



Demonic possession and exorcism

A comparative study of two books that deal with the Klingenberg case

Geoffrey Fagge

Umeå universitet Vt16

Institutionen för idé och samhällsstudier

Religionsvetenskap III, Kandidatuppsats 15 hp

Handledare: Olle Sundström

ABSTRACT

This study examines how two writers deal with demonic possession and exorcism in their written works that both have a common theme, the same alleged case of possession and exorcism. By comparing these written works I explore if the authors share any common or varying theories on possession and exorcism and investigate if the common theme of the two books has contributed to the authors writing similar books.

My results show that the two authors deal with demonic possession and exorcism differently, one has theological views of the phenomena but is sceptical of their role in the alleged case, whilst the other believes that demonic possession and exorcism can be explained using scientific theories and that they are phenomena that played a part in the alleged case. The two books are quite different. I conclude that both writers' theories of the phenomena are dependent on the existence of the phenomenon of religion.

Keywords, authors, writers, demonic possession, exorcism, the alleged case, theological views, scientific theories and religion.

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 TWO PHENOMENA: DEMONIC POSSESSION AND EXORCISM	1
1.2 MY OWN INTEREST IN THE CHOSEN TOPICS.....	2
1.3 A BRIEF HISTORY OF EXORCISM WITHIN CHRISTIANITY	2
1.4 AN ALTERNATIVE MODERN-DAY UTILISATION OF EXORCISM.....	3
1.5 POSSESSION AND EXORCISM IN POPULAR CULTURE	4
1.6 THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER	4
1.7 A DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO AUTHORS AND THEIR BOOKS	5
1.8 QUESTIONS.....	7
1.9 MY OWN MOTIVATION AND SUBJECT CHOICE.....	7
1.10 METHOD.....	8
1.11 THE LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	12
1.12 OUTLINE OF THE PAPER	12
2 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	14
2.1 THE CASE THAT THE TWO BOOKS PRESENT.....	14
2.2 HOW THE MAIN PURPOSE OF EACH AUTHOR'S BOOK IS INDICATED AND A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE LAYOUT OF BOTH BOOKS	14
2.3 HOW THE TWO AUTHORS PRESENT DEMONIC POSSESSION AND EXORCISM IN THEIR BOOKS 17	
2.3.1 General definitions of possession according to Duffey and Goodman	17
2.3.2 How possession is presented by Duffey and Goodman in their accounts of the Klingenberg case.	19
2.3.3 General definitions of exorcism according to Duffey and Goodman	24
2.3.4 How exorcism is presented by Duffey and Goodman in their accounts of the Klingenberg case.	26
2.4 THEORIES OF THE MICHEL CASE THAT THE AUTHORS PRESENT	29
2.5 WHICH DIFFERENCES OR SIMILARITIES CAN BE FOUND IN THE TWO BOOKS?	32
2.6 ARE THE BOOKS DIFFERENT OR SIMILAR AND WHY?	36
2.7 HOW THE TWO BOOKS DEAL WITH MY TWO CHOSEN PHENOMENA.....	37
2.8 A DEEPER UNDERSTANDING	37
3 DISCUSSION	38
3.1 THE OBJECTIVITY OF THE TWO AUTHORS	38
3.2 MY EXPECTATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SOME UNEXPECTED FINDINGS	38
3.3 AN ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO BOOKS' MESSAGES	39
3.4 HOW I RELATED MY WORK TO ITS PURPOSE	39
3.5 MY FINDINGS AS A WHOLE AND WHAT THEY TELL ME	40

3.6 HOW MY METHOD HELPED ME AND ITS DIFFICULTIES	41
3.7 MY WORK	42
References	43

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 TWO PHENOMENA: DEMONIC POSSESSION AND EXORCISM

Throughout history there have been several reported cases of demonic possession,¹ a concept that exists within many religious belief systems, everything from ancient tribal religions and folk religions, to more organised and modern religions, such as the Abrahamic religions.² Demonic possession is a relevant concept around the world, even in today's modern religious climate. The ritual that is closely associated with the spiritual malady of possession is exorcism, which has many different forms and is performed by many different types of religious practitioners ranging from ordinary people and witch doctors to Catholic priests.³ Exorcism is also considered as a possible avenue of therapeutic aid by certain psychologists,⁴ since a patient's own conviction that he or she is possessed by a foreign entity such as a demon or spirit, could mean that exorcism could be a possible spiritual relief for such a spiritual belief.⁵ Christianity is intimately connected to demonic possession and exorcism, the casting out of demons from possessed people is one of the miracles that Jesus performed and is a recurring theme in the New Testament's canonical gospels. Nowadays, this aforementioned Christian connection between possession and exorcism remains apparent, for example, it is reported that Vatican State has recently seen an increase in cases of possession and sanctioned exorcisms.⁶ Exorcism is a ritual that is not only performed by the Catholic Church, it can be performed by many different people who may not necessarily belong to any form of religious organisation.⁷

¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. *How about Demons? Possession and Exorcism in the Modern World*. USA. Indiana university press, 1988. Foreword, XII & XIII. Levack, Brian, P. "The Horrors of Witchcraft and Demonic Possession." *Social Research*, Vol.81 Issue 4, 2014 winter. PP 921-939. 924 & 925 <https://muse-jhu-edu.proxy.ub.umu.se/article/566958/pdf> Accessed 2015/12/20, 22:22.

² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 1988. Foreword, XII – XIV & Preface, XV & XVI.

³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 1988. Foreword XII & XIII.

⁴ Rosik, Christopher, H. "Critical issues in the dissociative disorders field: Six perspectives from religiously sensitive practitioners." *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, vol 31. 2003. PP 113-128. 116 & 117 <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=849d0cb9-d2a2-4090-9be0-4de3f5b87bb3%40sessionmgr4003&vid=1&hid=4104> Accessed 2016/1/12, 10:42.

⁵ Thomason, Timothy, C. "Possession, Exorcism and Psychotherapy." Published online at Northern Arizona University. [www.shsu.edu http://www.shsu.edu/piic/winter2008/Thomason.html](http://www.shsu.edu/piic/winter2008/Thomason.html) Accessed 2016/1/12, 13:30.

⁶ Hafiz, Yasmine. 2014. The Huffington Post. *Exorcism Conference At Vatican Addresses The Need For More Demon-Fighting Priests*. [huffingtonpost.com, updated 2014/5/13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/05/13/exorcism-conference-rome-priests_n_5316749.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/05/13/exorcism-conference-rome-priests_n_5316749.html) Accessed 2015/12/21, 20:38.

⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 1988. Foreword, XIII. Levack, Brian, P. *The Devil Within: Possession and Exorcism in the Christian West*. Padstow, Cornwall, UK. Yale University Press, 2013. E-book. 242.

Additionally, exorcism's methods can vary greatly, depending on the religious traditions of different global practitioners.⁸ There also exists cases of exorcism that have caused death. An example of exorcism as a direct cause of death is, according to news sources, a case from 2007 in New Zealand. A young girl was drowned by her family who attempted to cleanse her of evil by performing an old Maori-style exorcism which involved force-feeding her copious amounts of water.⁹

1.2 MY OWN INTEREST IN THE CHOSEN TOPICS

That which interests me in regard to my chosen topics; demonic possession and exorcism is that even though they are concepts that I have difficulty believing in, there are still global reports of the two phenomena.¹⁰ There are also several researchers from such diverse disciplines as theology, anthropology, psychology and psychiatry that for a myriad of different reasons are interested in researching this affliction and its supposed remedy. To make this study of particular interest to myself, I have chosen an alleged case of demonic possession and exorcism that fits into two categories that are close to my heart, the twentieth century and Christianity. The first of these categories is the century during which I grew up, which is also a remarkable period for world history, an era that saw two world wars and the first man on the moon, the second category is the religion which I am nearest to, Christianity, since I grew up in a small English church village. The case of demonic possession and exorcism that falls within my two categories, is the alleged case of Anneliese Michel, Klingenberg, Germany 1976.¹¹

1.3 A BRIEF HISTORY OF EXORCISM WITHIN CHRISTIANITY

It is rather difficult to say for sure when the phenomenon of demonic possession began, but a logical estimation is that it existed before 100 AD, since it is mentioned in the New Testament which was compiled from texts that date back to a period between the First and Second

⁸ Meza, Jose, Magallanes. "Multiple personality disorder and demonic possession." Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree PhD in Psychology. California Graduate Institute of The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. December 2010. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. 143 & 144.

<http://search.proquest.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/docview/1515299553/> Accessed 2016/1/12, 23:41.

⁹ news.com.au (2009). *Family accused of killing Janet Moses during exorcism*. news.com.au, updated 2009/5/4. <http://www.news.com.au/breaking-news/family-accused-of-exorcism-killing/story-e6frfku0-1225708496912> Accessed 2015/12/22, 17:17.

¹⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 1988. Preface, XV & 42 – 126.

¹¹ Hansen, Eric, T. 2005. The Washington Post. *What in God's Name?!* washingtonpost.com, updated 2005/9/4, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/02/AR2005090200559.html/> Accessed 2015/12/22, 18:24.

centuries AD.¹² In the early stages of Christianity, exorcism was a spiritual power to expel demons from a victim, as Jesus had done in the New Testament, which was believed a blessing that any person could have, be it either a priest or a layman.¹³ Around the time of 250 AD, the early Christian Church appointed certain members of the lower clergy as exorcists, which took the power of exorcism from laymen and made it a special function of the church. Exorcism was also incorporated into baptism as a preparatory ritual¹⁴ a practice which the Catholic Church continues. A Vatican document which discusses the functions of exorcism differentiates between the ritual's use in baptism and the expulsion of demons, the former is described as exorcism's simple form while the latter is described as the solemn exorcism, which is only permitted to be carried out by a priest who has the express permission of his bishop.¹⁵ This is in accordance with canon 1172 of the code of canon law.¹⁶ The ritual of exorcism according to the Catholic Church is liturgical, which means that there is a set method for its execution, rather than an ad hoc series of varying prayers. Exorcism's early liturgical function is part of the litany of saints which was used since the seventh century.¹⁷ In 1614 the Church published its various liturgical practices which were carried out by priests, exorcism being one such practice. The publication is a compilation of the Roman Ritual, one book which includes all the liturgical liturgies which were previously listed in various texts.¹⁸

1.4 AN ALTERNATIVE MODERN-DAY UTILISATION OF EXORCISM

For me, an atheist, it is interesting that the two concepts still exist today in varying contexts, for example during my initial research of possession and exorcism, I realised that even researchers who are bound by scientific rules and guidelines are, like a great many people in the world, affected by religious beliefs. Incidentally, the thing that led me to this aforementioned revelation, was that I began to stumble across articles about and by certain

¹² Biblical literature. *Britannica Academic*. 2016.

<http://academic.eb.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/EBchecked/topic/64496/biblical-literature/73384/New-Testament-canon-texts-and-versions> Accessed 2016/5/18, 01:40.

¹³ Exorcism. *Britannica Academic*. 2016.

<http://academic.eb.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/EBchecked/topic/198273/exorcism> Accessed 16/18/5, 0:51.

¹⁴ Exorcism. *Britannica Academic*. 2016. Accessed 16/05/18, 11:09.

¹⁵ Vatican. 2016. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Vatican.va.

http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p2s2c4a1.htm Accessed 16/05/18, 00:00.

¹⁶ Vatican. 2016. *Code of Canon Law*. Vatican.va. http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_P48.HTM Accessed 16/05/18, 13:18.

¹⁷ Vatican. 2016. *Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*. Vatican.va.

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19850924_exorcism_en.html Accessed 16/05/18, 14:14.

