

Hypothesis

Not peer-reviewed version

Autoapodixis: Proof of God – God Proves His Own Existence

[Chika Uzoigwe](#)*

Posted Date: 29 December 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202512.2552.v1

Keywords: proof of god; autoapodixis; apodixis; theoutapodixis; I AM; tetragrammaton; mooses; mount Horeb; Elijah; exodus 3:14; The Transfiguration; 1 Kings 19:12; Marian apodixis; the Magnificat; Luke 1:46-55; Isaiah 7:14



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#), which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Hypothesis

Autoapodixis: Proof of God – God Proves His Own Existence

Chika Uzoigwe

Harcourt House, UK; chika@doctors.org.uk

Abstract

Contemporary colloquy is monopolised by our proofs of God. There is much less attention on God's proof of his own existence. Few understandably have had the audacity to petition God to prove his being. The most iconic instance occurs in Moses' encounter in Exodus 3. Moses asks God, tangentially, for proof, euphemising with the term "name". Ironically hermeneutics have obfuscated the very answer; which is as much a proof, as it is a response to Moses' question. God's own proof cannot rely on that subordinate to him, namely creation, it must therefore be self-referential. Secondly it must be self-evidently true, axiomatic, irrefragable and of incontrovertible historicity. It must be an *Autoapodixis*. This *Theoautoapodixis* must be synchronous to persuade contemporaries but equally metachronous to convince future generations. Herein it is shown that God achieves the impossible Autoapodixis when Moses seeks proof. The name given to Moses and his contemporaries is "I AM THAT I AM", although it is potentially inclusive of multiple other tenses. However in Modern Hebrew the same word has the singular meaning "I SHALL BE THAT I SHALL BE". Hence, at a single point in time Moses asks God for proof. To Moses and his peers he says his name and his proof is "I AM THAT I AM" AND at that time in history, speaking to those in the future, who will also ask the same question and read the text, he says "I SHALL BE THAT I SHALL BE" even before "I SHALL BE" means "I SHALL BE". This is the Autoapodixis. This proof also tessellates with the previously articulated intriguing hypothesis that during the Transfiguration there was a coalescence time and the disciples saw Jesus speaking to Moses and Elijah in the past. We also evince and epiphanise a Marian apodixis.

Keywords: proof of god; autoapodixis; apodixis; theoautoapodixis; I AM; tetragrammaton; moyses; mount Horeb; Elijah; exodus 3:14; The Transfiguration; 1 Kings 19:12; Marian apodixis; the Magnificat; Luke 1:46-55; Isaiah 7:14

Introduction

No current religion espouses the notion of a God that created, then abandoned the world. Rather God seeks to know and relate to creation. There are some that doubt the existence of God. The Holy Grail in philosophy remains proof of the Existence of God. However much of the focus falls on our human proofs of God. An existing God is clearly aware that doubt exists. Hence one must engage how, God, who wants to know us, proves himself to be. Jesus proves God's love, which presupposes that God must have proven his existence, *a priori*, in advance.

Understanding Our Proofs of God

All proofs of the existence of God are formulated as though the prover is an advocate and an aporetic populous or individual is to be persuaded. In such a formula, proofs can fall into a number of paradigms. These include the proofs contingent upon logic, whereby rejection of the proof would evolve abjuring reason and logic and *reductio ad absurdum*. St Thomas Aquinas' Five Ways fall into this category [1,2]. The Saint set the standard very high in the most comprehensive proof quintet of the existence of God. It forms a perfect exemplar

The First Way: *First Mover*: Everything that changes or moves has been moved by something else. Change and movement are the result of transition from potentiality to actuality. This is impossible *ad infinitum*. Hence there must be a first unmoved mover or pure actuality. This is God

The Second Way: *First Cause*. All things must have both a co-eval synchronous and pre-existent cause. This cannot continue *ad infinitum*. There must be an uncaused cause. This is God.

The Third Way: *Necessary being*. There are things that exist, that could possibly also not have existed are thus “possible beings”. All possible beings require a reason for their existence. There must be a necessary being, not contingent upon anything for its existence. This is God.

The Fourth Way: *Gradation*. There is a gradation in so many things for example good and beauty. The scale is only possible if there is a gold standard or paragon. That which is imperfectly good requires that which is perfectly good for its existence and continent goodness. *Forme fruste* necessitates a *forme pleine*. This is God

The Fifth Way: *Final Cause*: Things without intellect or consciousness appear to move towards a goal. This can only be possible if there is a directing intellect. This is God

If one accepts the logic catenation of St Thomas Aquinas, then his proofs are irrefragable. It is predicated on accepting each postulate. Ontological arguments also fall into proofs contingent upon logic.
Error! Bookmark not defined.

Other methods while not incontrovertible *per se* seek to present compelling evidence which mandate an explanation, of which God is possibly the most parsimonious. Such cases include the existence of the universe in conjunction with the scientific finding of a start of the universe or human morality and consciousness. Other models refer to miracles. Miracles in turn fall into broad categories including for example those that contravene science and require supernatural causation. In addition there are those that are scientifically possible but so improbable due to the need of a unique temporal sequence of events that they demand a supernatural causality.

