# 1 Contemporary Demonology: The Christological Center, Critical Hermeneutics, and Responsible Discernment

## 1.1 Abstract

Contemporary demonology is neither an isolated addition to the Christian faith nor a repertoire of extraordinary phenomena. It is an integral part of the theology of creation, sin, freedom, redemption, and eschatological hope. Its proper center is not the person of the adversary, but Christ crucified and risen, who reveals the truth about God, man, and evil. This study analyzes the essential paths of the renewal of demonological reflection in the 20th and 21st centuries: the debate on demythologization, the return to biblical and liturgical language, the teaching of the Magisterium, the relationship between faith and mental health sciences, and the requirements of prudent pastoral discernment. Special attention is devoted to why belief in the personal reality of evil spirits justifies neither fear nor the hasty attribution of suffering to demonic activity. Mature demonology is a theology of the limitations of evil, personal responsibility, and the primacy of grace.

## 1.2 1. Introduction: What is Contemporary Demonology?

The term **“contemporary demonology”** can signify at least three different things. Firstly, it refers to theology which, in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, attempts to re-explain biblical and traditional discourse concerning Satan and evil spirits within a world shaped by the natural sciences, psychiatry, psychology, historical criticism, and the experience of secularization. Secondly, the term encompasses the official practice of the Churches: prayer for liberation, discernment, the ministry of the exorcist, liturgical regulations, and norms of canon law. Thirdly, it refers to a cultural phenomenon: the return of images of personal evil in the media, literature, film, esoteric milieus, and in public debates concerning mental health and the religious interpretation of suffering.

These three meanings must be distinguished. Theology is not a reportage on extraordinary events; ritual is not an instrument of private experiment; popular culture is not a source of normative doctrine. When these boundaries are blurred, two opposing deformations easily arise. The first consists in reducing the entire demonological language to a metaphor of social, psychological, or moral evil. The second attributes every difficulty, illness, conflict, or experience of anxiety to demonic activity. Both attitudes fail to recognize simultaneously the complexity of human life and the proper place of Christian faith.

In the Catholic approach, the starting point is different. The Symbol of Faith begins with God the Creator, not with the adversary. Spiritual evil is not a second beginning of the world, a competing principle, nor an equivalent cosmic force. The Catechism recalls that Satan and other demons are creatures that “became evil by their own doing” [1]. This sentence possesses not only metaphysical but also pastoral weight. It means that evil does not have the right to the last word, does not possess infinite power, and cannot invalidate either creation, human freedom, or the salvific efficacy of Christ.

Contemporary demonology is therefore meaningful exclusively as a part of paschal theology. The question is not primarily: “How great is the power of the evil spirit?”, but rather: “How does the victory of Christ over sin, falsehood, bondage, and death manifest itself?”. This shift in perspective protects against

sensationalism. At the same time, it allows for the recognition of the reality of spiritual warfare without making it the sole key to interpreting life.

## 1.3 2. 20th-Century Background: The Crisis of Language and the Recovery of Questions

In the first half of the 20th century, the discussion on demonology was part of a broader debate concerning the language of faith. The development of the empirical sciences, the experience of the world wars, the discoveries of depth psychology, the historical-critical study of biblical texts, and transformations in social life prompted many theologians to ask how to speak of angels, demons, and miracles in an intellectually responsible manner. This question was not inappropriate in itself; it became dangerous when the intended response was the elimination from the biblical testimony of everything that did not fit into a preconceived worldview.

Rudolf Bultmann, particularly influential in Protestant exegesis, argued that modern man cannot simply accept the ancient "three-story" worldview. His program of demythologization aimed to extract the existential meaning of the kerygma. In this approach, talk of demons could be interpreted as language expressing human enslavement by inauthenticity, anxiety, and sin. This program compelled theology to address the valuable question of how to interpret the text. At the same time, it raised an equally important question: does the translation of a symbol sometimes lead to the elimination of what the symbol was meant to convey? [2]

In Catholic reflection, the response was diverse. Many authors acknowledged the need for critical exegesis, the study of literary genres, and the consideration of the historical context of Scripture. However, this did not imply consent to the complete dissolution of the biblical language concerning the adversary into anthropology. In New Testament texts, Satan is not simply another name for human sinfulness. He is presented as an adversary, tempter, accuser, and the "father of lies," whereas sin is a human act or state. This distinction does not weaken moral responsibility; on the contrary, it protects it. Man may experience temptation, but his consent to evil remains his own act.