¹⁸ Fortescue, Adrian. O'Connell, J. B. Reid, Alcuin. *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*. 15th edition. USA. Burn and Oates. 2009. E-book. 422.

psychologists and psychiatrists who held Christian beliefs or who researched spiritual concepts and were interested in my two chosen subjects. For example, a Christian psychologist named James G. Friesen, explains that it is beneficial for a patient undergoing treatment for dissociative identity disorder (DID) to undergo spiritual cleansing, lest the Devil should attack the patient's soul during his or her state of mental and spiritual weakness.¹⁹ Friesen's explanation is a reply to a question posed in an article, which I quote as follows; "What is the role of exorcism in the treatment of DID?"²⁰ I thought that this was quite an unusual question for a scientific article. When asked the same question another psychologist, Mungdaze states in his conclusion of the topic that; "This leads me to conclude that exorcism has a role in the treatment of some DID clients, whose clinical picture shows the need for it."²¹

1.5 POSSESSION AND EXORCISM IN POPULAR CULTURE

Possession and exorcism have a place within popular culture, various media such as novels, films and even music are inspired by the two phenomena. Two rather famous cases which allegedly involved demonic possession and exorcism during the twentieth century have both inspired fictional films, the case of Anneliese Michel which I have previously mentioned and the case of a boy in the USA, 1949 who was given the pseudonym Robbie to protect his identity.²² The popularity of Demonic possession and exorcism has caused them to have their own sub category within the horror genre, giving them their own place amongst other such popular groups as vampires, werewolves and Zombies.

1.6 THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAPER

The purpose of this study is to investigate, compare and discuss how two writers with contrasting professional backgrounds deal with my chosen topics of demonic possession and exorcism in their own books which are both written about the same alleged historical case and to also investigate, compare and discuss their actual books.

I shall fulfil my purpose by comparing the work of a representative of the Christian faith and the work of a representative of anthropology both of which deal with the same subject matter, the possession and exorcism of Anneliese Michel, and find and discuss similarities or differences in the contents of their respective works. The thing that makes the works of both these writers relevant to this study is that they both deal with my chosen subjects of demonic

¹⁹ Rosik, Christopher, H. 2003. 116. Accessed 2016/1/12, 13:07.

²⁰ Rosik, Christopher, H. 2003. 113. Accessed 2016/1/12, 13:19.

²¹ Rosik, Christopher, H. 2003. 117. Accessed 2016/1/12, 13:26.

²² Meza, Jose, Magallanes. 2010. 13 - 16. Accessed 2016/1/13, 02:22.

possession and exorcism. The thing that makes their work comparable is that it is written about the same controversial case of demonic possession and exorcism. The reason why this study is interesting is because the two authors come from different walks of life, a priest and an anthropologist. In this study I shall execute a comparative literature study of two books that deal with the case of Anneliese Michel, *The Exorcism of Anneliese Michel* by Felicitas D Goodman, (2005, first edition 1981), and *Lessons Learned: The Anneliese Michel Exorcism: The Implementation of a Safe and Thorough Examination, Determination, and Exorcism of Demonic Possession* by John M Duffey (2011). Goodman is an anthropologist²³ and Duffey is a priest.²⁴

This study allows me the unique chance to explore two existing views from two different authors from two different fields of expertise that deal with the same alleged case of demonic possession and exorcism. I am interested in finding any common theories that the two writers have on my chosen topics and the alleged historical case and am equally interested in finding out if their findings or opinions of these differ or have similarities. In this study I basically want to know how the authors deal with possession and exorcism and if by comparing them, I can decide if my two chosen books are similar or different and why.

The reason why I am carrying out this study is because demonic possession and exorcism are phenomena that are not easily explained²⁵ and I want to illustrate two possible explanations from two authors.

Additionally, I want to show two comparable examples of books that exist because of the same alleged case of possession and exorcism and investigate if their authors wrote similar books or not. This is a way to get a deeper understanding of the two authors' points of view in regards to my two chosen phenomena.

1.7 A DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO AUTHORS AND THEIR BOOKS

John M Duffey's book, *Lessons Learned: The Anneliese Michel Exorcism: The Implementation of a Safe and Thorough Examination, Determination, and Exorcism of Demonic Possession*, deals with the dangers of performing exorcism and uses the Michel case as an example of how

²³ The Cuyamungue Institute. 2016. *Anthropology*. Cuyamungue. The Felicitas D. Goodman Institute. <http://www.cuyamungueinstitute.com/the-work/anthropology/> Accessed 2016/6/5, 22:13.

²⁴ Duffey, John, M. *The Anneliese Michel Exorcism: The Implementation of a Safe and Thorough Examination, Determination, and Exorcism of Demonic Possession*. Eugene, Oregon, USA. WIPF and Stock Publishers, 2011. Preface, XV.

²⁵ Levack, Brian, P. 2013. 2, 6-31, 83 – 85, 240-248 & 113.

the ritual can sometimes go dangerously wrong. The book asks many moral questions regarding exorcism as the author guides the reader through not only the theological aspects of the ritual but also the practical issues such as exactly how an exorcist prepares, performs and follows up an exorcism. Important practical questions are also asked, such as, is its performance necessary for particular clients? There are many relevant issues in the book, such as possible personal problems that possession victims can have, for example, psychiatric illnesses and problematic family relationships. Duffey's work is quite comprehensive and a valuable tool for anyone who may want to learn about demonic possession and exorcism and gain new insights of aspects of Anneliese's traumatic possession. Duffey presents himself as a priest who has been with the Reformed Catholic Church of North America (RCCNA) since 2004.²⁶ The RCCNA does not take orders from the Vatican and is not a division of the Roman Catholic Church. It is an American Christian Church that operates independently of the worldwide leadership of the Pope.²⁷ Duffy describes his previous field of study, before he was ordained as a priest, as the research of paranormal activity.²⁸

Felicitas Goodman presents herself in the introduction section of her book *The Exorcism of Anneliese Michel*, as an anthropologist²⁹ and presents her credentials in the following way, "I speak as a trained researcher with twelve years' experience in the area of religious trances."³⁰ Goodman, presents her book in the manner of a story, a chronological journal of the ordeals that Anneliese Michel, her family and her friends went through. The use of Anneliese's diary gives the book an empathic view of how it could have been for Anneliese during her harrowing period of possession, such as the experienced frustration the young woman may have felt when she tried to appeal to the Catholic Church to help her with her experiences. Goodman explains that the Catholic Church needed evidence before an exorcism could be approved, which prolonged the woman's suffering. The author describes extensively the Klingenberg case from its beginning to its dramatic end which concluded in the death of the young woman and the legal investigation of her parents and the attending priests. Goodman's academic credentials are a doctorate in cultural anthropology and a master's degree in linguistics.³¹ Her research into

²⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XV.

²⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Author's Disclaimers, XII.

²⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XV.

²⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. *The Exorcism of Anneliese Michel*. 2005 edition. Eugene, Oregon, USA. Resource Publications. 2005. Introduction, XVII.

³⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Introduction, XVII.

³¹ The Cuyamungue Institute. 2016. *Felicitas Goodman*. Cuyamungue. The Felicitas D. Goodman Institute. <http://www.cuyamungueinstitute.com/who-we-are/felicitas-goodman/> Accessed 16/09/04, 19:39.

religious trance, a proposed state of consciousness that can be reached by certain individuals when practising their religion, resulted in Goodman proposing a new theory of the speech of possessed individuals. She believed that speech patterns of possessed people were not an alternative type of language caused by a possession experience which was the accepted anthropological view, but were instead caused by facial and bodily contortions, thusly affecting speech. Goodman validated her new theory, she demonstrated via fieldwork that even when syllables of possessed people were different, their speech patterns were fixed biological patterns that retained their phonetic features even during contortions.³²

1.8 QUESTIONS

Are the books different or similar and why is this so, how do they deal with my two chosen phenomena?

To answer this I shall ask the following question below

Which differences or similarities can be found in the two books?

Sub-questions that aid in finding differences or similarities

How do the two authors present the two phenomena; demonic possession and exorcism, in their books?

What is the main purpose of each author's work, how is this purpose indicated?

Which theories of the Michel case do the two authors present, why are these similar or different?

1.9 MY OWN MOTIVATION AND SUBJECT CHOICE

Even in our current era of advanced communication technology much of the information that we consume is presented in written form. Different pieces of written information can vary or be similar depending on the writer and their sources, this can even apply to written information that deals with the same topic. As a university student studying religion, I have worked with a great deal of written texts when I have been researching the history of different world religions, more often than not I would need to read several different accounts of an historical event to gain a clear picture of it for my own understanding. This has increased my interest in written

³² The Cuyamungue Institute. 2016. *Felicitas Goodman*. Cuyamungue. The Felicitas D. Goodman Institute. Accessed 16/09/04, 20:12.

texts and is why I find it fascinating to read alternative interpretations of alleged historical events and look for similar patterns or variations.

I am writing this paper as part of my university education in the subject of religion. I am interested in some of religion's darker aspects and possession and exorcism are phenomena which have a strong connection to religion and to me are quite frightening.

1.10 METHOD

My chosen method is to write my paper in the style of a comparison and contrast essay.³³ A description of the method used to write this certain type of essay is that it is an academic writing style³⁴ which helps to organise and present comparisons into manageable paragraphs so that it is easy to be able to see each thing that is being compared, rather than mixing them together in the same paragraphs or in an ad hoc manner throughout a written work, it is also known as comparative analysis.³⁵ This method helps to present a comparison in a manner that has three features, it aids in presenting similarities and differences between two or several sources, presenting source information accurately and also uses a thesis which therefore gives the comparison a purpose.³⁶ The method can be used to contrast and compare any two things that can be described in writing and can be argued for. The limitation of things which cannot be compared with this method lies in the imagination of its user. For instance, things which are difficult to describe such as sensory perceptions or feelings can be almost impossible to describe in a written text. However, another limitation of this method is that it is essential to place the two comparable things in a frame of reference when choosing a context for the comparison. This means that specific sources are often the best frame of reference to choose a context from, for example two sources which share a common theme such as the topic choice of possession and exorcism in this paper makes instances from the sources comparable. If this method is used in a paper without a frame of reference, the end result is that the writer has difficulty in finding an angle from which to present a reasonable argument for each thing that

³³ The Writing Centre, St. Mary's University, Halifax, Canada. 2010. *Comparison and Contrast Essays* (PDF). Saint Mary's University. smu.ca. <http://www.smu.ca/webfiles/ComparisonandContrastDec.2010.pdf> Accessed 16/05/20, 18:51. The Writing Lab & The OWL at Purdue and Purdue University, Indiana, USA. 1995-2016. *Writing in Literature: Writing the Prompt Paper*. purdue.edu <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/713/02/> Accessed 16/05/20, 19:30.

³⁴ Jamieson, Sandra. 1999. *Comparison Writing*. Drew University On-Line Resources for Writers. <https://users.drew.edu/~sjamieso/Comparison.htm> Accessed 16/09/04, 23:14.

³⁵ Walk, Kerry. 1998. *How to Write a Comparative Analysis*. Harvard College Writing Center. <http://writingcenter.fas.harvard.edu/pages/how-write-comparative-analysis> Accessed 16/09/05, 00:09

³⁶ Jamieson, Sandra. 1999. *Comparison Writing*. Drew University On-Line Resources for Writers. Accessed 16/09/04, 01:27.

shall be compared.³⁷ The perceivable change when using this method is that the two things that are compared and contrasted show similarities or differences that were previously difficult to perceive and the method also makes it possible to see familiar aspects of a comparative argument, but in a new light, from an unexpected angle which was not apparent before the two things were pitted against each other.

This method is used to illustrate how two parts from a text, paragraphs or sentences, are similar or different. It can also show how texts can at the same time be similar in some ways and different in others. The method is suitable for comparing theories, events or even books, as is the case with this essay. But not for intangible things that cannot be put into words. There is a specific method that is suitable for longer essays when writing a comparison and contrast essay, this is called the point by point method.³⁸ First a thesis is chosen, in my case this will concern content written by the two authors Duffey and Goodman. For example.

Duffey and Goodman both believe that X was instrumental in the Michel Case.

Then relevant parts of the two books that support the thesis are presented in groups of two, each one representing a view from each of my chosen authors.

For example.

- A) Information by Duffey that supports my thesis.
- B) The same for Goodman.

After the two views (A and B) of each author are presented, a discussion concerning similarities or differences is included. A, B and their relevant discussion are a *point*. Contrasting or similar information from two sources are presented in these small consecutive groups or points, making it easy to see a comparison. Additional groups of A and B with a discussion, or points, can be presented for a given thesis. These manageable segments, points are dealt with one at a time or point by point. This is why this particular method is called the point by point method.³⁹ When using this chosen method, the key to success is to choose a thesis that is according to statements of the two authors, things that they state on a given topic that can be confirmed and

³⁷ Walk, Kerry. 1998. *How to Write a Comparative Analysis*. Harvard College Writing Center. Accessed 16/09/05, 01:49.

