravated if we compare the two biblical brothers with the twin brothers Pydzh and Pyzgesh, the heroes of the poetic legend “Nartxe ya dishe zhir (Нартхэ я дыщэ жыгыр)” – “The Golden Tree of Narts”, which is one of the earliest works of the Circassian Nart epic. Pydzh and Pyzgesh were not just twin brothers, they were alike, like two drops of water. Mygezesch-Guasche, Pyzgesch's wife, seeing Pydzh walking from the hunt for the first time, made

a mistake about him with her husband and greeted him as affectionately as her husband. That scene was seen by Pyzgash, who just appeared from the forest, too. But, having flared up, he directed his anger not at his wife or brother, but at himself. He launched the arrow vertically upward. It returned, pierced him through and went into the ground "through seven layers." Pydzh, seeing and understanding what had happened to his brother, did not dare to stay alive: he pierced himself with his own sword. A moral monster was also present in the legend – in the understanding of Narts. That was Tlebychezhey, who immediately, in exchange for a promise to bury the two brothers, offered the widowed Mygezesch-Guashche to marry him. But she, of course, refused him (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. I, 103-111).

Pastoral nomadism as a phenomenon has been studied for a long time. Researchers, in particular, noted that the pastoralist peoples showed a pronounced inclination to create "nomadic empires", the most famous embodiment of which is the Mongol Empire. And they draw scientific conclusions from the analysis of its civilizational characteristics: advantages, contradictions, costs, etc. (Legrand). However, the domestication of plants and animals first occurred on the territory of the Fertile Crescent in the Neolithic time, when the glaciers retreated to the north, and the local climate remained rather humid. The earliest pastoralism was also formed there – with the emergence of ever more extensive and still not too dry steppes. Therefore, that nomadism should be considered as a reference sample.

As it was stated in the above thesis, the peoples, engaged in agricultural production in a complex manner, were democratic. And that, in turn, reveals what the ideology of "nomadic empires" became an alternative to what brought the 'imperial' spirit into the Nart democracy. Therefore, the main cycles of the Nart epos of Circassians are devoted to the military upholding of their way of life, built on "(nartigha (нартыгъэ)" / "Nartness". The way they having escaped from authoritarianism, emanating, for example, from Bearded man ("Zhechezh (Жэклэжь)"), managed to return democracy in the form of their traditional governing body – Khase,

is shown in the legend "The History of Sethenai-Guashche" (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. I, 150-152).

The ancient Semites came to the nomadic shepherding not at once; moreover apparently not all of them did that. A convincing evidence of that is the character of the biblical Noah. Thus, having become by the will of God the builder of the ark (Bible, 6), he showed himself to be a very skilled person, belonging to the class of artisans, who appear mainly among farmers. Secondly, after the flood: "Noah began to cultivate the land and planted a vineyard" (Bible, 9), while, however, staying to live in a tent. Abram / Abraham – his descendant, the first Jew and Jewish patriarch, – leads only a nomadic way of life: "And Terah took his son Abram, and Lot, the son of Aran, his grandson, and Sarah, his daughter-in-law, the wife of Abram, his son, and went out with them from Ur of the Chaldees to go to the land of Canaan; but when they reached Harran, they stopped there." (Bible, 10). The reason for that delay, apparently, was the old age of Terah, Abram's father. Indeed, he died soon after that. Generally, the problem of the pastoralist peoples was, apparently, in the fact that only meat and dairy products did not feed them well enough for harmonious nutrition, as some crop production was still needed. That is, it became necessary to have exchange between nomads and sedentary inhabitants of the region. However, farmers, as a rule, did not suffer from a shortage of meat and dairy products, so such exchange could not be fair. And that exacerbated the competition among nomads and provoked them into conflict with farmers. Therefore, according to the promise of the Lord: "... I will make a great nation out of you" – Abram came "to the land of Canaan" (Bible, 11).

For Abram, as we know, there were no people at all for a long time. He and his wife Sarah, Lot's nephew, as the rest ones were numerous slaves from which he sometimes formed an army. But on the whole, Abram's focus on Canaan symbolizes the fact that with the dominance of nomadism in him, there was also his understanding of Attic democracy. After all, it is not for nothing that he was awarded the name "patriarch" – "father, ancestor, from πατήρ – father, ἀρχή – the beginning, the power" ("Great

Russian Encyclopedia") – the head of the patriarchal family, who, however, had to be a father only to his slaves for some time.

In Canaan "... the Lord appeared to Abram and said: I will give this land to your offspring. And he built there an altar to the Lord who appeared to him ..." (Bible, 11). But Abram did not stay there, despite the words of the Lord. By that time he could not get children from his wife Sarah, as she was "barren". And the production niche in Canaan into which he was able to fit, apparently, turned out to be fully occupied and well protected. Therefore, he went south, where, passing the hungry lands, he reached Egypt. There he managed to get rich, and his wealth with which he returned to Canaan was again calculated by the nomadic yardstick – his slaves and livestock.