Understanding God’s Proof of God

Christianity is the dominant belief system, with an estimated 2.6 billion adherents worldwide [3]. No other single belief system is numerically superior to the faith. Here, however, God is in the dock (Jesus); he is the Judge (God the father) and he is the Advocate (The Holy Spirit). Jesus is famously found not guilty but condemned to death nonetheless. In the Bible when God is asked to prove his existence he does not resort to the strategy of an Advocate espousing insuperable logic. Without wishing to be glib: when asked for proof of his being “*God does God things*” only. There is no logomachy. The reason for this is clear. Imagine your 3 year old nephew asks you to prove to him that you are good at maths. How will you prove it to him? You can show him quadratic equations. But he does not understand these and hence cannot be persuaded that you are good at maths. In the alternative you could show him that you know your 7 times tables. This proves to him that you are better at maths than your young cousin and may even prove to his satisfaction that you are good at maths. However, you know this is not a proof that you are skilled at maths. There is no point in mathomachy with your cousin as he does not have the tools to engage to satisfy himself of the proof that he seeks.

God Does God Things...Only

So mankind asks God to prove his existence. However, God, according to the formulation of the likes of Saint Thomas Aquinas, is existence itself, a concept unintelligible. This proof we seek we do not have the tools satisfy ourselves even if it were proffered. It is akin to saying to an interlocutor “I don’t speak Welsh. Prove to me that you can speak welsh”. Hence when there is a gap in intellect, ability, knowledge as there must necessarily exist between God and humans; proof requires a demonstration both can appreciate. When showing he is God or his divinity *de novo*, God does God things. Hence rather than evincing the logic of the Five Ways, he shows us the in scripture the immediate sequitur of the Five Ways elements.

1. First Mover: Hence God does not reveal a first unmoved mover but rather shows a *first moved* or first potentiality to actuality. For example, parting of the Red Sea in Exodus when the Israelites are trapped between same sea and the advancing Egyptian army. There is no preceding mover other than the first mover. Exodus 14:15-26
2. First Cause: God does not show a first cause but rather a *first effect*, for example changing the direction of flight of the quail, for the Israelites in the desert, which they ate and which satiated their hunger. There is no preceding cause other than the first cause, God. Exodus 16:13
3. Necessary Being: God does not expose the necessary being but a *first possible/contingent being*, for example Manna in the Desert. There is no preceding being before the Manna other than the necessary being. Exodus 16:13
4. Gradation: God first adds and expands our known limits of the scale in the form of the Blessed Virgin Mary and John the Baptist. Then he shows the apses of the scale with Jesus.
5. Design: God co-opts the design or end and redirects it. A possible example of this is when Jesus castigates the fig tree that produces no fruit. Mark 11:12-25

The cases enumerated above are in some ways indirect proofs as there was no explicit request for proof. What if there were?

Autoapodixis

God does God things when he proves his existence. However, if God were God, *when asked specifically to prove himself*, his proof must be conclusive and decisive and be self-evident. Indeed it must be apodictic. So evident, in and of itself, that the statement is proof of the thing itself. An example is $2+2=4$. The statement is the proof. The proof is self-evident in itself. Such a proof would also be auto-referential. If God must rely on something else to prove himself and his existence, he is lacking something which is not consistent with God. Can a creator be dependent upon his own creation for proof of his own existence? This is katadromic logic. God's proof must be self-evident and self-referential – Autoapodixis. Does God achieve this feat?

There are few recorded instances where God is asked to prove himself. The most iconic is when Moses tangentially raised the question. He asks in Exodus 3:13:

*“Then Moses asked God, “Suppose I go to the Israelites and say to them, ‘The God of your fathers has sent me to you,’ and **they ask me, ‘What is His name?’ What should I tell them?’”**”*

Could this reply be the ultimate proof of God's existence, if you like, an autoapodixis?

God Q&A:

In Exodus 3:14 Moses indirectly asks God to prove he be God.

The author makes it clear that Moses is patently aware of the fact that he is addressing God but nonetheless, requests proof or euphemistically his “name”. Out of reverence the question is indirect. However the meaning and intention are ineluctable.

God's response is:

אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה

'ehye 'ăšer 'ehye

I AM WHO I AM

“I AM WHO I AM” is the *translation* but not the whole gamut of *meaning*. The two are distinct. The nuances of language especially, over time, are such that the translation can be imperfectly transmitted and the meaning even mutated. The apotheosis of this is the word “*philotimo*”. The translation is “love of honour” is but there is no equivalent meaning in English.

Nonetheless, “אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה” (‘ehye ‘ăšer ‘ehye) is God's own proof. This may satisfy the requirement of a divine proof; firstly self-referential and secondly self-evident and conclusive and thus be an autoapodixis. To see if this is so, one must explore the meaning and not merely the translation.

Love Language

An understanding of the meaning of the words God uses to Moses requires an appreciation of grammar and Hebrew grammar. Verbs can be described by tense and/or aspect [4]. The tense refers to when the action occurred, for example: the future, present, past, imperfect and pluperfect.

I shall submit, I am submitting, I submit, I was submitting and I had submitted.

However, aspect describes how the event occurred over time. The most common aspects are the perfective and imperfective. The perfective aspect refers to a single complete action but has no reference to when it occurred. The imperfective describes an action that remains on-going, incomplete repetitive and continuous. However, the aspect in no way connotes when the action occurred.

