

ROBERT L. WINZELER

THE STUDY OF MALAY MAGIC

To protect the soul-substance of his staple food-plant, the Malay peasant, conservative as agriculturalists all the world over, is content with the primitive ritual of the animist, covered for decency's sake with a thin veneer of later religions.

Sir Richard Winstedt (1961:103)

"Again and again I have tried to abandon this inconvenient system [of coinage]", said a Pahang Prince to Abdullah Munchi; "but the tigers took to eating men, and the crocodiles became hungrier, and I desisted".

R. J. Wilkinson (1957:74)

Difficult as it is to discover with any degree of certainty the past of a primitive people from traditions and personal recollections, these sources, tapped by a competent inquirer, are for most purposes of greater value than early European records about that people, which in matters requiring more than bare observation and the simplest of deductions have to be scrutinized with care and used with caution.

E. E. Evans-Pritchard (1965a:133)

Introduction

There exists a large body of literature produced over a long period of time on aspects of belief, ritual and ceremony of the Malays of peninsular (west) Malaysia labelled "magic". Interest in this general topic has exceeded, perhaps considerably, interest in any other dimension of Malay culture. In this paper I undertake an analysis and critique of this literature. The purpose is to present both information about the scope and range of writings on Malay magic and an argument

ROBERT L. WINZELER, a Professor of Anthropology at the University of Nevada, who obtained his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, is specialized in the cultural anthropology of Southeast Asia. He has written, besides many articles on Southeast Asia, *Ethnicity in Kelantan*, Oxford University Press (forthcoming). Prof. Winzeler's address is: Anthropology Department, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV 89557, U.S.A.

about the nature and development of interest in the topic. The argument concerns specifically the relationship between the study of Malay magic and the colonial context in which much of it was produced. The general problems with which I shall be concerned have, I believe, a broader significance.¹

The study of Malay magic

Especially after the establishment of British control in western Malaya in the latter part of the 19th century, various observers began to collect and report on Malay ritual and belief as well as on other subjects — language, literature, history, folklore, on which considerable information had already been published — which altogether came to form the field of Malay studies. The ranks of the late 19th and early 20th century observers included those who published an occasional description of a Malay charm or divination technique in the *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, the *Journal of the Federated States Museum* or the *Malayan Police Magazine*, as well as those who wrote a great deal and gained wide recognition. Descriptions of Malay magical beliefs and practices, written up in the form of literary sketches and short stories, in descriptive notes, articles and reports, and in longer synthetic or interpretive accounts, were often widely disseminated in their original form, and in such comparative classics as Ernest Crawley's *The Mystic Rose* and James Frazer's *The Golden Bough*. The total volume of literature on the topic has never been assessed. A recent bibliography by Shaw (1975) lists over sixty notes and articles which are directly concerned with one or another aspect of Malay magic, plus many additional ones on other topics which contain information on magic. There are at least five books concerning Malays in which "magic" or "magician" appears in the title and an equal or greater number of others with related titles that are directly concerned with the topic.² A relatively complete bibliography of works focused more or less directly on the topic might run to well over a hundred items, and one which included those works which make at least some substantial mention of the topic would be far longer.³ Newspaper articles would greatly add to both.

While a substantial proportion of the existing literature on Malay magic was produced in earlier periods, both popular and scholarly anthropological analyses continue to appear.⁴ The latter may be on the increase. In 1970, Endicott's structural analysis based on earlier sources was published by Oxford University Press, and in 1975 Shaw's descriptive survey of the topic was published by the National Museum in Kuala Lumpur. Articles by Benjamin 1979; Firth 1967; 1974; Kessler 1977, and Taib bin Osman 1972 have also recently appeared. Finally, many of the earlier works have also been published in recent years as hardbound reprints and, often, in paperback editions.⁵ These

continue to serve as popular and scholarly introductions to Malay religion and culture.

The study of Malay magic thus has been an abiding interest of those who have become acquainted with Malaya. Westerners who have spent time in the country have been drawn especially to the topic for the past century. Anthropologists and other scholars will in all likelihood continue to make use of the existing literature both as a source of information and of ideas. For those interested in symbolic, structural or other sorts of cultural analysis, the literature is particularly rich, as Endicott's (1970) work suggests. Finally, the quality of writing or analysis of the older accounts varies greatly, as might be imagined. Some, in particular those of Wilkinson, are powerful and compelling and have continued to influence writing about traditional Malay culture.⁶

Yet it cannot be said that Malay magic has been well studied, or even that we have a good basic understanding of it, or even further that the topic itself exists in any sense as a real category or dimension of Malay culture as opposed to western interest. Several of the scholars who have written on Malay magic recently have noted the problematic character of the literature. Endicott (1970:vii) notes that the older accounts were often fragmentary and acknowledges that his own analysis, which is based on existing written sources, is speculative and may be wrong. He feels, however, like some of the earlier observers, that the main difficulty is the "extreme inherent complexity of the Malay religious traditions, a complexity bordering on chaos" (Endicott 1970:1). Wilder and Firth, in turn, are critical of both the older accounts and of more recent studies which have made use of them. An article by Parkinson (1967:31-46) attempting to explain Malay "economic retardation" in part with reference to notions of Malay magic as presented in the older literature drew a sharp attack from Wilder (1968:155-164), viz.:

Finally, there is Parkinson's claim that religion and magic prevent Malay peasants from adopting rational methods to improve their economy. The alleged influence of 'spirits' on rice planting has been mentioned. More generally, the reliance on magical ritual is supposed to be understandable from the fact that 'the Malay, it seems, cannot bear to live in an environment where the unexplained occurs, or at least where he comes into contact with it'. The Malay thus has recourse to magic. The desire to assign certain occurrences to certain spirits and to have certain prescribed methods of placating them is all based on a desire to expect what is seen, and to see what is expected . . .

. . . These statements are evidently culled from Winstedt. Empirically they cannot be supported one way or another. (Wilder 1968:158.)

Firth's criticisms, on the other hand, are more blunted and do not make reference to particular scholars, but they make the same general points. In the introduction to an article on Malay magical beliefs and practices as he found them in the east coast state of Kelantan, he writes that:

Even in recent publications one may read of 'the Malay world view' or 'Malay magical thought' as if all Malays, even nowadays, shared the same concepts. My argument, to the contrary, is that certainly nowadays, and even a generation ago, in a part of Malaya which has long been recognized as a stronghold of magical practices, Malays have been more pragmatic, showed more variation in their beliefs, been more experimental in their attitudes, than could be inferred from the literature. (Firth 1974:190.)

