Article QR

Title:	**From Fear to Framework: Tracing the Social Construction of Magic, Religion and Science**
Author (s):	Ahsan Fazal[1] and Maryam Siddiq[2]
Affiliation (s):	[1]Beaconhouse National University, Lahore, Pakistan [2]University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.32350/sri.31.07
History:	Received: April 16, 2025, Revised: April 30, 2025, Accepted: May 20, 2025, Published: June 20, 2025
Citation:	Fazal, A., & Siddiq, M. (2025). From fear to framework: Tracing the social construction of magic, religion and science. *Sociological Research and Innovation*, *3*(1), 138–154. https://doi.org/10.32350/sri.31.07
Copyright:	© The Authors
Licensing:	This article is open access and is distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
Conflict of Interest:	Author(s) declared no conflict of interest

From Fear to Framework: Tracing the Social Construction of Magic, Religion, and Science

Ahsan Fazal* and Maryam Siddiq[2]

¹Razia Hassan School of Architecture, Beaconhouse National University, Lahore, Pakistan

²Department of Architecture, University of Engineering and Technology, Lahore, Pakistan

Abstract

The current study aimed to explore how the boundaries between magic, religion, and science have changed over time in human history. It explained that these categories are not fixed or universal, however, have been shaped by different cultures, historical events, and power dynamics. Using historical, anthropological, and sociological texts, this study attempted to identify five key themes. These include fear and control, institutional boundary-making, cultural fluidity, knowledge progression, and epistemic exclusion. Furthermore, the study determined that the differences between magic, religion, and science are not fixed or natural instead, they are created by cultures and societies over time. These findings add to the ongoing discussions about how people in different times and places have understood, accepted, or challenged different belief systems. In the end, it argued that all three, magic, religion, and science, are ways that human beings have developed to understand and deal with the mysteries of life.

Keywords: anthropology, control of nature, desire, history and magic, magic, religion, science

Introduction

Scholars have long noted that magic, religion, and science have coexisted, interacted, and competed across human history. Early anthropologists observed that "magical" and "religious" practices often formed integrated systems of meaning. Later, historians argued that religious reforms, especially during the Protestant Reformation, created firm lines between "approved" religious ritual and "illicit" magic. The scientific revolution, in turn, established new norms of empirical inquiry that marginalized anything deemed "superstitious" or "pseudoscientific".

---

*Corresponding Author: ahsan.fazal@bnu.edu.pk

The study began by establishing a theoretical framework and clarifying key concepts. Afterwards, methodological approach was explained, detailing the coding procedures and the way individual codes were synthesized into overarching themes. Next, it traced the evolution of magic, religion, and science from their origins in ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt through the development of early Christianity and the shifts of the Protestant Reformation. The narrative then moved into the emergence of modern science and its role in reshaping if not "disenchanting" the understanding of the world. Building on this historical foundation, the study explored how elements of magic persist in today's society as well as introduced a schematic model to illustrate the overlaps among these domains.

Theoretical Framework Working Definitions

To analyze how magic, religion, and science have been conceptualized, definitions by Stark ([2004](#)) were used which are as follows:

Magic

Practices believed to manipulate hidden forces, often through rituals, spells, or talismans, that lie outside or alongside institutional religious structures. Magic encompasses folk traditions, court sorcery, shamanic rituals, and alchemical experiments.

Religion

A socially organized system of beliefs, myths, and rituals centered on supernatural beings or principles, typically maintained by institutional authorities. The author emphasized Catherine Bell's ([1997](#)) notion of religion as praxis, focusing on ritual performance rather than solely doctrinal content.

Science

A systematic method of inquiry based on empirical observation, reproducibility, and rational argument. Its emergence in the 16th through 18th centuries privileged naturalistic explanations over supernatural ones.

These definitions intentionally overlap, since historical actors rarely distinguished between them as sharply as modern scholars do. Furthermore, this study is grounded in a social constructionist epistemology, which posits

that knowledge categories are negotiated through social interactions, institutional practices, and power relations (Simpson, 1967).

Tarbet's (1978) analysis of power/knowledge relations underscores how discourses become authoritative through intersecting networks of power religious institutions, legal codes, courts, and later scientific academies. Boundary-work theory (Gieryn, 1983) further informs the approach by emphasizing the rhetorical and strategic efforts by professional groups to establish legitimate from illegitimate knowledge.