And Abram gained such property thanks to the fact that he deceived Pharaoh, presenting his wife Sarah as a sister and marrying her to Pharaoh. In reality, she was both his sister and wife. Referring to his kinship with the pharaoh, he could probably use better quality pastures, exchanged his animals for crop products under more favorable conditions, sold surplus cattle-raising activities, acquired what was needed, etc. For us it seems important to emphasize that even in the most progressive agricultural Egypt of that time with especially unique opportunities for it, Abram managed to neglect the complex agricultural labor activities. Despite the fact that the Lord regularly appeared to Abram, and that is tantamount to Circassian Narts' understanding of the gift of God – talent, – he, trying to increase his herd quantitatively, did not care of its quality – he did not carry out any selection work in it. That can be considered with the fact that he was married his sister, and his son Isaac, born of him after the direct intervention of the Lord by the already very old Sarah, insisted to marry a close relative, too. As it happened, Isaac was sent to the homeland of Abraham – Mesopotamia, where he married his cousin Rebekah. At the same time the Bible emphasizes: that was done so that Isaac would not bring a Canaanite into the family. That is, if Abram / Abraham did not recognize eugenics, with the help of which the mankind can be improved, and ignoring of which, in particular incest, leads to

disastrous genetic consequences, then, having abandoned the requirements of selection, he could have a not disease-resistant degenerating herd ... Figuratively speaking – to own property but not good.

It is believed that incest – incestuous marriages – came into practice in order to let property accumulated by fathers, remain in the families of heirs. That was especially true of those families who were in power. But from the earliest of their application, there was also an ideological basis for that. For example, the pharaohs of Ancient Egypt were considered to be children of the gods, and they practiced incest so that the rule was passed on to descendants who possessed "pure blood." The divinity of one father, according to their ideas, was not enough, it was important that mother also had the same quality. That means that a pharaoh could wait for a heir to the throne either from his own sister or even from his daughter (Prudnikov, 47-48). Somewhat different but leading to a similar result, apparently happened with the tribe of the ancient Semites interesting to us. At first, having fallen under the influence of the one All-Creator "The" – the Giver and the Father, it showed intolerance towards Him. Then, finding their purpose in cattle breeding and becoming members of the new agricultural world in that capacity, its founders came to pastoralism and the theory of divine election. That is, an imperial ideology arose, which substantiated, in particular, the seizure of power in agricultural Canaan.

But Abraham himself, having already got married his son Isaac, the second Jewish patriarch after himself, his sister, seems to have become more tolerant of Atta agricultural democracy. So, after the death of Sarah, he nevertheless acquired his first land plot from the "Hittites" in Canaan, although not for processing but for the burial of his deceased wife – in a cave on its edge. "The sons of Het answered Abraham and said to him: Hear us, our lord; you are the prince of God in our midst; bury your dead in the best of our burial places; none of us will refuse you a burial place for the burial of your dead" (Bible, 21), the Bible says. On the one hand, the entire subsequent scene of the transfer of the land site into Abraham's ownership is filled with signs of mutual respect between

representatives of two different peoples participating in it. The owner offered to give the land for free, and the acquirer insisted on paying for it without fail. On the other hand, the phrase “you are the prince of God in our midst”, said by the sons of Het, seems to distinguish and exalt Abraham among the present ones as a noble person – chosen by God.

However, if the indicated phrase is considered from the point of view of our research, it may turn out that it is both a support for faith in one God and an attempt to reward it. Only the Attas – not even the Hutts or Hittites, – who originally had many gods – could appreciate the monotheism of Abraham. Even if by that time a goddess named Anatha had appeared under the influence of neighboring religions. The second aspect of the matter, apparently, is that if it was not difficult for Abraham to find empty land to graze his livestock, then he could choose any suitable site from them for his special needs. However, he acted the other way, apparently because it was possible to secure it for himself only after acquiring from a person who at that time represented the ruling class of the state and was a legalized owner of the local lands.

Moreover, after the death of Sarah Abraham married a Canaanite by the name of Hetturah which name has meaning for our study. And if earlier he had only two sons: the first – Ishmael, born by Hagar, a slave of Sarah, the second – Isaac – by Sarah herself, then the last wife “... gave birth to Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak and Shuakh.” (Bible, 24). Thus, she seemed to confirm the thesis that the increase in the number of people in that period was possible not on the basis of nomadism, but on the basis of settled life and diversified farming on the land.

### **Conclusion**

In general, the last marriage of Abraham in addition showed that the struggle of ideologies – pastoralism and democracy – will continue to be waged not only between the societies professing them, not only within the societies separated by them, but also in the souls of individuals, seized by doubts, temptations, etc. It also illustrated that the societies of nomadic pastoralists who develop

the imperial ideology of pastoralism, did not separate forever from the societies engaged in complex agricultural labor and inclined towards democracy.

