


Cosmogonic or creation myths

A mythical, philosophical and theological interpretation of the diverse cosmogonic myths: In conversation with Charles Long

**Author:**Johan A. van Rooyen¹ **Affiliation:**

¹Department of Systematic and Historical Theology, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

Research Project Registration:**Project Leader:** D.P. Veldsman**Project Number:** 01224719**Description:**

This research is part of the project, 'Religious Experience from an evolutionary perspective', directed by Prof. Dr Danie Veldsman, Department of Systematic and Historical Theology, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria.

Corresponding author:

Johan van Rooyen,
roojresearch@gmail.com

Dates:

Received: 16 Oct. 2019

Accepted: 18 Dec. 2019

Published: 14 Apr. 2020

How to cite this article:

Van Rooyen, J.A., 2020, 'Cosmogonic or creation myths A mythical, philosophical and theological interpretation of the diverse cosmogonic myths: In conversation with Charles Long', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 76(1), a5853. <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i1.5853>

Copyright:

© 2020. The Authors.
Licensee: AOSIS. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

Read online:

Scan this QR code with your smart phone or mobile device to read online.

Cosmogonic myths, also referred to as creation myths, are theological and philosophical explanations of ancient myths of creation within a religious *Homo sapien* hamlet. In the context of this article, the word myth is attributed to the extravagant quixotic interpretation in anecdote (in both visionary and narrative sense) of what is accomplished or ceased as a key or essential phenomenon. The terms or language concepts of cosmogonic or creation invoke the start of things, whether by the desire and action of a surpass Actuality, by emergence from some eventful Actuality or by an additional alternative process. Mystics, scientists, philosophers and theologians of today set forward a method, to my mind, of pluralistic interpretation of the whole understanding and interpretation of a cosmogonic and creation myth that includes a variety of Actualities (deities or gods), in the world, according to basic Western and Eastern religious and rational classifications. These rational classifications have a phenomenological epistemic impact and even a certain righteousness of *whoever wants to believe whatever of creation*. Let it be ..., as it should be ontological (showing the relations between the concepts [*myths*] and categories [*criterion of these myths*] in a subject area [*a variety of philosophies or religions*] or domain [*places where these myths are experienced*]) and epistemological (relating to the theory of knowledge [*how these myths evolved in the thought processes of sapiens*], especially with regard to its methods [*e.g. sacramental*], validity [*the genuineness and lawfulness of these myth's*], scope [*the extend thereof*] and the distinction between justified belief and opinion) and be positive for theologians as objects and religious *sapiens* as subjects.

Keywords: cosmogonic; creation; pluralism; diversity; myths; Richard Long; Actualities as gods or deities; epistemological and ontological.

Introduction

The myths of cosmogonic¹ and creation are the allegorical interpretations of the beginning of our world as understood by distinct *Homo sapien* hamlets.² The recent principles of cosmogonic creation are an analysis of this myth according to the past events in an obligated hamlet. Therefore, it is, for instance, true that all theologies and opinions concerning cosmogonic creation in a Christian hamlet (defiantly not by all Christians or their hamlets) are located in the scriptural book of Genesis and in the contexts of eschatology, of the new creation in Jesus Christ. Charles Long in his *Creation or Cosmogonic myth* (2016:1) explained this as follows: 'Doctrines of cosmogonic creation are based on the myth of creation within this distinct Christian and peculiar religious hamlets'. In this article, the cosmogonic myth is the principle and, therefore, it is ascribed as proportionate towards the direction of philosophy, however, different than philosophy, it is created by an order of symbols,³ and therefore it is regarded as the foundational ensuing illuminative understanding as it consists of rational and irrational forms of thought. This article explores the existential experiences underlying cosmogonic myths. It arrives at a pluralistic understanding of the phenomenon that explains how the myths explain the insufficiencies of life

1.The word 'cosmogonic' means the 'origin of the world'.

2.The term 'hamlet(s)', in this context, is a substitution for the term 'community'. The reason for this substitution has to do with the term 'community', that is to my mind is a laden (heavy) term in the relevant present-day society, and therefore, the term 'hamlet' is used in the context of this article.

3.Note that the author uses the terms 'symbols' and 'images' in subsequent different contexts in this article. The reason for this is that from time to time, as the article develops, the terms have been used interchangeably when that specific context responds to one or the other.

in different cultural contexts and lead to certain religious experiences and patterns of behaviour. This observation may even vindicate the assumption of their validity.