³⁸ The Writing Centre, St. Mary's University, Halifax, Canada. 2010. *Comparison and Contrast Essays*. Accessed 16/05/20, 20:11.

³⁹ The Writing Centre, St. Mary's University, Halifax, Canada. 2010. *Comparison and Contrast Essays*. Accessed 16/05/21, 17:51.

backed up by relevant sources from the books.⁴⁰ My choice of thesis will involve me backwards engineering things which I already know for sure to have been stated by the authors and then using the information to create a relevant thesis, which means that any thesis I present is not guesswork, it is a statement concerning relevant facts from the two books. However, I shall only use the method where I deem it to be suitable as I desire to be able to freely present information.

I present next a concrete example of how I use this method in the result and analysis chapter of my work. However the arguments and discussions have been edited to save space, but it is rather simple to see the general idea of my method utilisation. The complete version of the example from my work can be read on pages twenty-one to twenty-three.

Example thesis

In Goodman's book, certain strange events are stated to have happened during Anneliese's possession, Goodman describes these events objectively. In Duffey's book, there is some mention of these events, but the descriptions carry the author's opinion.

Information by Goodman that supports my thesis

Goodman states that in the spring of 1973, Anneliese complained to her mother that she could hear knocking in her bedroom and that her mother said to Anneliese that she must have dreamt it because she did not hear it.

Information by Duffey that supports my thesis

When Duffey describes the alleged incident of strange noises, he introduces it as one of Anneliese's hallucinations and states that no one else in the house heard any such noise.

Discussion concerning similarities or differences

Goodman deals with the strange noises to describe how it may have been a frightening experience for Anneliese and her family, she gives no personal opinion of the alleged incident, whereas Duffey categorises the event as one of Anneliese's hallucinations which is an indication that he does not believe the event to be supernatural. *Example ends.*

My choice of method was influenced by my previous studies in English literature, during which I read about it and was interested in finding a suitable opportunity in which to use it.

⁴⁰ The Writing Centre, St. Mary's University, Halifax, Canada. 2010. *Comparison and Contrast Essays* Accessed 16/05/21, 18:18.

Alternatively, instead of relying entirely on the books of Duffey and Goodman, I could have interviewed the two authors and asked them to answer my study questions in person. This would have added an extra dimension with which to compare my own analysis. I considered this as an option during my research for this paper. Communication with the authors via the internet or telephone would have been my preferred method for the practical reason of avoiding travelling to meet them, which would have been a strain on my time constraints. However, I then discovered that Goodman had passed away⁴¹ in 2005,⁴² which meant that it would only be possible to reach Duffey for an interview and if he agreed my paper would be unbalanced. Another alternative method for my comparative study would be to execute it using a quantitative method, although this would be rather difficult and involve me deconstructing my study questions to fit criteria which could be easily observed and measured. For example, in how many occurrences in author A and author B's books are the phenomena of possession and exorcism dealt with in a positive manner? A quantitative question such as this would help me to get an idea for the authors' attitude towards the phenomena, but would not suffice in functioning alone. It would need several other questions to present a realistic representation of an answer to my question. However the nuances of how the phenomena are dealt with could easily be missed unless I presented a great deal of questions with which to cover all possible eventualities that reveal how the authors' deal with my chosen phenomena.

In regard to my own objectivity, I read the two books with an open mind and made a conscious effort to not be biased towards any of the two authors. Being an atheist does not restrict me in comparing two books that deal with a subject that I am rather sceptical towards, as religious phenomena such as possession and exorcism are particularly interesting to me, because they make my imagination run wild. My writing cannot be one hundred percent infallible because there must be cultural aspects of my own way of thinking that will cloud my judgement without me even being aware of it, but this applies to any person.

⁴¹ Duffey, John M. 2011. Preface, XIV.

⁴² Nauwald, Nana. 2005/2008. *Trance Ritual Body Postures and Ecstatic Trance*. [ecstatictrance.com](http://www.ecstatictrance.com)
<http://www.ecstatictrance.com/pages/trance.html> Accessed 16/09/05, 23:05

1.11 THE LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

As this study looks at the work of two authors, I wish to limit the scope of my analysis to the contents of both authors' books which I have chosen to compare. Therefore, I shall not discuss any opinions of these two writers, made by either the writers themselves or by third parties, which may exist outside of the books which I have chosen to analyse. Additionally, I shall not present the work of the two authors or any of my source references as my own and ensure that external sources have clear references.

1.12 OUTLINE OF THE PAPER

The first chapter of this paper, the introduction, presents the theme of the paper and describes the study that is executed and explains the purpose, method and study questions that are used to conduct the study. The first segment of chapter one, introduces demonic possession and exorcism and begins with a presentation of the two phenomena which is general and towards its conclusion puts emphasis on dangerous exorcism rituals. This chapter also has a short historical overview of exorcism within Christianity, an overview of an alternative utilisation of exorcism and a short discussion on demonic possession and exorcism in popular culture. These sections complete the introduction of the phenomena. Later, in this first chapter, the purpose of the study is stated as being a comparative investigation to find out how John M Duffey and Felicitas D. Goodman deal with demonic possession and exorcism in their respective works which are both written about the case of Anneliese Michel and to find out if the similarities of or the differences between the two works contribute towards similar or different books. Next, follows an overview of the two written works that are analysed in the paper and an introduction of the authors of the works which also includes a short description of their field of study and previous research. The paper's study questions are then stated. After this, a description of the method used in this paper's study is given which can be summarised as using comparative analysis to present the paper in the style of a comparison and contrast essay. A concrete demonstration of this chosen method, using excerpts from chapter two of this paper, is given.

In chapter two, results and analysis, the results of the comparative analysis of the two author's written works are presented, the study questions are also answered. The chapter begins by introducing the case that the two authors write about. A presentation of the layout of the author's books and the manner in which the authors reveal the main purpose of their respective works is presented next, this serves as the initial stage of identifying any common factors or differences between the two books. Next, the manner in which the two authors present the

chosen phenomena of demonic possession and exorcism in their books is given through comparison, this is a large section of the second chapter and utilises the method described in chapter one. Next, follows theories of the authors concerning the chosen phenomena and is a section which further utilises the paper's chosen method. After this, chapter two's results from the findings of the study questions are discussed with focus on differences and similarities between the two author's books and using this information it is determined whether the two books are similar or different, the information is also used to determine how the two authors deal with the two chosen phenomena. The chapter concludes with a discussion regarding the nuances of the findings from the comparative analysis.

Chapter three is the discussion chapter of the paper. The results of the main questions which were asked in the second chapter are discussed. This begins with a brief discussion concerning the two authors' objectivity. Next, the author of this paper's expectations of the comparative study are briefly mentioned and findings of particular interest are discussed. After this, an alternative way of interpreting the messages found in the two written works of the chosen authors is discussed. This is based on considering messages that relate to the two chosen authors' viewpoints of the chosen phenomena and the case of Anneliese Michel from the actual findings of the comparative analysis and considering them in regards to the phenomenon of religion. The following segment discusses how the study performed in the paper relates to the paper's purpose. The next segment which follows, presents the total findings of the study and discusses possible theories that can be gained from them. The penultimate segment of chapter three discusses the usage of the chosen method used in the paper. To conclude chapter three and the whole paper, there is a short segment that discusses if the paper represents an accurate interpretation of its purpose.

2 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

2.1 THE CASE THAT THE TWO BOOKS PRESENT

The two books present the alleged case of Anneliese Michel, otherwise known as the Klingenberg case.⁴³ Anneliese, who was born on the 21st of September 1952 and died on the 1st of July 1976, was part of a devout Catholic family who believed that demons had possessed her,⁴⁴ but she suffered from symptoms of epilepsy according to findings made by the courts which dealt with her case.⁴⁵ Two Catholic priests are alleged to have performed several exorcism rituals on Anneliese who was supposedly refusing to eat⁴⁶ the case ended in her death, the official cause being starvation.⁴⁷ Although, Michel was an adult who was legally responsible for her own well-being, negligent homicide through a failure to aid her was the criminal charge issued to two Catholic priests and Michel's parents, an indirect consequence of the exorcism sessions.⁴⁸

2.2 HOW THE MAIN PURPOSE OF EACH AUTHOR'S BOOK IS INDICATED AND A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE LAYOUT OF BOTH BOOKS

The title of Duffey's book, *Lessons Learned: The Anneliese Michel Exorcism, The Implementation of a Safe and Thorough Examination, Determination, and Exorcism of Demonic Possession*⁴⁹ gives the reader a clue to its purpose; that we can learn lessons by observing the case of Anneliese Michel, *Lessons Learned*⁵⁰ or that lessons ought to be learned. In any case it is a poignant title that requires one to think a little. The subtitle is fairly specific that the book suggests "The Implementation of a Safe and Thorough Examination, Determination, and Exorcism of Demonic Possession"⁵¹ although it is not that specific that it says exactly which purpose the book is intended for. In the preface section of the book in a segment under the header "Implementing a safe and thorough exorcism"⁵² Duffey points out that it was the Klingenberg case that was the reason behind him writing the book and that he believes that it is of paramount importance to correctly investigate suspected demonic

⁴³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XVIII.

⁴⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 40 – 81.

⁴⁵ Hansen, Eric, T. 2005. The Washington Post. *What in God's Name?!* Accessed 16/05/23, 21:55.

⁴⁶ Hansen, Eric, T. 2005. The Washington Post. *What in God's Name?!* Accessed 16/05/24, 17:07.

⁴⁷ Hansen, Eric, T. 2005. The Washington Post. *What in God's Name?!* Accessed 16/05/24, 18:36.

⁴⁸ Hansen, Eric, T. 2005. The Washington Post. *What in God's Name?!* Accessed 16/05/24, 18:53.

⁴⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Cover page.

⁵⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Cover page.

⁵¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Cover page.

⁵² Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XVIII.

possession, he also states the importance of every participant of an exorcism having their safety ensured, especially the possessed victim.⁵³ Duffey continues and states that an incorrectly diagnosed case of possession and a poorly conducted exorcism can be fatal.⁵⁴ Duffey introduces his book by stating that he is using the exorcism of Anneliese Michel “as an example of poor evaluative investigation that led to misdiagnosis of possession and negligent application of the exorcism rite.”⁵⁵ Duffey then discusses how his book has a section that deals with signs of possession that can actually be mental disorders and then he describes the final section that discusses “...a safe, ethical and effective approach to the performance of the exorcism rite.”⁵⁶ According to Duffey, his book is written for “clergy and members of the Christian faith”⁵⁷ and that many exorcists forget that one should take care of the physical needs of a possessed victim and not just the spiritual ones.⁵⁸ Duffey never explicitly states what his book is or its actual purpose. However, the book is written in the style of a handbook for exorcists, a guide to ensure the physical well-being of the possessed, Duffey even states that one of the book’s goals is to remind the clergy that they must be responsible for the physical well-being of people whom they are helping.⁵⁹ When I read Duffey’s book, I could see that the alleged historical events of the Klingenberg case were not the author’s prime concern, as only part one of the book⁶⁰ deals with them and uses them as a launch pad for the proceeding five parts of his book⁶¹ (which has six parts) which deals with different aspects of possession and exorcism both practical and theoretical and only uses the Michel case as a reference point, Duffey continually presents his own opinions in all the sections of his book. In the conclusion of his book⁶² Duffey elaborates on his theme of physical needs having the same importance as spiritual ones when he states that science and religion have over the years been adversaries, but are really two different ways to observe God’s creations, science is simply the discovery of divine creations whilst religion is the celebration of them.⁶³ A full understanding of God requires the acceptance of both the theological and scientific aspects of God’s universe, states

⁵³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XVIII.

⁵⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XVIII.

⁵⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XVIII.

⁵⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XIX.

⁵⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XIX.

⁵⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XIX.

⁵⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XVIII.

⁶⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 3-31.

⁶¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 35 - 213.

⁶² Duffey, John, M. 2011. 217 - 218.

⁶³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 217.

