

Ks. dr hab. Marcin R. Wysocki prof. KUL
Sekcja Historii Kościoła i Patrologii
Wydział Teologii KUL

**Review of the doctoral dissertation
of Rev. mgr lic. Ovie Valentine Aghoghophia
entitled *Creation and fall of angels. The angelology of Augustine of Hippo
facing the Manichaeans and Platonists*,
written under the supervision of Rev. Prof. dr hab. Tomasz Stępień,
Warszawa 2023, pp. 369**

The works of St Augustine have been the subject of interest and analysis for many centuries. It is not easy, therefore, to find an area of research that has not already been studied. The angelology of St. Augustine, as well as the influence of Manichaeism and Platonism/Neoplatonism on the Hipponian, have been the subject of many studies, even in recent years, but the issues related to the influence of Manichaean and Neoplatonic ideas on the angelological views of Augustine of Hippo have not yet been presented in a systematic way. Therefore, any attempt to explore this topic is to be welcomed with interest. One such attempt is the work of Rev. Ovie Valentine Aghoghophia, entitled *Creation and fall of the angels. The angelology of Augustine of Hippo facing the Manichaeans and Platonists*.

Having been appointed by the Council for the Discipline of Theological Sciences of the University of Stefan Cardinal Wyszyński, I present an evaluation of the above work, which is to be considered as an achievement in obtaining the degree of Doctor of Theological Sciences.

1. Evaluation of the work structure

The structure of the thesis is, of course, the result of the author's choice of topic, and this will be analysed in the context of the evaluation of the work's content; however, at the stage of the discussion of its structure, a few remarks should be made in connection with this. The theme points to four fundamental factors around which the evaluated work should be built: the works of Saint Augustine of Hippo, his angelology, the creation and fall of the angels, and the Manichaean and

Platonic/Neoplatonic views. The author intuitively follows this path and divides his work into five chapters dealing with the above-mentioned topics. The first chapter - *Main Sources of Augustine's Theology on Angels* - is designed to show Manichean, Platonic and Biblical ideas (and this is the internal division of this chapter into three paragraphs: *Manichean Influences in Augustine's Theology of Angels*; *Platonic and Neoplatonic Influences in Augustine's Theology of Angels*; *Biblical Influences on Augustine's Theology of Angels*) which, according to the nomenclature of the sections, are thought to have influenced Augustine's views on angels. Each section touches on issues characteristic of the various strands related to the problems outlined in the title of the work: the nature of God, the theory of knowledge, the nature of evil, the theory of time, demons, the Creator. The chapter therefore seems to satisfy the last of the above-mentioned factors arising from the theme of the work. The next four chapters then deal with the other three factors and so Chapter II is entitled *Good and Unchangeable God - Creator of the Angels and the Universe* and consists of four paragraphs on understanding the nature of God in opposition to Manichaeism doctrine, God's relationship to time and change, the creation of heaven and earth and the creation of angels as heaven and light. Chapter three - *The Sin of the Angels and the Nature of Evil* - consists of seven paragraphs: *Augustine's Concept of the Nature of Sin*; *The Nature of the Sin Committed by the Angels*; *Augustine's Concept of Pride as the Primal Sin*; *The Timing of the Sin of the Angels*; *The Consequences of the Sin of the Angels*; *The Possible Purpose of the Angelic Fall*; *Angelic Sin Shows the True Nature of Evil*. Chapter IV is devoted to the intellect and the will of the angels (*The Intellect and the Will of the Angels*) and consists of 10 paragraphs: *Augustine and the Angelic Intellect*; *The Doctrine of Divine Illumination – Mode of Angelic Cognition*; *The Three Epistemological Visions of Augustine*; *The Vespertine/Evening Knowledge of the Angels*; *Matutine/Morning Knowledge of the Angels*; *The Consequences of the Sin of the Wicked Angels on their Knowledge*; *Angelic Knowledge and the Problem of Predestination*; *The Nature of the Angelic Will*; *Free Will and Grace in the Angel*; *The Will of the Blessed and Wicked Angels*. The fifth and final chapter is entitled *Angelic Guardianship and Demonic Assaults* and consists of nine paragraphs: *Augustine's Interpretation of the Angelic Guardianship in the Old Testament*; *Angelic Ministry and the Nativity of Christ*; *Angels and Soteriological*