The above-mentioned pluralism tools are a reminiscence and celebration of the myths that allow the religious hamlets to think, share their thoughts and find their epistemological and ontological foundational time and space, and it then culminates in a pluralistic approach of orientation that empowers the *H. sapiens* in their respective hamlets to define, articulate and designate their cultural life in a definitive demeanour.

To clarify this point, as well as to enrich this positive inclination, the following are my recommendations. Firstly, a recommendation that investigates *sapiens* differentness in and around symbolic thought in making use of the forthcoming chronological. Secondly, to make use of a variety of creation or cosmogonic myths to explain the forthcoming recommendation. Thirdly, explaining the creation Actuality⁴ in seeking its role and position in this recommendation. Fourthly, a reminiscence on the emergence of these cosmogonic myths. Fifthly, an explanation of the cosmogonic myths by the world patrons. Sixthly, an explanation of the role of the cosmic egg and earth divers in certain cosmogonic myths. Seventhly, I suggest certain essential mythical themes and prehistorical problems in discussing dualisms and antagonisms, the sacrifice of creation within the framework of theological and philosophical frameworks where otherness and transcendence are explained through the emanation of creation. And eighthly, to the beginning of the end, the dualistic effect on cosmogonic myths is enlightened as it empowers *sapiens* thoughts as a positive thought process.

Nevertheless, before we continue, although a pluralistic tool or approach is mentioned here, the whole idea of pluralism is too wide a concept to deal with entirely, and for this reason, it is not discussed as an entire philosophical idea. Although the concept of pluralism plays an important role in subsequent positive answer of why the debate of cosmogonic or creation myths must continue, it is not just the significance in a pluralistic sense, however, it nevertheless also contributes to religious *sapiens* awareness of and in such a positive diversity that it is exhibited as a pluralistic accessory (especially in this article, where *sapiens* can literarily observe that the cosmogonic and creation myths are fundamentally a positive process, precisely because it has a sapient communality). Although this communality is a language that can differ between epistemological and ontological views, some can or some would not even bother to notice this plebeian.

These views are so different that some *sapiens* labelled them as a philosophical impossibility and that they are too incomprehensible and unknowable, whatever their

4. In the context of this article, the terms 'God(s)' and 'deity(ies)' are substitutes (although not all) for the terms 'Actuality(ies)'. My reason for this is that I am of the opinion that the term 'Actuality' reaffirms the process of the above-mentioned terms as Actuality(ies) better in the context of the pluralism tools of diversity has been used in understanding and interpretation of the cosmogonic or creation myths.

convictions about creation are. To me, if there is no possibility to be found, at least there should be a probability and therein lies my aimed positiveness, as it brings me to nature and its implication for interpretations of these cosmogonic or creation myths.

Fables are interpretations of certain essential judgements in any religious hamlet. The cosmogonic creation myths indicate the evolvement of interpretations over whatever the human world has adjusted to, and in addition this 'adjustment' is given a palpable form, as it also speaks to *sapiens* within the whole of their realities and serves as a basis for the direction of *H. sapiens* within their world as focus. This 'focus' designates *sapiens*' place in the universe or cosmos and the altruistic declaration of compassion that *sapiens* had to include as an alternative for *sapiens*' disposition, which includes the whole non-sapient world. Therefore, is this world designated as an amalgamated set of symbolic allegorical quixotic interpretations, in subsequent contributions.

These interpretations are meant to resolve all other motives to with, to act with and prepare a foundationalist approach for *sapiens*' epistemology, especially in the ontology of cultures. Therefore, I commence with my first aim in investigating *sapiens* differentness in and around symbolic thought.

Humans differentness regarding symbolic thought

Historically, the notion that makes *sapiens* appear dissimilar from all beings is the constant expectation of the thought processes of the West. These different idiosyncrasies of expectations are almost always infinite, as they contain language, tool use, intelligence, morals and aesthetics. Without any doubt, an abundance of anticipation-thoughts has evolved in the humans world, and it is the direct result of Darwin's evolutionary theory. Therefore, it is my belief that all thoughts of epistemological knowledge, accumulated over the centuries, regarding humans life must be revisited in the light of the fact that *sapiens* do originate from the order of animals and that the infinite quantity of knowledge, presently populating our consciousness regarding non-*H. sapien* species, must be re-examined and reinvestigated. Although *sapiens* are decisively exclusive in some regard, the aim is to pinpoint the substantial dissimilarities and, in addition, not to renounce any dissimilarities at all. In *The Believing Primate*, Wilson (2009:320) signify '[t]hat our species is unique in its capacity for symbolic thought'. Wilson (2009:320) stipulated that '[a]ccording to Deacon, thinking symbolically doesn't require an especially large brain or even a different brain from that possessed by our primate ancestors'. Therefore, the chimpanzee and the bonobo do have the capacity to think symbolically, and it is therefore possible to teach a chimpanzee or bonobo to think symbolically. The difficulty is that it needs an onerous preparation method that still, up to this point, has no match in nature. Notwithstanding this, the upside is that symbolic thoughts create the basic forms

of a group with a common denominator being that learning to adjust, in most natural environments, is the best way to survive, as Wilson (2009) stated:

If I pair the sound of the word cat with an actual cat in a conditioning experiment, mice will learn how to associate the two, but if I then say the word cat many times without a cat actually being present, the object and its symbol will become dissociated again. (p. 320)

In contrast, the word cat can be pronounced to *sapiens* on a thousand occasions, and they will link the significance with a cat. Popular allegorical understanding needs patterns and what it means when it strives to remain universal in its mentality, where there is a non-universality to detect in the substantial world. Wilson (2009:321) stressed this in a figural example: ‘Symbolic thought is like a lofty peak in an adaptive landscape that can be climbed only by first crossing a valley of low fitness’.

For this reason, especially in the context of this article, with its abundant symbolic interpretations, cosmogonic or creation myths, it is my view that the uniqueness of *sapiens* is the foundation that makes symbolic thoughts to adjust their initial phases, allowing *sapiens*, and *sapiens* alone, to transcend their new horizon(s) (border(s)). As Van Rooyen (2018) stated:

Religiously viewed, an experience of a transcendent does not constitute a transparent understanding into the being of the transcendent (in this context: symbolic thoughts), but rather a transparent perspective of Homo sapiens [*sic*] own understanding of themselves and their world. It is therefore a necessity to understand any religious consciousness, as transcendence, as the outcome of the relationship of Homo sapiens towards [*their*] God. (p. 2)

Also, Durkheim (cited in Wilson2009:321) expressed it in a bridge metaphor: ‘... in all its aspects and in every moment of history, human, social life is only possible thanks to a vast symbolism’.

Still, the myths of cosmogonic and creation possess another peculiar characteristic that prepares both the models for non-mythic interpretation in the cultures along with other enlightened myths. Long (2016) elucidated it in a coherent example:

Therefore, the solitary human must differentiate between cosmogonic myths and the myths of the cause of cultural (in an ontological and epistemic modus-JvR), [*sic*] relic as it generates the anecdote of the creation of the world, together with other myths, in portraying these so-called creations in a clear-cut, limited, or even in an ambiguous discovery.⁵ (p. 1)

It is in this area of cultural life where portrayals of the stylistic structure of the cosmogonic myths are discovered. In diffraction, and in the context of this article, most myths are probably etiological.⁶ Notwithstanding this, it may have

5. It all depends on how a *H. sapien* views this in her own epistemic reality.

6. Etiologic is a discipline that explains actual origins and not the eventful cause of things, in all forms of humans life.

to do with the fact that the creation of fables is never solely etiological, as it handles the eventual cause and infinite eventualities of all belongings; they have a prevalent structure and their interpretation constitutes a form of theological and philosophical paradigms.

In spite of this, it covers only one scope of its responsibilities within the image in any enlightening life. Although, historically, the creation myth does automatically point to formality in its interpretation, as an interpretation of a ritual it is often the dramatic result that emphasises the perpetuation and effectiveness of the basic theme of the myth. This again leads to the combination of the structure, meaning and value, especially in a culture, and, therefore, in the dramatisation of the ritual, as it usually constitutes the start-up of liturgy, especially in a religious hamlet when it pursues (my inclination) the recreation of time and space of the beginning.

As a result, religious hamlets that institute the notion of ritual dramatisation (and to be exact, in most hamlets, time and space) are creations for Actualities and their sacrilegious aftermath. Again Long (2016:2) stated that, ‘The prominence of the cosmogonic myth creates the being, or the reality of the human world lived’. In this reality, the most effective process for sapient lives is that they speak in a language of cosmogonic myths that entertains the prehistoric model(s) which have the most significant symbolic interpretation for them, in their respective hamlets as sapiens. This brings me to the second aim of my recommendation, namely, the use of a variety of creation or cosmogonic myths.