Duffey⁶⁴ because God exists in both spiritual and physical domains and so does the enemy, Lucifer and if we are to defeat the Devil we must be able to fight a war on two fronts, the spiritual and the bodily.⁶⁵

In contrast to Duffey's revealing title, Goodman's *The Exorcism of Anneliese Michel*⁶⁶ does not reveal any clue to the book's purpose. However, in the introduction section of her book Goodman states its purpose quite explicitly; that it is an alternate hypothesis of the things that happened to the young German woman, an alternative to the hypothesis that the court used to base its judgment on in the trials of the Klingenberg case.⁶⁷ Goodman states that her hypothesis factors in the experience of possession and its reality for the affected.⁶⁸ Her account of the alleged historical events of the Klingenberg case takes up the majority of her book⁶⁹ and is presented in a very objective way, as no references to any personal feelings or theories are included in the alleged events. The introduction and chapters nine, ten and the epilogue section (the book consists of an introduction, ten chapters and an epilogue) are a different story, Goodman uses chapter nine to introduce theories concerning the Religious Altered State of Consciousness (RASC)⁷⁰ and uses the Michel case as a reference to its different aspects, it is here that we first see the author's own opinions and that we begin to understand what she means by the book paying consideration to the experience of possession and its reality for the affected, as Goodman discusses how people experiencing RASC may act and behave during possession and refers to episodes from Anneliese's experiences to give examples. Chapter ten further expands on Goodman's scientific theories of RASC and also examines practical reasons in regards to why Anneliese Michel died. Goodman frequently indicates that a lack of understanding for religious experiences played its part in the Michel case, for example she states that in the court hearings of the case, there were perhaps no psychiatrists involved who had any idea about possession as a world-wide phenomenon that affects many people,⁷¹ another example of this is when Goodman describes how Anneliese's neurologist did not stop prescribing her medication when she told him about her religious experience.⁷² In her epilogue Goodman implies that Anneliese was a victim of a modern secular society that takes no

⁶⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 218.

⁶⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 218.

⁶⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Cover page.

⁶⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Introduction XVII.

⁶⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Introduction XVII.

⁶⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 1 - 199.

⁷⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 223.

⁷¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Introduction, XIV.

⁷² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 80.

consideration to religious matters,⁷³ when she states, that Anneliese “fell victim to the demons of her age. And for them there is no exorcism.”⁷⁴

2.3 HOW THE TWO AUTHORS PRESENT DEMONIC POSSESSION AND EXORCISM IN THEIR BOOKS

Both phenomena are presented in two ways by both books, they are defined in general terms and presented as phenomena that play a role in the Klingenberg case.

2.3.1 General definitions of possession according to Duffey and Goodman

The two authors have views of how possession is defined that differ, but both authors have two similar aspects of their definitions that are apparent.

Goodman’s definition of possession is that it is an experience that is due to a person being in the Religious Altered State of Consciousness (RASC)⁷⁵ a state that is often caused by a religious experience. Goodman proposes RASC as an addition to the three traditional states of consciousness being awake, dreamless sleep and dreaming whilst sleeping.⁷⁶ A belief in the Devil is not a prerequisite for becoming possessed, states Goodman, as Pentecostal believers often experience possession by the Holy Ghost.⁷⁷ Possession as a phenomenon is recognised by Western psychiatry according to Goodman, and “...has assembled quite a body of theory about possession, most of it with the idea in mind that it is definitely very sick.”⁷⁸ Goodman states that psychological anthropology is interested in defining the phenomenon of possession and refers to the work of Bourguignon⁷⁹ a researcher in the above mentioned field of discipline, who believes that possession often affects women more than it does men, especially women raised in Catholic communities who often lack independence and use possession as a way of gaining power and attention.⁸⁰

Duffey’s definition of possession is according to Christianity as it refers to both Catholic and Protestant definitions.⁸¹ He summarises the Catholic definition by stating; “Generally, demonic possession is defined as the entering into and controlling of a human body by Satan or other

⁷³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 251.

⁷⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 251

⁷⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 223.

⁷⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 223.

⁷⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 223.

⁷⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 223.

⁷⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 223.

⁸⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 224.

⁸¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 35 – 40.

demonic entity.”⁸² Demonic possession is feasible only to Catholics who believe that the Devil and his demons can only manifest in spiritual form and not in a physical, argues Duffey and continues by stating that if a physical form of Satan or demons could exist on earth, then the need for possession would be redundant, but a spiritual manifestation of evil could possibly use a human as a vessel. Intelligent beings who use possession in a tactical way is how Duffey describes Satan and his host of demons⁸³ who use possession sparingly so as not to waste energy and whose preference is possessing individuals with power and influence over many.

Duffey’s Protestant definition is that the Devil enters the human body but does not possess it. The person is instead influenced and tempted by Satan and that the ritual of casting out demons is known as a deliverance service, which expels the satanic influence. Prevailing Protestant conceptions of demonic infestation are that evil forces can enter the thoughts of people whose minds and deeds attract evil and that possession can thusly be described as a form of sin.⁸⁴ When describing how possession is an existing phenomenon that is recognised by the scientific community, Duffey states the following “Psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and priests all agree that people do experience what is often described as demonic possession.”⁸⁵ Duffey continues by stating that even if the aforementioned professions may or may not agree on the legitimacy of possession, they all agree that it is an experience that is real to the victim.⁸⁶

The main difference between the two authors’ definitions of possession is that Duffey focuses on a Christian definition and Goodman focuses on possession being an experience brought on by RASC, a proposed additional state of mind which itself is caused by religious experience. However, both of the above differences have a similarity, both aspects are dependent on the existence of the phenomenon known as religion. The definitions differ greatly in terms of a demonic aspect, in both Duffey’s Catholic and Protestant definitions, the Devil and his demons play a pivotal role, whereas Goodman shows that even within Christianity, Satan is not a necessary belief for a person to become possessed, the example with possession by the Holy Ghost is her argument for this. Another similar aspect is that both authors refer to possession as an existing phenomenon that is acknowledged by different disciplines. Goodman refers to psychiatry and anthropology acknowledging possession as an existing phenomenon and Duffey refers to psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists and priests doing the same. A critical

⁸² Duffey, John, M. 2011. 36.

⁸³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 36 -37.

⁸⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 39.

⁸⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 45.

⁸⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 45.

aspect of these two points of view is that they both lack quality in their arguments, the writers would have a better case for their arguments if they presented them scientifically, with hard evidence with which to support them. Duffey's argument is made as a standalone statement without anything to back it up, as is Goodman's when she refers to psychiatry having theories on possession which are derogatory, she fails to include the actual psychiatric theories in her statement.

2.3.2 How possession is presented by Duffey and Goodman in their accounts of the Klingenburg case.

The initial incidents

Both authors describe Anneliese Michel's possession as a gradual process during which the young woman's mental and physical health deteriorated due to certain alleged incidents that happened to Anneliese between 1968 and 1976. However, the authors have very different methods in regards to how they begin presenting these incidents.

Goodman earmarks two incidents, which allegedly took place around the time of Anneliese's sixteenth birthday at the start of the new school term of 1968 to 1969, as the first ones in her list of problems.⁸⁷ The first is that Anneliese blacked out whilst sitting by her desk at school⁸⁸ and the second is that during the night after the first incident she experienced paralysis, which was strong enough to wake her and felt like an invisible force was pressing down on her abdomen which made her urinate. When she told her mother, Anna, about it the next day, she was given permission to take the day off from school. As these were isolated incidents, Anneliese soon forgot about them.⁸⁹ Goodman is subtle when first introducing these incidents she does not make the reader aware that they are the first of many to follow⁹⁰ one can only see this by continuing to read her book.⁹¹

Duffey also uses the same two alleged incidents⁹² as Goodman uses to describe the beginning of Anneliese's problems, albeit that he describes the first as a "trancelike state".⁹³ He also states the same outcome as Goodman; that Anneliese soon forgot about the incidents.⁹⁴ However,

⁸⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 13 - 175.

⁸⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 13.

⁸⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 14.

⁹⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 13.

⁹¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 13 - 175.

⁹² Duffey, John, M. 2011. 5.

⁹³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 5.

⁹⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 5.

Duffey introduces these incidents in a quite candid way, he is discussing how Anneliese was a healthy young woman who took pleasure in athletic sports when he states the following “But, this was soon to change drastically when she experienced her first of many symptoms that would come to be medically identified as epileptic seizures and spiritually misidentified as demonic possession.”⁹⁵ Directly after the aforementioned citation, Duffey then proceeds to describe Anneliese’s school and night-time incidents.⁹⁶

Duffey and Goodman both choose the school blackout and the subsequent night terror as their alleged incidents that show the earliest signs of anything being wrong with Anneliese and also use them as initial incidents from a list of many in their descriptions of Anneliese’s decline. The difference between how the authors use their chosen information is that before Duffey begins to present these two events, he is clear that he believes that Anneliese was not a victim of demonic possession, Goodman simply presents the two alleged events without any personal opinion. This is an indication that Duffey is sceptical in regards to demonic possession being the reason behind the two stated events and believes that the role that possession played in the Klingenburg case was, according to his own words, a spiritual misidentification.⁹⁷

Possession is suggested by a third party

According to Duffey and Goodman, Anneliese was not the person who first suggested that she was possessed. When describing this alleged information, both authors use it for a different purpose.

Duffey describes how Anneliese had suffered a recurrence of her trancelike state and the night terrors⁹⁸ and that her mother, Anna, was probably desperate for people not to believe that her daughter was suffering from mental illness.⁹⁹ Duffey continues by stating that Thea Heinz, who was a member of the church (the church is not specified by Duffey) and a good friend of Anna, suggested that Anneliese could be a victim of demonic possession and that Anna seized this idea since it freed her of blame for Anneliese’s condition.¹⁰⁰ The author describes this event as a turning point for Anneliese because her unexplained symptoms were suddenly perceived as signs of demonic possession, and as her seizure-like illness continued and worsened, it became

⁹⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 5.

⁹⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 5.

⁹⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 5.

⁹⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 10.

⁹⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 10.

¹⁰⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

easier for members of her family and church to believe that Anneliese was suffering at the hands of the Devil.¹⁰¹

Goodman describes how Thea Hein (a different surname for Thea than Duffey uses) contacts Father Rodewyk of Frankfurt and describes Anneliese's behaviour during a pilgrimage which she had taken with her father.¹⁰² Anneliese had shown aversion to religious symbols such as a shrine and a picture of Christ and spoken to Hein using a man's voice.¹⁰³ Rodewyk then suggests that Hein should send a letter to him, detailing her observations of Anneliese's behaviour during the pilgrimage. Rodewyk's answer to this letter was that he believed that Anneliese was possessed.¹⁰⁴ He then suggests that it would be possible for Anneliese to visit Father Herrman in Aschaffenburg.¹⁰⁵ Hein tells Josef, Anneliese's father about Herrman, Josef then contacts Herrman who agrees to talk to Anneliese.¹⁰⁶ According to Goodman, Anneliese and Herrman had around ten meetings during which Anneliese would complain about seeing visions of nasty faces and not feeling herself.¹⁰⁷

The similarities here are that according to both Duffey and Goodman, possession is first suggested by someone other than Anneliese and that Thea Hein was involved in such a suggestion. The differences are that Duffey explicitly states that Heinz came up with the idea, whilst Goodman only implies that Hein may have suggested this, but is explicit in naming Rodewyk as the person who made the suggestion. Duffey's purpose for using the alleged information on Heinz (a surname that differs between authors) is to state that her suggestion of possession was a catalyst which made Anneliese's family and members of the church explain her illness and behaviour as signs of demonic possession. Goodman's purpose is more neutral, she shows how for the first time Anneliese discussed her problems with a member of the clergy.

Various phenomena

In Goodman's book, certain strange events are stated to have happened during Anneliese's possession, Goodman describes these events objectively. In Duffey's book, there is some mention of these events, but the descriptions carry the author's opinion.

¹⁰¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

¹⁰² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 41.

¹⁰³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 33 - 36.

¹⁰⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 41.

¹⁰⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 42.

¹⁰⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 42.

¹⁰⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 42.

