

Healings or Exorcisms? Evil Spirits as Impersonal Powers in the Gospels

Uzdrowienie czy egzorcyzm? Złe duchy jako bezosobowe moce w Ewangeliach

Keywords: miracles; healings; exorcisms; Jesus of history; demons; evil spirits; unclean spirits; Satan; Gospels.

Słowa kluczowe: cuda; uzdrowienia; egzorcyzmy; Jezus historii; demony; złe duchy; duchy nieczyste; szatan; Ewangelie.

Abstract. *Pneuma* in Greek and *ruah* in Hebrew should be understood impersonally as “wind, invisible power”. *Daimonia* are indefinite half-divine powers, occasionally personified (Jas 2.19). These “evil powers” are never equated with Satan, and only some enemies of Jesus made them satanic agents. “Unclean” means “unholy, belonging to the profane, earthly sphere”. “Evil” means “malicious”. Accordingly, the Gospels imply that so called “possession” is an insane behaviour with unknown causes; from our point of view they could be medical, moral, or satanic. The authors of the Gospels and Jesus himself followed the popular way of speaking without judging it. However, on the literary level, the descriptions of such cases in the Gospels are similar to the other stories of healings and they should not be separated from them. They are not too similar to the apocryphal descriptions of exorcisms. Even if Jesus was perceived as exorcist, the Gospels do not really support this view.

Streszczenie. *Pneuma* po grecku oraz *ruah* po hebrajsku należy rozumieć bezosobowo: jako „wiatr, niewidzialna siła”. *Daimonia* to nieokreślone siły półboskie, czasami personifikowane (Jk 2, 19). Te złe moce nie są nigdy identyczne z szatanem, a tylko niektórzy przeciwnicy Jezusa uważali je za wysłańców szatana. „Nieczysty” znaczy „nieświęty, należący do sfery świeckiej i ziemskiej”. „Złe” znaczy „złośliwe”. Tym samym Ewangelie zakładają, że tak zwane opętanie to szalone zachowanie o nieznanym przyczynach; z naszego punktu widzenia mogą one być medyczne, moralne i szatańskie. Autorzy Ewangelii i sam Jezus naśladowali popularne sposoby mówienia bez osądzania ich. Jednakże na poziomie literackim opisy takich przypadków w Ewangeliach są podobne do innych opisów uzdrowień i nie powinny być od nich oddzielane. Nie są zbyt podobne

do apokryficznych opisów egzorcyzmów. Nawet jeśli Jezus bywał postrzegany jako egzorcysta, Ewangelie tak naprawdę nie popierają takiej opinii.

Some acts of Jesus described in the Gospels are qualified by scholars as exorcisms. Accordingly, Jesus is sometimes called exorcist¹. In the wide-spread popular opinion, the essence of this activity consisted in casting out evil spirits (or demons) from the possessed persons. The notion of satanic possession inspired ancient and modern exorcisms practiced in the Christian church.

This attitude should be revised on many levels, but not primarily because of critical opinions stemming from the modern worldview or medical knowledge. As we will see, the Gospels themselves show that the above reading is simplified and untenable. Unclean spirits are not the same as devils and the acts of Jesus cannot be placed so easily in the category of exorcisms².

1. The meaning of the words “spirit” and “demon”

The word translated “spirit” is *pneuma* in Greek and *ruah* in Hebrew. The first meaning of these terms is “wind”. As the wind is invisible but powerful, it can serve as an image of the spiritual and divine reality, of internal forces and drives. The term is neuter in Greek and does not imply a personal action. In the religious sphere it can mean simply “invisible superior force”, “divine action” etc.

In the Old Testament the Spirit of God is not yet a person. Human spirit is not a separate being, but a factor of human activity. Therefore, there is no reason to imply in advance that in the context of the life of Jesus “evil spirits” were understood as personal beings. The Old Testament use suggests that they are evil factors of human behaviour, either resulting from the movements of human mind and will, or coming from outside.