You accepted perfective (past simple English)

You were accepting imperfective (pass progressive in English)

Some languages incorporate some temporal terms in a chimeric tense-aspects such as the "perfect aspect". Verbs in this aspect connote actions are complete in the specific timeframe for example:

I had published, I have published and I will have published

Are all conveyed by single word – verb-aspect...the perfect aspect.

Biblical Hebrew however forms a cluster of languages that was predominantly if not exclusively aspectual, with no tenses [5]. Verbs were either perfect (complete) or imperfect (on-going). This corresponded with the perfective and imperfective aspects respectively. The general convention was that the perfect was used to connote events in the past; the imperfect correlated with the present or future. However, within the imperfect, as it is an imperfective aspect, a single word could simultaneously confers the translations.

they had been reading, they were reading, they read, they are reading, they will be reading.

Which of the possibilities is the actual meaning, is determined by the context. The "pure" perfective is very difficult if not impossible to convey in English, as all tenses in some way convey a temporal aspect with regard to when the action occurred. A pure perfective has no indication to time.

In aspectual languages the context is germane to interpretation. The same too applies for the tense verbs to a lesser degree.

I eat.

Can imply amongst other "I have no moral objection against eating"

I eat meat

or "I typically eat" as per

After the gym, I eat

Note that the more empirical the word the greater the contextual requirement. "Eating" is so basic that contextualisation is necessary to evince a singular meaning. In the absence of contextual cues, the definitive meaning is either ambiguous or inclusive of all the possibilities.

Consider words like

"I publish" or "I run" or "I repair"

Such words are much more specific. Little contextual panorama or accessorisation is required to convey meaning.

The Meaning vs The Translation

In biblical Hebrew strictly speaking אֶחְיֶה אִשֶּׁר אֶחְיֶה ('ehye 'ăšer 'ehye) is in the imperfective aspect [6,7]. Hence the words could literally mean

"I am that I am"

"I am being that I am being"

"I shall be that I shall be"

"I shall be being that I shall be being"

"I was being that I was being"

"I had been being that had been being"

Note the lack of contextualisation in the most empirical and fundamental verb of any language, the verb to be. This points to an inclusive, rather than an ambiguous interpretation. The implication of every permutation of being adumbrates Saint Augustine, Scottish Franciscan Friar John Duns Scotus and Saint Thomas Aquinas who described God as existence: "*ipsum esse*" [8], "*Deus est Ens*" [9], "*ipsum esse subsistens*" , in the 4th, 12th and 13th respectively, working ab initio from first philosophical principles.

To facilitate interpretation, with a limited tense-aspect repertoire, Biblical Hebrew also used certain prefix constructs. One such is the "waw" or "vav" consecutive "waw" literally meaning "hook" "peg" and "and". It was used as narrative instrument. To connote the past tense the imperfective is conjugated with a prefix ׀ (waw). The future is denoted by a perfective with a prefix ׀ (waw) [10]. However, in the absence of the these, Moses contemporaries may have construed this as the present tense "I AM THAT I AM" [11–13]. Strictly speaking a wide more inclusive meaning is possible. Indeed, this may have well been the very intention.

The inclusive present tense translation is corroborated in the Septuagint, a third century BC Greek translation of the Pentateuch conducted by Jews living in the Ptolemaic Kingdom, a Greek state, based in Egypt [14]. It is translated as:

ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν (*Ego eimi ho on*), 'I am The Being'

This anticipates again Delphic exegeses of Saint Augustine, Scotus, and St Thomas Aquinas. Clearly the meaning conveyed was at least inclusive of the present tense. This is significant. Within the literature there has been an emphasis on adhering to a single rendering of the phrase. However, this betrays possibly an overzealous focus of the translation rather the meaning. The meaning is not intentionally ambiguous but intentionally inclusive of all the verb permutations. This reflects the nature of the all-encompassing being of God. The translators of the Septuagint sought a term that simultaneously and contemporaneously meant

Am

Will be

Had been being

Was being

Am being

Will be being

They selected "*the being*", not "*a being*" but "*the being*". It has been suggested that the Septuagint translation is philosophical interpretation but clearly it is the meaning. Greek has a constellation of tenses and aspects in its grammatical bauplan. Some meaning is invariably lost by constraining "אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה" to a single tense-aspect silo. English has fewer tenses indeed just a present and past. All other tenses are necessarily conjugated by auxiliary modal verbs had, have, shall, will, should, would. Indeed the verb "to be" is used to conjugate present progressive of all verbs. Hence "I am that I am" is may be more inclusive meaning than "*ego eimi hos ego eimi*" (the literal ancient Greek Translation of "I that am I am)

The Autoapodixis

The most intriguing element is when we look to the Modern Hebrew. In Modern Hebrew the imperfective tense invariably, singularly and exclusively construes *the future tense*. Hence the contemporary translation is singularly:

"I shall be that I shall be".