I would agree and suggest to begin with that there were and are major conceptual problems involved in the study of Malay magic. These concern the overall nature of Malay religion and culture and the place of magic within it. Anthropologists and other students of comparative religion are by no means in complete agreement about what the notion of magic should mean,⁷ though it is widely held to refer to beliefs and ritual activities involving the manipulation of the material world through supernatural means (Endicott 1970:7; Firth 1974:191). The extent to which such a concept of magic is useful as a means of categorizing and analysing an entire or major segment of Malay culture is doubtful. Scholars have generally assumed that the concept of magic can be translated into Malay as *ilmu* (Winstedt 1963a:227). *Ilmu*, however, most literally means "knowledge" or "science" (Winstedt 1963b:128). The notion of magic is certainly implied by the common traditional Malay use of *ilmu* to refer to esoteric knowledge involving supernatural power, and in the various concepts Malays use for charms, divination, lore, medicine and so forth. But the idea that all such Malay concepts form an integrated system underlying a major segment of their culture, organized around a central notion corresponding to our notion of magic, has not been established and does not seem viable.

Actually, most scholars who have written on Malay beliefs and ritual which they have labelled as magic have not tried to use the concept in this way. More commonly the term Malay magic has been used to refer to a broad range of beliefs and practices which are held to constitute the "popular" or "folk religion" of the Malays (Endicott 1970:7; Blagden 1900:vii). Such an approach is akin to what other scholars have termed the "pragmatic" (Mandelbaum 1966) or "practical" (Leach 1968) level of religion. Beyond the general use of the term magic, the notion that "orthodox Islam" and Malay folk religion, however labelled, are or were distinct traditions has been a

very powerful enduring idea in Malay studies. Endicott (1970:7) thus writes that he is "interested in Islam only to the extent that it has become embedded in this generally held [magical] body of ideas"; in fact, with the exception of the category of Sufism, Islam is mentioned only in passing.⁸

Conceptual problems are not, however, the only difficulty with the literature on Malay magic, and it is likely that these are partly symptomatic of other, more substantial, difficulties. Since no full-scale field study of magic in Malay culture and society has been undertaken, or at least reported, in the recent period, all current as well as past discussion has been dependent upon the earlier literature. Any effort to understand the study of Malay magic thus must seriously consider the earlier writings, particularly those of Wilkinson and Winstedt. This itself involves some difficulty. Anthropologists, who have been most critical of previous studies of Malay magic, base their objections on the disparity between what is reported in the literature and what they themselves have learned in their field work. At the same time anthropologists are apt to feel that they are not in a position to fully understand what conditions were like in earlier periods, before extensive change in Malay society and culture had taken place. Nonetheless, the earlier literature must be evaluated in its historical — that is social, cultural, political, scholarly — context.

The development of the study of Malay magic

From a chronological perspective, the most important of the earlier 19th century observations concerning Malay magic form a part of longer, wide-ranging accounts. These were meant to give an introduction to areas and topics of existing or likely interest regarding particular regions of Malaya or the country in general, and were in the tradition of the books of Raffles (1817), Crawfurd (1820) and Marsden (1783) on Java, Indonesia, and Sumatra respectively. Newbold's (1839) *Political and Statistical Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca* and McNair's (1878) *Perak and the Malays* are two prominent examples of such Malayanist accounts, but there were a number of others. Material on Malay religion and custom (e.g. Favas 1849) also appeared (often also in the context of longer and broader studies) in the *Journal of the Indian Archipelago*, which was published in Singapore from 1848 to 1862.

Following the establishment of British control or authority over substantial portions of the Peninsula itself, beyond the Straits Settlements, there appeared, beginning in the 1880's, scholarly papers that were published in the *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* (established in 1878 in Singapore) and in other journals.⁹ There were also literary accounts of places, events, or persons which sometimes concerned or often had reference to some

Malay magical or religious activity. Swettenham and Clifford¹⁰ are the two most prominent authors of such writings, but Skeat, Winstedt, and others occasionally produced them as well.

The first quarter of the 20th century forms a sort of classic era of Malayanist writing on the topic. The period spans the publication of Skeat's *Malay Magic* in 1900 and Winstedt's *Shaman, Saiva and Sufi: A Study of the Evolution of Malay Magic* in 1925 (later titled *The Malay Magician*), and includes much other important work as well.

Skeat's *Malay Magic* was an effort to draw together the considerable volume of information on Malay magical belief and practice which had already been published in diverse books and articles. It also contained material drawn from his own observations carried out during his tenure as a government officer in the 1890's in Western Malaya, though not from those made during the famous Cambridge Expedition to the Northeast Coast which he organized and led in 1899-1900 (Laidlaw 1953). Except for the information contained in his personal narrative of the Expedition, which was published long afterward (Skeat 1953), and in some literary sketches in his *Fables and Folktales From an Eastern Forest*, Skeat did not publish material on Malay magic gathered on this venture.¹¹ *Malay Magic* itself is nearly seven hundred pages long. It is a collection of diverse items of existing information on Malay folk religions and magical belief and practice; that is to say, those items which had caught the attention of Skeat and other late 19th century observers and were deemed sufficiently interesting to be written up and published. There is neither an introduction — except as provided by C. O. Blagden in a preface — nor a conclusion. The chapter titles give a fair indication of its scope and orientation: "Nature"; "Man and His Place in the Universe"; "Relations With the Supernatural"; "The Malay Pantheon"; "Magic Rites Connected with the Several Departments of Nature"; and "Magic Rites as Affecting the Life of Man".

During the next several decades a number of books and articles appeared. These include Wilkinson's *Malay Beliefs* in 1906 and *The Incidents of Malay Life* (a study of Malay ceremonies and life crises) in 1908; Annandale's contributions to *Fasciculi Malayenses* (a report of the Cambridge Expedition published in 1903), Gimlette's *Malay Poisons and Charm Cures* (a study of poisons, magical pharmacopoeia, divination and exorcism) in 1915; and Winstedt's *Shaman, Saiva and Sufi*, a culture history of Malay religious and magical traditions, in 1925. There also appeared during the first quarter of the 20th century some forty articles and notes by a dozen authors which concerned Malay magical practices or lore. Of these, those of Annandale (1903 c; 1909) and Winstedt (see below) are notable. The articles by Annandale, a member of the Cambridge Expedition, are valuable descriptive

accounts of Malay ritual and belief in a then little-known area of the peninsula.

After this period interest, or at least output, declined somewhat, though notes, articles and subsequent editions of several books continued to be published. Beginning in 1936, however, Jeanne Cuisinier, a French ethnologist who had carried out field work in Kelantan on Malay trance and the shadow play several years before, published several monographs on these topics (Cuisinier 1936; 1951; 1957). While written in French and otherwise outside the main tradition of British colonial Malayanist scholarship, Cuisinier's earliest study (*Danses Magiques de Kelantan*) was used as a source of information by later scholars (Winstedt 1961; Eliade 1964; Firth 1967; Endicott 1970).

Wilkinson and Winstedt

From the perspective of the kinds of literature which were produced, the classic 20th century Malayanist writings tend to form two types: those which report primary information with little explicit interpretation, and those which synthesize and interpret existing knowledge. Skeat's *Malay Magic* does not fit well with this scheme — it is both synthetic and descriptive — but most of the other works do. By and large the scholars who produced the main interpretive accounts wrote slightly later than those who provided the first series of original descriptive accounts. It is these later scholars who put forth generalizations and conclusions about Malay magic and culture. Wilkinson and Winstedt are the two major interpretive authors and warrant special consideration at this point.