Goodman states that in the spring of 1973, Anneliese complained to her mother that she could hear knocking in her bedroom¹⁰⁸ and that her mother said to Anneliese that she must have dreamt it because she did not hear it.¹⁰⁹ The author states that Anneliese kept insisting that she had heard knocking until her mother finally suggested that she should see a doctor named Vogt to check her hearing.¹¹⁰ Anneliese and her mother visited Vogt who found nothing unusual with the young woman's hearing, but referred her to a specialist who also found that nothing was wrong.¹¹¹ When Anna described this to Joseph, Anneliese's father he said that he expected as much because he thought that his daughter was slightly mad.¹¹² According to Goodman, Anna then said that other family members had also heard noises such as rapping or the noise of a chair falling and noises that sounded like knocking from inside wardrobes, under the floorboards and from the ceiling.¹¹³ Goodman states that Anna believed that the noises could mean that something supernatural was going on.¹¹⁴

When Duffey describes the alleged incident of strange noises, he introduces it as one of Anneliese's hallucinations¹¹⁵ and states that no one else in the house heard any such noise. He also tells of Anna and Anneliese visiting Vogt and a hearing specialist and that her tests showed no problems.¹¹⁶ Duffey states that Anna had at first not heard any noises, but after Thea Heinz's suggestion of demonic possession,¹¹⁷ she too began to hear noises.¹¹⁸

Another example of an alleged strange occurrence which is described by Goodman is that after Anneliese had gone through the ordeal of her first exorcism, she started seeing clouds of flies that would suddenly disappear and small shadowy animals that ran to and fro.¹¹⁹ Goodman states that eventually Anneliese's family started to see them too.¹²⁰

¹⁰⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 30.

¹⁰⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 30.

¹¹⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 30.

¹¹¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 30.

¹¹² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 30.

¹¹³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 30.

¹¹⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 30 & 31.

¹¹⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

¹¹⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

¹¹⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

¹¹⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

¹¹⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 83.

¹²⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 83.

Duffey's description of this event is that Father Alt, who was one of the priests who exorcised Anneliese, described seeing a cloud of flies and small scurrying shadowy animals.¹²¹ Duffey comments that this literally could be described as scene from a film.¹²²

Goodman deals with the strange noises to describe how it may have been a frightening experience for Anneliese and her family, she gives no personal opinion of the alleged incident, whereas Duffey categorises the event as one of Anneliese's hallucinations which is an indication that he does not believe the event to be supernatural. He also uses the incident to help confirm his previous theory that Heinz's suggestion of possession caused Anneliese and her family to believe that possession was the young woman's problem and blames this suggestion for causing Anna to hear the noises. Duffey's description varies from Goodman's, he specifically picks out Anna as the other person than Anneliese who heard the noises, while Goodman refers to Anna stating that *other* family members heard them. The information about flies and shadowy animals differs greatly in how it is presented by the two Authors, Duffey implies that Father Alt's description of this is somewhat unbelievable, Goodman just mentions that it was something that started happening to Anneliese and then her family. The author, unlike Duffey, does not provide her own opinion of the information.

Anneliese's possession

When describing how Anneliese's alleged possession affected her, Goodman goes into great detail in describing the young woman's suffering during the summer of 1975 and does this in a way that is descriptive and free from any of the author's personal views. In contrast, Duffey focuses on a different aspect when describing Anneliese's life during the same time period.

Goodman describes how in August 1975, which was the period between her first minor exorcism and the solemn one which would take place in the following month, September, Anneliese was in a state of torment where sleep was almost impossible¹²³ and that she would sometimes repeatedly pray forgiveness from Christ for a whole day.¹²⁴ The author states that Anneliese would hurt herself by jumping into a kneeling position, back up to her feet and then again onto her knees until they were swollen.¹²⁵ Goodman claims that during periods of physical agitation, Anneliese would display an increase in muscle power that was almost

¹²¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 21.

¹²² Duffey, John, M. 2011. 21.

¹²³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 81.

¹²⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 81.

¹²⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 81 & 82.

superhuman, one example of this is when she leaped up, grabbed her sister and threw her to the floor like a doll.¹²⁶

Never once in his alleged historical account of the Klingenburg case does Duffey describe Anneliese's situation by mentioning her behaviour in any great detail, he instead summarises her situation.¹²⁷ His depiction of Anneliese's life around August 1975 is no exception and lacks an in-depth description of the young woman's behaviour,¹²⁸ he instead mentions how Bishop Stangl of the Catholic Church failed to demand any documentation of Anneliese's mental health when he issued an authorisation allowing the girl to be exorcised.¹²⁹ According to Duffey such documentation would have not shown the girl to be possessed and would instead have shown her to be mentally unstable.¹³⁰

These two instances that depict August 1975 show a difference in the two authors' styles, Goodman goes into as much detail as possible in describing Anneliese's plight and gives no reason or explanation for her behaviour, whilst Duffey does not try to depict what may have happened to her in any detail, at least not in the style of Goodman, but instead focuses on his own interpretation of how she was not possessed but was mentally ill. It is interesting to see how the two authors have a different focus when describing the alleged events of 1975.

2.3.3 General definitions of exorcism according to Duffey and Goodman

The two authors' general definitions of exorcism display a contrast, Duffey's definition is according to Catholic dogma whilst Goodman attempts to give a scientific explanation. Nevertheless, there are similarities in their definitions.

Duffey's general definition of exorcism refers to it from a Catholic viewpoint, as a rite that is performed in accordance with the Roman Ritual.¹³¹ He speaks of piety and humility as being the most important qualities of a priest who shall perform an exorcism¹³² and also that the priest should not be young and have a great deal of experience in matters of both the Church and in worldly ones.¹³³ Interestingly enough, he also mentions that a priest who was involved in

¹²⁶ Goodman, Felicitas D. 2005. 82.

¹²⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 3-31.

¹²⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹²⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹³⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹³¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 48 – 54.

¹³² Duffey, John, M. 2011. 48.

¹³³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 48.

Anneliese's exorcism was too young and unstable for the task.¹³⁴ To not seek fame or recognition is also a quality that a priest should possess according to Duffey's reference to the Roman Ritual.¹³⁵ After stating this Duffey continues by elaborating on his own idea that one of the priests who exorcised Anneliese, Father Alt, wanted to be involved in an exorcism to give him the chance to write books and give lectures about his experience.¹³⁶

According to the Ritual Romanum, as stated by Duffey "The actual Roman exorcism ritual consists of eleven prayers and seventeen biblical text readings."¹³⁷ The ritual takes between twenty and twenty-four minutes to perform, but must be repeated several times in order to ascertain that the demons have truly left the victim and also that the exorcism should be carried out in a Church or holy ground, adds Duffey.¹³⁸ He then continues by stating that the Roman Ritual advises that an exorcism can be held at the sufferer's home if physical or mental illness prevents a journey to the church.¹³⁹ Duffey argues that this advice ignores any mental illness of the possessed and that Fathers Alt and Renz who exorcised Anneliese took advantage of this and did not pay heed to Anneliese's worsening physical health or mental well-being and continued to exorcise her.¹⁴⁰

Goodman describes exorcism as a ritual that serves as a means of changing the brain activity of a sufferer of possession from a mode that is holistic to one that is more linear.¹⁴¹ According to her theory of RASC, people who go through a religious experience such as possession process external stimuli in a holistic manner.¹⁴² This is in contrast to what Goodman states as the human brain's manner of processing stimuli during ordinary consciousness, which she describes as linear.¹⁴³ She also states that it is likely that people have for a long time known that it is possible to teach our brains how to switch from a holistic mode to a linear.¹⁴⁴ Goodman states that this requires manipulation of the mind and that religious rituals serve to do this.¹⁴⁵ The time constraints of the exorcism ritual are the first way in which the ritual begins to change the brain's processing from a holistic mode to a linear by introducing a situation that consists

¹³⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 48.

¹³⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 48 & 49.

¹³⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 49.

¹³⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 50.

¹³⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 50 & 51.

¹³⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 51.

¹⁴⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 51.

¹⁴¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 229.

¹⁴² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 227.

¹⁴³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 227.

¹⁴⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 228.

¹⁴⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 228.

of a linear structure, states Goodman,¹⁴⁶ a ritual which as a beginning, middle and end. At the start of the ritual, the victim is expected to display their altered, possessed state¹⁴⁷ through a type of expectation which Goodman describes as “cultural suggestion”.¹⁴⁸ She explains that people can easily enter into a religious trance and that this was likely when people close to Anneliese began experiencing strange phenomena¹⁴⁹ and further elaborates on the aforementioned expectation and how Anneliese would go into a religious trance and begin speaking in demon voices, when she knew she would be exorcised or was going to be the focus of an audio recording.¹⁵⁰ However, Goodman does not include any explanation as to how the middle and end sequences of an exorcism affect the victim’s mental processes.

The similarity in these definitions of exorcism is that both authors both authors describe exorcism as some form of event, namely a ritual and both refer to the Klingenberg case. One difference is that Duffey’s definition is Catholic and Goodman’s refers to anthropological research into RASC, another difference concerns Duffey and Goodman’s respective methods of using the Michel case to help explain exorcism which can be described as accusation contra explanation, as Duffey uses his own interpretation of the Roman Ritual to direct an accusation towards the two priests involved in the Michel exorcisms, whilst Goodman tries to explain the Michel case with research that she believes in, for example her theories on mental processes. This comparison also shows that Duffey accuses both priests of negligence and also speculates that Father Alt was planning to do the rounds in Academia with the Michel case as his showpiece.

2.3.4 How exorcism is presented by Duffey and Goodman in their accounts of the Klingenburg case

The priests

Duffey and Goodman both state that two Catholic priests were involved in the exorcism rituals of the Klingenburg case, but the priests have different roles in both Duffey and Goodman’s alleged accounts.

¹⁴⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 229 & 230.

¹⁴⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 230.

¹⁴⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 230.

¹⁴⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 230.

¹⁵⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 230.

Duffey states that Fathers Alt and Renz were involved in Anneliese's exorcisms.¹⁵¹ He also states that the Bishop of Würzburg, Josef Stangl gave Father Alt written permission to perform solemn exorcism on Anneliese¹⁵² and that Father Renz was the assistant exorcist.¹⁵³

Goodman also states that Fathers Alt and Renz were involved in Anneliese's exorcisms.¹⁵⁴ However, she states that the Bishop of Würzburg gave Father Renz written permission to perform solemn exorcism on Anneliese.¹⁵⁵ She also states that a group of priests including Father Alt agreed that Renz would be a suitable alternative to Alt as the exorcist, as it would be impractical for Alt to travel 120 kilometres every day from his home in Ettleben to the Michel household in Klingenburg.¹⁵⁶ Father Alt was responsible for requesting permission from Bishop Stangl for Renz to be the exorcist according to Goodman.¹⁵⁷

It is interesting to observe how alleged information can be so different according to the works of two authors. Namely, the disagreement as to who played the role of the exorcist in the Klingenburg case. Goodman states Renz whilst Duffey states Alt. Both authors also state a differing secondary role for each priest, Duffey refers to Renz as an assistant exorcist, whereas Goodman's stated secondary role for her chosen priest is Alt's role as the person who reached out and appealed to Bishop Stangl to appoint Renz as exorcist.

The exorcisms

Goodman's book gives detailed accounts of the exorcism sessions that Anneliese allegedly was privy to, the author does this without criticising the attending priests. Duffey's book in comparison devotes little space to any detailed account of the alleged exorcisms and instead summarises the alleged events and criticises the exorcisms by stating that they were dangerous.

Goodman catalogues an in-depth collection of descriptions of the various exorcism rituals that allegedly took place during 1975 and 1976,¹⁵⁸ for example on August 3rd 1975, a minor exorcism was held, since the bishop had not at that time given permission for a solemn one.¹⁵⁹ Father Alt allegedly performed this ceremony. Goodman goes into detail and describes how

¹⁵¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface XV & 29.

¹⁵² Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹⁵³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 29.

¹⁵⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 88 - 90.

¹⁵⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 89 & 90.

¹⁵⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 88.

¹⁵⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 88 & 89.

¹⁵⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 80 - 175.

¹⁵⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 80.