This meaning is related to the expressions like “spirit of sleep”, or “of weakness” (cf. e.g. Isa 19.14; 20.10; Luke 13.11); a personified “lying spirit” occurs, but it belongs to story-telling, not to doctrinal opinions (1 Kings 22.22). It confirms the basically impersonal and metaphoric sense of *ruah* / *pneuma*.

Let us ask now what it means that the spirits are unclean or impure, in Greek *akatharta*. Being clean implies belonging to the sacred sphere, lack

¹ E.g. G.H. Twelftree, *Jesus*; A. Witmer, *Jesus*.

² In this article I shall make extensive use of some chapters from my book: M. Wojciechowski, *Cuda*, pp. 73–104.

of any blame. Impurity is not just dirt, but being profane, unfit for the participation in the cult, far from holiness. Unclean things are from *this* world, as opposed to the higher, spiritual reality. Hence “unclean spirits” cannot be superior beings.

In the Old Testament laws about impurity, the issue of “spirits” is absent. An interesting parallel can be found in 1 Samuel 1.13–14, where Eli the priest suspects Hannah of being drunken because of her strange behaviour, and wants to send her away from the sanctuary. Apparently, such behaviour excluded from the cult. In answer, Hannah explains that she is neither drunken nor mad – word a word “a daughter of Belial”. Belonging to Belial (Beliar) implied possibly an ecstatic and insane behaviour during the pagan cult. It would conflict with the sacral purity demanded from the Israelites.

Spirit can be also described as evil, *poneros* (Matt 12.45 = Luke 11.26; Luke 7.21; 8.2: much less frequently than in modern languages). This adjective does not imply an ontological evil, but a mode of behaviour: malicious, aggressive, offensive. “Evil spirit” is an unidentified force, external or internal, making people behave badly and foolishly. Therefore “in unclean spirit” means simply “degraded”, “insane”, “mad” – without indicating whence this madness comes.

In the Gospels, *daimonia*, mistranslated as “demons”, are synonymous to the unclean spirits. In Greek they are generally understood as “divinities”, “superior powers”, “superhuman forces”. The term is neuter and not quite personal, as *daimonion* of Socrates shows – the voice of conscience. However, *daimonia* could refer to demi-gods, divine forces from the sphere of air, between earth and heaven.

Accordingly, *daimonizomenos* is not “possessed (by Satan)” but rather “dominated by an external force” or even “ecstatic”. In John 10.20 “have a demon” and “be out of his mind” are synonyms. Personal understanding of *daimonia* as “demons” has become current only in the late antiquity. In the Bible, only in James 2.19, outside the Gospels, *daimonia* are fully personal beings. In the Gospels they are personalized less frequently and not directly (Mark 1.34; 3.11; 5.1–20; cf. Matthew 12.43–45 par.). “Seven demons” cast out from Mary Magdalene (Mark 16.9; Luke 8.2) mean a very serious illness; seven is a symbolic number.

These Gospel texts reproduce second-hand opinions, shedding light rather on the popular perception than on the views held by Jesus and the Gospel writers. This occasional personalization of winds/spirits reflects the general ancient tendency to make personal beings of the forces of nature. However, calling love “Aphrodite” was a way of speaking and not a declaration of faith. It is also worth remembering that for the ancient mentality everything stronger than men was considered “divine”.

Concluding: all this vocabulary does not imply satanic possessions, but madness: an insane, foolish, offensive behaviour, making people evil and unclean, and resulting from an influence of some superior strange force. It was verbalized and conceived as “bad wind”, i.e. “unexpected evil drive”, “external malicious force”.

Today, we would tend to look for a precise source of insane behaviour. For us, madness could have neurological, psychiatric, moral or satanic causes. The Gospels and their world have not made such distinction. They knew only that Jesus was able to overcome and cure such madness. Jesus and the authors of the Gospels followed the popular way of perceiving such phenomena and speaking about them, but without judging its value. Modern explanations of “evil powers” as epilepsy, schizophrenia etc. is not in conflict with them.