The literature on magic and religion has evolved from Durkheimian functionalism and Frazerian evolutionism to more contextualized accounts that highlight regional specificity (Thomas, 1975; Versnel, 1991). Anthologies by Manning (2014) trace how magical techniques persisted alongside religious rituals. Scholarship on the Scientific Revolution by Dear (1995) documents how experimentalism gradually displaced alchemy and occultism, although often through contested processes rather than seamless displacement.

Recent critiques from postcolonial studies (Stoler, 2020) and anthropological research. Winkelman (1990) highlight that western institutions frequently marginalized indigenous practices by labeling them as superstition or irrational. These studies stress the importance of exploring how power imbalances and colonial interactions have influenced global understandings of what counts as valid knowledge.

Limitations

While this study provides a broad thematic overview of the boundaries between magic, religion, and science, it is limited in several important ways. Firstly, the research is based entirely on secondary literature. It draws from historical and anthropological texts but does not include primary fieldwork or direct interviews. This reliance on existing sources may overlook local voices or contemporary interpretations that differ from published academic narratives.

Secondly, the study takes a global and historical approach, however, many of the examples come from European contexts. Although, efforts were made to include non-western perspectives—such as the Piaroa people or tantric traditions in India, these are still filtered through western academic frameworks. Resultantly, the study may unintentionally reinforce some of the same Eurocentric assumptions it seeks to challenge.

Thirdly, while the thematic analysis identifies recurring patterns across time and cultures, it does not account for all possible variations. The meanings of magic, religion, and science differ greatly depending on language, location, and social context. Some cultures may not even recognize these as separate categories, making comparative analysis difficult.

Lastly, the concept of "epistemic violence" is introduced to highlight how certain practices and knowledge systems have been excluded or marginalized. However, this concept is complex and requires more detailed engagement than this study could offer. A deeper investigation into postcolonial and feminist theories would strengthen this aspect.

These limitations suggest that further research should include ethnographic work, linguistic analysis, and engagement with contemporary belief systems. More attention to indigenous epistemologies and lived experiences would also help refine the discussion and make it more inclusive.

Research Question

The current study aimed to answer the following research questions: How have the boundaries among magic, religion, and science been constructed, contested, and redefined throughout intellectual history?

To answer this question, a thematic analysis of the existing scholarship was undertaken as well as recurring concepts were identified through a systematic coding process. By examining texts from antiquity through the 18th century, the study showed that the categories of "magic", "religion", and "science" are not intrinsic, timeless entities; rather, they are historically contingent, shaped by social power structures, fear of the unknown, and shifting epistemologies.

Research Objectives

The current study aimed to address the following objectives:

Clarify Definitions

Provide working definitions of magic, religion, and science that account for their fluid, overlapping nature.

Trace Historical Trajectories

Demonstrate how thematic patterns, such as overlapping, boundary making, and marginalization arise in different eras and regions.

Develop a Schematic Model

Present a dynamic overlaps model to visualize how magic, religion, and science have intersected across time.

Research Methodology

To conduct this research, thematic analysis was performed. For this purpose, The Braun and Clarke's (2006) six steps were followed.

Phase 1: Familiarization

Read each text multiple times, noting initial impressions regarding the portrayal of magical, religious, or scientific activities.

Phase 2: Generating Initial Codes

Using this, passages referencing were coded: (a) agency over nature, (b) institutional sanction, (c) ritual practice, (d) epistemic claims, (e) sanctions and exclusions.

Phase 3: Searching for Themes

Codes were grouped into provisional themes. For instance, codes related to anxiety and uncertainty formed the fear and control cluster.

Phase 4: Reviewing Themes

Each theme against raw data was cross-checked, ensuring thematic coherence and distinction. A codebook documented definitions and inclusion/exclusion criteria for each theme.

Phase 5: Defining and Naming Themes

Themes were refined to reflect latent meanings. Sub-themes were identified (e.g., within institutional boundary-making: juridical sanctions vs. ecclesiastical censure).

The sources also included ancient works (e.g., Hesiod), medieval church law (e.g., Malleus Maleficarum), Reformation writings (e.g., Luther), Enlightenment science (e.g., Boyle), and ethnographies (e.g., Evans-

Pritchard on Azande) discussed by Whitford (2008), Martin (2018), and Mair (1970).