The presented analysis also showed the Lord God in development – from polytheism to monotheism. At the same time we saw the reason why the Pra-Circassian "The" – the All-Creator, the Giver and the Father – found a pair with Anatha. We also saw how "Tha", having transferred a part of his powers to Anatha, took the first step from his monotheistic nature to a polytheistic one. Biblical morality is gradually evolving from fratricide to the words of Christ "turn the other cheek", and Nart etiquette is simplified from the incredible actions of Narts Pydzh and Pyzgesh to cunning, even deceit, used in battles, for example, by such a fundamental hero of the Nart epic of Circassians as Sousyryko. He also killed his brother – a cousin – true, being unaware of that kinship, and during a knightly duel (Narts (Adyghe Epic), Vol. II, 141).

#### Literature

*Анат.* (*Anat*, (electronic resource) – Access mode: <https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/ruwiki/393253>, (date of access 09/26/2021).

Anath deity (h). (electronic resource) – Access mode: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Anath>, (date of access: 08/31/2021).

Ахохова Е.А., «Природа теонима «Тха» («Бог»): базовые гипотезы», *Мир культуры адыгов.* – Майкоп, 2002. – С. 112-117. (Akhokhova E.A., "The Nature of the Theonym "Tha" ("God"): Basic Hypotheses", *World of Circassian Culture*, Maikop, 2002, pp. 112-117).

Бгажноков Б.Х., *Этноним «кас» в топонимике Евразии* (Bgazhnokov B.Kh., *The Ethnonym "Kas" in the Toponymy of Eurasia*) (electronic resource) – Access mode: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=22532504>, (date of access: 08/31/2021).

*Библия. Книги священного писания Ветхого и Нового завета*, Москва, 1991, 296 с. (*Bible. Books of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*, Moscow, 1991, 296 p.)

*Библейская Энциклопедия Брокгауза. Хеттеи.* (*Bible Encyclopedia of Brockhaus, Hittites*). (electronic resource) – Access mode: <https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Spravochniki/biblejskaja-entsiklopedija-brokgauza/4428>, (date of access: 09/09/2021).

*Большая российская энциклопедия. Патриарх.* (*Great Russian Encyclopedia. Patriarch.* (electronic resource) – Access mode: [https://bigenc.ru/religious\\_studies/text/2324037](https://bigenc.ru/religious_studies/text/2324037), (date of access 07/10/2021).

Касьян А.С., *Клинописные языки Анатолии (хаттский, хуррито-урартские, анатолийские): проблемы этимологии и грамматики*, Москва, 2015, 445 с. (Kasian A.S., *Cuneiform Languages of Anatolia (Hatti, Hurrian-Urartian, Anatolian): Problems of Etymology and Grammar*, Moscow, 2015, 445 p.).

Легран Жак, *Пасторальный номадизм и его роль в истории.* (Legrand Jacques. *Pastoral Nomadism and its Role in History.* (electronic resource) – Access mode: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pastoralnyy-nomadizm-i-ego-rol-v-istorii>, (date of access: 09/15/2021).

Ловпаче Н.Г., *Этническая история Западной Черкесии*, Майкоп, 1997. (Lovpache N.G., *Ethnic History of Western Circassia*, Maikop, 1997).

*Нартхэр (адыгэ эпос)*, Текст угъоигъэ томибл / *Нарты (адыгский эпос)*, Собрание сочинений в семи томах, Мыекъуапэ / Майкоп, 2017. (*Narts (Adyghe Epic)* / Collected works in seven volumes. – Maikop, 2017).

Прудников М.Н., *История государства и права зарубежных стран*, Москва, 2013. (Prudnikov M.N., *History of State and Law of Foreign Countries*, Moscow, 2013).

Тарихъым шъышъ зы напэ. Хъатухэр / Одна страница истории. Хатты // Гъээтэу «Гъуаз» / Газета «Вестник». – Стамбыл / Стамбул, 1913. – №46. (One of the Pages of History. Hatts // Newspaper "Vestnik". – Istanbul, 1913. – No. 46).

Шаззо А.М., «Этимология этнонима «адыгэ» в свете его дополнительного значения», *Вестник науки АРИГИ*, №19 (43), Майкоп, 2018. (Shazzo A.M., "Etymology of the Ethnonym "Adyghe" in the Light of its Additional Meaning", *Bulletin of science of the ARSIGR*, No 19 (43), Maikop, 2018).

Шаззо А.М., «К цивилизационным параллелям между легендарной Нартией и Древним Египтом», *Вестник науки АРИГИ*, №27 (51), Майкоп, 2021. (Shazzo A.M., "Towards Civilizational Parallels Between the Legendary Nartia and Ancient Egypt", *Bulletin of Science of the ARSIGR*, No 27 (51), Maikop, 2021).

Шифман И.Ш., «Во что верили древние евреи?», *Атеистические чтения*, 1988. (Shifman I.Sh., "What Did the Ancient Jews Believe?", *Atheistic Readings*, 1988. (electronic resource) – Access mode: <http://www.etheroneph.com/gnosis/47-vo-chto-verili->, (date of access 08/31/2021).