Following the Second Vatican Council, the topic was revisited within a broad theological space. The Council did not produce a separate treatise on demonology; however, it established a framework without which contemporary reflection on evil loses its measure. The constitution *Gaudium et spes* describes man as a participant in a "dramatic struggle between good and evil," yet its fundamental tone is not one of dread. Man is called to communion with God, and Christ liberates him from the bondage of sin [3]. In this light, the language of spiritual warfare cannot replace the language of grace, conscience, the sacrament of reconciliation, justice, and love of neighbor.

## 1.4 3. Magisterium: between reductionism and fascination

An important document in this discussion is the 1975 Christian Faith and Demonology Congregation Study. The document arose in a situation where some of theological opinion treated Satan's speech merely as a mythological personification of evil. The text does not correspond to a simple pole or catalog of unusuals. First of all, it reminds us that the Gospels represent Christ's temptation, His exorcism, prayer "save us from the Evil" and Passover as elements of His mission. In this sense, the question of personal evil is not a marginal addition that can be removed without prejudice to Christianity [4].

However, the document emphasizes equally firmly that Christianity should never transform the Good News of the Risen into a "pronunciation of horror". He refers to the tradition of the Fathers who spoke of the Adversary in order to show the greater power of Christ and call for vigilance. This criterion is particularly valid in the day of immediate communication. Theology, which devotes more attention to what is dark than to what is salvific, ceases to be Christocentric even when it uses Christian vocabulary.
The catechism of the Catholic Church describes science with an extraordinary brevity. He speaks of fallen angels, their free rejection of God, and their limited nature. The most important passage states that Satan's power is "not infinite"; it is a creation, and its action remains under the mystery of Divine Providence [1]. This sentence excludes two errors. We must not negate all actions of spiritual evil simply because it is not measured by laboratory tools. Nor can we portray the Adversary as an almost all - powerful force to which man is to oppose only defensive technology.
In modern practice it is therefore necessary to distinguish between the statements of faith**, the theological hypotheses**, the pastoral testimonies** and the cultural stories**. The claim of faith is that God is the only Creator, that spirit creatures are creatures, that evil has no substance, that Christ overcomes sin and death, and that man remains responsible for his actions. Hypothesis or interpretations are detailed models of the influence of evil spirits, descriptions of temptation mechanisms, or attempts to classify experiences. Pastoral certificates may be important, but they are not self-serving doctrinal norm. Film and online stories cannot function as either theology or diagnosis.

## 1.5 4. Evil, Sin, and the Person: A Critique of False Alternatives

One of the greatest achievements of contemporary reflection is the renewed distinction between metaphysical, moral, social, and spiritual evil. Metaphysical evil is not a being, but the privation of due good. Moral evil pertains to the free human act that turns away from the good recognized as an obligation. Social evil can be entrenched in structures, language, violence, inequality, and indifference. Spiritual evil refers to the personal dimension of opposition to God, of which Scripture and tradition speak. These distinctions do not divide reality into impenetrable spheres; rather, they protect against confusing levels of description.
If someone suffers from depression, anxiety disorder, trauma, domestic violence, addiction, or a serious illness, the experience of suffering in itself does not constitute proof of demonic activity. A medical explanation is not a competitor to faith in God, and psychological assistance is not a failure of the spiritual life. Conversely: prayer, the sacraments, conversation with a pastor, and community are not superfluous merely because suffering also possesses a psychological or social dimension. The human being is a bodily, psychological, relational, and spiritual unity; responsible assistance must acknowledge this.
Contemporary studies in religious science describe the current discourse on exorcism as a field of tension between medicalization and demedicalization. On the one hand, religious practice appeals to medical and psychological consultations so as not to confuse illness with a religiously interpreted experience. On the other hand, some authors attempt to employ medical language in a way that automatically confirms a pre-accepted spiritual explanation [5]. The pastoral conclusion is simple: cooperation with competent specialists cannot be a mere decoration or a sham stage. It must be a real protection of the person, their health, dignity, and freedom.
This does not mean that theology should surrender its concepts to psychiatry or vice versa. Both fields ask different questions. Medicine inquires about symptoms, risks, mechanisms, and treatment. Psychology

examines psychological functioning, the history of relationships, trauma, behavioral patterns, and the resources of the person. Theology asks about the relationship with God, the meaning of freedom, sin, hope, prayer, and salvation. Conflict begins when one discipline answers questions for which it lacks competence, or when it uses its authority to invalidate the other.