A variety of creation or cosmogonic myths

The world has an interpretation structure and value that do not appear in the same behaviour as in all *H. sapien* hamlets, and it is therefore true that there are just as many cosmogonic myths as sapient cultures. Currently, the moniker of all these myths, on an emergence phase, separating the greatest prehistoric benightment to present-day cultures of the West,⁷ was and is the most prominent process of requirement for these myths. Long (2016) justified this when he mentioned:

[T]hat the Newly, 20th-century scholars, however, have begun to look at the diverse variations of myths in terms of design, rather than seeing them on an emergent scale that extends from the purported transparent to the complex, for, theoretically, there are no transparent myths that are truly worthy for the creation of the world. (p. 3)

Why would I mention this here? The reason is that when we debate the trueness of creation in the context of the symbolism of cosmogonic myths, the reader will discover that there could be many, or there could not be any, authenticities in the readers’ epistemic mind. The creation of our planet is simultaneously the creation of sapient circumstances or status, and thus, it is unreasonable to speak of the creation as

7. From the undoubtedly transparent to the most complicated.

if it were transparent. This brings me to the third aim of my recommendation, the creation by a Supreme Being, or as indicated in this article, an Actuality.

Creation by an Actuality

Although the historical characteristics of the creator-Actuality could vary from culture to culture, there is a definite omnipresent design of the character-Actuality. The ensuing characteristics tend to be universal, and Long (2016:4) simplified it in this manner: One, she is all mighty and wise, and because of her insight, she is adept to engineering the world on account of her might. Two, she prevails unattended, proceeding to the creation of the world and there are no Actualities that precede her existence. No interpretation can therefore be comprehended of her existence, even before one can even think of encountering this eventful mystery. Three, the process of creation is sensible, thoughtful and systematic, and this exemplifies the condition of the creator's watchfulness and might. The creation arrives on an account that the Actuality implies to be in possession of a pronounced strategy and subjective with the additional execution of the creation on an experimental basis, as an example, and for instance, in Genesis peculiar and finicky parts are created seriatim.⁸ Four, the world's creation is together an interpretation of the independent and objection of the Actuality. Meaning that the creation is distinct and in tension with the divine creator. Her process of creation implies this arrangement, and it determines the process as well as the objectives of all visible features of creation, although the Actuality is not obligated through her creation. Her relation to the creation, post-creation, is once more a condition of her ability. Five, in the fashionable creation myths of this calibre, the creator-Actuality separates herself after she created the world. In post-creation, the Actuality leaves her work, just to reappear again when a tragedy or (theodicy-event-JvR), scare the created order. Six, the supreme Actuality is often to a sky-Actuality which evolves in an exhibition manner as a situation of judgement over spiritualities as symbolism of the sky heavens.

These mentioned variety of creation myths, the creation per se, with the knowledge that the creator-Actuality, creates a perfect utopia where evil does not exist. However, before the post-result of the creative act or after post-creation, the created system or the motive of the creator-Actuality is circumvented by a grotesque calibre of transgression by one of the creatures. My understanding is thus that the tension between creature and Creator is occasioned by a transgression of the creature. Present is a communion in the myth of creation, and in a few myths, this communion is the result of the exit from creation by the Actuality. However, because of the lack of space and time, all creation myths that could have been relevant for this article have not been dealt with. I only chose five Cosmogonic or Creation myths, which to my understanding are the most pertinent to the

8.Ensuring what different speculation myths are about: for example, the Egyptian myth, *Kheper*, the creator-Actuality, says (speculating in this context): 'I planned in my heart', and the creator-Actuality of the Maori myth design from stagnation to increasing phases of instigation or rise.

goal of this article: (1) The Dogon *sapiens* from West Africa⁹, (2) The world egg, cosmic egg or mundane egg from proto-Indo-European,¹⁰ (3) The Navajos *sapiens* from the Southwestern United States¹¹, (4) The Zuni *sapiens* from New Mexico¹² and (5) The Enûma Elish of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (Mosul, Iraq).¹³

The Dogon *sapiens* in West Africa¹⁴ interpret this in the following myth-fashion: The creator-Actuality initially initiates an egg.¹⁵ This egg contains twins of two pairs. An individual pair consists of a female and male. It is believed that they are twins and are presumed grown-ups within the egg, becoming hermaphrodites at success and accomplishment. It is therefore believed that it is ideal for these females and males to control the world.

Before maturation, one twin dislodges from the egg, as it hopes to control creation. In doing so, she takes a piece of the egg with her, and then she designs an incomplete world. The creator-Actuality then sacrifices the other one to create equilibrium in the world, and the creation then is not an ideal world, as was intended, but rather an uncertain world.