2. What has Satan to do with unclean spirits

Nowadays, Satan, devil, fallen angel, evil spirit and demon are treated as synonyms. In fact, they were not. From this list only Satan and devil are synonymous, because *śatan* in Hebrew corresponds to *diabolos* in Greek (“accuser”). He was also identified with the Serpent from Genesis, as Revelation 12.9 shows. It is also clear that Satan is a personal superior being.

The Bible mentions him about 60 times³. He was seen as a member of divine court, as Job 1 proves. Towards humans he was an accuser and adversary, according to his name. He was called The Tempter. Subsequently, as the enemy of men, he was expelled from heaven; for the New Testament it was a contemporary event (Luke 10.18; Rev 12).

The supposed relations between Satan, a personal being, and unclean spirits are hard to trace in the Gospels. The enemies of Jesus said: “He is possessed by Beelzebul, and by the prince of demons he cast out the demons” (Mark 3.22). It is the only statement of this kind. Jesus in answer did identify Beelzebul with Satan, but falsified the whole reasoning. Another loose association between Satan and demons or spirits can be found in Luke 10.17–20.

We can infer from this discussion that in the times of Jesus any evil phenomena were associated with the realm of Satan. However, Jesus and the Gospels abstained from proclaiming it as a revealed truth. They never teach about the satanic presence in humans neither casting out the Satan. It is clear that any relation of Satan with the spirits could be only indirect. In the biblical worldview

³ About Satan and evil in the Bible e.g.: S.H.T. Page, *Powers*; I. Fröhlich, E. Koskenniemi, *Evil*; K. Gózdź, *Teologia*; R. Zajac, *Szatan*.

the ultimate cause of any evil is Satan, but there are also various direct causes. An excellent example is offered by Luke 13.10–17: “There was a woman who had had a spirit of infirmity [...] a daughter of Abraham whom Satan bound for eighteen years”. Jesus tolerated this way of thinking.

It seems therefore that some of the evil drives in humans stem from the physical world, some are moral and can result from temptation. The tempted people can become so dependent of Satan that they do need exorcism, but such a situation is neither specified nor described in the Gospels. The Gospels do not imply, either, that Satan makes people his puppets. The popular notion of satanic possession stems from another source: from the pseudepigraphic texts. There, indeed, humans are possessed by Satan himself or by personal, named spirits. They should be cast away from them.

3. Do the Gospels describe exorcisms?

Earlier ancient texts do not contain typical exorcisms. It happens only after the Gospels, even if some related ideas can be traced earlier: in Tobit 6–7; *Jubilees* 10; *Genesis Apocryphon*; *Prayer of Nabonidus*.

A document from about second century A.D., the apocryphal *Testament of Solomon* contains mainly descriptions of exorcisms⁴. From the formal side we observe that these descriptions are relatively long. They contain complex dialogues, prayers, magic formulas and orders. The enemies are personal, demons have names. The exorcist is able to dominate them because of prayers and a magic ring. The control is gained after long efforts. Similar motives can be found in other documents from the post-biblical period, including other traditions of Solomon (Josephus, *Antiquities* 8.45–49), *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* by Philostrates, and Greek magical papyri. They reappear in the Christian exorcism liturgies.

Nevertheless, such features do not resemble the Gospel model (Mark 1.21–28; 5.1–20; 7.24–30; 9.14–29; Matthew 9.32–34 with 12.22–24; with parallels). Gospel stories on the unclean spirits are short. After an inquiry on the case, Jesus heals with one order. These stories either contain a short exchange of words with the healed person (two cases: Mark 1.24–25; 5.5–12), or only one saying of Jesus (two cases: Mk 9.25; 7.29), or even no quotation (Matthew 9.33; 12.22). The summaries mentioning casting the spirits away are very brief. They contain no suggestion of long “exorcisms” (Mark 1.32–34; 4.24; Luke 7.21; 8.2 with parallels).