## 1.6 5. Christology of Contemporary Demonology

In the New Testament, Jesus' exorcisms are not an independent technique of combat against a hostile energy. They are signs of the coming of the Kingdom of God. "If it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you" (Mt 12:28). Crucial here is the connection between the Spirit, the kingdom, healing, and Jesus' mission. There is no room for a magical opposition between two equal powers. It is the revelation of the sovereign initiative of God, who restores man to life, communion, and freedom.

Contemporary theology should read these texts in the perspective of the entire Paschal mystery. The Cross is not a triumph of violence, and the Resurrection is not an escape from history. Through obedience to the Father, Christ exposes the lie of sin, unmasks the logic of domination, and opens the path of forgiveness. Therefore, Christian discourse on the activity of the adversary must always be subordinated to discourse on conversion, reconciliation, and service. Otherwise, demonology easily becomes a way of shifting responsibility onto an external force.

At this point, a distinction is necessary. Temptation may be experienced as pressure, accusation, distraction, discouragement, or a false promise. However, it is not coercion that destroys freedom. The Catechism speaks of the activity of the evil one as action that can cause spiritual and, indirectly, physical harm, but does not deprive man of the ability to respond to grace [1]. Theologically, this means that a person is neither defenseless nor determined. In the Christian life, faith, prayer, the sacraments, love, truth, conscience, and concrete concern for the good remain the fundamental paths of growth.

## 1.7 6. Hermeneutics: Neither Literalism Without Reflection, Nor Reduction Without Residue

Contemporary exegesis teaches that biblical texts possess literary genres, distinct contexts, and their own modes of imagery. One must not read accounts of temptation or exorcisms as if they were a transcript of a modern clinical examination. At the same time, one must not draw the conclusion from this fact that the texts speak of nothing beyond subjective experience. Hermeneutics does not consist in the contemporary reader selecting from Scripture only what aligns with their prior convictions. Its task is to understand the meaning of the text within the entirety of the canon and the tradition of faith.

The document of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith points out that in the Gospels, Jesus does not treat speech about the adversary as a marginal decoration of His mission. At the same time, He does not make it the center of His preaching. This tension is methodological. Jesus speaks of the adversary primarily in the contexts of vocation, prayer, suffering, forgiveness, and fidelity to the Father. Therefore, it is worth asking not only: "Does the text use the word 'demon'?", but above all: "What truth about God, man, and salvation does this text reveal?"

Critical hermeneutics also protects against directly transferring biblical language onto a specific individual. Gospel accounts do not authorize anyone to publicly label a person as possessed, accuse them of sin, or replace a clinical examination with a religious label. Jesus restores dignity and a place in the community

to individuals; He does not build a spectacle around them. Contemporary pastoral ministry, if it wishes to be evangelical, must particularly protect privacy, avoid pressure, and refrain from creating an atmosphere of fear.

## 1.8 7. Liturgy, Sacramentals, and the Boundaries of Ministry

In the Catholic tradition, the ordinary exorcism belongs to the liturgy of baptism: it is a prayer for liberation from sin and for the transition to the freedom of the children of God. Its significance is programmatic. It teaches that the primary path of liberation is not the search for the extraordinary, but immersion in the death and resurrection of Christ. The baptismal life develops in the Eucharist, reconciliation, prayer, the hearing of the word of God, and deeds of love.

The so-called major exorcism has a different character. The Catechism recalls that it is celebrated publicly and with due authorization from the diocesan bishop; it may be performed by a designated priest acting prudently, in accordance with the norms of the Church [6]. Canon law associates this ministry with the explicit permission of the Ordinary and the qualities of piety, knowledge, prudence, and integrity of life (can. 1172) [7]. These norms themselves constitute an important theological message: the ministry is neither a private charismatic spectacle nor a field of competition for authority.

The 1999 ritual *De exorcismis et supplicationibus quibusdam* preserves the essential caution of the tradition. Before proceeding to a major exorcism, serious discernment is required; illness, especially mental illness, must not be confused with demonic activity [8]. This norm is not merely a legal-administrative precaution. It stems from Christian anthropology. A sick person is not less worthy of spiritual care, but needs help appropriate to their situation. Subjecting them to a religious procedure instead of necessary treatment can deepen suffering and violate trust.