Anneliese said “Stop! It’s burning”¹⁶⁰ when Alt recited the exorcism.¹⁶¹ According to Goodman Alt believed the exorcism helped Anneliese, but he still had concerns about Anneliese being attacked by demons.¹⁶² Another example of Goodman’s level of detail in her descriptions of the exorcisms is the first solemn exorcism on the 24th September 1975.¹⁶³ Goodman states that Renz went over to the Michel residence and met Anneliese and her parents and that everything seemed normal in regards to Anneliese.¹⁶⁴ The exorcism is described using alleged information from Father Renz’s diary accounts¹⁶⁵ and tells of a ritual that lasted for sixteen hours, involved the girl being physically restrained which was for her own and the attendees safety, involved the young woman howling like a dog and complaining that the Devil was sitting on her back.¹⁶⁶

Duffey’s description of the alleged events of the minor exorcism¹⁶⁷ gives no details as to what may have happened and only mentions that the exorcism took place on August 3rd 1975 and that Father Alt believed that Anneliese had benefitted from the ritual, but was also worried about the possible occurrence of “further demonic molestations”.¹⁶⁸ Duffey only describes that the solemn exorcism, the first exorcism, would take place in September 24th 1975¹⁶⁹ and gives hardly any further detail of it, except to mention that Renz met with the Michels (Duffey is unclear as to when this alleged meeting took place) and did not observe any evidence of demonic possession in regards to Anneliese.¹⁷⁰ Duffey then proceeds to state that from September 1975 till her death in July 1976, Anneliese would be involved in a great many exorcisms that were kept a secret and did not help her and that during this time, she had lost her desire for eating and became thin, but was not helped by her family or the attending priests.¹⁷¹

In this comparison of Anneliese’s first two alleged exorcisms I see that Goodman and Duffey have similar aspects, the dates for each of the alleged events are in agreement and Father Alt performed the minor exorcism. However, this is where the similarity ends. This is due to Duffey’s lack of detail, for example, he states that Father Renz visited the Michels but is not

¹⁶⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 81.

¹⁶¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 81.

¹⁶² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 81.

¹⁶³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 95 & 96.

¹⁶⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 93 & 94.

¹⁶⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 95.

¹⁶⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 95 & 96.

¹⁶⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹⁶⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹⁶⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹⁷⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹⁷¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 15.

specific if this was a precursory event of the second exorcism or not, the reader is left guessing, Goodman's book gives a far deeper documentation and even refers to Father Renz's diary for the description of the solemn exorcism. Events between 1975 and 1976 are described very differently by Duffey and Goodman. When describing the period of time when the alleged exorcisms took place, Duffey states that they did not help Anneliese and implies that the attending priests did nothing to aid the young woman's welfare and that the exorcisms of the Klingenberg case were harmful to Anneliese. This is a period of time that is described in one paragraph by Duffey, in comparison Goodman's documentation of the exorcisms that allegedly took place between 1975 and 1976 takes up 95 pages.¹⁷²

2.4 THEORIES OF THE MICHEL CASE THAT THE AUTHORS PRESENT

According to both Goodman and Duffey, Anneliese visited a doctor named Lenner for psychotherapy. Both authors state that the doctor believed that Anneliese had strict parents and that this was problematic for Anneliese, each author uses this alleged information in a quite different way.

Goodman describes how Anneliese had various complaints such as nocturnal seizures and visions of grotesque faces.¹⁷³ These complaints led to her becoming depressed and visiting Dr Lenner to try and help her with her depression.¹⁷⁴ When describing Anneliese's conversation with Lenner concerning her relationships with her parents, Goodman states that Lenner perceived her as a classic case of someone who was suffering from a neurosis which had been building up for quite some time and was caused by her parents, a father who did not understand her and a mother whom she had a powerful feeling of hate towards.¹⁷⁵ Directly after this segment, Goodman describes how Anneliese visited a Dr Schleip at a neurological clinic who told her that she had brainwave patterns that were similar to those associated with epilepsy.¹⁷⁶ The author then discusses how, according to Lenner, all of Anneliese's problems were probably psychological in their origins and how, according to Schleip, they probably originated from a problem with her brain. Goodman reasons that it was probably frustrating for Anneliese to visit different specialists and still get no real help in alleviating her symptoms.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 80 - 175.

¹⁷³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 14 – 18.

¹⁷⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 51 & 52.

¹⁷⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 52.

¹⁷⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 53.

¹⁷⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 53.

Duffey also mentions that Lenner believed Anneliese was suffering from a neurosis which was rooted in her problematic relationship with her parents, namely a lack of understanding from her father and hate towards her mother.¹⁷⁸ The author then continues to discuss how this poor parental relationship could have progressed until Anneliese's feelings towards her mother and father became particularly adverse, especially towards her mother. The culmination of this, according to Duffey, may have resulted in Anneliese harbouring murderous thoughts about her mother, a result of which may have led to a feeling of guilt which in turn could have later manifested itself in Anneliese's creation of the alter ego of Cain which she displayed during her so called possession.¹⁷⁹ Duffey explains this connection by mentioning that Cain was forced to bear guilt for the remainder of his life after he murdered Abel.¹⁸⁰

Goodman and Duffey both use Anneliese's alleged visit with Dr Lenner as a bridge that leads to something else, Goodman uses this bridge to elaborate on how frustrated Michel probably felt, that neither a doctor nor a neurologist had any answers to her problems and Duffey uses the information for his own explanation to Anneliese's manifestation of an alter ego. Both of these views are rather speculative, but show how both authors believe that Anneliese was depressed. However, Duffey's view is the more elaborate of the two and makes use of the Lenner visit in a way that Goodman's does not, by stating that Anneliese's alter personality was a manifestation of guilt he discredits the theory that Anneliese was possessed by demons. This is one of many examples of how Duffey constantly maintains an opinion that Anneliese was not a victim of demonic possession, but a young woman with psychological illness. He asserts this view even from the very beginning of his book, in the preface¹⁸¹ he asserts that Anneliese was "suffering from a combination of epilepsy and mental illness."¹⁸²

In contrast to Duffey's mental illness theory, Goodman believes that Anneliese's possession can be explained as a religious experience, a part of RASC.¹⁸³ For Anneliese possession trance, a trance state which often involves the mimicking of a different or alien personality, was likely, according to Goodman.¹⁸⁴ She also states that Anneliese was a hypersensitive, a person who has an over stimulated nervous system which is more sensitive than most other people's¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 26.

¹⁷⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 27.

¹⁸⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 27.

¹⁸¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XV.

¹⁸² Duffey, John, M. 2011. Preface, XV.

¹⁸³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 217, 202-239 & 242 – 248.

¹⁸⁴ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 224.

¹⁸⁵ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 202.

which amplified the intensity of her religious experience and caused an exaggerated emotional state¹⁸⁶ and even hallucinations such as visions.¹⁸⁷ Goodman believes that the religious altered state of consciousness is not an indication of mental illness and is a quite normal human activity.¹⁸⁸

In regards to the reasons the authors give for Anneliese's alleged possession there is a similarity, both writers do not believe that a demonic force had entered her. Duffey's believed reason is mental illness together with epilepsy and Goodman's is various religious experiences which may be due to Anneliese having had an over sensitive nervous system. Duffey and Goodman both use their stated reasons to their own advantage, in the case of Duffey this is to promote his message of safe exorcisms, an ongoing theme in his book whereas Goodman uses the chance to promote theories of RASC. The difference between these two theories is that Goodman believes that Anneliese's behaviour was nothing out of the ordinary for someone in the state of RASC whereas Duffey believes that Anneliese's alleged possession was a sign of mental illness.

Duffey and Goodman have differing theories as to why Anneliese died. Duffey is accusative towards the priests and their failure to help her, he states that there is information in the Roman Ritual that requires a possessed victim to fast and speculates that the priests who exorcised Anneliese may have been starving her to drive out Satan. He also speculates that this would explain their lack of willingness to get the young woman medical help.¹⁸⁹ Goodman points out that medication called Tegretol, that Anneliese was taking which was prescribed to her by Doctor Schleip at the medical services of Würzburg University,¹⁹⁰ has a dangerous side effect and alters blood cells.¹⁹¹ Goodman has a theory that Anneliese's refusal to eat may have been caused by this drug¹⁹² and that her death was actually caused by suffocation while she slept due to Tegretol causing her red blood cells to lose oxygen.¹⁹³

Even though the stated reasons for Anneliese's death differ, they have a similarity in that they both point a finger of blame, Duffey's reason is very critical of the priests that performed exorcisms and believes that they may have been using a certain part of the Roman Ritual that

¹⁸⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 202.

¹⁸⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 206.

¹⁸⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 210 & 211.

¹⁸⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 15.

¹⁹⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 243.

¹⁹¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 244.

¹⁹² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 248.

¹⁹³ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 248.

involves fasting and they may have tried to starve the woman to drive out Satan. Goodman's reason is critical but in a subtle way as she only blames a drug for Anneliese's death, the reader is left to make their own logical connection between the drug and the prescriber of it.

Both books have a similar message, that Anneliese's possession was misinterpreted by the people who tried to help her. Duffey blames priests but indicates a positive attitude towards psychiatrists, he contrasts these attitudes when he points out that the belief of Anneliese being possessed was growing in the minds of the clergy, but at the same time the psychiatrists she had seen believed she was suffering from epilepsy and psychosis,¹⁹⁴ he shows that he agrees with this diagnosis when he states that in 1974 Anneliese suffered a mental breakdown and acted in the following way "Anneliese would display intense fits of anger between legitimate epileptic attacks."¹⁹⁵ Goodman's view is the opposite, she implies negative feelings towards psychiatrists and is positive towards priests, she does this by listing the various medication that Anneliese received and pointing out that much of it had dangerous side effects¹⁹⁶ and that Anneliese did not need anticonvulsive drugs because her convulsions were part of a condition which anthropologists refer to as a "shamanistic illness"¹⁹⁷ and also by stating that exorcism was actually showing signs of helping her, but the drugs tampered with this process.¹⁹⁸

2.5 WHICH DIFFERENCES OR SIMILARITIES CAN BE FOUND IN THE TWO BOOKS?

These are the things that I have discovered by comparing the two books

Differences in alleged information

In my comparison of the two books. I have noticed that much of the alleged information of the Michel case is quite similar, but I have unearthed a few discrepancies. For example Goodman states that Father Rodewyk suggested that Anneliese was possessed, whilst Duffey indicates Thea Heinz as the one who made this suggestion, Duffey states that Anna heard strange banging noises whilst Goodman states that Anna said that *other* family members had heard it. The biggest discrepancy in the information of the two books that I have compared is that they do not agree on who was chosen to be the exorcist. Why do these differences exist? In his alleged

¹⁹⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

¹⁹⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

¹⁹⁶ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 240 -246.

¹⁹⁷ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 240.

¹⁹⁸ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. 245.

accounts of the Klingenberg case, Duffey frequently refers to Goodman's book¹⁹⁹ as his information source. Goodman states that her information came from a defence lawyer involved in the Michel court case which comprised of a dossier of almost eight-hundred pages of witness statements, letters and reports, depositions from doctors who treated Anneliese and court psychiatrists.²⁰⁰ Additionally she also states the following information as her source material, information from Anneliese's diary, written contact with Alt and Renz, sound tapes of the exorcisms,²⁰¹ letters from Anneliese to Alt and interviews with Peter, Anneliese's boyfriend, Roswitha, Anneliese's sister and the all chief persons involved in the case.²⁰² So we have two books that have differences in alleged accounts, even though one book often uses the other as its source. However, the three varying instances all share a common factor, Duffey's presentation of them does not state Goodman as their source (Thea suggesting exorcism,²⁰³ Anna hearing noises²⁰⁴ and Alt as chief exorcist²⁰⁵) and this gives some explanation as to why the alleged information differs. Incidentally, the three people that Duffey uses in my three examples of varying information are all criticised in his book for fuelling the hysteria surrounding Anneliese's alleged possession. Duffey also uses these three alleged instances of the Michel case to reinforce his own message of the dangers of misdiagnosing a case of demonic possession by pointing out chief antagonists responsible for creating and sustaining the belief that Anneliese was possessed. Thea is allotted the role of the creator of the belief,²⁰⁶ Anna the person who sustains it after she is infected by Thea's hysteria and begins hearing noises²⁰⁷ and Alt becomes the ringleader of the antagonists, the chief exorcist²⁰⁸ of a case of possession that Duffey frequently states he does not believe in. To back up my argument of Duffey blaming these three people for the belief of possession I here present relevant instances from his book. Anna is described as a believer of outdated Catholic beliefs²⁰⁹ whose faith and view of the church is stated as "medieval".²¹⁰ She is also stated to bear the belief that since her

¹⁹⁹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. *The Exorcism of Anneliese Michel*. 2005 edition. Eugene, Oregon, USA. Resource Publications. 2005.