⁴ Zob. M. Parchem, *Pisma*, 393–451; J.H. Charlesworth, *Old Testament* 1, 935–987.

In the vocabulary of these stories, the mentions of *pneumata* and *daimonia* take part of the diagnosis in the ordinary healing stories. Other vocabulary is close to the healing stories. All these stories do not suggest any particular effort from the side of Jesus, a supposed exorcist. He remains always in control. He neither need to pray nor to repeat his orders. The only longer dialogue (Mark 5.5–12) contains an inquiry, the “spirits” remain submissive. We shall return to this text later.

The literary scheme of these stories fits in the general model of Gospel miracle stories, more exactly the healing stories⁵. This model, named *Wundergeschichte* by German scholars, includes the following elements: a) an initial situation; b) a presentation of the problem, a diagnosis; c) asking Jesus for help; d) a reaction of Jesus (in words and sometimes gestures); e) a description of effects – the healing; f) the event is commented and becomes popular – this conclusion is nearly always editorial, and not essential for the story.

All these features can be repeatedly found in our five stories. In Mark 1.21–28 we lack only the petition to Jesus, but it perhaps results from the nature of madness. The spread of the news is omitted twice. Accordingly, from the perspective of oral tradition and Gospel writers, stories on the unclean spirits are basically healing stories.

“To have a spirit” is an illness or symptom, and not a special category, a “possession”. The cause of this illness was not known, but it was a standard situation in the ancient medicine. If the “spirits” are related to the forces of evil, all the illnesses can be attributed to them on the same principle. Even if Gospels use the ancient way of speaking about madness, they remain moderate in approach and do not try to teach us about its causes.

These incidents could be labeled “exorcisms stories” only if we decided in advance that any dealing with “spirits”, evil forces, must be an exorcism, by definition⁶. However, this method, often applied unconsciously, is incorrect. We must understand exorcisms according to the practice of ancient exorcists. Even if the enemies of Jesus adapted an *a priori* definition and in advance considered Jesus an exorcist, it does not necessarily prove that the perception of Je-

⁵ Confrontations with “spirits” and “demons” are usually included into miracle stories, but not into the category of healings. Some books on Gospel miracles including sections on exorcisms: V. Busse, *Wunder*; E. Eve, *Jewish*; H. Hendricx, *Miracles*; J.K. Howard, *Disease*; R. Latourelle, *Miracles*; J.P. Meier, *Marginal*, vol. 2; *Les miracles*; G. Theissen, *Urchristliche*; G.H. Twelftree, *Jesus*; D. Wenham, C. Blomberg, *Miracles*.

⁶ An obvious tendency of authors talking about exorcisms; cf. G.H. Twelftree, *Jesus*; idem, *In the name*; A. Witmer, *Jesus*; G.E. Sterling, *Jesus*.

sus and of the Gospel authors was the same. It seems very doubtful that Jesus were an exorcist, even if he has been seen as such. He was a healer.

4. Particular Gospel stories

The only Gospel text with some closer relation to the ancient exorcism stories is Mark 5.1–20 par⁷. It is, however, rather different from the other Gospel episodes, much longer and adorned with fantasy. Even if this story about healing an insane man, perhaps a schizophrenic, has had a historical kern, its present form is legendary.

The place of action cannot be identified because of the divergences between the manuscripts⁸. Iron chains cannot be broken by human hands. There is no place on the lake Gennesaret where a flock can fall into water. Pigs do not flock and tend to disperse when in danger. Pigs swim well. The entering of demons into pigs is ridiculous and contrasts with the dignity of the Bible. We meet a midrashic elaboration here, inserted into the Gospel because of its literary and symbolic values.