It is also worthwhile to avoid language that conflates **intercessory prayer**, **prayer of deliverance**, **blessing**, **spiritual direction**, and **major exorcism**. These are not interchangeable concepts. In ordinary Christian life, every person can pray for goodness, strengthening, and protection. Ministry requiring liturgical authorization, however, has its own boundaries that serve both the Church and the person seeking help. Pastoral maturity does not consist in the expansion of extraordinary practices, but in recognizing when not to apply them.

## 1.9 8. Medicine, Psychology, and the Protection of the Person

One of the most important signs of responsibility in contemporary demonology is the consent to multidisciplinary discernment. This is not a concession to the "secular" world, but a practical application of the truth that grace does not destroy nature. A person may simultaneously need a physician, a psychotherapist, family support, protection against violence, social assistance, and spiritual conversation. None of these paths is automatically opposed to another.

Research on the relationship between possession, theology, and mental health shows that religious beliefs can influence how people understand symptoms, seek help, and undergo treatment [9]. Therefore, the language used by pastors has real consequences. A formulation uttered too hastily can increase anxiety, reinforce a delusional interpretation of experiences, hinder contact with a physician, or burden the family with unnecessary guilt. On the other hand, disregarding a person's religious language can deprive them of an important dimension of meaning and trust. What is needed is listening that does not automatically confirm any interpretation, yet does not ridicule the question.

In practice, this entails several principles. First, safety must be cared for: when someone is at risk of suicide, violence, severe agitation, detachment from reality, or the neglect of basic needs, urgent medical or crisis intervention is necessary. Intervention must not be delayed in the name of private spiritual discernment. Next, the context should be examined: health history, trauma, substance use, sleep, isolation, violence, conflicts, and ongoing treatment. Only within such a space can a conversation about the life of faith, prayer, the sacraments, and the experience of temptation develop.

Theology does not provide a "symptom test" allowing a layperson to determine that they are dealing with demonic activity. Church tradition speaks of cautious signs considered by competent ministry, never of a do-it-yourself checklist. It is particularly dangerous to equate unexplained wounds, family conflicts, bad luck, psychological pain, or intense emotions with certain proof of the presence of the evil spirit. Such interpretations can lead to stigmatization, violence, and the neglect of treatment.

## 1.10 9. Contemporary Culture: "Re-enchantment" and the Risk of the Spectacle

In many societies, modernity has not simply led to the decline of belief in spiritual entities. Alongside secularization, new forms of interest in magic, esotericism, the paranormal, and the language of energy have emerged. Researchers sometimes speak of the "re-enchantment" of culture. This phenomenon can take very different forms: from interest in symbolism and alternative practices to commercial promises of immediate protection, purification, or access to hidden knowledge [5].

In this environment, Catholic demonology is exposed to two risks. The first is the infiltration of categories alien to the Christian faith: anonymous energies, control techniques, the magical efficacy of formulas, and the conviction that ritual operates independently of faith, morality, and communion with the Church. The second is mediatization. Films, recordings, and accounts of exorcisms have their own dramaturgy: conflict, mystery, emotion, and the promise of immediate resolution. However, the life of a suffering person should not become material used to build the recognition of a cleric, an internet creator, or a religious group.

The culture of the spectacle can imperceptibly transform ministry into a performance. Simple rules counteract this: absolute respect for privacy, a ban on exploiting the image of the suffering person, non-sensational language, the absence of public diagnoses, and no promises of a guaranteed result. Equally important is educating the faithful in distinguishing Christian prayer from manipulative practices. Christian prayer is a relationship with God, not a technique for gaining control over the world.

## 1.11 10. Contemporary Ecclesial Questions

Contemporary demonology also raises questions regarding authority, responsibility, and discernment within the Church. A properly exercised ministry protects both the person asking for help and the community. It requires humility before the competence of others, transparency toward superiors, and respect for norms. It prevents a situation in which a pastor's individual conviction becomes the sole criterion for evaluating a complex case.

This does not mean that faith is to be entirely subordinated to public opinion. The Church does not cease to profess that Christ liberates humanity from the power of sin and that prayer is a real participation in His victory. It is a matter of the proper order. Pastoral authority is meant to serve the truth and the good of the person; it cannot be used to create dependency, fear, or obedience based on threat.