These two men were both closely linked and broadly similar in their scholarly interests and orientation. Wilkinson was the earlier figure, the mentor of the latter, and, by modern opinion (Roff 1967:130-142), the better (if less productive) scholar. In British Malaya both were associated in particular with education, Wilkinson from 1896 to 1906, Winstedt from 1916, when he was appointed Assistant Director of Schools, to 1935. Both were also extensively involved in scholarly studies of Malay language, history and folklore. Wilkinson was thus the first general editor and chief contributor to what remains one of the most important efforts in Malay studies, the *Papers on Malay Subjects* series (Burns 1971:1-8); Winstedt was a contributor to this series as well as the author of many subsequent articles and books.

There were, however, important differences. Winstedt was a true antiquarian who regarded the literary and cultural achievements of Malay civilization to be things of the past. His writings show a marked detachment from a period of rapid social and cultural change with which, as a high level officer of education, he was necessarily involved. Wilkinson was also very interested in the Malay past and was

pessimistic about the course of change as he perceived it early in the 20th century. But he was also deeply concerned about developments affecting Malay society in the period in which he served (Roff 1967: 130-142). After retiring from service in Malaya, Winstedt went on to embark on a long and prominent academic career at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London (Bastin and Roolvink 1964); Wilkinson, on the other hand, after serving in Africa, retired to Greece and worked on a revision of his Malay dictionary.¹² What is relevant at this point in the writings of these two men is their ideas on the developmental nature of Malay culture in general. Here they share a similar general orientation, that of the comparativist interested in particular in survivals. But whereas Winstedt's interpretations tend to be mechanical, Wilkinson's have a more psychological character.

In his monographs on ceremonies and the life cycle, Wilkinson (1957:74) suggests that Malay culture has developed in accordance with a principle of addition rather than replacement. This is an argument which is fundamental in the interpretations of Winstedt as well. The following passage from Wilkinson's *Incidents of Malay Life, Malay Beliefs* is probably one of the more influential statements made about the nature of Malay culture and religion.

The Malay is afraid to give up an ancient practice because he fears the vengeance of the creators of the practice; he thinks that the dead hand of some old lawgiver may reach out over the intervening centuries and strike down the impious being who dares to alter what the past ages have approved. To meet this difficulty he keeps the old while adopting the new. He has gone on preserving custom after custom and ceremony after ceremony while his whole life is a sort of museum of ancient customs — an ill kept and ill designed museum in which no exhibit is dated, labelled or explained. For the Malay has not retained these old ceremonies for their own sake or because he loves them; he has preserved them as mere formalities; dead things for the satisfaction of his dead ancestors. (Wilkinson 1957:74-94.)

Winstedt's study of Malay magic is probably the most well known book on the topic and perhaps the best known of the British Malayanist work in general. In this study and in his writings on Malay literature and language, he attempts to sort the various elements that comprise Malay culture into their appropriate levels or traditions — indigenous, Hindu, Moslem. A main concern is the way in which earlier beliefs and practices are adapted, transformed or preserved in new guises. The following quote illustrates his general style of analysis and orientation:

Whatever the origin of the distinction between the two classes, the Malay magician, whether ordinary practitioner or shaman, commands respect by possessing a body of occult knowledge

derived often from cultures greater than his own and framed by the ingenuity of many forerunners into an acceptable dogma of superstition. Before he left Yunnan on his southern trek he had got from Babylon or some other centre in the Middle East the practice of divining the future by the inspection of the liver of beasts and by observation of the flight of birds. From the same source, it is surmised, he learnt to employ the incantation or spell and so to have recourse to prayer and sacrifice, if indeed he had not already essayed them. (Winstedt 1961:8.)

A notable characteristic of the interpretive accounts of both Winstedt and Wilkinson is that they show little interest in the social bases or contexts of magical phenomena. There is little evident awareness of the relationship of belief, practice and custom and the social forces and complexities of Malay society as it actually existed in the period in which their accounts were written or to which they had reference. There is little consideration given in these studies to the matter of *which* Malays believed and practised what, and only the most rudimentary reference made to the question of how what was believed and practised fitted into the circumstances of Malay life.¹³ Nor is there discussion of particular geographical settings. These omissions and the style of analysis which is followed make such interpretive accounts of considerably less value than the primary ones for the later scholar seeking specific information about Malay magic and religion in earlier periods, yet it is the interpretive accounts which have been most heavily utilized.

The context of the study of Malay magic

Having discussed the nature of Malayanist studies of magical belief and practice, I turn now to the question of how and why such a tradition of scholarship came to exist as it did. It is my contention that a series of factors are involved. These include 1) the nature of the setting in which Malayanist scholarship took place, and the training and background of the scholars, 2) an absence of either an actual or perceived significant utilitarian basis for research and knowledge about Malay magic or about other aspects of Malay religion, culture or society which might have fostered more empirical traditions of scholarship, combined with 3) a strong inherent interest in the phenomenon which included a marked element of romanticism.

1. The Local Context

The tradition of scholarly study of Malay magic developed primarily, though by no means exclusively, in the context of Malaya and Singapore. This is true to a large extent of Malay studies in general, from the publication of *The Journal of the Indian Archipelago* from 1848 to 1862, in Singapore; through the establishment of the Straits Branch

of the Royal Asiatic Society in 1878 (also in Singapore); to the publication of the *Papers on Malay Subjects* series, and the subsequent transfer (and renaming) of the Straits Branch to Kuala Lumpur in 1923, and so forth. Throughout the colonial period various Malayanists, including C. O. Blagden and, most notably, Winstedt, did hold faculty appointments at the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London, but such metropolitan-colonial connections were of little significance when compared, for example, with those of the Dutch Universities, Institutes, and Museums (above all, but not only, those in Leiden) and Dutch Colonial Indonesian Studies (Ellen 1976). Without the local traditions of research and publication there would hardly have been a field of British Malayan Studies.

Within this local context the individuals involved were neither, initially at least, ethnologists in particular nor, with a few exceptions, research scholars in general. Annandale was a natural scientist who took part in the Cambridge Expedition as a zoologist and who, in the course of the venture, became interested in Malay animism, cures and related magical lore. He consequently collected and published some of the best of the available material on these topics. Somewhat similarly, Gimlette was a physician who in the course of his work in Kelantan became concerned with Malay poisons, sorcery and curing. Beyond these two men, however, who were, as noted, producers of primary information rather than synthesizers or interpreters, the Malayanists of the period were mainly men who were educated in the classics or other humanities who were drawn to the study of Malay religion, magic and culture after reaching the country. As scholars, their interests were generally broad and indulged in alongside full-time administrative duties.