In Mark 1.23⁹ we read about someone “in unclean spirit”, *en pneumati akatharto*. Lack of article before *pneumati* strengthens the impersonal character of the expression. The Greek *en*, “in”, can introduce a description of symptoms, as in Mk 5.25 nearby: *en rhysei haimatos*, “in a flow of blood”. *En pneumati* can refer to various situations, as prophetic inspiration (Ezek 32.1), form of baptism (Mark 1.8), intense prayer (Eph 6.18) – but not to a personal presence of a “spirit” (cf. *en pneumati theou* in Mt 12.28). We should translate simply “insane”, “mad”, or “under an influence of bad wind”. The man the Gospel talked about was perhaps a schizophrenic. Translations and comments with the word “possessed”, absent in Greek, should be avoided.

⁷ Cf. Commentaries on Mark: C.A. Evans; R.F. France; J. Marcus; R. Pesch; A. Yarbro Collins – ad locum. Articles: J. Adna, *The Encounter*; B. Gérard, *Marc*; A. Macura, *Kim jest*; P. Nasiłowski, *Egzorcyzm*; Z. Niemirski, *Bemerkungen*; G.S. Oegema, *Jesus*; A. Paciorek, *Demony*; Y. Redalié, *L'indemoniato*; A. Strus, *Cristo*; S. Szymik, *Współczesne*.

⁸ I opt for the reading of Sinaiticus *prima manus*: three different names in three Gospels. The starting point was probably *ger-gezey*, “foreigners from the other side” (of the lake) – so A. Strus, *Géraseniens*.

⁹ Apart commentaries: M. Wojciechowski, *Jezus*, pp. 44–70; W. Bytner, *Perykopa*; B.D. Chilton, *Exorcism*; B. Kollmann, *Schweigegebote*.

In Mark 9.14–29¹⁰ (with parallels) we have obvious symptoms of epilepsy. And indeed, Matthew uses the word “epileptic” here (verbal form *selenizetai* in Greek), implying an illness, and not “a possession”, even if below there is a question of *daimonion*. For the ancient medicine epilepsy was an illness, sometimes correctly associated with brains.

People spoke about “spirit”, i.e. *pneuma*, i.e. “wind”, but “have a mute spirit” means nothing more than “being muted by an unknown factor”. The words of Jesus in this story “you dumb and deaf spirit, I command you, come out of him, and never enter him again”, should be interpreted in the same way.

Two parallel stories from Matthew 9.32–34 and 12.22–24¹¹ mention a “dumb (and blind) possessed” (*kofon daimonizomenon*). It is an infirmity caused by an unknown superior factor. The cure is labeled “casting out the demon” (*ekblethentos tou daimoniou*) in Matthew 9.33, but “healing” (*etherapeusen*) in Matthew 12.22. It implies that both notions are nearly synonymous. They are parallel also in Luke 8.16; Mark 6.13 par.; cf. Matt 17.16.

In Mark 7.25¹² a girl “had an unclean spirit” (*eichen ... pneuma akatharton*, no article; “possessed” is incorrectly supplemented in translations). Once more it is a description of symptoms, avoiding personal connotations. Perhaps the epilepsy is meant here. The pagan mother asked for expulsion of the demon, what suggests that she had expected an exorcism. It did not take place, because, in answer, Jesus just assured the mother that the demon had already left. As in Mark 9, the popular way of speaking is adopted, but without making the “spirit” a personal being.

Conclusions

1. So-called spirits and demons in the Greek texts of the Gospels should be interpreted as unidentified, usually impersonal forces, making humans mad and unclean.
2. The relations of these evil forces to Satan are loose and indirect.
3. Gospels do not offer any clear explanation of these forces, although we would like to associate them with medical, moral or spiritual causes.

¹⁰ Cf. commentaries and: A. Malina, *Wszystko*; S. Ormanty, *Działanie*; G.E. Sterling, *Jesus*.

¹¹ Commentaries: V. Luz; W.D. Davies, D.C. Allison; D.A. Hagner; A. Paciorek – ad locum.