There is sometimes a temptation to regard the translation into Modern Hebrew as reflecting an anachronistic solecism or constrains meaning. However, Moses asks God essentially to prove himself at single point in history, but it is a question all generation will ultimately pose. The most basic explanation is that God is saying to Moses and contemporaries, *at that time in history*: "I AM THAT I AM". However to future generations he says "I SHALL BE THAT I SHALL BE", this what we read when we interpret the text today in Modern Hebrew. However God says this even before "I SHALL BE" exclusively means "I SHALL BE". Moses and peers would interpret the "name" as "I AM THAT I AM" and in Modern Hebrew we can only interpret it today as "I SHALL BE THAT I SHALL BE". The incident occurs at a single point in time and hence the present tense applied to Moses and the Israelites. However the future applies to us. Whoever you construe "I AM" to be. "I AM" says to Moses "I AM" in antiquity and "I AM" also said "I SHALL BE" to future generations even before "I SHALL BE" means "I SHALL BE". This is the autoapodixis. The very statement is the proof. "I AM" said "I SHALL BE" before "I SHALL BE" meant "I SHALL BE" and it is so. In the passage God even confirms that his name is the name for future generations. The whole surrounding text of Exodus is instructive.

Exodus 3:14-15

God said to Moses, "***I am who I am***. This is what you are to say to the Israelites: '***I am has sent me to you***.'" God also said to Moses, "Say to the Israelites, 'The Lord, the God of your fathers—the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob—has sent me to you. ***This is my name forever. The name you shall call me from generation to generation***'"

He uses the future tense not to connote the fact that he is not here in the future but rather to connote that the fact that we have not arrived at that future yet. Note also in addition to the Autoapodixy, אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה ('ehye 'ăšer 'ehye), God specifically **also** uses the more conventional word, God, אֱלֹהִים ('ēlōhê) rather than "I AM". "I AM THAT I AM" is his essence, being, proof and Autoapodixis (the haecceity "who" and the proof). God is the quiddity (the "what") and the existence of which is to be proved.

Even with this proof Moses and his peers cannot fully comprehend this proof. It is only from the vantage point of future is it self-evidence.

Aba (Auto)apodixis Anaology

Consider this analogy. Chidi who lives in Sheffield, plans to visit Chima, his sister living in Aba, Nigeria. Their father used to live in Abuja. However unbeknownst to both of them, their father has moved from Abuja to Aba. The father wants to send *a single message* in their group *WhatsApp* saying to Chima, in Aba, that he is with her in Aba already and to Chidi that he will be with him in Aba when he arrives. A single expression cannot convey this message in English or Igbo, so in the group *WhatsApp* he messages tagging Chima saying

"I am with you in Aba"

Chima reads the messages is surprised but understands.

The father messages Chidi, while he still in Sheffield, England

"I shall be with you in Aba"

Chidi misses the message because she is watching Thomistic Institute, Godsplaining and Notre Dame Parish on Youtube shorts.

When Chidi arrives in Aba she surprised to see her father. She checks the message saying

"I shall be with in Aba" sent *before she* left and it makes perfect sense.

"I AM" tells MOSES "I AM" and simultaneously tells futures generations "I SHALL BE" even before "I SHALL BE" means "I SHALL BE". This is autoapodixis satisfying the necessary self-referential and self-evident proof of God. Even if one were to consign this to coincidence, it is self-evident and has occurred. I essentially equivalent to arguing that it is a coincidence 2+2 is 4. It is simply 4.

Context Is Key

Context give the words the meaning. From the passage Exodus 3:14-15 it is clear that the rules espoused and the relationship between “I AM” and Moses and his posterity both in heritage and by faith is to be eternal. Given that this message, even when it was written, was intended for a future time, for subsequent generations, after in posterity, an equally apposite meaning for Exodus 3:14 includes:

“I shall prove that I am” to Moses and contemporaries and

“I shall prove that I shall be” to the generation today in Modern Hebrew, where the future tense is the only possible translation.

“Prove” is used in the New World Translation [15]

Back to the Future

Unquestionably one of the most thurmaturgical events in the Gospels is the Transfiguration (Mark 9:2-8, Matthew 17:1-8, Luke 9:28-36). A number of authors have proposed a fascinating interpretation that at this event there was a coalescence of time. Peter, James and John saw Jesus speaking to Moses and Elijah in the past [16,17]. However for Moses and Elijah it was their present time. The transcendental proof of God as the immutable “I AM” is congruous with this transcendental event. Hence God speaks from an atemporal frame, but from some perspectives the future, to say to Moses “I AM” which will mean “I SHALL BE”. He at the same time or in the past or in the future gives to Elijah his prophetic knowledge.

I shall however diverge from and expound on the previous commentaries on two accounts. Firstly consistent with the *Theoautoapodixis*, I submit that the moment in Moses’ life encapsulated with the temporal lability of the Transfiguration is the first revelation of the Burning Bush. It is at this encounter that the Lord gives his title and arguable proof as “I AM”. However further Luke’s Gospel states that with Moses and Elijah Jesus is discussing his departure (Luke 9:31). However this is a crude translation. The word used for departure is “exodus” (ἐξοδον). This is precisely the same word used in the Septuagint for the Exodus from Egypt and by St Paul referring to the Exodus (Hebrews 11:22). Indeed the Greek is instructive.

“They appeared in glory and were speaking of his departure, which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem” NSRVCE Luke 9:31

“οἱ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν ἐξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.”