Despite the local context in which it developed, the study of Malay magic — at least in its interpretive phase — has some affinity with what has come to be known as “armchair scholarship”. In this regard, much emphasis has been placed upon the differences between earlier and later modes of scholarship, especially where analyses of religious phenomena are concerned (Evans-Pritchard 1965-b:5-10). The leading figures in the “earlier” comparative studies of primitive religion for the most part did not themselves gather the information upon which they relied, or live among the peoples of whom they wrote. More to the point, such individuals relied upon the use of accounts produced by, among others, colonial administrators. The British social anthropologist Evans-Pritchard has described such materials as “highly suspect” and asserted that:

Much of it was false and almost all of it was unreliable and, by the standards of professional research, casual, superficial, out of context, and to some extent this was true of the earlier

professional anthropologists'... statements about simpler peoples' ideas and beliefs, and even more interpretations of them, cannot be taken at their face value and should not be accepted without critical examination and without weighty corroborative evidence. (Evans-Pritchard: 1965-b:6.)

Such observations may be more fully appropriate to studies carried out in earlier periods or among simpler peoples than those concerned here. However, they may have some applicability in the present instance as well. In the case of the descriptive accounts of Malay belief and practice, the items of information that were published singly or gathered into longer accounts appear to have been collected often as a matter of chance rather than design. Over time, considerable information was accumulated on various topics, but usually not systematically, or with regard to any particular principle of classification or question; the activities of classification and the formulation of questions, when they took place, did so after rather than before the collection of information. Much or most of the literature was thus produced without evident reference to any sort of theory. The formulation and testing of hypotheses or the delineation of problems for further research were not an evident part of the process. In this regard Wilkinson's museum metaphor quoted above was ironic. It was at least in part the way that Malay religion and culture were studied that made them appear to be a collection of unconnected customs and beliefs.

In the case of certain studies theoretical influences are noted. Skeat (1900:71-73 and *passim*) quotes from and elsewhere cites Tylor's (1871) *Primitive Culture* in his *Malay Magic*. Similarly Winstedt writes in the preface to his *Shaman, Saiva and Suji* that he is indebted to the "classis works of Tylor, Frazer and Jevons", but that since he was writing from an inadequate library he had relied in particular upon Hasting's *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. Such interpretive studies, however, are also marked by some of the features which are taken to be characteristic of the earlier or "armchair" orientation. These include a failure in general to locate accounts in particular historical, geographical and social contexts, a tendency to speculate and an interest in origins, cultural survivals and evolutionary levels. Winstedt's writings in particular indicate that, while he made some use of informants, he was mainly oriented to the use of texts and documents rather than persons, social events and scenes as sources of information in his description of Malay magic and of Malay culture generally.

At the same time, neither Winstedt nor the other Malayanists of the early 20th century lacked first-hand familiarity with their subjects of study, even if they did not live with them in the fashion of later anthropological field work. In particular, knowledge of the language, upon which Evans-Pritchard and other critics of "19th century"

writings have placed much emphasis, was not apt to be a barrier to contact or understanding. However isolated colonial life may have been from that of the inhabitants (Butcher 1979), most of the Malayanists lived for many years in Malaya, in some cases for a number of decades, and most were fluent in Malay. Both Wilkinson and Winstedt were accomplished lexicographers whose knowledge of the Malay language remains unquestioned. Indeed, Wilkinson's (1901) Malay-English dictionary continues to be regarded as a thorough and highly reliable source of both linguistic and ethnographic information. Neither Winstedt nor Wilkinson tended to discuss the circumstances under which they gathered information on Malay magic and religion — though Wilkinson did so in regard to his dictionary and his methods were those characteristic of the anthropological linguist (Wilkinson 1957:i-iv). Thus, the nature of their writings on these topics cannot be so easily attributed to the inherent limitations of the conditions under which they gathered information as in the case of observers who had only occasional, superficial contact with the remote peoples about whom they wrote. This brings us to the second set of factors.

2. *Scholarship and Practical Interest*

A more recent theme in discussions of the history of anthropological and ethnological studies has concerned the relationship of the development of such scholarship to the structure and process of colonial expansion and domination (Asad 1975). It has been argued that scholarship traditions of research and writing on non-western peoples are largely the consequence of colonialism, and that, more specifically, such traditions are a response to needs for information and understanding which would help to maintain, justify, or advance European political and economic interests regarding subject peoples.

Within the broader history of British Malay and Indonesian studies it is possible to note many works which were specifically concerned with utilitarian political and economic matters ranging from soil types and agricultural possibilities, demography, local products and manufacturers to native political systems, piracy and trade (e.g. Crawfurd 1820; Marsden 1783; Raffles 1817). Such works were quite explicitly intended to convey "useful" information on a variety of topics. Moreover, some of the most valuable and seemingly reliable information about a variety of matters was produced by observers who were primarily concerned with strategic or commercial perspectives. Snouck Hurgronje's seminal work, for example, was grounded in such motives, to judge from his introduction to the English edition of *The Achehnese*:

During a residence in Arabia (1884-85) I had been in a position — especially at Mecca — to obtain an intimate knowledge of the influence of Mohammedan fanaticism upon the obstinate resistance of the Achehnese to Dutch rule; some time spent in direct

relations with Achehnese on their own soil was required to round off the knowledge gained by me from literature and from my experience in the sacred city of the Arabs. (Snouck Hurgronje 1906 Vol. 1:v.)

In Malaya in the 19th century, as we have already noted, a certain amount of information on Malay ritual and belief was included in the practical, wide-ranging accounts and "histories" of McNair (1878) and Newbold (1839). But the main body of research and literature on Malay religion and magic was not produced for any simple utilitarian reason. This was true particularly of the work produced at the beginning of the 20th century and after, which is most of it.

The following points seem relevant to any answer to the question of why this should have been the case. Throughout the colonial world generally interest in native magical or folk religious traditions was commonly linked to a desire to promote political domination or stability, or to Christian missionary activity. However, neither of these seem to have been of much importance as incentives in the study of Malay magic in the early 20th century. As for Christian missionary activities among Malays, these were forbidden by treaties established between British colonial authority and the Malay rulers of the various states of Malaya. The matter of the lack of strong political motives is more complicated. While the enhancement of British control or authority and stability in Malaya was definitely a paramount concern, this would seem to have been mainly irrelevant to the study of Malay magic. For in contrast to the situation in Netherlands India during the same period, and to some extent to that which had prevailed earlier in Malaya, Malay magic or folk religion was not perceived to be linked to significant opposition to the establishment or perpetuation of British colonial rule in 20th century Malaya.

It is true that claims were at least occasionally made about the utilitarian value of knowledge about Malay magic. In his preface to Skeat's *Malay Magic*, Blagden suggested that such knowledge was useful in that:

...had certain persons paid attention in 1857 to the sort of facts dealt with by Skeat in this volume, the Indian mutiny could have possibly been prevented, and that although it was unlikely that such serious matters were likely to arise in the present case, an understanding of the ideas and modes of thought of an alien people in a relatively low stage of civilization facilitates very considerably the task of governing them. (Blagden 1900: viii-ix.)

However, this assertion appears to have been mainly promotional and after the fact. If Skeat's work itself was based to any extent upon such concerns, this is not apparent from either the contents of the volume or from any introductory or concluding statement, of which there was none.