Activities of Christ; Angelic Ministries in the Church; Angelic Ministry and the Eschatological Event of Human Death; The Beatific Vision of Both Angels and the Saints; Demonic Assaulting Activities; Exorcism; Judgment Day and the Punishment of Hell. In addition, each of the above-mentioned chapters contains an introduction and a conclusion, the purpose of which is to introduce and summarise the considerations made in each section. The work also contains the usual elements required for this type of work: an Introduction, a Conclusion, a Bibliography, but also, not included in the Table of Contents, a List of Abbreviations of Augustine's Works and an Abstract, as well as Acknowledgments, which are not used in the Polish style of writing doctoral theses, and which are an expression of the author's gratitude to the many people more or less involved in the preparation of the present work.

This simple overview of the content of Rev. Aghoghophia's work shows that the four main factors shown above have been elaborated. The structure does indeed show Manichaeian and Neoplatonic views, as well as angelology, and from the references that sometimes appear, it can be inferred that St. Augustine's angelology is the subject. It is, as can be seen, discussed in great detail and comprehensively. This simple overview of the content of Rev. Aghoghophia's work shows that the four essential factors shown above have been elaborated. The structure does indeed show Manichaeian and Neoplatonic views, as well as angelology, and from the references that sometimes appear, it can be inferred that St. Augustine's angelology is the subject. It is, as can be seen, discussed in great detail and comprehensively. Here, however, is the first objection - the title of the work clearly limits the scope of the subject: it is not intended to be a description of the whole of angelology, but to show the aspect of the creation and fall of angels in the context of the Manichaeian and Platonic/Neoplatonic views. Given this thematic detail, chapters four and five seem largely redundant. Yes, they contain elements that are important in considering the creation and fall of angels (such as morning and evening knowledge), but they should be placed within a consideration of the creation of angels. Since the PhD Candidate has chosen this way of framing the topic, he should follow it and stick to it. Instead, what we get in this case is a manual of angelology - much of it by St Augustine, about which more

will be said in the next section of this review of the content of the evaluated thesis. Unfortunately, the structure of the dissertation under review indicates that the author was tempted by the evil angel of research hubris to write about everything and not only about what is contained in the topic of the dissertation. Surely the first three chapters, touching on the essence of the topic, would have sufficed for a correct and well-argued dissertation, but the result is a 369-page colossus, in keeping with Callimachus' curse: a big book - a big evil.

In discussing the structure of the dissertation, it is also worth briefly considering the structure of the two permanent elements of the dissertation, the introduction and the conclusion, as this will allow some conclusions to be drawn in the following sections of this review. Unfortunately, the eleven-page introduction does not provide the reader with the information required for this part. First of all, the author does not inform us about the *status quaestionis* of the subject. It is true that in the introduction he summarises four works on the subject in almost seven pages, but this is not a classic presentation of the state of research, because in the bibliography alone we can see many positions that are part of the study of the creation and fall of the angels in Hipponian's thought, but are not included here. Secondly, the introduction does not give any information about the sources of the present study. We know from the subject that these will be the works of St Augustine, but the author does not specify whether these will be all of the Hipponian's works or only a selection. Similarly, the sources for Manichaeism and Platonism are not defined, with the result that the reflections refer to the views of the Neoplatonic philosopher Proclus, who was active many years after the death of St. Augustine and whose works had no influence on the views of the Hipponian, as the author himself points out (p. 54). Another issue related to the lack of source identification is the unclear place of Scripture in the narrative of the work, but this is more a matter for the substantive evaluation of the dissertation. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, the introduction should include a justification and explanation of the thesis topic. The introduction to this paper does not contain this. Thus it is difficult to guess what the author means by including the term 'facing' - for it can have two meanings: either Manichaeism and Platonism as adversaries to be fought, or as sources influencing views. The lack of a clear definition of the

subject causes both concepts to appear in the introduction, leading to confusion, and once to mention the influence on Augustine's angelological views, and once to mention that Augustine's angelology is a reaction to the errors of, for example, the Manichaeans. The correct construction of the introduction is one of the most important indicators of the mastery of the scientific technique, and asking appropriate questions in it is half of the success and avoiding mistakes, which unfortunately the author of the analysed dissertation did not avoid.