²⁰⁰ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Introduction, XV.

²⁰¹ Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Introduction, XV.

²⁰² Goodman, Felicitas, D. 2005. Introduction, XVI.

²⁰³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

²⁰⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

²⁰⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011, 14.

²⁰⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

²⁰⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 11.

²⁰⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 14.

²⁰⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 19.

²¹⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 19.

infancy Anneliese bore a curse cast upon her by a jealous neighbour.²¹¹ Her beliefs are described as “superstitious”²¹² and to have played their part in influencing Anneliese who developed hysteria and irrational fears because of them.²¹³ When discussing a possible explanation to a so called sign of possession that Anneliese displayed when she showed aversion to religious symbols and objects, Duffey states that she was likely to be rebelling against religion, but such rebellion was unheard of in her family.²¹⁴ As Duffey continues this discussion he also points out the three people responsible for the belief of Anneliese’s possession when he states “Unfortunately, the possibly unstable Father Alt, her mother Anna Michel, and Thea Heinz would interpret this resentment for such icons as demonic possession.”²¹⁵ Duffey’s main antagonist from this trio is Alt who he describes as being considered by psychiatrists to possess a personality that was not normal and possibly someone who suffered from a psychosis that was of a schizophrenic nature.²¹⁶ Duffey continues his diagnosis of Alt by stating that “Surprisingly a lot of the things described by Father Alt that were determined to be manifestations of schizophrenic psychosis are remarkably similar to the experiences reported by young Anneliese.”²¹⁷ He then states the plausibility of Alt’s own delusions having affected the young woman’s beliefs which could possibly have caused her own psychosis to have degenerated into a serious mental condition.²¹⁸ By listing him as chief exorcist Duffey strengthens Alt’s role of being a ringleader by stating that he was the person who insisted that Anneliese should be exorcised, even when no other priests thought that she should be,²¹⁹ and also by suggesting that Alt caused the assistant exorcist, Renz²²⁰ to be influenced by religious hysteria which led him to believe that Anneliese was possessed.²²¹

Differences in how information is used

Duffey and Goodman focus on certain alleged events for different reasons. Goodman’s focus is often as descriptive as possible, for example her dramatization of Anneliese’s suffering during her possession in 1975, whilst Duffey summarises the same events and criticises the

²¹¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 19 & 20.

²¹² Duffey, John, M. 2011. 20.

²¹³ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 20.

²¹⁴ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 23 & 24.

²¹⁵ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 24.

²¹⁶ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 12.

²¹⁷ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 12 & 13.

²¹⁸ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 13.

²¹⁹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 29.

²²⁰ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 29.

²²¹ Duffey, John, M. 2011. 29 & 30.

Catholic Church. This pattern of describing alleged events and adding his own critical opinions is present in most of the observations I have made on Duffey's book. Goodman's criticism and her own opinions are limited to the areas of her book that do not directly deal with the alleged historical account of the Michel case, the actual case account is written quite objectively. Duffey's criticism and opinions are apparent throughout his alleged historical account, the book's theoretical chapters and its chapters that give practical advice on how exorcism ought to be conducted.

Differences in the purpose and layout of the two books

Duffey does not explicitly state his book's purpose, but its title, layout and the author's strong opinion that the clergy need to be concerned with the physical well-being of a so called possessed person, which is a recurring theme throughout the book, strongly indicate that it is a handbook for exorcists which focuses on the safety of the client. Goodman explicitly states the purpose of her book as being an alternative hypothesis to the one that the court used to judge the case of Anneliese Michel. Her book is mostly devoted to the Klingenberg case, with the rest concerning theories of RASC which use Anneliese's story as examples and a section that deals with Anneliese's death.

General definitions of possession and exorcism, variation and similarities

Goodman's general definitions of possession and exorcism attempt to explain the phenomena using science. Duffey's refer to his own faith. Both authors' definitions depend on the existence of religion to define possession and both see it as a phenomenon that is acknowledged by different disciplines. Exorcism is also defined from the respective fields of science by Goodman and faith by Duffey, but both describe exorcism as some form of event, namely a ritual and both authors refer to the Klingenberg case. However, Duffey uses the case to criticise the attending priests. Goodman does not.

Differences in how Duffey and Goodman interpret possession and exorcism in their accounts of the Klingenberg case

Both authors describe the phenomenon of possession in the Klingenberg case using similar information such as 1968 – 1976 being the period of the alleged possession beginning with unexplained illnesses, then a suggestion of possession from a third party, strange phenomena and finally the traumatic events of 1975. The thing that makes these accounts different is that Duffey applies his own opinion to them and denies any supernatural involvement whilst Duffey does not. The phenomenon of exorcism in the Michel case can be described as lacking any

detail in Duffey's book and he instead discusses his ongoing message of the physical needs of the possessed victim by pointing out that Anneliese was starving during the exorcisms and criticises the attending priests. Goodman gives a rich description of how Anneliese displayed bizarre behaviour during the exorcism sessions which were often long and involved her being physically restrained, the author does not state any personal theories in her descriptions. The two authors' narratives of possession and exorcism in the Klingenberg case was the area where I found discrepancies in alleged historical information.

The authors' theories of the Michel case are mostly different

Both authors discuss that Anneliese was depressed and received psychotherapy. However Duffey speculates that this could explain how she displayed the alter ego of Cain. Goodman makes no such speculation. Goodman's theory of Anneliese's alleged possession is rather similar to her general definition of possession, that she was experiencing possession trance due to being in RASC and that she was a hypersensitive, a person with an over sensitive nervous system. Duffey's theory on Anneliese's alleged possession is that she suffered from epilepsy and mental illness. Goodman sees Anneliese's behaviour as normal, Duffey sees it as mental illness, but both authors' indicate the absence of a supernatural presence. In regards to Anneliese's death, Duffey states that the priests who exorcised Anneliese may have been starving her to drive out Satan. Goodman states that her death was caused by medication called Tegretol.

Similar messages that the two authors make

Duffey frequently takes the opportunity to give his opinion that exorcists need to make sure the possessed person is safe and taken care of and is quite critical towards the attending priests in the Michel case, he even goes as far as to suggest that they caused Anneliese to die of starvation. In comparison Goodman has a critical view of the organs of modern society involved in the Michel case. This is apparent in the way she implies criticism towards the psychiatrists that gave Anneliese medication, drugs which she blames for Anneliese's demise. These are two similar messages, Michel is a victim and both involve criticism and blame, but differ in that they are directed towards different people.

2.6 ARE THE BOOKS DIFFERENT OR SIMILAR AND WHY?

After considering all the findings of my comparisons in this the result and analysis section of my paper and judging by the amount of differences in them, I state that these two books are

quite different. Why are they different? Because of the way the two authors use their accounts of the Klingenberg case, their common theme. Duffey uses his account to express his own opinions of the case and also strengthen his message of safe exorcism whilst Goodman only expresses her own theories of the case in the theoretical chapters of her book that do not deal directly with the Michel case and in far fewer instances than Duffey. The alleged case has inspired the authors to both write cautionary works in regards to how possession and exorcism can be misunderstood, but Duffey's message of caution is more apparent than Goodman's, which makes for two quite different books.

2.7 HOW THE TWO BOOKS DEAL WITH MY TWO CHOSEN PHENOMENA

Duffey defines the phenomena of possession and exorcism according to Christianity, as spiritual concepts of the demonic invasion of a person and the casting out of the invading entity by prayer, but does not believe the Michel case was a case of demonic possession and that the exorcisms were unnecessary. His descriptions of the two phenomena in the Klingenberg case are intended to illustrate his view of disbelief by presenting them as indications of epilepsy and mental illness. Goodman's definitions are according to her area of anthropological study, possession as a religious experience and exorcism as a method of bringing relief to a person afflicted by such religious experience. She presents the two phenomena in the Michel case in an objective way that allows the reader to make their own judgement, then in the latter parts of her book discusses the case and refers to her own anthropological theories. Both authors state that possession requires religion and is acknowledged by different disciplines. Both writers present my two chosen phenomena as negative and frightening for the alleged possessed victim.

2.8 A DEEPER UNDERSTANDING

Through comparing the books of Duffey and Goodman, I have gained a deeper understanding of their points of view of my two chosen phenomena. Although these two authors have different views on these phenomena, a theological one in Duffey's case and a scientific anthropological in Goodman's, both writers express *respect* for the phenomena. Duffey respects them by stating that they are dangerous concepts that should only be considered after mental illness has been ruled out whilst Goodman illustrates the dangers of relying on conventional medicine to explain religious experience. This aspect of respect was easier for me to see after I compared the two works with each other than when I first read each respective book.

3 DISCUSSION

3.1 THE OBJECTIVITY OF THE TWO AUTHORS

Duffey, a priest

I have deduced from my findings that the overall message in his book is that the priests involved in the Klingenberg case were naïve and acted with a disregard for the young woman's life. This is a point of view that permeates his account of the Michel case and is easy to observe when reading his book, but even easier when comparing it to Goodman's which deals with the same topic. It is through reading and comparing the two books that I am given a clear picture of the lack of objectivity in Duffey's book. However, I find it refreshing that Duffey is willing to express his own view of other priests in an unbiased way, he also shows that he questions the safety aspects of exorcism which I have pointed out frequently in my results. In other words, Duffey does not advocate his own profession. It is quite clear to me that Duffey intentionally sacrifices an objective narrative of the Michel case in order to strengthen his message, so even though I refer to a lack of objectivity, it is not necessarily a negative judgement for my part.

Goodman, an anthropologist

I came to the conclusion that her book portrays a view that is quite anti-establishment, that the people who helped Anneliese could not fully understand her religious experience. However, this does not flavour her alleged historical account of the Michel case which is presented in an objective manner. That said, the latter chapters of her book present many of her own theories and apply them to the Michel case. It is then that she advocates her own profession.

3.2 MY EXPECTATIONS OF THE STUDY AND SOME UNEXPECTED FINDINGS

I was hoping but did not expect to find discrepancies in the alleged historical narratives of the two books and am quite pleased that I did, especially within the limits of the comparisons that I made in this paper. I can safely say that I did not already know the answers to my questions posed in this paper before I wrote it, so my findings are genuine and new. I wonder, if anyone was to scrutinise all the similar elements from the alleged historical events of these two books and then compare them, would more differences be found?

The results in my findings of the differences between the two authors' general definitions of possession and exorcism were for the most part as I expected them to be. I believe that the authors' vocations affect their choices of definitions. For example, Duffey, a priest, chooses to give Christian definitions of possession and exorcism, whilst Goodman, an anthropologist who

studies RASC, gives definitions that refer to this area of study. That which is unexpected to me is that these views from two diverse disciplines both consider religion as a necessary factor for possession. There is also an unexpected consensus in that even though both authors describe exorcism from their own disciplines, I did not foresee that the scientific definition given by Goodman would concur with Duffey's theological description and refer to it as a method to cure possession. The two writers' respect for the two phenomena was something that was not apparent from the onset of this work, it was through comparison that I uncovered this.

The data from my comparisons suggests an interesting way of thinking for Duffey's part, he has Christian definitions of the phenomena of possession and exorcism that require faith, but also has a strong worldly sense of practicality and judgement since he is sceptical of the Michel case.