Gimlette's study of Malay folk medicine, magic and poisons provides another example, one in which there might have been a more substantial claim to practical significance than Skeat's, though of a different sort. Gimlette was a physician with the government of the Federated Malay States who served throughout the second decade of the century in the east coast state of Kelantan and who, as a result, published a pioneering study of what today might be called medical anthropology. In a foreword written by W. H. Wilcox (Gimlette 1971: xiii-xiv), Medical Advisor to the Home Office, it was suggested that many of the poisons described have active ingredients which would prove useful for modern medicine, and that Gimlette had opened up a major field of study for the physiologist and pharmacologist. Otherwise, the work is recommended as a "fascinating scientific account". Gimlette himself may have understated the practical value he saw in his work, but if so, this is not discussed in the text itself. In the preface to the second edition he notes in 1923 that the original book "was found useful for medico-legal reference in the lower courts of law" (Gimlette 1971:vii). In the preface to the first edition he suggests only that "the 'witchcraft' of the 'medicine man' is always of general interest, but the investigation of Malay medicines, poisons and their antidotes is of special scientific interest" (Gimlette 1971:x). Finally, the prefatory comments of both Wilcox and Gimlette about the practical (as well as scientific) value of the study have reference mainly to the significance of its findings about material or pharmacological substances rather than magical beliefs and practices. The latter, however, occupy a sizeable portion of the book.

The foregoing observations help to explain the development of the classic body of colonial literature on Malay magic and folk religion. Had there been greater pragmatic interest in these topics, it seems likely that they would have been approached in more empirical and more contextual terms than they were. At the same time, this leaves unanswered another question. Why, if knowledge of Malay magical or folk religious belief and practice had little perceived utilitarian value, did they receive the degree of attention that they did? It is possible that the individual scholars who produced this literature found it useful to do so from the perspective of their own careers or reputations. Yet, unless sufficient numbers of people found such knowledge of some value or interest, there would have been little incentive to record or at least publish it. This brings us to the third consideration.

3. *Other Incentives*

The Malayanist scholars who wrote about Malay magic and folk religion did not always make even a passing reference to the reasons for their studies. The most extensive statement is C. O. Blagden's preface to Skeat's *Malay Magic*, which, as noted above, is mainly an

effort to justify the book. In addition to arguing that knowledge of Malay magic could have utilitarian value for those governing Malays, Blagden suggests that "... all knowledge has a claim to be considered of importance from a scientific point of view, and until everything is known, nothing can safely be rejected as worthless" (Blagden 1900:ix). Other scholars also make reference to the "scientific interest" or simply to "interests" of the phenomenon described. Finally, there are explicit or implicit references to the likelihood that, in a period of rapid change, traditional Malay customs and beliefs would eventually disappear and, thus should be recorded while this was still possible (Wilkinson 1957:79).

Such statements, even when they are made, seem to offer only limited insight into the range of possible reasons or incentives for recording, describing or analyzing Malay magic. It seems safe to say that the most commonly felt reason for those involved was that the phenomena were inherently interesting, "scientifically" or otherwise, and thus deserving of the attention of some wider community, or being recorded while still in existence. This, of course, simply raises the question of why such magical beliefs and practices should have been so regarded. A full answer to this question would have to make reference to both the wider intellectual climate of the time and to the more specific one of colonial Malaya in the first decades of the century, and, as such, is beyond the scope of this paper. In brief, the following points seem relevant.

Evans-Pritchard (1965-b:4) notes that there was an intense interest in primitive religions on the part of the Victorian and Edwardian scholars and suggests that this may have been because they faced a crisis in their own — that is, Western — religious life. He writes (Evans-Pritchard 1965-b:5) further that the prevailing mood of the period was one of a "curious mixture of positivism, evolutionism and the remains of a sentimental religiosity", and that the comparativist scholars of the time regarded all religious belief as absurd (Evans-Pritchard 1965-b:15-16). On the basis of their published works such statements seem to ring true as regards the interests of the Malayanist scholars of Malay magic, some of whom, as noted, credit the comparativists — Tyler, Frazer, Jevons — of the period as influences.

Beyond such likely general influences, however, there would appear to be more particular reasons why the Malayanists of the first decades of the century were drawn to the topic of Malay magic and folk religion. The first of these — characteristic of Wilkinson at least — was linked to an attitude of ambivalence toward the colonial transformation of Malay society that was in full swing at the turn of the century. Wilkinson saw the changes that were occurring in Malay society, including "the loss of traditional craft skill, the ruin of men deservedly held in good repute in traditional society, and the elevation

of men willing to serve the foreigner" as inexorable but in some respects evil (Wilkinson 1902:686). On the other hand, in writing about Malay magical belief and ritual, he speaks of these phenomena as "useless relics", interesting to the observer, deserving of record, but archaic within the context of 20th century Malay life.

Again, we may ask ourselves: How long are these old Malay ceremonies likely to survive? Not long, perhaps. The Malay is becoming educated; he is commencing to believe in newspapers and books, and, above all, he is beginning to have a good conceit of himself. Why should he defer to the custodians of these ancient customs, old and ignorant people who cannot read and write? He does not discard — he would not be a Malay if he did — but he improves upon what went before and his improvements are of a most deadly character. There was once a Malay who tried to introduce poetic elements into the official letter-writing of the State Secretariat with which he was connected. The object was laudable enough, but the fond expressions used by Malay lovers seemed singularly out of place in official documents. Anyone who attends a modern Malay ceremony, be it a wedding or an ear-boring or even the installation of a prince, will be struck by the inevitable confusion between the new and the old. Not even Malay conservatism will suffice to preserve the old customs of the country from the disintegrating influence of modern improvements.

The change in Malay life is not really for the worse. The ancient Malay planted for his own consumption; the Malay of the future will plant to sell. (Wilkinson 1957:78.)

In this passage, traditional Malay custom and ceremony became a metaphor for Malay culture and society generally, by which Wilkinson is able to accept its destruction as necessary or even beneficial. If traditional Malay culture was basically absurd and archaic, at least within the context of the 20th century, then there was not much to be regretted in its oblivion.

Of the other Malayanists of the period there is less evidence of doubt about the value of the colonial transformation for Malay society; in the case of Winstedt, the other major colonial interpreter of Malay magic, folk religion and culture generally, there is none. Instead, for Winstedt and the others, part of the particular attraction of Malay magic seems to have been more simply romantic.¹⁴ The pioneering phase of British imperialism in the Malay peninsula was perceived to have ended by the turn of the century. This was not exactly the case. A substantial region of the country, in particular the Malay states of the north, remained to be brought under British control in the period of 1904-14, and this was not accomplished without a certain amount of conflict (Allen 1968). At the turn of the century the far northeastern

area of the Peninsula, where pre-colonial Malay regimes were still in place, was little known, and it was for this reason that the Cambridge Expedition of 1899-1900 was undertaken.