2. Evaluation of the merits of the work

In order to assess the merits of the thesis, it is necessary to start with the continuation of the thread related to the theme of the thesis, which guides the flow of the thesis and the conclusions drawn. The deficiency mentioned above affects the narrative flow of the thesis. For it must be admitted that, on the one hand, the PhD Candidate succeeds very well in implementing the part of the title concerning the discussion of Augustine's angelology itself in chapters II and III, and this is the best part of the work, while, on the other hand, he gets completely lost when it comes to indicating the place of the Manichaean and Platonic views and of Scripture in Augustine's views, and this juxtaposition is almost absent from the work. In fact, as mentioned above, already in the introduction he speaks of the influence of Manichaeism, Platonism and the Bible on the Hipponian angelology (p. 11), only to speak in a moment about the biblical foundations of his angelology (p. 11), or about the tensions between Manichaean beliefs and the theology of St Augustine ("by examining the tensions between Manichaean beliefs and Augustinian theology" - pp. 11-12). At one point, contrary to the title of the work, the author even states that the work is intended to allow us to understand the development of Augustinian theological thought by delving into the complex interplay between Manichaean influences, Platonic/Neoplatonic philosophy, and biblical insights („By delving into the intricate interplay between Manichaean influences, Platonic and Neoplatonic philosophies, and scriptural insights, we contribute to our understanding of the development of Augustine's theological thought and its implications for Christian theology" – p. 11). Surely for Augustine, as an orthodox Christian theologian who fights against Manichaean views and is

in fact based on a Platonic system, the primary source for angelology is Scripture, not just some 'insights' from it. Nor can one agree with the author's statement that „the third main source of Augustine's theology is the Holy Scripture” (p. 23). It is the first and most important source. In many places the author understands this and correctly identifies the sources of Augustinian angelology, but at the same time such vague terms appear. The role of the eponymous Manichaeans and Platonists in the construction of the Augustinian theological system is also not clearly indicated - whether it was created in opposition to them, or directly the other way round - it took over their views. Reading the work, both are indeed possible. A conspicuous omission in showing the formation of Augustine's angelological thought is the complete absence of references to tradition and the writings of other early Christian writers. Augustine did not operate in a theological vacuum. Many authors before him had studied angelology, had drawn on Platonic thought and had fought against heresies, but there is almost no mention of them in the work. Other authors appear, but only in passing (e.g. pp. 143, 154). The strangest thing, however, is that at a certain point in the work Augustine himself begins to be missing. For here, in chapter five, paragraphs 5.7, 5.8 and 5.9, the author refers to Thomas Aquinas (and points out that it is he who interprets Hippo's thought in this way - p. 292) rather than to Augustine, even explicitly stating that something of the reality described is not mentioned by him (p. 289), or that „we could not find where Augustine defined it *per se*, we intend to lend Aquinas' definition of it” (p. 271). Such ahistoricism in such studies is unacceptable, especially since the topic of the work does not discuss the reception of Augustine's thought by scholastic authors or their interpretation of his angelology. There is another substantive issue related to the subject matter of the work that needs to be addressed here, as it affects the evaluation of the dissertation under review. The title of the thesis indicates a presentation of the relationship between the views of the Manichaeans, the Platonists/Neoplatonists and the angelological views of St Augustine. The conception of the dissertation is therefore, in line with what has already been shown, either that these views influenced the Hipponian or that the Hipponian formed his views in opposition to their claims. Unfortunately, and this is one of the more serious objections to the work under review, we do not learn from it what this