¹² Articles: Z. Grochowski, *Heroiczna*; M. Rosik, *Donna*.

4. Some dependencies of the popular magic worldview are visible in the way of speaking adapted in the Gospels and in the legendary elaboration of Mark 5.1–20.
5. When Jesus confronts such forces, the Gospels feature such situations as healing stories and not as exorcism stories, which could be compared with the extracanonical literature.
6. And indeed, these situations were extraordinary healings from mental diseases. According to the Gospels, Jesus healed the insane persons rather than cast out the demons.
7. Later personification of “spirits” and “demons” has deformed the perception of the Gospel texts.

Bibliography

Miracles

- Busse U., *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesu*, Forschung zur Bibel 24, Stuttgart 1977
- Cavadini J.C. (ed.), *Miracles in Jewish and Christian Antiquity. Imagining Truth*, Notre Dame Studies in Theology 3, Notre Dame 1999.
- Cotter W., *Miracles in Greco-Roman Antiquity. A Sourcebook*, London–New York 1999.
- Eve E., *The Jewish Context of Jesus' Miracles*, JSNT Supplement Series 231, London–New York 2002.
- Hendrickx H., *The Miracle Stories of the Synoptic Gospels*, San Francisco 1987.
- Howard J.K., *Disease and Healing in the New Testament. An Analysis and Interpretation*, Lanham et al. 2001
- Jaschke H., *Jésus, le guérisseur*, Paris 1997.
- Latourelle R., *Miracles de Jésus et théologie du miracle*, Montreal 1986.
- Les miracles de Jésus*, [collected essays] Paris 1977.
- Meier J.P., *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2, *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*, Anchor Bible Reference Library, New York–London 1994.
- Theissen G., *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten*, Studien zum Neuen Testament 8, Gütersloh 1974.
- Twelftree G.H., *Jesus the Miracle Worker. A Historical and Theological Study*, Downers Grove 1999.
- Wenham D., Blomberg C. (ed.), *The Miracles of Jesus*, Gospel Perspectives 6, Sheffield 1986.
- Wojciechowski M., *Cuda Jezusa*, Częstochowa 2010.

Exorcisms and Satan

- Fröhlich I., Koskeniemi E. (ed.), *Evil and Devil*, London 2013.

- Góźdz K. (ed.), *Teologia o szatanie*, Lublin 2000.
- Jędrzejewski S., *U korzeni zła*, Lublin 1997.
- Kościelniak K., *Złe duchy w Biblii i Koranie*, Kraków 1999.
- Maggi A., *Jezus i Belzebub. Szatan i demony w Ewangelii św. Marka*, Kraków 2001.
- Page S.H.T., *Powers of Evil. A Biblical Study of Stan and Demons*, Grand Rapids 1995
- Sorensen E., *Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament and Early Christianity*, WUNT 157, Tübingen 2002.
- Thomas J.C., *The Devil, Disease and Deliverance. Origins of Illness in New Testament Thought*, Journal of Pentecostal Theology. Supplements 13, Sheffield 1998.
- Twelftree G.H., *In the Name of Jesus: Exorcism Among Early Christians*; Grand Rapids 2007.
- Twelftree G.H., *Jesus the Exorcist. A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*, WUNT 2. Reihe 54, Tübingen 1993;
- Witmer A., *Jesus, the Galilean Exorcist: His Exorcisms in Social and Political Context*, Library of New Testament Studies, New York 2013.
- Zając R., *Szatan w Starym Testamencie*, Lublin 1998.