Clearly at Mount Horeb the Lord was discussing with Moses the Exodus. There is extensive typographical similitude between the Exodus of the Israelites out of Egypt and Jesus mission, passion, death and resurrection [18]. Also critically the Greek uses the genitive of the pronoun *autos* (αὐτοῦ) to connote the relationship of this Exodus with Jesus rather than the possessive pronoun eos (ἐος). This is significant and conveys a distinct meaning. This is not Jesus’ Exodus in the same manner that it was the Exodus of the Israelites. For the latter it was their deliverance from slavery to Israel and capital, Jerusalem by God. However for Jesus it is not *his* deliverance but a deliverance or Exodus that he has brought about or effected in his own divinity in Jerusalem. Compare with how St Peter speaks of his departure:

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Β' 1:15 Greek NT: Nestle 1904

σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ἐκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἐξοδον τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιῆσθαι.

Again from the context it is very clear that he is referring to his metaphysical departure to Heaven. The English thus reads

“¹²So I will always remind you of these things, even though you know them and are firmly established in the truth you now have. ¹³I think it is right to refresh your memory as long as I live in the tent of this body, ¹⁴because I know that I will soon put it aside, as our Lord Jesus Christ has made clear to

me. ¹⁵ And I will make every effort to see that after my departure you will always be able to remember these things.” 2 Peter 1:12-15

St. Peter deploys the adjectival possessive pronoun (ἐμῆν) and not genitive of me μου which would be the equivalent of αὐτοῦ.

However Elijah is not excluded from the conversation. Elijah was a pre-eminent prophet to whom Jesus would have explicitly been mentioning his plans on his ascent to Mount Horeb in 1 Kings: 8-18 but also invariably salvation history.

Critically Moses, Elijah and the disciples Peter, James and John at Mount Horeb intersect at a point they all need affirmation and reassurance. Moses asks for a proof and Elijah is fleeing Jezebel. They both seek and are furnished with something typified by a different and yet the same persons of the Trinity. The Lord affirms he will show his power to the Egyptians and the Israelites through Moses. Elijah has been rejected. Jesus shows that he too will be rejected and put to death. On Mount Horeb Elijah perceives that the Lord is not in the mountain-shattering wind, earthquake or fire but in the small voice (1 Kings 19:12). A leitmotif in the New Testament is the meekness of the Jesus which is paradoxically a show of strength, exemplified by his acceptance of the Cross (John 10:18). Peter, James and John are fortified as the Lord affirms Jesus is his son and the need to listen to him. All attendees need what could be viewed as a Paraclete or paracletic support.

Apodixis

Mary the mother of Jesus and therefore by God is a key figure in the Christian Tradition and World History [19]. In the Roman Catholic tradition Latria is reserved for worship of God alone. Dulia refers to reverence to paragons of faith such as the canonised saints. Hyperdulia is a further special reverence applied to Mary [20]. The Bible contains a Marian apodixis as *theotokos* (Mother of God), a self-evident proof peculiar to her. This initiated in Isaiah 7:14 in the prophecy that

“Look, the young woman is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel ” [21]

This is depicted and perfectly narrated and articulated by the Gospel of Luke and revolves around the juxtaposed accounts of the Angel Gabriel and Zechariah and the Angel Gabriel and Mary in Luke 1:5-25 and Luke 1:26-33 respectively. The narratives are germane to an appreciation of this apodixis

First is presented the meeting of Zechariah and Angel Gabriel. Luke characterises Zechariah. Both he and his wife, Elizabeth are of formidable and auspicious heritage. They are both from much vaunted sacerdotal ancestry; Zechariah belonged to the priestly division of Abijah and his wife, Elizabeth descended directly from Aaron, the first High Priest and brother of Moses. Luke also makes the point that they are unimpeachable with regard to their moral probity, not sinless, but exhibiting the highest standards of fidelity and piety. Luke states

“They were both righteous in the sight of God, following all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blamelessly” Luke 1:6

Zachariah is selected by lots to burn incense before the God in the “Holy Place” of the Temple, this the most consecrated site on earth. Essentially Zechariah was selected by God to come into his presence. This is in the presence of a huge crowd presenting themselves at the Temple for veneration. There is no greater personal and public accolade or privilege, than that, that fell upon Zechariah. While in the Temple the Angel Gabriel appears to Zechariah. The Angel offers Zachariah no salutation but rather immediately announces to Zechariah his wife will have a child, they are to call John, who is John the Baptist. Zachariah expresses some doubts and the Archangel appeals to authority as Gabriel the Archangel, “who stands before God”.

“I am Gabriel, the one who stands in the presence of God, and I was sent to speak to you and to bring you this good news” Luke 1:10

Not only does Gabriel sojourn in the presence of God, he stands whereas all others must kneel, prostrate themselves or adopt some other posture reflecting the utmost reverence (Genesis 18:2). He is amongst those at the apex of the hegemony of created beings.

We segue then to the *Annunciation* where the Angel Gabriel now visits Mary to announce the birth of Jesus. We move from the Temple in Jerusalem and the most sacred site on the earth to residential premises in Galilee. We transition from the priest selected by God to meet him in the most consecrated site on Earth, to a woman or young girl betrothed to be married. We move from a Priest of priestly heritage and sacerdotal family ties to Joseph's fiancée, Mary. Archangel Gabriel, "*the one who stands in the presence of God*" and gave no salutation to the Zechariah the Priest, does something most extraordinary on his meeting with Mary. The Archangel grants her a salutation, not merely a salutation of engagement but a salutation that is a mark of respect and conferred upon one with authority.