For this reason, contemporary theology should develop a language of **listening**, **accompaniment**, and **discernment over time**. A suffering person rarely needs a quick label. They need a relationship in which they can tell their story, receive help, and be directed to the appropriate individuals. Sometimes the most Christian response is not a grand explanation, but the reassurance that a person is not alone, that their life is valuable, and that they can benefit from professional help without losing their place in the community.

## 1.12 11. Demonology and the Ethics of Freedom

The theology of evil makes sense only when it leads to a deeper respect for human freedom. The human person is not merely the sum of biological, social, psychological, or spiritual influences. They are a person capable of response, even though this response may be wounded, weakened, and in need of assistance. Discourse on temptation is not intended to justify guilt; rather, it serves to remind us that freedom matures through truth, vigilance, and grace.

In this context, it is worth recalling the classical means of the Christian life. Systematic prayer, participation in the Eucharist, the sacrament of reconciliation, the reading of Scripture, care for relationships, rest, honesty, the avoidance of practices contrary to the faith, and the capacity to ask for help are not "secondary prophylaxis." They are the ordinary path of forming freedom. They do not guarantee an absence of suffering, but they anchor the person in a relationship with God and the community.

From this perspective, it becomes clear why demonology cannot be detached from social ethics. Falsehood, contempt, violence, racism, sexual abuse, corruption, and economic indifference are real forms of evil that wound individuals and communities. Theology should not use the language of spiritual warfare to distract from the responsibility for justice. Christ's victory over evil summons us to truth, the redress of wrongs, the protection of the vulnerable, and the building of peace.

## 1.13 12. Contemporary Theology: The Language of Faith After the Experience of Secularization

Contemporary demonology does not develop in a vacuum. It emerges after the experience of secularization, which transformed the social conditions of faith without eliminating questions about evil. In some circles, the religious language of good and evil has been replaced exclusively by psychological, political, or sociological terminology. In others, the opposite reaction has occurred: everything that could not be quickly explained was deemed proof of the activity of an invisible adversary. Contemporary theology must refuse both shortcuts. This is not because it seeks to maintain a compromise between extremes, but because the Christian faith describes reality more comprehensively than any single method of cognition.

Crucial here is the distinction between **disenchantment** and the **loss of meaning**. Natural and medical sciences legitimately investigate the natural causes of phenomena. This is not an assault on faith, but an expression of the responsible use of reason. However, demonstrating natural mechanisms does not resolve all questions concerning truth, freedom, guilt, forgiveness, hope, and the purpose of life. A person may know a great deal about the biology of anxiety and still ask how to live honestly after betrayal. They may receive an accurate diagnosis and still need reconciliation, prayer, and community. Similarly, a Christian may believe in personal evil while at the same time not treating this faith as an alternative to science.

In post-Vatican II theology, greater attention has been directed toward history, personal subjectivity, and the social dimension of sin. Such a perspective does not eliminate the question of evil spirits, but it demands

that this question not be used to obscure human responsibility. When violence is explained solely through the agency of the adversary, it is easy to overlook the perpetrator, the victim, the mechanisms of abuse, and the obligation to make restitution. When systemic injustice is labeled merely as "spiritual warfare," one can easily forget the law, education, the protection of the vulnerable, and the economic sources of suffering. The Christian tradition does not permit such evasion: sin is an act of a person, and at the same time it can generate structures that hinder the choice of the good.

For this reason, contemporary demonology ought to speak of the adversary in a theologically precise manner, yet with a modest language. Modesty is not a doubt concerning the truth of faith. It is the recognition that the details regarding the manner in which evil spirits operate have not been handed down to us in order to construct systems of curiosities or rigid interpretive schemes for every biography. Revelation provides above all a soteriological orientation: God is the Creator; humanity is called to freedom; sin wounds relationship; Christ is victorious; the Holy Spirit guides the Church; hope is stronger than despair. Everything that goes beyond this orientation demands all the greater prudence.

## 1.14 13. Discernment as a Communal Process Rather Than a Private Decision

In the language of contemporary pastoral care, the word "discernment" is frequently used, but it is sometimes understood too hastily. It is not an intuition that relieves one from verifying facts; nor is it a special feeling of a person possessing religious authority. In the classical Christian tradition, the discernment of spirits requires time, prayer, familiarity with Scripture, honesty regarding one's motives, the capacity to accept correction, and rootedness in a community. In matters concerning possible psychological suffering or alleged extraordinary action, it furthermore requires competence, consultation, and a clear division of responsibilities.