Commentaries

- Bovon F., *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3/1–3, Zürich i in. 1989–2001.
- Brown R.E., *The Gospel according to John*, Anchor Bible 29–29A, New York 1966–70.
- Davies W.D., Allison D.C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, Edinburgh 1988–97.
- Evans C.A., *Mark 8:27–16:20*, Word Biblical Commentary 34B, Nashville 2001.
- Fitzmyer J.A., *The Gospel according to Luke*, Anchor Bible 28–28A, Garden City 1981–85.
- France R. F., *The Gospel of Mark*, The New International Greek Testament Commentary, Grand Rapids – Carlisle 2002.
- Guelich R.A., *Mark 1–8:26*, Word Biblical Commentary 34A, Dallas 1989.
- Hagner D.A., *Matthew*, Word Biblical Commentary 33AB, Dallas 1993–95.
- Luz U., *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament I/1–4, Zürich i in. 1985–2002.
- Marcus J., *Mark*, Anchor Bible 27–27A, New York et al. 1999–2009.
- Neuer Wettstein, Neuer Wettstein. Texte zum Neuen Testament aus Griechenland und Hellenismus*, ed. U. Schnelle, Teilband 1.1–2, Berlin 2009–2013.
- Nolland J., *Luke*, Word Biblical Commentary 35ABC, Dallas 1989–93.
- Pesch R., *Das Markusevangelium*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, wyd. 2, Freiburg/B 1984.
- Schnackenburg R., *Das Johannesevangelium*, Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament IV/1–3, 1966–77.
- Yarbro Collins A., *Mark*, Hermeneia, 2007.

Articles and studies:

- Adna J., *The Encounter of Jesus with the Gerasene Demoniac*, in: *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, New Testament Tools and Studies 28.2, ed. B.D. Chilton, C.A. Evans, Leiden 1999, pp. 279–301.
- Bauckham R., Davila J.R., Panayotov A. (ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids 2013.
- Bytner W., *Perykopa o uzdrowieniu opętanego z Kafarnaum (Mk 1,21–28) w świetle analizy pragmatycznej*, *Studia Płockie* 28(2000), pp. 81–91.
- Chapa J., *Exorcistas y exorcismos en tiempos de Jesús*, in: *Los milagros de Jesús. Perspectivas metodológicas plurales*, ed. R. Aguirre, Estella 2002, pp. 121–146.
- Charlesworth J.H. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1–2, London 1983.
- Chilton B.D., *An Exorcism of History: Mark 1:21–28*, in: *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, New Testament Tools and Studies 28.2, ed. B.D. Chilton, C.A. Evans, Leiden 1999, pp. 215–245.
- Chilton B.D., *Exorcism and History: Mark 1:21–28*, in: *The Miracles of Jesus*, Gospel Perspectives 6, ed. D. Wenham, C. Blomberg, Sheffield 1986, pp. 253–271.
- Conrady J. – Vouga F., *Zur Interpretation der Erzählungen von Exorzismen im Markusevangelium. Ein Werkstattbericht aus einem interdisziplinären Dialog zwischen einem Arzt und einem Theologen*, in: *Exegese und Methodendiskussion*, TANZ 23, ed. S. Alkier, R. Brucker, Tübingen 1998, pp. 257–270.
- Gérard B., *Marc 5,1–20: Des hommes, des démons et des cochons!*, *Lectio Divina* 96 (2013), pp. 26–37.
- Grochowski Z., *Heroiczna wiara i wytrwała modlitwa Syrofeniczanki*, in: *Kobieta w życiu Kościoła*, ed. M. Karczewski, M. Żmudziński, Elbląg 2004, pp. 41–48.
- Guijarro Oporto S., *The Politics of Exorcism: Jesus' Reaction to Negative Labels in the Beelzebul Controversy*, *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 29(1999)3, pp. 118–129.
- Jędrzejewski S., *Demonologia w Biblii i w pismach z Qumran*, in: *Z badań nad Biblią. Gwiazda Jakuba – demony – Niewiasta Apokalipsy*, ed. T. Jelonek, Kraków 2007, pp. 53–76.
- Kollmann B., *Jesu Schweigegebote an die Dämonen*, *ZNW* 82(1991), pp. 267–273.
- Macura A., *Kim jest Jezus w świetle perykopy o uzdrowieniu opętanego Gerazeńczyka (Mk 5,1–20)*, in: *Prorok potężny czynem i słowem*, Fs. J. Kudasiewicz, ed. B. Szier-Kramarek et al., Lublin 1997, pp. 59–71.
- Maggioni B., *Chrystus i szatan w Ewangelii Markowej*, in: *Zło w świecie*, Kolekcja Communio 7, Poznań–Warszawa 1992, pp. 34–49.
- Malina A., *„Wszystko możliwe dla wierzącego” (Mk 9,23)*, *Verbum Vita* 3(2004)5, pp. 89–105.
- Miquel E., *How to Discredit an Inconvenient Exorcist. Origin and Configuration of the Synoptic Controversies on Jesus' Power as an Exorcist*, *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 40 (2010)4, 187–206.
- Nasiłowski P., *Egzorcyzm w Gerazie (Mk 5,1–20)*, in: *Trud w Panu nie jest daremny (por. 1 Kor 15,58)*, Fs. J. Załęski, ed. W. Linke, Niepokalanów 2010, 277–299.