But for the administrator-scholars serving in the west coast Malay states and in the Straits Settlements, Malaya was no longer the land of danger, adventure and opportunity that it was perceived to be in earlier periods; nor were the Malays perceived to be the same people who had forcefully resisted British advances and who had often lived by piracy and other treacherous, dissolute means that strongly appealed to the romantic side of the Victorian and Edwardian colonial imagination. The considerable volume of short stories, novels, and sketches produced by the colonial administrators of the period — above all, those of Sir Hugh Clifford and Sir Frank Swettenham — represent the most direct and obvious attempt to maintain and keep alive contact with the intriguing less civilized side of Malay life (Allen 1964). But the literature on Malay magic would seem to reflect such interests as well. Here also, then, Malay magic and the Malay magician are metaphors for what was seen as a vanished or vanishing side of traditional Malay life. For Winstedt the Malay magician was explicitly an incarnation of earlier levels of religious and cultural development — animism, Hinduism and Islamic Sufism. But implicitly he was also an incarnation of the more primitive and mysterious aspects of Malay personality and culture with which Winstedt and many of the other Malayanists were most able to identify and which they thus chose to emphasize as most real.

Conclusion

The body of literature produced over more than a century on the general topic of Malay magic commands attention in several respects. For the Malayanist or scholar of comparative religion it is a substantial record of information on a range of individual or collective beliefs, values, practices and customs of a sort in which there appears to be a continuing interest. As such a record, the literature is problematic and needs to be used with caution. This is particularly so of the more interpretive works which seem to have exerted the strongest influence on subsequent thought about Malays and Malay culture.

The literature on Malay magic is also of interest as a case study in the culture and scholarship of imperialism. The relationship between this literature and the circumstances of colonial rule within which it was produced is ambiguous in that it seems to have had little of the practical significance which underlay much imperialist scholarship. In a sense knowledge about Malay magic is quite definitely a by-product of the general need for expertise on Malay language and culture. At the same time, there is little evidence that the literature on Malay magic in particular, or the investigations on which it was based, were to any

significant extent a consequence of a perceived need for practical information of any kind. The proximate motives for studying and writing about Malay magic were mainly that it was inherently interesting, an important part of Malay life and culture, and so on. Behind these motives lay a complex of attitudes and values with regard to the nature of traditional Malay society and the changes it was undergoing as a consequence of colonial domination.

April 1982

NOTES

- 1 I would like to thank the following people who have provided detailed comments on one or another of the drafts of this paper over the years: Oliver Wolters, Shelly Errington, William Douglass, Michael Brodhead, and, especially, Judith Winzeler. The interpretation, and any remaining flaws, are my own.
- 2 Skeat 1900; Cuisinier 1936; Winstedt 1961; Endicott 1970; Shaw 1975.
- 3 See the appended bibliography and Shaw 1975:257-270.
- 4 The line between these two types is not always easily drawn. Popular accounts in recent decades include McHugh (1955) and Wavell (1965). Recent scholarly studies are discussed in the text. Shaw (1975) occupies a middle ground.
- 5 Wilkinson's *Malay Beliefs*, originally published in London in 1906, and *The Incidents of Malay Life*, originally published in the Papers on Malay Subjects Series in 1908, were combined and republished in 1957 by the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society as a monograph; Skeat's (1900) *Malay Magic* was reprinted in 1966 in New York and London; Gimlette's *Malay Poisons*, originally published in 1915 in London, was published in revised editions in 1924 and 1929, the last of which was reprinted in 1971 in Kuala Lumpur; Winstedt's (1925) *Shaman, Saiva and Sufi* was published in revised editions in 1951 and 1961 in London as *The Malay Magician*.
- 6 Recent attempts to interpret Malay culture based on Wilkinson's ideas may be found in Parkinson's (1967) discussion of Malay economic backwardness and in Wolff's 1965 analysis of Malay resistance to modern medicine.
- 7 See Wax and Wax (1963) and Rosengren (1976), for example.
- 8 The role of Islam in Malay life was generally neglected in the literature of Malay magic and folk religion, as I shall note at length in a separate article.
- 9 Most notably the *Malayan Police Magazine* and the *Journal of the Federated States Museum*. A few articles were published in the British journals *Man* and *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*.
- 10 See the collections of the writings of each edited by Roff (Clifford 1966; Swettenham 1967).
- 11 Annandale, a zoologist by training, published a number of articles on Malay magic and folk religion, in addition to several contributions on the topic in *Fasciculi Malayenses*, the volume covering the Cambridge Expedition (Annandale and Robinson 1903).
- 12 Wilkinson's Malay-English dictionary was first published in 1901 in Singapore. The revised edition was published in Greece in 1932.
- 13 Though more so in Wilkinson's writings than in Winstedt's.
- 14 In his memoirs Winstedt (1969) presents an account of Malay seances as he witnessed them in 1903 with reference to the famous seance that was held by the Sultan of the Malay State of Perak before the insurrection in which the British resident was slain in 1875. This seance, which took place in a

period which "seemed centuries remote even in 1903", is described as follows:
Before that historic ceremony began, Abdullah, . . . then Sultan of Perak, had smoked opium and said to his chiefs, 'If there are any prophets or spirits left in the land, let us look into the future of the British resident and see if anyhow Mr. Birch's steamer may be wrecked on the bar of the river and his death brought to pass'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdu'l-Majid bin Haji Zainu'd-din
1920 'A Pawang's Instructions for Selecting Doves and Turtle-doves', *Journal of the Federated Malay States Museums (JFMSM)* 9:19-20.
- Abdul Majid, Haji
1930 'The Auspicious Moment', *Malayan Police Magazine (MPM)* 3:19-20.
- Abdullah, Dato Setia Raja
1927 'The Origin of the Pawang and the Berpuar Ceremony', *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (JSBRAS)* 5-2:310-313.
- Allen, J. de V.
1964 'Two Imperialists: A Study of Frank Swettenham and Sir Hugh Clifford', *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society (JMBRAS)* 37-1:41-73.
1968 'The Kelantan Rising of 1915: Some Thoughts on the Concepts of Resistance in British Malay History', *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 9:241-57.
- Annandale, N.
1902 'Human Souls and Ghosts Among the Malays of Patani', *Report of the British Association for the Advancement of Science* 72:752-3.
1903a 'Religion and Magic Among the Malays of the Patani States', in: N. Annandale and H. Robinson, *Fasciculi Malayenses*, Anthropology, Parts I (89-104) and IIa (21-57), Liverpool: University Press.
1903b 'Primitive Beliefs and Customs of the Patani Fishermen', in: *Fasciculi Malayenses*, Part I (73-78).
1903c 'Notes on the Popular Religion of the Patani Malays', *Man* 3:27-28.
1909 'The Theory of Souls Among the Malays of the Malay Peninsula', *Asiatic Society of Bengal, Journal*, n.s.v.:59-66.
- Annandale, N., and H. C. Robinson
1903 *Fasciculi Malayenses. Anthropological and Zoological Results of an Expedition to Perak and the Siamese Malay States, 1901-2*, Liverpool: University Press.
- Anonymous
1886 'Belief in Spirits and Demons', *JSBRAS* 17:126-130, in Notes and Queries.
1897 'Protective Charm', *JSBRAS* 30:305, in Notes and Queries.
1929 'The Extent of Malay Superstition', *MPM* 2:414.
1929 'Mat Malacca', *MPM* 2:454-456.
1930 'Sacred Trees', *MPM* 3:215.
1934 'Believe it or Not', *MPM* 7:23-24.
1934 'Magic and Men', *MPM* 7:208.
1939 'Pawang Sa'at Gabang's Capture', *MPM* 12:182-184.
1940 'A Case of Poltergeistism', *MPM* 13:292-293.
1940 'Kramat Batu Tujoh', *MPM* 13:262-264.
1940 'The Spirit of the Rhu', *MPM* 13:318-319.