influence was. The author himself seems to have a problem with this, since he speaks once of influence and once of polemics (pp. 23, 154). Unfortunately, there is no systematic attempt, even in the conclusion, to show what this influence consisted of and in what areas it took place. The attractiveness and novelty of the proposed topic lies precisely in the fact that it is possible to show both Augustine's influence and his polemics with these two groups in terms of angelology - unfortunately, the study in its present form does not do this. Moreover, in the final fifth chapter there are almost no references to the Manichaeans and Platonists. There are quotations from works directed against the Manichaeans, but there is no juxtaposition and no conclusions drawn from a comparison of their opposing views, and indeed no mention of Manichaean or Platonic ideas at all (e.g. pp. 238-239, 247). Another issue to be raised in reviewing the work is the way in which the sources are used, firstly, and secondly, the secondary literature on the subject of the thesis. In discussing the structure of the work, particularly the introduction, it has been pointed out that there is no discussion of the sources of the work, which can generally be inferred from the fact that the work is about St Augustine, but another issue is their use. The author makes extensive use of Augustine's writings, citing a total of 48 in the bibliography, almost half of Augustine's rich literary legacy. Unfortunately, it is not clear why the doctoral student does not use all the writings against the Manichaeans, but only some, since the work is supposed to be about Augustine's response to their views, and these writings are a natural source for such a formulated topic. In Chapters II, III and IV the use of sources is generally correct, although more could be gained from them with a more thorough comparative analysis, both linguistically (issues of Latin terms) and by comparison with extant Manichaean or Neoplatonic works, or more generally with their views as transmitted by other authors. On the other hand, the use of the sources in Chapter V is problematic: as already mentioned, it is not based entirely on the sources, but they are adapted to the content resulting from later scholastic views or biblical passages, and the views presented therein do not follow directly from the analysis of these sources, as the theme of the work suggests. It is also strange to find in the footnotes texts by other early Christian or pagan writers to whom the work does not refer, e.g. a sermon by St. John Chrysostom appears, although there

is no reason for it in the text (p. 248, fn. 670), or whether Origen (p. 65), St. Basil (p. 103) or Aristotle (p. 93) are mentioned in this way, not to mention the quotation from the Summa of St. Thomas (e.g. pp. 203, 204, 205, 206, 206, 207, 229, 245, 284, 288, 289, 292). It is a misunderstanding to invoke the person of Proclus, who lived and worked after Augustine, when discussing Neoplatonic thought, as the author himself informs us (p. 54). What influence could he have had on the Hipponian? If this were a work on the development of Platonic thought over the centuries, it would be a legitimate evocation, but it is completely out of place when it comes to Augustine's response to certain Neoplatonic views and their use in angelology.

In the context of Augustine's interpretation of the texts and his views, as well as the author's research skills and scholarly integrity, the words about the way the sources were used sound strange, to say the least: „We have taken a great amount of time and effort to discuss the nature of the will, its operations, and its relation to grace. We have also taken a detour to relate Augustine's concept of the will and grace explicitly to humans but we inferred and applied it to the angels both directly and indirectly” (p. 228). What does "directly and indirectly" mean? Does the author mean that he has interpreted Augustine's thought in his own way and used it contrary to his intention? Unfortunately, such a procedure is indicated elsewhere in the treatment of one of Augustine's sermons (unfortunately, it is not known which one, because the author does not indicate which numbering of the sermons he follows, and in the available editions and translations under Sermo 21 there is a completely different sermon from the one indicated by the author... see p. 249), where the author refers the word "today" to the day of the Resurrection and not to its memorial, i.e. Passover, misinterpreting Augustine's words. Even when Augustine clearly states that he is speaking of grace in relation to human beings, the author, contrary to Hipponian's instructions, also applies his words to angels (p. 227). He also gives biblical fragments a completely different meaning, bending them to suit his narrative (p. 64 on the eschatological condition of human beings). When it comes to the use of the Latin original of Augustine's works, the method of citing his works is puzzling - sometimes the author of the dissertation refers to the Latin original in a footnote, sometimes he does not (e.g. pp. 137, 139, 146, 181, 182, 184, 230, 240-241, 287); generally, in the absence of a literal quotation, he does not

cite the Latin text, but sometimes he does (e.g. pp. 28, 130, 157, 227). There is no consistency here. As for the Latin quotations in the footnotes, it unfortunately happens that the Latin text does not correspond to the English text contained in the corpus of the work or to the Augustinian thought mentioned there - they are completely different (e.g. pp. 183, 218) or partially overlap (e.g. pp. 135, 136, 140, 168, 170, 230, 244). Another mistake is to point out that Augustine says something in his writings, but there is no reference to where he says it, or there is a reference to contemporary scholarly work, not always devoted to Augustine (e.g. pp. 94, 95, 172, 209, 276, 287, 300), or the whole passage is devoted to Augustine and the footnote includes a reference to the work of Theodore of Mopsuestia (p. 285) or to the work of Basil the Great (p. 112). It has also happened that the author has not indicated which work of Augustine he is quoting (p. 223).