- Niemirski Z., *Einige Bemerkungen zu „der Besessene von Gerasa“ Erzählung (Mk 5,1–20)*, *Studia Diecezji Radomskiej* 1(1998), 121–136.
- Oegema G.S., *Jesus' Casting Out of Demons in the Gospel of Mark against Its Greco-Roman Background*, in: *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt – Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment*, ed. A. Lange et al., Tübingen 2003, 505–518.
- Ormanty S., *Działanie Jezusa w oparciu o psychologię „Gestalt” na przykładzie perykopy o uzdrowieniu epileptyka (Mk 9,14–29)*, in: *Sentire cum Societate*, ed. W. Necel, Poznań 2007, 89–102.
- Paciorek A., *„(Demony) prosiły Jezusa: ‚Poślij nas w świnie’. I pozwolił...” (Mk 5,1–20) – opętanie w krainie Gerazeńczyków*, in: *Gaudium in litteris*, Fs. S. Wielgus, ed. S. Janeczek et al., Lublin 2009, 305–315.
- Parchem M. (ed.), *Pisma apokaliptyczne i testamenty*, Kraków – Mogilany 2010.
- Redalié Y., *L'indemoniato di Gerasa (Mc 5,1–20). Una tessera nei “ritratti originali di Gesù”*, in: *Nuovo Testamento: teologie in dialogo culturale*, Fs. R. Penna, *Rivista Biblica. Supplementi* 50, ed. N. Ciola, G. Pulcinelli, Bologna 2008, 115–123.
- Rosik M., *La Donna Sirofenicia (Mc 7,24–30). Analisi esegetica ed interpretazione teologica*, *Studia Warmińskie* 39(2002), 259–279.
- Skierkowski M., *Egzorcyzmy Jezusa*, in: *Szatan w religii i kulturze*, ed. S. Bujalski, Szczecin 2008, 113–126.
- Sterling G.E., *Jesus as Exorcist: An Analysis of Matthew 17:14–20; Mark 9:14–29; Luke 9:37–43a*, *CBQ* 55(1993), 467–493.
- Strus A., *Cristo, Liberatore dell'uomo nella catechesi di Pietro, secondo Mc 5,1–20*, *Salmaticensis* 44(1982), 35–60.
- Strus A., *Géraseniens dans la tradition synoptique: jalon topographique ou omen onomastique?*, in: *El misterio de la palabra*, Fs. L. Alonso Schökel, ed. V. Collado, E. Zurro, Madrid 1983, 283–301.
- Szymik S., *Współczesne metody analizy tekstu biblijnego na przykładzie Mk 5,1–20*, *RBL* 48(1995)2, 94–100.
- Wojciechowski M., *Jezus jako Święty w pismach Nowego Testamentu*, Warszawa 1996.