"*Chaire kecharitōmenē*" Luke:

"*Hail, She having been filled with grace*"

The greeting of such reverence is remarkable from the *one who stands in the presence God himself*. "*Chaire*" is used in the three other Gospels, namely that of Mathew, Mark, and John when the Roman soldiers mockingly refer to Jesus as they address him during his Passion: "Hail King of the Jews" (Mathew 27:29 Mark 15:18, John 19:3). It reflects a salutation that is a suitable conjugate to a title of the highest authority and meritorious of the highest deference. Judas also uses the term when he meets Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane (Matthew 26:49). Essentially *Chaire* is salutation used only for Jesus and Mary in the Gospels.

Gebirah is the title given to the "Queen Mother" in Israel essentially the Mother of the King. There was no higher state of office or position of honour for a woman in Israel. Early Christianity and Jewish converts would have automatically considered Mary to be the Gebirah or Queen Mother [22].

Kecharitōmenē

The stem *chartio* essentially implies to grace or bestow with favour. It is augmented and potentiated by the intensive prefix *ke*. There is no veritable English translation but the meaning can be conveyed to some degree. One hermeneutically instructive language here is Igbo, a West African language, originating in South East Nigeria.

The Greek is

Kecharitōmenē

English uses the term "full of grace"

In Igbo the term for "filled" or "full" is

ju

but there is another term that is has a more emphatic superlative meaning, akin to "fuller than full" or possibly "filled up" that is :

juputa

Even beyond this, there is another even more emphatic superlative meaning "fuller than fuller than full", essentially with no English cognate translation that is:

juputara

This latter term is used in the translation of *Kecharitōmenē* in Igbo [23].

Juputa is a portmanteau of *ju* and *puta*. *Put* meaning, almost simultaneously, to come out and come towards to the speaker.

Juputara is a lexical connexion of *ju* and *putara*. *Putara* being a potentiated emotive dramatic form of *puta* meaning come right out or ostensibly or glaringly obviously to come out, to burst out/into somewhere, again generally connoting toward the speak. Possibly one could say in the vernacular "come up in here" without any confrontational connotation. It adds a "ra" intensive suffix to *puta*. It

must be emphasised that *puta* and *putara* are not on a comparative or superlative scale. Both *juputa* and *juputara* are “superlative” in meaning; *juputara* would be a “super-superlative”.

The Welsh translations also opts for an intensive affix, in this instance a suffix.

Kecharitōmenē

In Welsh becomes

Cyflawn

Llawn means full or abounding [24,25]

Cyf is the intensive prefix likely having the same etymology via Proto-Indo-European, Italo-Celtic and thence Proto-Celtic. Together the word connotes implies, complete perfected, accomplished, perfection virtue and excellence [26].

The fact that the verb, *Kecharitōmenē*, in the perfect participle, is instructive here connoting an event that occurred in the past that continues today. It is thought to refer to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary [27]. This is the state of being conceived without original sin and there a grace conferred upon her before birth.

Mary is not alarmed by the Angel, which may imply previous acquaintances, but rather is moved by greeting. Luke 1:29 states

“Mary was greatly troubled at his words and wondered what kind of greeting this might be and what it could mean”

This is significant. The author of Luke’s Gospel knew it was the angel Gabriel that visited Zechariah as the Angel identified himself to Zechariah. Zechariah then conveyed this message to another party. Indeed throughout the Bible, in both Old and New Testament, a consistent and recurring findings is that whenever there is an angelic visitation, the Angel’s name is only ever known, when Angel or another celestial being reveals their identity to the one visited [28,29]. Where the visiting Angel does not reveal their identity, the author invariably refers to the heavenly visitor as merely the Angel. This is cogent, as if the Angel does not share their name, there is no way that the ones visited can know the name and hence neither can the author, writing the account of the visitation; unless of course there had been a previous encounter. Angels are rarely identified by name. In Revelation 7:12 the author, describing a vision not a visitation, states *“Michael and his angles fought against the dragon”*. They do not identify an individual as being Archangel Michael. Moving to the named visitations, Archangel Raphael explicitly identifies himself as Raphael to Tobit (Tobit 12:15). Daniel manifestly does not recognise Gabriel and describes him as *“one having the appearance of a man”* (Daniel 8:15-16). He only becomes aware it is Gabriel upon hearing a voice saying *“Gabriel, explain the vision to this man”* (Daniel 15:16). Daniel reaffirms his unfamiliarity with Archangel Gabriel during their second encounter, he states:

“while I was still praying, Gabriel, the man I had seen in the earlier vision,” (Daniel 9:20)

The Angel Gabriel does not say his name is Gabriel to Mary, yet the author of Luke’s Gospel and hence Mary still knew it was Gabriel. This may or possibly must imply previous acquaintances. This may explain why Mary was *“troubled”* by the greeting but apparently not by the presence of Gabriel, unlike Zechariah.

In response to the revelation Mary states.

“Behold the handmaid of the Lord. Let it happen to me as you have said”. In Greek translation, *“Genoito”* meaning *“let it happen”* is in aorist optative. The use of aorist tense rather than present optative suggest her agreement to specific events rather to a general her assent to a general state of affairs [30–32]. Hence she consents to both the Immaculate Conception grace granted her and to be being the mother of God.