- Asad, Talal
1975 *Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter*, Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press.
- Bastin, J., and R. Roolvink (eds.)
1964 *Malayan and Indonesian Studies: Essays Presented to Richard Winstedt*, Oxford University Press.
- Benjamin, G.
1979 'Indigenous Religious Systems of the Malay Peninsula', in: A. L. Becker and A. A. Yengoyan (eds.), *The Imagination of Reality*, pp. 183-222, Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Blagden, C. O.
1896 'Notes on the Folk-lore and Popular Religion of the Malays', *JSBRAS* 29:1-12.
1900 'Preface', in W. W. Skeat, *Malay Magic: An Introduction to the Folklore and Popular Religion of the Malay Peninsula*, pp. xii-xviii, London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd.
- Bland, R. N.
1904 'Hunting Invocations', *JSBRAS* 42:19-22.
- Burns, P. L.
1971 'Introduction', in: R. J. Wilkinson, *Papers on Malay Subjects*, pp. 1-8, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Burridge, K.
1961 'Kuda Kepang in Batu Pahat', *Man* 61:33-36.
- Butcher, J. G.
1979 *The British in Malaya, 1880-1941: The Social History of a European Community in Colonial Southeast Asia*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clifford, H.
1966 *Stories by Hugh Clifford*, edited by W. Roff, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Coope, A. E.
1933 'The Black Art (Ilmu Jahat)', *JMBRAS* 11-2:264-272.
1939 'The Black Art (Ilmu Jahat)', *MPM* 12:229-231.
- Crawford, J.
1820 *History of the Indian Archipelago*, 3 vols., Edinburgh: A. Constable and Co.
- Crawley, E. A.
1902 *The Mystic Rose: A Study of Primitive Marriage*, London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd.
- Cuisinier, J.
1936 'Danses magiques de Kelantan', *Travaux et Memoires de l'Institut d'Ethnologie, Université de Paris*, No. XXII, Paris.
1951 *Sumangat. L'âme et son culte en Indochine et en Indonésie*, Paris, Gallimard.
1957 *Le theatre d'ombres a Kelantan*, Paris: Gallimard.
- Danaraj, A. G. S.
1964 *Mysticism in Malaysia*, Singapore: Asia Publishing Co.
- Eliade, M.
1964 *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*, New York: Random House.

Ellen, R. F.

- 1976 'The Development of Anthropology and Colonial Policy in the Netherlands: 1900-1960', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 12:303-324.

Endicott, K. M.

- 1970 *An Analysis of Malay Magic*, London: Oxford University Press.

Evans, I. H. N.

- 1923a 'Lucky and Unlucky Keris Measurements', *JFMSM* 12:12-16.
1923b *Studies in Religion, Folk-Lore & Custom in British North Borneo and the Malay Peninsula*, Cambridge University Press.
1923c 'Two Malay Methods of Divination', *JMBRAS* 11:247.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E.

- 1965a *The Position of Women in Primitive Societies and Other Essays in Social Anthropology*, New York: Free Press.
1965b *Theories of Primitive Religion*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Favas, Rev. P.

- 1849 'Pawang's', *Journal of the Indian Archipelago* 3:115-116.

Firth, R.

- 1967 'Ritual and Drama in Malay Spirit Mediumship', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* IX:190-207.
1974 'Faith and Skepticism in Kelantan Village Magic', in: W. Roff (ed.), *Kelantan: Religion, Society and Politics in a Malay State*, pp. 190-224, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Frazer, J.

- 1911-d. *The Golden Bough*, 3rd. ed., 12 vols., London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd.

G.C. 1885 'Malay Superstitions', *JSBRAS* 15:53, in Notes and Queries.

Gimlette, J. D.

- 1913 'Some Superstitious Beliefs Occurring in the Theory and Practice of Malay Medicine', *JSBRAS* 65:29-35.
1915 *Malay Poisons and Charm Cures*, London: J & A Churchill.
1920 'A curious Kelantan Charm', *JSBRAS* 82:116-118.
1924 'Smoking Over a Fire to Drive Out an Evil Spirit', *Man* 24: Art. 3.
1926 'A Bee Bomor', *JMBRAS* 9-3:421-2.
1939 *A Dictionary of Malayan Medicine*, ed. and completed by H. W. Thompson, London: Oxford University Press. Reprinted 1971.
1971 *Malay Poisons and Charm Cures*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press (reprint of the 3rd edition, published in 1929).

Hale, A.

- 1920 'How Mir Hasan Became a Pawang', *Straits and States Annual*: 108-114, Singapore.

Hamilton, A. W.

- 1926 'Malay Love Charms', *JMBRAS* 4-1:136-138.

Honderd Jaar Studie van Indonesië 1850-1950

- 1976 Compiled by H. J. M. Maier and A. Teeuw, The Hague: Smits.

Josselin de Jong, P. E. de

- 1977 'Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands: Creature of Circumstance', in: P. E. de Josseling de Jong (ed.), *Structural Anthropology in the Netherlands*, pp. 1-29, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

- Kessler, C.
1977 'Conflict and Sovereignty in Kelantanese Malay Spirit Seances', in: V. Crapanzano and V. Garrison (eds.), *Case Studies in Spirit Possession*, pp. 295-331, New York: Wiley.
- Koentjaraningrat, R. M.
1975 *Anthropology in Indonesia; A Bibliographical Review*, The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Laidlaw, F. F.
1923 'Note on the Invocation of Akuan', *JMBRAS* 1-2:376-7.
1953 'W. W. Skeat, 1866-1953: Obituary', *JMBRAS* 26-1:224-228.
- Leach, E.
1968 *Dialectic in Practical Religion*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McHugh, J. N.
1955 *Hantu Hantu: An Account of Ghost Belief in Modern Malaya*, Singapore: Donald Moore.
- McNair, F.
1878 *Perak and the Malays: Sarong and Keris*, London: Tinsley Brothers.
- Machado, A. D.
1903 'On the Supposed Evil Influence Exercised by Ghosts in the Malay Peninsula', *JSBRAS* 39:208-209.
- Mandelbaum, D.
1966 'Transcendental and Pragmatic Aspects of Religion', *American Anthropologist* 68:1174-1191.
- Maquet, J.
1963 Le conditionnement social de l'anthropologie culturelle, Sixième Congrès International des Sciences Anthropologiques et Ethnologiques, Tome II, Vol. I, Paris: Musée de l'Homme.
- Marsden, W.
1783 *The History of Sumatra*, London: T. Payne.
- Maxwell, W. E.
1878 'Malay Keramat', *JSBRAS* 2:236-243.
1883 'Shamanism in Perak', *JSBRAS* 12:222-232.
1886 'Pelas Negri', *JSBRAS* 16:80-82, in Notes and Queries.
1906 'Mantra Gajah', *JSBRAS* 45:1-53.
1907 'Mantra Gajah', *JSBRAS* 49:71-86.
- Newbold, T. J.
1839 *Political & Statistical Account of the British Settlements in the Straits of Malacca*, London: John Murray.
- Overbeck, H.
1923 'Shaer Raksi. Raja Haji Ahmad', *JMBRAS* 1-2:282-307.
1929 'Shaer Ta'bir Mimpil', *JMBRAS* 7-2:338-375.
- Parkinson, B.
1967 'Non-Economic Factors in the Economic Retardation of the Malays', *Modern Asian Studies* 101:36-38.
- Raffles, T. S.
1817 *The History of Java*, London: Black, Parbury and Allen, etc.
- Rentse, A.
1931 'Kelantan Malay Charms', *JMBRAS* 9-1:146-157.
1933 'Notes on Malay Beliefs', *JMBRAS* 11-2:245-251.
1936 'The Kelantan Shadow-Play (Wayang Kulit)', *JMBRAS* 14-3:284-301.
1936 'Majapahit Amulets in Kelantan', *JMBRAS* 14-3:302-304.