3.3 AN ALTERNATIVE DESCRIPTION OF THE TWO BOOKS' MESSAGES

In my results I reported that I had found the messages that both authors expressed in their books, Duffey shows the danger of assuming that a person's problems are spiritual and not psychological whilst Goodman's message is that spirituality is manifested by personal experiences which are real phenomena for the person who lives through them and warns that modern society with its organisations of psychiatric and medicinal treatment is not suitable for helping people with complicated experiences such as those that are tied to religion. Before I read and compared the two books, if I had seen these two messages as I have presented them now with no prior knowledge as to who expressed them, I would have assumed that Duffey, a man of faith, had expressed Goodman's message and that Goodman, the anthropologist, had made Duffey's. In my results I found a similarity between these messages since they claim that Anneliese was a victim and blame people for her death. A different way of looking at these two messages is to give consideration to how religion plays a part in them, Duffey's message is that religion caused Anneliese's death and Goodman's is that a lack of understanding of how important religion is to certain individuals caused her death.

3.4 HOW I RELATED MY WORK TO ITS PURPOSE

In pursuance of the two writers' views of my chosen phenomena, I did not limit my study to one area of their books. My study questions helped me to read between the lines of the two works, as I took consideration to not only how the authors suggested they dealt with the two phenomena via the statements that they both made, but also how they chose to present their books and the layout and the stated purpose of their books also gave me clues. When I added

these factors to the perceived messages that I have recently discussed, I was given a bigger picture to work with. If I had used a narrower comparison to deduct how the phenomena were dealt with, for example if I had only used the two authors' alleged accounts of the Klingenberg case, I would have ended up with narrow descriptions of how the writers dealt with the phenomena. For example, in Duffey's case it would have seemed that he was overly sceptical of the phenomena, which he is not, but to be able to know this, one cannot concentrate on his alleged case account. Studying these two books from several different angles also made the second part of my purpose more interesting, it really gave me a chance to compare the two works. An interesting aspect of my comparisons was that I wanted to get an idea for the two authors' own moral sensitivities, so I included theories that Duffey and Goodman had in regards to how they explain Anneliese's death, a choice that reflects my desire to deal with controversial material that could possibly prompt the authors to reveal some of their own emotions in their writing. Both authors did.

3.5 MY FINDINGS AS A WHOLE AND WHAT THEY TELL ME

The two books are written by two authors both of whom wish to make their own opinions of the case known. Duffey does this overtly and Goodman limits this to the end of her book. They both have differing general definitions of possession and exorcism and also the roles of these phenomena in the Klingenberg case. The instances I have compared display a tendency for a lack of objectivity in Duffey's case, this is the main factor of why the books are quite different and why they deal with my chosen phenomena in different ways. Each author shows respect for possession and exorcism and states that possession is acknowledged by different disciplines. The aspect from my findings that was of greatest interest to me was that even though the two writers are from two diverse professions, one is a priest and one an anthropologist, the phenomenon of religion was a large factor in both of their general definitions of possession.

These two books are not at all what I expected, in one you have a priest who expresses his belief for his own faith, but has a lack of belief for the alleged case and shows the weaknesses of his own religion, in the other you have an anthropologist who investigates and comes up with her own cause of death for the alleged victim and illustrates a weakness in mankind's modern society, but is positive towards religion. Her overall message does not interfere with how she deals with my two chosen phenomena, possession and exorcism, in her book, she simply describes them as things that can happen according to her general definitions, as things

that did happen in the alleged case and then in the latter sections of her work tries to explain how the phenomena work and why they happen to certain people such as Anneliese, whereas Duffey deals with my two chosen phenomena by stating general definitions which are in line with his faith and as bogus phenomena in the Klingenberg case.

It was interesting to observe that Duffey often stated Goodman's book, which was the first to be published from the two, as his source. However, this does not mean that his account of the alleged case is a mini version of Goodman's or that Goodman's is the parent document. The differences between Duffey and Goodman's historical accounts of the Klingenberg case cause me to wonder if Duffey had access to extra information from the case, extra sources that he did not refer to. Could it be that he simply interpreted Goodman's sources in a different way than she did? In any case Duffey has produced a competently written book that goes down different avenues than Goodman's. Both writers have their own styles and methods and present their books in these. As to how they deal with my chosen phenomena, I believe that much can be learned from these two authors even though their views are akin to opposite sides of a coin. Duffey's belief of the phenomena carries a responsibility for priests who investigate possible cases of possession and perform exorcisms. Goodman's belief of the phenomena shows that the religious aspects of the two phenomena do not require any true spiritual evidence because the person affected need only experience RASC to display signs of possession and to benefit from the exorcism ritual.

3.6 HOW MY METHOD HELPED ME AND ITS DIFFICULTIES

My method of writing my paper as a compare and contrast essay helped me to see each comparison clearly because I presented my arguments for the case of each author in separate segments, this gave my paper a clear structure. If I had written this paper with no prior knowledge of my chosen method, I would have most likely attempted to present arguments from each author in the same segment, for example a sentence about Duffey followed by one about Goodman. This would have created a rather untidy essay. Ending the comparison with a discussion about the two segments really sealed the deal for my comparisons and was also practical because it made it harder for me to forget any points I had made in my two segments. The thesis, the opening statement of a given comparison was an area that I think creates interest for a potential reader of my work, there is an element of mystery, which I believe should compel the reader to want to continue reading and get an explanation to the thesis.

In terms of how work is presented when using my chosen method I chose to present a thesis, the arguments and the discussion in their own separate paragraphs, this led to section two of this paper taking up many pages, another reason for this was that the views and descriptions of the two authors presented in these comparisons were tied to events of the Klingenberg case and I deemed it necessary to include a certain amount of information that was relevant to the historical accounts of the case, otherwise it may have been difficult for someone reading the paper to picture exactly what I was describing. Choosing varying theses was very difficult and for me is an aspect of this method that one really must master, as it requires much imagination and the ability to state something in an unorthodox manner. I was often torn between revealing my conclusions in my theses and trying to make the reader guess and I'm not entirely sure if I found a happy medium for this, which is ironic because I still believe that the theses are the most interesting aspect of using this method. The greatest difficulty I had in regards to using my chosen method was sticking to it, as it is not always practical to use the style and it can reduce a writer's freedom. I made a compromise with this and restricted the use of my method to certain areas of the results and analysis section of my paper. I did, after all, state in section one of this paper that I would use this method at my own discretion. My overall verdict of my chosen method is that I would use it again, but for dealing with less complicated information than I used in this paper. I felt like I was taking up too much space when I described narratives from my chosen books when I used this method.

3.7 MY WORK

Is my work of comparing the two books an accurate portrayal of how my chosen authors deal with possession and exorcism and an accurate portrayal of the differences and similarities between their two books? Yes, I think so. However, it is only fair to say that it is a fair portrayal of the aspects that I chose to compare in my study questions and that someone comparing these two books from a different angle with different questions may not necessarily come to the same conclusions that I did. However, even in the limited cross section of my scrutiny which is made up of a finite number of comparisons, I managed to observe the style with which the two authors used to present their books in and also the overall messages of the two authors, this tells me that I chose a sufficiently large cross section. Additionally, I believe that, if there was another existing comparison of these two books, the two authors' different styles of writing would play a part in its results.

REFERENCES

Biblical literature. *Britannica Academic*. 2016.

<http://academic.eb.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/EBchecked/topic/64496/biblical-literature/73384/New-Testament-canon-texts-and-versions>

Accessed 2016/5/18, 01:40.

Duffey, John, M. *The Anneliese Michel Exorcism: The Implementation of a Safe and Thorough Examination, Determination, and Exorcism of Demonic Possession*. Eugene, Oregon, USA. WIPF and Stock Publishers. 2011.

Exorcism. *Britannica Academic*. 2016.

<http://academic.eb.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/EBchecked/topic/198273/exorcism>

First Accessed 16/18/5, 0:51.

Fortescue, Adrian. O'Connell, J. B. Reid, Alcuin. *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described*. 15th edition. USA. Burn and Oates. E-book. 2009.

Goodman, Felicitas, D. *How about Demons? Possession and Exorcism in the Modern World*. USA. Indiana university press. 1988.

Goodman, Felicitas, D. *The Exorcism of Anneliese Michel*. 2005 edition. Eugene, Oregon, USA. Resource Publications. 2005.

Hafiz, Yasmine. The Huffington Post. *Exorcism Conference At Vatican Addresses The Need For More Demon-Fighting Priests*. huffingtonpost.com, updated 2014/5/13. 2014.

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2014/05/13/exorcism-conference-rome-priests_n_5316749.html

Accessed 2015/12/21, 20:38.

Hansen, Eric, T. The Washington Post. *What in God's Name?!* washingtonpost.com, updated 2005/9/4. 2005.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/02/AR2005090200559.html/>

First accessed 2015/12/22, 18:24.

Jamieson, Sandra. *Comparison Writing*. Drew University On-Line Resources for Writers. 1999.

<https://users.drew.edu/~sjamieso/Comparison.htm>

First accessed 16/09/04, 23:14.

Levack, Brian, P. *The Devil Within: Possession and Exorcism in the Christian West*. Padstow, Cornwall, UK. Yale University Press, E-book. 2013.

Levack, Brian, P. "The Horrors of Witchcraft and Demonic Possession." *Social Research*, Vol.81 Issue 4, 2014 winter. PP 921-939. 2014.

<https://muse-jhu-edu.proxy.ub.umu.se/article/566958/pdf>

Accessed 2015/12/20, 22:22.

Meza, Jose, Magallanes. "Multiple personality disorder and demonic possession." Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree PhD in Psychology. California Graduate Institute of The Chicago School of Professional Psychology. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. December, 2010.

<http://search.proquest.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/docview/1515299553/>

First accessed 2016/1/12, 23:41.

Nauwald, Nana. *Trance Ritual Body Postures and Ecstatic Trance*. ecstatictrance.com. 2005/2008.

<http://www.ecstatictrance.com/pages/trance.html>

Accessed 16/09/05, 23:05.

news.com.au. *Family accused of killing Janet Moses during exorcism*. news.com.au, updated 2009/5/4. 2009.

<http://www.news.com.au/breaking-news/family-accused-of-exorcism-killing/story-e6frku0-1225708496912>

Accessed 2015/12/22, 17:17.

Rosik, Christopher, H. "Critical issues in the dissociative disorders field: Six perspectives from religiously sensitive practitioners." *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, vol 31. 2003 PP 113-128. 2003.

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy.ub.umu.se/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=849d0cb9-d2a2-4090-9be0-4de3f5b87bb3%40sessionmgr4003&vid=1&hid=4104>

First accessed 2016/1/12, 10:42.

The Cuyamungue Institute. *Anthropology*. Cuyamungue. The Felicitas D. Goodman Institute. 2016.

<http://www.cuyamungueinstitute.com/the-work/anthropology/>

Accessed 2016/6/5, 22:13.

The Cuyamungue Institute. *Felicitas Goodman*. Cuyamungue. The Felicitas D. Goodman Institute. 2016.

<http://www.cuyamungueinstitute.com/who-we-are/felicitas-goodman/>

First accessed 16/09/04, 19:39.

The Writing Centre, St. Mary's University, Halifax, Canada. *Comparison and Contrast Essays* (PDF). Saint Mary's University. smu.ca. 2010.

<http://www.smu.ca/webfiles/ComparisonandContrastDec.2010.pdf>

First accessed 16/05/20, 18:51.

Thomason, Timothy, C. "Possession, Exorcism and Psychotherapy." Published online at Northern Arizona University. shsu.edu. Publication year not available.

<http://www.shsu.edu/piic/winter2008/Thomason.html>

Accessed 2016/1/12, 13:30.

Tompkins, Case. *Writing in Literature: Writing the Prompt Paper*. The Writing Lab & The OWL at Purdue and Purdue University, Indiana, USA. purdue.edu. 2013.

<https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/713/02/>

Accessed 16/05/20, 19:30.

Vatican. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*. vatican.va. 2016.

http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/p2s2c4a1.htm

Accessed 16/05/18, 00:00.

Vatican. *Code of Canon Law*. vatican.va. 2016.

http://www.vatican.va/archive/ENG1104/_P48.HTM

Accessed 16/05/18, 13:18.

Vatican. *Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith*. vatican.va. 2016.

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia//congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19850924_exorcism_en.html

Accessed 16/05/18, 14:14.

Walk, Kerry. *How to Write a Comparative Analysis*. Harvard College Writing Center. 1998.

<http://writingcenter.fas.harvard.edu/pages/how-write-comparative-analysis>

First accessed 16/09/05, 00:09.