This process can be described in several stages. The first is a calm listening to the person without ridiculing their religious language and without confirming any interpretation at the outset. The second is the identification of urgent needs: safety, treatment, protection from violence, support from loved ones, social or crisis assistance. The third is inquiry into the ordinary life of faith: prayer, the sacraments, relationships, forgiveness, habits, rest, and the utilization of professional help. Only subsequent spiritual discernment can make sense, and that within the limits of the guide's competence.

The proper form of protection is cooperation. The bishop, the authorized priest, the pastoral caregiver, the physician, the psychologist, or the psychotherapist do not perform the same task, but they can mutually respect the boundaries of their roles. The point is not to create a bureaucratic procedure that leaves a human being isolated. The point is that no one should have to choose between faith and health. High standards of prudence do not weaken the ministry of the Church; they make it more credible and more aligned with Jesus's care for the individual person.

In this context, the importance of consent and confidentiality must be emphasized. A person asking for prayer should understand what is happening, have the opportunity to interrupt the meeting, know the limits of assistance, and not be isolated from their loved ones or from medical treatment. They must not be urged to disclose intimate matters before a group, forced into humiliating behaviors, or subjected to practices that increase dependence on the facilitator. Any spiritual ministry that does not respect freedom and dignity contradicts what it proclaims regarding liberation.

## 1.15 14. Digital Culture and Responsibility for the Word

The digital environment presents a new challenge. Materials regarding demons, possession, and exorcisms are readily accessible, frequently presented in an emotional manner detached from context. Algorithms amplify content that evokes fear, anger, or fascination; unverified testimony can achieve a wider reach than calm pastoral information. Under such conditions, even correct theological concepts can become a tool of anxiety.

Responsible communication regarding demonology therefore requires criteria. First, a clear distinction must be made between the teaching of the Church and the opinion of the author, personal account, or hypothesis. Second, one must not publish recordings, photographs, or detailed descriptions concerning suffering individuals, especially without their full and informed consent. Third, language that promises immediate certainty must be avoided: "this symptom proves," "this prayer always works," "this object is definitely cursed." Such statements are not an expression of faith, but rather an abuse of the need for security.

Special caution should be exercised with regard to children, individuals in crisis, and those with a history of anxiety, obsessive, or psychotic disorders. Content saturated with horror can intensify suffering and hinder the search for professional help. The Christian community has the duty to build a culture of the word that does not exploit the weaknesses of recipients. A non-sensational style is not a stylistic addition; it is a form of love for one's neighbor.

On the other hand, digital culture can serve the good. It can facilitate access to reliable information, contact with pastoral care, crisis helpline numbers, Church teaching, and formation materials. It can serve as a reminder of the ordinary means of grace, the importance of the sacraments, and the fact that in situations of severe crisis, medical assistance is necessary. The difference does not lie in the technology itself, but in the truth, purpose, and responsibility of those who use it.

## 1.16 15. Contemporary Demonology and the Practice of Everyday Faith

In everyday Christian life, the greatest mistake would be to expect extraordinary means where ordinary means are needed. The spiritual tradition does not begin with the question of exceptional experiences, but with conversion. Faith matures through the rhythm of prayer, character development, responsibility for one's words, care for the family, professional integrity, rest, confession, the Eucharist, the reading of Scripture, and love of neighbor. It is precisely in these places that a person learns to discern truth and falsehood, freedom and enslavement, peace and false consolation.

This does not mean trivializing serious suffering. Rather, it means that spiritual help cannot be a substitute for the whole of moral life. No prayer exempts one from the duty to apologize to an offended person, undertake addiction therapy, treat an illness, protect a child from violence, or renounce practices that destroy the conscience. In this sense, contemporary demonology is demanding: it does not allow one to comfortably shift the entire problem of evil onto an external enemy.

The ordinary practice of faith also has a communal dimension. A person is more easily overcome by fear when alone, deprived of support, and trapped in a circle of interpretations that feed anxiety. The parish, the family, spiritual direction, friendship, and responsible specialized help can create a space in which experience is named without haste. Such a community does not deprive a person of their history; it helps them recover it within the perspective of hope.