Long (2016) designated:

That this myth is not only present and displays a manner, as communion takes place within the myth itself, but it also points to the fact that the essence of the supreme creator deity, as mentioned above, seldom exists separate from other mythological contexts. (p. 5)

The extensive images of duality (the divine twins), the infinite egg and sacrifice are vital descriptions and interpretations in the make-up of this myth from Africa. The calibre of this myth's eminence prerequisite, most of the time, powers to the mighty creator sky-Actuality, under whose protection and patronage the created plan springs to life. This leads us

9.The Dogon sapiens are living in the central plateau region of Mali, West Africa, south of the Niger bend, near the city of Bandiagara and in Burkina Faso. They speak the Dogon languages, which are considered to constitute an independent branch of the Niger-Congo language family. See Dogon sapiens at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dogon_people.

10.The world egg, cosmic egg or mundane egg is a mythological motif found in the cosmogonies of many cultures that descend from the proto-Indo-European culture and other cultures and civilisations. Typically, the world egg is a beginning of some sort, and the universe of some primordial Actuality comes into existence by hatching from the egg, sometimes lying in the primordial sea of the Earth. See Cosmic egg at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_egg.

11.The Navajos are Native American people of the Southwestern United States. More than 300 000 are enrolled tribal members of the Navajo Nation that is the second largest federally recognised tribe in the United States – the Cherokee Nation being the largest – and has the largest reservation in the country. See Navajos at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Navajo>.

12.Zuni mythology is the cosmology and religion of the Zuni people. 'The Zuni are a Pueblo people located in New Mexico. Their religion is integrated into their daily lives and respects ancestors, nature, and animals. Because of a history of religious persecution by non-native peoples, they are very private about their religious beliefs. Roman Catholicism has to some extent been integrated into traditional Zuni religion.' See Zuni mythology at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zuni_mythology.

13.The Enûma Elish is a creation myth from the Babylonian times: 'It was recovered by Austen Henry Layard in 1849 in the ruined Library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh (Mosul, Iraq). A form of the myth was first published by George Smith in 1876; active research and further excavations led to near completion of the texts, and improved translation.' See Enûma Elish at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/En%C3%BBma_Eli%C5%A1.

14.See footnote 9.

15.See footnote 10.

to the fourth aim of the recommendation, namely, evolution and emergent thought of creation.

The emergence of the creation reflection

In revision to the creation of a sky-Actuality, there is another type of symbolic myth of creation that gave the impression that it evolves over its own occupation of her central power from beneath the earth. Once again Long (2016) stated:

In this fashion of myth, the created emergent regularities are in constant phases, and it is the same as the rebirth of the world from its immature phase to maturity. (p. 5)

The imaginaries of the earth form a storage place as a depository of all power-forms. In these kinds of myths (e.g. Navajo emergence myth),¹⁶ the progress, from an inferior phase to a more advanced one, is projected by an error of the creatures who reside beneath the earth. Still, these errors are singular corollaries of an automagical uppermost progress in the world.

The same is present in the context of the myth of the creator-Actuality, as it does form an impartiality or homology (equal opportunity) to the sky, and, as a sapient-evolving myth, forms an impartiality with the earth and its parturition females. Long (2016:5) expanded on this: 'In several instances the emergence of the created phase is like the growth of a child in the womb with its diffusion or discharge at birth'. These images are best interpreted by a *Zuni* myth,¹⁷ when Long (2016) stated that:

Anon is the nethermost world. The seed of men and creatures took form and increased; even as in eggs in warm places speedily appear ... Everywhere were unfinished creatures, crawling like reptiles one over another, one spitting on another or doing other indecencies ... until many among them escaped, growing wiser and more manlike. (p. 5)

The abyss, before the created phases, was in shambles. The creatures or *sapiens* took up residence without cohesion, and they committed immoral acts. This chaos affected the definite phase of order; however, the orders themselves were dormant in various forms, and from the outside it reflected to the disposition of orders.

From another point, Long (2016) asserted that:

[T]he emergence myth, is like the seed, and when this similarity of the seed is referred to, the meaning of virility and death are at once introduced. The seed must die before it can be reborn and actualise its ability. (p. 5)

These images are defiantly bestowed in an expansive sphere of burial rituals: Firstly, because a creature is concealed in the earth in the belief of a rebirth out of the earth or, secondly, because the earth is the depository of the forbearer from where a new creation appears. In each phase, this appearance of the emergence myth manifests

16. See footnote 11.

17. See footnote 12.

the dormant effectiveness as immanent in the earth as a depository of all spirit, and this leads to the fifth aim of the recommendation, namely, the creation of the world parents, as this symbolises immanent influences as depository to all life forms.