Roff, W.

- 1967 *The Origins of Malay Nationalism*, Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.

Rosengren, K. E.

- 1976 'Malinowski's Magic: The Riddle of the Empty Cell', *Current Anthropology* 17-4:667-685.

Shahrum Bin Yub

- 1966 'Kelantan Black Art: Three Examples', *FMJ* 11:37-46.

Shaw, W.

- 1971 'Mining Superstitions, Magic and Taboos', *FMJ* 16:29-52.
1972 'Black Magic', *FMJ* 17:31-59.
1973a 'Miscellaneous Notes on Malaysian Magic', *FMJ* 18:1-70.
1973b 'Aspects of Spirit-Mediumship, Trance and Ecstasy in Peninsular Malaysia', *FMJ* 18:71-176.
1975 *Aspects of Malaysian Magic*, Kuala Lumpur: Museum Negara.

Sheppard, M. C.

- 1938 'The Talisman, Ancient and Modern', *MPM* 11:50.
1968 'Feast for the Sea Djinns', *Straits Times Annual*:38-41.

Sircom, H. S.

- 1921 'Keramat in Lower Pahang', *JFMSM* 9:153.

Skeat, W. W.

- 1898 'Some Records of Malay Magic by an Eye-Witness', *JSBRAS* 31:1-41.
1900 *Malay Magic*, London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd.
1901 *Fables and Folk-tales from an Eastern Forest*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skeat, W., and F. Laidlaw

- 1953 'The Cambridge University Expedition to Parts of the Malay Peninsula 1899-1900', *JMBRAS* 26-4:1-174.

Snouck Hurgronje, C.

- 1906 *The Achehnese*, translated by A. W. S. O'Sullivan, 2 Vols., Leiden.

Swettenham, F.

- 1967 *Stories and Sketches*, selected and introduced by W. Roff, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Taib bin Osman, Mohd.

- 1972 'Patterns of Supernatural Premises Underlying the Institution of the Bomoh in Malay Culture', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde* 128-II/III, pp. 219 ff.

Tylor, E. B.

- 1871 *Primitive Culture*, 2 vols., London: John Murray.
1902 'Malay Divining Rods', *Man* 2: Art. 20.

Wavell, Stewart

- 1958 *The Lost World of the East. An Adventurous Quest in the Malayan Hinterland*, London: Souvenir Press.
1965 *The Naga King's Daughter*, London: Allen & Unwin.

Wax, M., and R. Wax

- 1963 'The Notion of Magic', *Current Anthropology* 4-3:495-518.

Wilder, W.

- 1968 'Islam, Other Factors and Malay Backwardness', *Modern Asian Studies* 2-2:151-164.

Wilkinson, R. J.

- 1901 *A Malay-English Dictionary*, Singapore: Kelly & Walsh.
- 1902 'The Education of Asiatics', *Special Reports on Educational Subjects*, Vol. 8, Col. 835 of 1902, Parliamentary Papers of Great Britain.
- 1906 *Malay Beliefs*, London: Luzac & Co.
- 1908 *The Incidents of Malay Life*, Papers on Malay Subjects, Series 1, Kuala Lumpur.
- 1932 'Some Malay Studies', *JMBRAS* 10-1:67-137.
- 1957 *Malay Customs and Beliefs*, Monographs on Malay Subjects, No. 4, *JMBRAS*:30-4.

Winstedt, R. O.

- 1920a 'The Camphor Language of Johore and Southern Pahang', *JFMSM* 9: 59-80.
- 1920b 'Malay Charms; Part I, Love Charms', *JFMSM* 9:129-159.
- 1920c 'Propitiating the Spirits of a District (Menjamu Negeri)', *JFMSM* 9: 93-95.
- 1920d 'Rice Ceremonies in Negri Sembilan', *JFMSM* 9:122-128.
- 1920e 'Rice Ceremonies in Upper Perak', *JFMSM* 9:116-121.
- 1921 'Of Magicians', *Straits and States Annual*: 13-18.
- 1922 'Malay Charms: Part 2, Miscellaneous', *JFMSM* 9:231-244.
- 1923 'Three Peninsula Charms', *JMBRAS* 1-2:383-384.
- 1924 'Karamat: Sacred Places and Persons in Malaya', *JMBRAS* 2-3:264-279.
- 1925a 'A Kelantan Invocation to the Earth Spirit', *JMBRAS* 3-1:83.
- 1925b 'A Perak Invocation to the Langsuyar', *JMBRAS* 3-1:83-84.
- 1925c *Shaman, Saiva and Sufi*, London: Constable & Co., Ltd.
- 1927 'More Notes on Malay Magic', *JMBRAS* 5-2:342-347.
- 1929a 'The Perak Genies', *JMBRAS* 7-3:460-466.
- 1929b 'Royal Tabus in Negri Sembilan', *JMBRAS* 7-2:454-455.
- 1947 'Notes on Malay Subjects', *JMBRAS* 20-1:140-142.
- 1951 *The Malay Magician*, revised and enlarged edition of *Shaman, Saiva and Sufi*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 1961 *The Malay Magician: Being Shaman, Saiva and Sufi*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.
- 1963a *An Unabridged English-Malay Dictionary*, Kuala Lumpur: Marican and Sons.
- 1963b *An Unabridged Malay-English Dictionary*, Kuala Lumpur: Marican and Sons.
- 1969 *Start From Alif, Count From One*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

Wolff, R. P.

- 1965 'Modern Medicine and Traditional Culture: Confrontation on the Malay Peninsula', *Human Organization* 24:339-45.

Zainal Abidin Bin Ahmad

- 1925a 'The Tiger Breed Families', *JSBRAS* 85:26-39.
- 1925b 'The Akuan or Spirit Friends', *JSBRAS* 86:378-384.
- 1925c 'Dato Paroi, Were-Tiger', *JMBRAS* 3-1:74-78.