When it comes to the use of secondary literature, things don't look any better. Although the author has collected a considerable amount of literature, the bibliography of which runs to 32 pages, its use is unfortunately minimal and often incorrect. Firstly, the author rarely refers directly to the works he has collected. He does not argue with the authors, but only sometimes refers to them to confirm his claims. The footnotes look quite good, because almost every page contains some reference to various scientific publications, but a closer look at these references leads to the conclusion that they are in fact empty references, because the author refers, for example, to the entire monograph (I do not mention the articles, because practically all of them are cited in this way) without even pointing to its specific pages (e. g. pp. 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 58, 67, 68, 71, 84, 85, 95, 102, 111, 124, 134, 175, 191, 192). For in the classic work by J.N.D. Kelly on the development of Christian doctrine, there is no mention of St. Augustine's understanding of sin on every page (p. 134)! It is also difficult to accept references to literature completely unrelated to the subject of the work, or even to literature unrelated to the scientific field and to non-scientific literature. What could add to the understanding of St. Augustine thought an album with pictures of the works of art (p. 62), an article about Dan Brown's book (pp. 278-279 - unless it is about the title of the controversial book, i.e. *Angels and Demons*...), a monograph on the exorcisms of Anneliese Michel (p. 285), or discussions of the fifteenth-century Spanish poetry

of Juan de Mena (p. 301), Puritan eschatology (p. 302), or contemporary European political utopia (p. 301), demons in Dante's *Divine Comedy* (p. 275) or contemporary France (p. 268), the eschatology of Bonaventure and Joachim de Fiore (p. 300), or the views of the 10th-century chronicler Rodulfus Glaber (p. 298), or the 14th-century fairy tales (p. 293), as well as the medieval (p. 272) and modern astrology and magic (pp. 272, 275), divination in ancient Chinese religion (p. 274) or at the Burgundian court (p. 274). It is also difficult to find information on angels and Scripture in the article devoted to church music (p. 255). Closer to the subject, but still inappropriate in view of the title of the dissertation and the way in which the argument is conducted in a given place, are publications on scholastic theologians (e.g. pp. 289, 291-292), or controversies about baptism and exorcism during the Reformation (p. 286), or an entire article devoted to the 18th-century theologian Voetius (p. 188), the work of Hugo of St. Victor (p. 60), the 10th-century theologian Aelfric (p. 62), or evil in Tolkien's works (p. 34). The problem with these references is that the author does not indicate their purpose or point to a specific place in a given work where a reference to Augustine's thought might be found, but refers to the whole work as if it were entirely devoted to the subject under discussion. The subject of this work is not the reception of Augustine's angelological thought by later authors and its influence, but influence on Augustine. It is similar with the reference to the works of the famous theologian Edward Schillebeeckx - in this case the author refers us to the six-volume edition of the collected works, without indicating in which volume we should look for information on the devil who cannot love (p. 258). What is the purpose of inserting a footnote to a quotation, e.g. a biblical one, with a reference to literature in a title unrelated to the topic of the quotation (p. 294, note 803)? Another problematic way of referring to literature on the subject is to cite reviews of monographs published in various journals, which often contain nothing more than a description of a particular publication. It is therefore difficult to build a narrative of Augustine's views on their basis, but this is what is done in this work (pp. 32, 51, 68). Another problem is changing the tone of the author's thoughts. For example, the well-known researcher of patristic eschatology, Brian Daley SJ, in his classic work on it, speaks of the *visio beatifica* in relation to human beings, and the author of this thesis applies his words to angels

(p. 209). Sometimes he does not indicate the publication to which he refers (p. 41, note 118; p. 207, note 595). He also refers to an article, in the context of the concept of time and eternity in the Bible, in which there is not a single word on this matter, but the whole article is quoted as it treats on it (p. 72, note 300). We are left with the strange impression that, after writing the corpus, the author simply added to the footnotes various works that he had not even read, in order to make the footnotes look rich and impressive.