Creation by world patrons (parents)

The above type of myth declares that the world is created as the progeny of a prehistoric father and mother. These world parents are simultaneous images of the earth and the sky. These calibres of myths mean that the parents, in most cases, must present themselves at a later phase during the process of creation. Total pandemonium and anarchy existed before the world parents came into existence. Long (2016) presented the Babylonian myth, *Euna elish*,¹⁸ when *Euna* articulated it in the following modus:

When on a high the heaven had not been named
Firm ground below had not been called by name,
ought but primordial Apsu, their begetter,
(And) Munnu-Tiamat, she who bore them all
Their sea comingling as a single body. (p. 6)

The same fact is being propagated by the Maori, as they proclaim that their world parents are emanating out of *Po*, and for them it factors in as a fundamental secretion of a score and process by which creation appears. In this manner, some facts of existence appear long before the reappearance of the parents of the world.

Similarly, the world parents are interpreted and depicted in speech and writing, within a context of sexual embrace, as no state of being active is taking place. Long (2016:6-7) made it clear: '[t]hey appear inactive and dormant, however, the devil's syndicate-like formation of the earth is a secret potentiality that tends to govern the world'. The parents of the world are most of the time oblivious to the fact that they are parents and, in a way, a lack of interest is expressed. The portrayal of female and male in sexual context is a like image of fullness and entirety. The same happens in the Dogon African myth, where there is a significant similarity of bisexual male and female traits depicted. In proper sequence, it then appears as a sign of accomplishment. The carelessness of the parents of the world is not an indication of inexperience, but rather a silence of accomplishment. In the Maori and Babylonian myths, the world parents do not want to be agitated by their progeny, and for the parents, the progeny are signs of Actualities, specifically, as they are characterised as a phenomenon.

As a communion, the myths of the world parents, according to Long (2016), acquiesced:

This segregation is induced by the progeny who both, male and female long for more time and illumination for themselves, as they are located in the middle of their parents [*sic*] bodies. (p. 6)

18. See footnote 13.

Segregation, in some myths, is induced by a female who ascends her grind so steep, in an abrasive grain, which pummel the sky, and thus bring about the sky to withdraw into the background. In this manner, she creates an opportunity for sapient activities, and in both cases, an opposing motive is ascribed to the forces of segregation.

The prehistoric union of the world parents has an infinite ambition for knowledge and, for me, a most unlike divergent in and of time and space. After the segregation, inferior-Actualities are related akin to the solar symbolism, and they then take charge of creation. In these myths, the light and the sun must be perceived with eyes, which purports to depict the desire for sapient-ness and cultural interpretation as it opposes the lifeless and dormant phases of the merging parent-Actualities. Against this mark of segregation, Long (2016) agreed that:

... [T]he myth narrative of the world parent myth, states how unlike the interpretation of culture knowledge are brought to humans by their offspring, as they are the agents of segregation. (p. 7)

Segregation of the parents of the world is evidence of a recent cosmic phase, a phase loyal and hardworking to the method, expertise and interpretation of the knowledge of the sapient culture. This evidence, to my mind, can be best ascribed to in the cosmic egg and the earth divers and the creation thereof.

The cosmic egg in creation and the earth divers

In the Dagon myth, the cosmogonic Actuality commences this response by creating and establishing two rudimentary identical twins in an egg. A female and a male are found in each set of twins. Together and concurrently with the activity of the advancement development, they form prehistoric beings. In a Tahitian myth,¹⁹ as Long (2016:7) signified: ‘... the creator deity, herself, lives alone in a shell and after breaking out of the shell, she then creates her match, and together they compose their work of creation’.

A couple of essential features are substantial in the myths of this calibre. Firstly, the phase of the creation water purporting to depict the undifferentiated sea that is knowable ahead of the planet’s creation. Secondly, a beastlike carnal is present, who dives inside the water to present a piece of the earth. Importantly, the significance of this carnal lies in a pre-sapient species, and an elementary design of the divers from earth has been altered in Europe’s myths that transmit the prehistoric sea devil as well as the Actuality. Here, in the earth-diver myth, the devil pretends to be the Actuality’s helper and friend, and the devil becomes the diver who is

sent by the Actuality to transfer the piece of earth from the lowermost foundational place of the sea.