Finally and intriguingly Mary has the final word and the angel departs. In all encounters between humans and Celestial beings, the latter almost invariably if not invariably has the final word and then departs as emblem of their superiority. Here the obverse occurs, Mary has the last word. Throughout the Gospel and Bible Mary, has unique place and beatific depiction.

Mary visits her cousin Elizabeth. Elizabeth greets her cousin Mary, as the Angel did, with her title rather than her name, notwithstanding the fact that Elizabeth is many years her senior and respect is owed her as elder kinswoman.

“When Elizabeth heard Mary’s greeting, the baby leaped in her womb, and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. She exclaimed with a loud voice, “Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the child in your womb! And who am I that the mother of my Lord should come and visit me? For the instant the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the baby in my womb leaped for joy. And blessed is she who believed that what was spoken to her by the Lord would be fulfilled.” Luke 1:41-45

The Archangel speaks of Mary’s past in the Immaculate Conception. Elizabeth speak of her present as the Mother of God . In her *apodixis* Mary refers to her future, she sings.

“For from now on all generations will call me blessed” Luke 1:48

This is self –evidently true, from a Gospel incontrovertibly written in the first century AD [33]. The statement was made while Mary was a member of a conquered and subjugated peoples. It was transcribed into the book of Luke possibly around the time when the Temple was destroyed and the Romans engaged in almost genocide against the Jews. No historical or contemporary personality has made or would make such an audacious and outrageous statement and for none other than Mary has it come true. This is the Marian apodixis. This is not merely the over-exuberance or hyper-ebullience, the whole narrative of the Gospel hitherto expounds the “blessedness” to which Mary refers.

The Marian Apparition of 1854 to St Bernadette in Lourdes is reported as saying, in the child’s native Gascon Occitan language

“Que soy era Immaculade Concepciou”

Gascon Occitan is at the language-dialect interface similar to Spanish, but having significant similarities to French and Italian.

The phrase has been translated as *“I am the Immaculate Conception”* .It has been suggested there were “era” the definite article, “er” would be used to avoid phonic conflict between “a” and “I” of “era” and “Immaculada” as an elision or simply as a contracted form [34]. “Era” could equally be the imperfect tense of the verb “be” [35] or the pronoun “she” [36]. Further still “soy” is distinctly the Spanish form of the first person present of the verb “to be”. “Soi” is the most similar corresponding form in Gascon dialects, but is seen in Bearnese and possibly Commingeois Gascon dialect-languages-variations [37].

Hence the phrase could mean

“I am she has been immaculately conceived” or

“I am the immaculately conceived”

“I am she the immaculately conceived”

This is essentially identical to verb-noun title given to here by Archangel Michael in *Kecharitōmenē* but seems an intentional solecism for an inclusive meaning.

Apodixy

There are similarities between the Autoapodixis and Marian apodixy. Mainly they speak of future generations observing the name and title respectively. However they differ fundamentally in that one refers to divinity and other to humanity. God tells Moses his divine nature, namely his being. Mary proclaims her state as blessed, but this is a blessing like all blessings that emanate from God and no intrinsically from her. In the Gospel the term used to connote Mary will be call blessed is *“makariosin”* . Alternative and fuller translations of the word have been posited including: *“pronounce blessed, as the result of enjoying the benefits (privileges) that (literally) extend from God.”* This is consonant with the *Kecharitōmenē* one filled up/replete/“juputara” with grace [38]. Note that both Archangel Gabriel and Elizabeth make the unequivocal affirmation that Mary is blessed by God not merely counted as blessed. The Greek word here is *“Eulogēmenē”* [39]. This unmistakably a derivative of

Logos, word, which refers to God himself. We refer to the very instrument of God's autoapodixis. The use of words by God to prove himself are thematically consonant and attested to by the Evangelists.

Lukes' Gospel states

"Now many have undertaken to compile an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, like the accounts passed on to us by those who were eyewitnesses and servants of the word from the beginning" Luke 1:1-3

John States

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was fully God. The Word was with God in the beginning." Gospel John 1:1-3

Word is the basic instruments of the Autoapodixis and the Marian apodixis. Finally both are contingent upon the epithet of God

"Truly I am God, I have no peer; I am God, and there is none like me, who announces the end from the beginning and reveals beforehand what has not yet occurred; who says, 'My plan will be realized, I will accomplish what I desire;'" Isaiah 46:9-10. The controversial Sapir-Whorf hypothesis posits that language defines perspective and reality. Adherents to the Abrahamic religion all accept that God chose the Jewish people first for revelation. The reason for this attracts much philosophical and religious debate and dialectic even amongst the most incurious. Clearly there is a language that can express his being simultaneous, synchronously and metachronously averring "I AM BE" and "I SHALL BE" across millennia. This is a feat one would consider linguistically and even conceptually impossible and incomprehensible had not been achieved.

The vast majority to proofs to date are synchronous, heterotheodictic and historical. They use an historical event or sempiternal precept as a synchronous second party validation of the existence of God. The logic of St Thomas Aquinas has always been true but required the inspired and erudite intellect of St Thomas Aquinas to evince them as a synchronous proof. Here we present a proof that is metachronous and a single event which provides a contemporaneous proof specifically for today. Rather than a proof, it is a self-event and self-referential and can be described as theoautoapodixis.