As part of the above-mentioned questions about the content of the work, but also about its structure, and more specifically about its title and the titles of the sections, there is another remark which is related to what has already been noted here. The first chapter is entitled *The Main Sources of Augustine's Theology of Angels*, and its parts, as shown above, are sections discussing Manichaeism, Platonic/Neoplatonic and Biblical doctrine in relation to the topics discussed in the work, i.e. creation, knowledge, demons, angels and evil. Firstly, the author suggests in that way that Manichaeism was the source (or is it really?!) of Augustine's angelology; secondly, he puts the Bible and philosophical views on an equal level in terms of influencing the views of the Hipponian (rather the Bible was the primary source for him!); and thirdly, in what is always a serious substantive mistake in scholarly works, the one chapter actually exhausts the subject of the whole work - at least in terms of nomenclature and terminology. It should have been written about Manichaeism, Platonic views or doctrine, rather than about the influence on Augustine, because this is a duplication of the subject. Another controversial issue in this trend is the nomenclature and content of the fifth chapter. The title of the chapter refers to "angelic guardianship" and "demonic assaults". Meanwhile, in the content, apart from the topics indicated in the title, there are also the activities of angels at the birth of Christ in Bethlehem, at the death and resurrection of Christ, and the tasks of angels in the Church, but also issues related to exorcisms. The chapter title should have emphasised the action of angels in the work of salvation, rather than the clearly associated and specific function of the guardian angel. The chapter title does not match the content.

The work also contains awkward phrases that smack of theological errors. For example, on page 255, the author says: "The holy Scripture that was brought to

us by the ministry of divine beings" - is this a new way of transmitting Revelation? Or the statement regarding humans and angels: "We share the same ancestor" (p. 60). There are also very significant and revealing statements: "There are three creations according to the Manichaeans: the first creation, the second creation and the third creation" (p. 24).

The dissertation lacks a synthetic approach to the issues, which would significantly reduce its size and, above all, provide clear reflections on the theme of the work. An example of this is the completely unnecessary description of the interpretation of the creation of the world from the book of Genesis, which is contained in the commentary on Genesis, on seventeen pages of the work. It would be better to select the most important information on angels and present it in a synthetic way (pp. 94-111).

A few words should also be said about the conclusions of each chapter and the general conclusion of the whole work. Some of them fulfil their role, as they are summaries of single chapters, but it happened - in the summary of chapter III - that the author introduced new quotations and new considerations, which is contrary to the idea of the summary. The final summary completely fails to meet the expectations of this part of the thesis. In 27 pages, the author describes each chapter and paragraph without providing a synthetic summary or answer to the theses contained in the title of the work regarding the influence of Manichaean and Platonic/Neoplatonic views on St. Augustine's angelology in the context of the creation and fall of the angels. Thus, in such a long conclusion, Manichaeism appears only 19 times and Augustine only 17 times. Nor is there any reflection on the difficulties of the work, the possibilities of use it in the future scientific research (only pastoral use is mentioned), or suggestions for further research on this part of Augustine's theology.

Unfortunately, this extensive commentary on the substantive aspect of the evaluated thesis is not favourable to it. Only a few examples of the indicated weaknesses have been given, but they allow us to see that this work would require significant reworking and changes in order to meet the minimum substantive requirements for doctoral thesis.

3. Evaluation of the formal side of work

The formal aspect of the dissertation is also not one of its strongest points. The first objection, although the lightest and slightly subjective one, is the issue of the language of the dissertation. For example, the author forgets that it is supposed to be different from the language of popular science articles or lectures, which aim to show certain truths in an easy way, and gives such an explanation: „For instance, because I've gone to Brussel, I can recall certain visuals from that trip. Although I have never been to London, I can conjure up hypothetical pictures of what it would seem like based on a variety of recollections.” (p. 195). These are certainly not the words of St. Augustine. Elsewhere, he allows himself to be carried away by rhetorical fantasy: „While in the corridors of the Old Testament prophetic literature, let us the following remarks that are typically regarded to be addressed against the devil through the prophet Ezekiel's voice” (p. 276). It is difficult to judge whether the author is paraphrasing or quoting, or speaking from himself, because he does not add a footnote, but on page 191 we can find such the words: „My words convey a message to the audience, which they can afterwards confirm in light of God's enlightenment. We are only able to advance from simple true belief to knowledge through illumination. Justification is provided through illumination”, which sound equally artificial. The author himself is also pleased with his work, although the judgement of it should be left to the reviewers and readers, and he repeatedly notes or emphasises with regard to the study: „remarkable doctoral dissertation” (p. 11); „vaulable insights” (p. 11); „This theological adventure's nuanced response” (p. 314); „This academic enterprise undertook a meticulous examination” (p. 313); „This research meticulously examined” (p. 311); „This theological adventure thoroughly explored” (p. 309); „Additionally, this academic voyage rejected” (p. 309). As this review shows, it is better to refrain from such self-indulgence. It is not an appropriate style for scientific work.