Long (2016) expanded:

In most accounts of this myth, the deity does not come into sight to be omnipotent, often depending on the knowledge of the devil for certain analyses regarding the creative details that she learns through tricks she plays with the devil. (pp. 7–8)

Yet, in another account of this myth, the historical friendship amidst the Actuality and the devil progresses from helper-friend to the direction of an enemy. Although they remain co-creators of the earth, their rivalry made the creation abstract and unknowable. In this myth, it is depicted as a verifiable truth, as the devil is the one that creates and sustains evil.

Some of the most important calibres of creation myths have been fixed by the above. Arising from these myths and their superior themes, philosophical and theological theories have been advanced in various religious hamlets all over the world, and they then point to some basic reflections of mythical themes. These basic reflections are indeed necessary and have to be investigated as they point to the basic plural tool of diversity as a positive modus fashion.

Essential prehistorical mythical themes

In various myths, it is expressed that prehistorical substances of creation have come into existence from some phases of comparable substance (e.g. an egg, a monster, water or chaos). It is out of these comparable substances that the world emerges, or is fashioned, and in the event of the monster and egg images, there appears to be a phase of an exact prototype arrangement. However, these arrangements are always comparable with certain prehistoric symbols or insignia, for the egg image is ambiguous and rudimentary. So, the monster figure contains the whole quantity of utter confusion, in a Horrible fashion, and it articulates the subject matter of chaos in an indifference, as per example, water. In this context, does water opposes creation, although creation is the consequence of the qualification of this prehistoric substance. It is this substance (water) that converses and decides the limit to the continuation of the world in time and space. Therefore, in hamlets where myths of this kind find their verbalisation, there are reliable phases of rituals that are mythical, as valid seasonal phases where the world retires to its initial utter confusion, and then they rise from this original confused phase.

Albeit, it being declared that an Actuality created the world and there was no prehistoric substance present prior to her existence, the perseverance of the world is incognito and reflects the character of the Actuality, and it points to a unique conclusion that the fate of the world and of course *H. sapiens*, in their respective hamlets, has got nothing to do with an Actuality. The end and, to my mind, the eschatological meaning, post-world, and with it its longing for the beyond is

¹⁹Society and Tahiti Islands mythology encompass the sayings, historical tales and legends of the age-old ancient sapiens of the Society Islands, consisting of Moorea, Huahine, Raiatea, Tahiti, Bora Bora and other islands. Their religion was officially suppressed in the nineteenth century, and ultimately abandoned by the natives in favour of Christianity: See Tahiti at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tahiti_and_Society_Islands_mythology.

thus not destined by prehistoric substances but rather by the emergence of life that was not the result of an Actuality. And therefore, it is she alone who does not, destines the protection and maintenance as well as the end of her creation. It is for this reason that we, at this stage of the article, must investigate the pluralistic tools of dualisms and antagonisms in the contexts of emergent myths, where the role of the Actuality is reduced.

The beginning of the end: Dualisms and antagonisms with my aimed recommendation and conclusion

According to me, there seems to be a much easier interaction between one phase of creation and the other. Yet, as has been reflected in the Navajo myth, during every underground phase, there are a few forms of opposition by the whole prosperous prehistorical animals and their happenings from one phase to the next. Although the myths of emergence depict a gentle phase of this animosity, it is still relevant regarding these varieties of myths. The animosity between the progeny and their mothers and fathers is tangible. The rivalry amid progeny reproductions and the parent's origination are, to my mind, the result, today, of the very fast-expanding world of knowledge (for instance, technology), as it is breathtakingly fast. This is where the debate concerning creation and the sacrifice of this creation are important.

In the introduction of this article, I mentioned that the myths of cosmogonic and creation are the allegorical interpretations of the beginning of our world as understood by a distinct *H. sapien* hamlet. This was indicated when recent opinions of cosmogonic creation were discussed as interpretations of myths considering the ensuing history and obligated hamlets. In doing so, I indicated, for instance, that all speculations and therefore, in this text, theology having to do with cosmogonic creation in a Christian hamlet (defiantly not by all Christians, or their hamlets) are located in the myths of creation in the scriptural book of Genesis and of eschatology in Jesus Christ. I then went forward in using Charles Long's *Creation or Cosmogonic myth* to explain that opinions of cosmogonic creation are based on the myths of creation within this distinct Christian and peculiar religious hamlets.