## 1.17 16. Toward a Theology of Hope

Contemporary demonology should conclude not with a description of the adversary, but with a confession of hope. In the Apocalypse, the symbol of the dragon is not the final image of history. The final image is God, who "will wipe away every tear from their eyes" (Rev 21:4). Christian hope does not mean the denial of suffering nor a banal optimism. It is the trust that evil is not the source of being, is not the master of history, and does not possess the capacity to destroy the communion that God establishes in Christ.

In this sense, mature reflection on evil spirits should be calm. It does not reject the testimony of Scripture or Tradition, but it does not use it to instill fear. It respects the experience of suffering persons, but it does not turn their stories into proof of a thesis. It cooperates with medicine and psychology without reducing the human person to mere mechanism. It defends freedom, knowing that grace does not abolish the person, but heals and strengthens them.

## 1.18 17. Principles of Responsible Pastoral Discernment

In conclusion, it is worth gathering the fundamental principles that can be helpful for the community and for individuals seeking support.

1. **Christ remains the center.** Discussion of evil should lead to faith, prayer, hope, and love, rather than to a fascination with the adversary.
2. **Self-diagnosis should be avoided.** Difficult emotions, conflicts, illness, pain, and failures are not in themselves proof of the extraordinary action of evil.
3. **Safety takes precedence.** In the event of a threat to life, suicide, violence, severe psychological crisis, or loss of contact with reality, immediate medical, psychiatric, psychological, or crisis assistance is necessary.
4. **Specialized help is not opposed to faith.** Consultation with a physician and a psychologist can be an expression of care for the human person, rather than a lack of trust in God.
5. **Ecclesiastical ministry has limits.** Major exorcism is not a private prayer for independent use and requires authorized ministry as well as the norms of the Church.
6. **Dignity and privacy must be protected.** No suffering person should be presented as an example, an object of sensationalism, or a subject of public discussion without full protection of their well-being.
7. **Ordinary means of grace come first.** Prayer, Sacred Scripture, the sacraments, community, works of charity, and an honest life constitute the fundamental path of Christian growth.

## 1.19 Conclusion

Contemporary demonology is credible when it maintains proportion. It is a theology of creation, thus reminding us that evil has no divine source of its own. It is a theology of freedom, and therefore does not deprive humanity of responsibility. It is a theology of the Pascha, and thus does not describe the world as a domain of fear. Finally, it is a theology of the Church, which respects norms, competence, health, and human dignity.

In a world where it is easy to pass from trivialization to panic, Christian discernment requires patience. It does not consist in the immediate explanation of everything, but in the search for truth in the light of Christ. Where medicine is needed, one should seek medicine. Where psychotherapy is needed, one should seek psychotherapy. Where reconciliation, prayer, and the sacraments are needed, they should be utilized.

And where the Church prudently recognizes the need for a particular ministry, it should exercise it with humility, discretion, and trust in the victory of God.

# 2 Footnotes and bibliography

[1] **Catechism of the Catholic Church**, No. 391–395, 407, 414–421, [Watykan](https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/ P1C.HTM).

[2] Rudolf Bultmann, *New Testament and Mythology*, in: H. W. Bartsch (ed.), *Kerygma and Myth*, Vol. 1, SPCK, London 1953.

[3] Vatican Council II, pastoral constitution *Gaudium et spes*, No. 13 and 37, [Watykan](https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist councils/ii vatan council/documents/vat-ii const 19651207 gaudium-et-spes en.html).

[4] Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith, *Christian Faith and Demonology* (1975), [Watykan](https://www.vatican.va/roman curia/collections/cfair/documents/rc con cfair doc 19750626 fede-cristiana-demonologia en.html).

[5] R. Bauer, "The Devil and the Doctor: The (De)Medicalization of Exorcism in the Roman Catholic Church", *Religions* 13 (2022), 87, DOI.

[6] **Catechism of the Catholic Church**, No. 1673, [Watykan](https://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG0015/P4E.HTM).

[7] **Canonical Law Code**, can. 1172, [Watykan](https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic lib4-cann1166-1190 en.html).

[8] *De exorcismis et supplicationibus quibusdam*, editio typica, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1999; cf. discussion of ritual norms and history in: Bauer, d. c.

[9] C. C. H. Cook, "Demon Possession, Theology, and Mental Health", *Theology & Psychology* (2025), DOI.

[10] International Exorcist Association, Formative Materials and Communications, A.I.E..