With regard to the structure of footnotes, they are generally consistent, although there is sometimes inconsistency in the use of the authors' full names and surnames or initials. It is questionable, and incorrect from the point of view of bibliometric principles, that the place of publication of the monograph is almost always omitted (although full records appear as well), and that in the case of

collective monographs, only the publishing house is given, leaving out the editor(s). Sometimes neither the place of publication nor the publisher is given (pp. 279, 341). There are misprints in the titles of works, which should not occur (e.g. De fide et symbol – p. 6; De uera religion – p. 7; De Beati Vita – p. 176; De Sancta Virgina – p. 245). The list of abbreviations (pp. 8-9) lacks consistency in quoting the titles of ancient works - sometimes the Latin title appears and sometimes the English one. In the bibliography (a list of abbreviations of Augustine's works), two works have the same page numbers in the published translation (p. 335). In "Secondary Sources" there appear titles that should be transferred to the sources (editions of Augustine's works - p. 338). Various notation for doctoral theses is used (pp. 348 and 349).

There are also linguistic and stylistic errors - e.g. p. 15 ver. 5 top: instead of "literature" rather "work" should be used; in the same line: the author's name alone ("Elizabeth") is not used when discussing a publication; in theological studies morning and evening knowledge are used rather than matutine and vespertine knowledge; "Church" should be written with a capital letter (e.g. pp. 21, 27); Porphyry – is in lowercase p. 32; grammar – "the day began in the evening and ends in the morning" (p. 186); the term "liturgists in the worship of God" is inappropriate when referring to angels (pp. 249 and 303). Strange entries in the footnotes, e.g. pp. 30, 31, 32, 33, 51, 296. Lack of accents in the Greek spelling of the word (pp. 230, 277). The word daemon/demon should be standardised. Footnote numbers are duplicated (pp. 51, 58, 193). There are numbers in the text which may indicate the copy/paste method (pp. 69-70, 212, 226). The word "Confessionum" alone is not used to refer to St. Augustine's famous work, but only in the compound "Confessionum libri XIII", or if in one word, rather "Confessiones" or English "Confessions" should be used (pp. 93, 101, 113). "Scripture" should be capitalised (p. 117). Incorrect source reference - not IV.6, but IV.7 (p. 224).

There are also some editorial errors and inconsistencies (lack of italics, lack of quotation marks, punctuation errors, inconsistency in the use of capital letters, way of justifying the text; non-uniform font; automatic corrections - e.g. deficiu.nt, sacrificiu.m; lack of spaces), which easily can be eliminated during proofreading and are not that important for the final assessment of the work. It would also be

appropriate, in accordance with the rules of text editing, to use a single emphasis on the titles of works: either quotation marks or italics, and not both.

4. Summary and final conclusion

Every doctoral thesis, at least as the author of these words understands it, should be a confirmation that the person who writes it has reached a certain level of scientific refinement and has acquired skills related to scientific research and the writing of scientific papers resulting from the research carried out. No human work is an opus perfectum, the writer of these words is well aware of this, and also of the fact that the person who writes a doctoral thesis is only at the beginning of the scientific career, being called a "young scientist", but every doctoral thesis already requires some knowledge of the scientific proficiency, and this work did not convince the reviewer about it.

Taking all of this into account, I hereby conclude that the work of Rev. Ovie Valentine Aghoghophia M.Th. L.Th. does not meet the requirements for doctoral theses and therefore cannot be the basis for further stages of the doctoral process and the award of a doctoral degree in the field of theological sciences.

ks. dr hab. Marcin R. Wysocki prof. KUL

Lublin, January 25, 2024.