Also, I have indicated that the cosmogonic myth is the myth superior, and it is ascribed to the comparability of philosophy; however, unlike philosophy, it is created by an arrangement of symbols. Then my argument indicates that these symbols are the base for ensuing cultural thought, as it consists of rational and irrational phases of thought. And, as a result, I stipulated the initial reason to interpret the world through the cosmogonic myth that provides the answer to my question in this article. The question of: does a positive pluralist view indicate a pluralistic pristine structure of cultures and does it then articulate the evolving phases and designations to certain cultural life, out of which assorted and diverge phases of cultures, sapient behaviours and especially religious experiences are explained and

perhaps vindicated? If so, then these varieties of pluralism tools are reminiscences and a celebration of the cosmogonic and creation myths, as it then allows the religious hamlets to think and share their epistemic and ontological foundational thoughts on time and space.

Yet, with these cosmogonic and creation myths in mind, the pluralistic approach of orientation empowers the *H. sapiens* in their respective hamlets to define, articulate and designate their cultural life in a definitive demeanour.

Throughout this article, the concept of pluralism is indicated as important, especially in the role that is subsequent to a positive answer. This answer then exhibits why the debate of cosmogonic or creation myths must be continued. In doing so, I indicated the significance to religious *sapiens* when, and if, they become aware of this positive diversity. Also, it was reiterated that *sapiens* can now (when they understand this positive diversity) literarily observe that the cosmogonic and creation myths are a foundationalist approach and a positive process in a sapient communality or hamlet.

Lastly, I indicated that this communality is a language that differs vastly between epistemological and ontological views of *sapiens* and that *sapiens'* differential views are labelled as a philosophical possibility and that it is comprehensive and knowable, whatever their convictions about creation are. To me, if there is no possibility to be found in the understanding of cosmogonic and creation of diverse myths, especially in religious *sapiens* epistemological consensus, at least there should be an aimed probability of positiveness.

Not with standing this, and in an extension to this, theologians and philosophers today have introduced a method and, to my mind, a pluralism of interpretation of all understandings of cosmogonic and creation myths, which includes a variety of Actualities, and the world, according to the basic religious and rational classifications.

These rational classifications have a phenomenological epistemic impact and even a certain righteousness of *whoever wants to believe whatever of creation*. Let it be ..., as it should be ontological, (showing the relations between the concepts [*myth's*] and categories [*criterion of these myth's*] in a subject area [*a variety of philosophies or religions*] or domain [*places where these myths are experienced*]), and epistemological (relating to the theory of knowledge [*how these myths evolved in the thought processes of sapiens*], especially with regard to its methods [*e.g. sacramental*], validity [*the genuineness and lawfulness of these myths*], and scope [*the extend thereof*], and the distinction between justified belief and opinion), and be positive for theologians as objects and religious *sapiens* as subjects.

Therefore, it is my final intuitiveness of trust that was bestowed by me in my own context, critique and communication that theologians should not enter the debate in trying to dislodge and discredit the scepticism concerning rational knowledge in the accord between Actualities and the

cosmos or universe, and in addition, the cosmogonic creation, albeit in the form of experienced experiences as myths.

Acknowledgements

The author of this article acknowledges the significant role that the acclaimed scholar Charles H. Long (2009) had on his thinking on the subject matter at hand and wishes to thank him.

Competing interests

The author has declared that no competing interest exist.

Author(s) contributions

I declare that I am the sole author of this research article.

Ethical consideration

This article followed all ethical standards for a research without direct contact with human or animal subjects.

Funding information

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Data availability statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

Disclaimer

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of any affiliated agency of the author.

References

- Cosmic Egg, n.d., *World egg*, viewed 21 August 2019, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_egg.
- Dogon sapiens, n.d., *Dogon people*, viewed 05 July 2019, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dogon_people.
- Enuma Elish, n.d., *Enûma Eliš*, viewed 08 July 2019, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/En%C3%BBma_Eli%C5%A1.
- Long, C.H., 2016, *Creation myth*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., viewed n.d., from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/creation-myth/Skepticism-regarding-creation-2019>.
- Tahiti society, n.d., *Tahiti and Society Islands mythology*, viewed 09 July 2019, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tahiti_and_Society_Islands_mythology.
- Van Rooyen, J.A., 2018, 'Transcendence, immanence and religious experience in a post-transcendence era', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 39(1), a1838. <https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v39i1.1838>
- Wilson, D.S., 2009, 'Narrowing (but not yet bridging) the gap', in J. Schloss & M. Murray (eds.), *The believing primate. Scientific, philosophical, and theological reflections on the origin of religion*, pp. 318–338, SPI Publisher Services, Pondicherry.
- Zuni Sapiens, n.d., *Zuni mythology*, viewed 05 July 2019, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zuni_mythology.