References

1. St. Thomas Aquinas Summa Theologica Part I Question 2 Article 3
2. Niskanen Samu. Anselm's Predicament: The Proslogion and Anti-intellectual Rhetoric in the Aftermath of the Berengarian Controversy. J Hist Ideas. 2021;82(4):547-568.
3. <https://www.gordonconwell.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/13/2023/01/Status-of-Global-Christianity-2023.pdf>
4. Becker Raymond, Ferretti Todd, Madden-Lombardi Carol. Grammatical aspect, lexical aspect, and event duration constrain the availability of events in narratives. Cognition. 2013 Nov;129(2):212-20.
5. Bhat, Dewi. 1999. The Prominence of Tense, Aspect and Mood. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
6. Gowan, Donald (1994). Theology in Exodus: Biblical Theology in the Form of a Commentary. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
7. Skempton, Simon (2014). 'I Am That I Am': Being as Absolute Subject. Sophia 53 (4):497-513.
8. Garside Bruce (1968). [Review of the book St. Augustine and Being: A Metaphysical Essay]. Journal of the History of Philosophy 6(1), 79-80
9. Cross, Richard. (2016). DUNS SCOTUS ON GOD'S ESSENCE AND ATTRIBUTES: METAPHYSICS, SEMANTICS, AND THE GREEK PATRISTIC TRADITION. Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales, 83(2), 353-383. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2648607>
10. Park-Taylor Geoffrey, hwhy, Yahweh, the Divine Name in the Bible (Waterloo, Ontario, 1975).
11. van der Merwe Christo, Naudé Jacobus and Kroeze Jan, A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 141-142.
- 12.

13. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Exodus%203&version=NET>
14. Lundbom Richard, "God's Use of the Idem per Idem to Terminate Debate," HTR 71 (1978):
15. The International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Brenton's Translation of the Septuagint, re-accessed 25 October 2016
16. New World Translation of the Holy Scriptures (Brooklyn, NY: Watchtower Bible And Tract Society of New York, Inc., 1984).
17. Elijah, Moses and Time Travel Phenomenon <https://www.scribd.com/document/16076606/Elijah-Moses-and-Time-Travel-Phenomenon>
18. Youvan DC Exploring the Concept of Time Travel in the Bible: A Modern Interpretation July 2024 DOI:10.13140/RG.2.2.16825.17763
19. Thompson JS. How Luke's Gospel Portrays Jesus As The Exodus Or Way Of The Temple.
20. John F. O'Grady Catholic beliefs and traditions 2002 ISBN 0-8091-4047-0 page 145
21. Summa Theologica Part III, Question 25 Article III
22. Wolf HM. A Solution to the Immanuel Prophecy in Isaiah 7: 14-8: 22. Journal of Biblical Literature. 1972 Dec 1;91(4):449-56.
23. Buby, Bertrand (1999) "Marian Studies--Scripture," Marian Studies: Vol. 50, Article 13.
24. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=95kmb21y4tE>
25. Morris Jones, John (1913) A Welsh Grammar, Historical and Comparative, Oxford: Clarendon Press, § 156 i (9)
26. Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru Online (in Welsh), University of Wales Centre for Advanced Welsh & Celtic Studies
27. <https://welsh-dictionary.ac.uk/gpc/gpc.html?cyf->
28. Meszaros, Andrew. (2021). John Henry Newman and the Thomistic Tradition: Convergences in Contribution to Development Theory. *Nova et vetera* 19(2), 423-468.
29. Bible Hub https://biblehub.com/greek/strongs_32.htm Bible Hub
30. Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb. By W.W. Goodwin Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Library 2005 (page 10 <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/moa/AHT8098.0001.001/30>)
31. Bates College Greek 202 Aristophanes [http://abacus.bates.edu/~hwalker/Syntax/10fearing.html#:~:text=the%20Aorist%20\(Subjunctive%20or%20Optative,%3D%20%22I%20am%20standing.%22](http://abacus.bates.edu/~hwalker/Syntax/10fearing.html#:~:text=the%20Aorist%20(Subjunctive%20or%20Optative,%3D%20%22I%20am%20standing.%22)
32. Herbert Weir Smyth, A Greek Grammar for Colleges [2231]<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0007%3Apart%3D4%3Achapter%3D53%3Asection%3D136>
33. Perkins, PHEME (2009). Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels. Eerdmans. ISBN 978-0-8028-6553-3.
34. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aranese_dialect
35. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occitan_conjugation#%C3%88sser_\(%22to_be%22\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Occitan_conjugation#%C3%88sser_(%22to_be%22))
36. Olivieri, Michèle, and Patrick Sauzet, 'Southern Gallo-Romance (Occitan)', in Adam Ledgeway, and Martin Maiden (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages* (Oxford, 2016; online edn, Oxford Academic, 18 Aug. 2016), <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0019>, accessed 18 Aug. 2023.
37. Karina Anne High Non-Cyclical Change in Negation and Indefinites in Romance: A Case Study of Béarnese Gascon <https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstream/handle/2152/116572/HIGH-DISSERTATION-2022.pdf?sequence=1>
38. BibleHub <https://biblehub.com/greek/3106.htm>
39. https://biblehub.com/greek/euloge_mene__2127.htm

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.