Findings

Fear and Control

Throughout history, fear of the unknown, such as illness, natural disasters, or misfortune has led people to develop rituals and beliefs in order to feel more in control. Kotansky (2019) explains that in ancient Mesopotamia and Greece, people used omens and spells to predict or influence events. Religious prayers asked for help from gods, while magical practices tried to directly change the outcomes. Mair (1970) showed that the Azande explained bad luck through witchcraft which helped them feel less helpless. Early humans also began to see powerful natural forces, such as fire or the sun, as gods. They believed that worship and rituals could protect them. Mansour (2017) adds that this belief turned into faith and then into magic when people tried to control events through specific actions. In this way, fear led to belief and belief led to both religion and magic as ways to cope with uncertainty.

Anxiety Management

Anthropologist Bartlett (1937) showed that the Azande explained misfortune by blaming it on witchcraft which helped them make sense of bad events and reduced fear by giving those events a cause. In a similar way, early scientific weather forecasting aimed to describe and predict weather patterns instead of trying to please the forces behind them. This marked a shift from using rituals to influence events to using observation to understand them.

Linguistic and Cultural Origins of Magic in Greek Thought

The conceptual origin of magic is deeply tied to its etymological roots in ancient Greece. The term *magos* originally referring to Zoroastrian priests, was adopted by Greek writers but gradually acquired negative meanings. Lloyd-Jones (1995) and Bremmer (1999) explained that by the 5th century BCE, Greek philosophers, playwrights, and physicians used *magos* to denote trickery and foreign deceit. Figures, such as Heraclitus grouped Magi with secretive religious sects, while Sophocles and medical texts including *On the Sacred Disease* accused *magoi* of fraud. This theme illustrates how cultural biases and intellectual rivalry transformed the image

of magic from sacred ritual to suspicious manipulation. The negative framing of *magos* helped separate magic from religion in Greek and later Roman contexts, influencing western definitions of both.

Etymology and Othering

The demonization of *magos* shows how language and cultural perceptions contributed to boundary-making. Magic came to be associated with foreignness and deception, distancing it from institutional religion and early science.

Institutional Boundary-making and Authority

Religious and political powers have historically legislated boundaries between acceptable and unacceptable forms of belief and practice. Ancient Roman law distinguished between *religio publica* (state-sanctioned cults) and *superstitio privata* (private, often magical or unauthorized rituals), with the latter being criminalized (Versnel, 1991). Similarly, medieval ecclesiastical courts prosecuted maleficium, harmful magic using canon law to enforce religious orthodoxy (Kieckhefer, 1990). The invention of the printing press amplified reformers' efforts to standardize doctrine; figures, such as Luther and Calvin condemned many popular magical practices as heretical deviations from proper faith (Benavides, 1997).

Juridical vs. Ecclesiastical Sanctions

Wei (2021) analyzed the *Malleus Maleficarum* as a primary source, which stands as a pivotal text that blurred legal and theological boundaries, serving as a manual for the persecution of witchcraft. It enabled secular courts to prosecute individuals on theological grounds, reinforcing how religious knowledge was upheld and disseminated through civil authority.

In more complex societies, the state often plays a central role in determining which belief systems are legitimate. These powers typically define "official religion" as morally acceptable while casting "magic" as fraudulent or dangerous. This division becomes institutionalized through the appointment of state-approved religious figures and the criminalization or marginalization of independent or folk practices. This dynamic is visible across historical contexts and religious traditions.

In contrast, simpler societies often do not draw such rigid boundaries. Among the Piaroa of South America, for instance, shamans fulfill spiritual, agricultural, and political roles simultaneously, indicating an integrated

understanding of magic, religion, and governance (Winkelman, 1990). The absence of state institutions allows these domains to remain interconnected.

Over time, distinctions between "religion" and "magic" are often socially internalized. For instance, ancient Roman society elevated institutional religion while condemning divination, spell-craft, and fortune-telling under the label of superstition. Similarly, early Christianity repurposed pagan rituals, reframing them as demonic. By the Middle Ages, the Catholic Church labeled popular healers, midwives, and folk practitioners as heretics, thus reinforcing its own religious authority by criminalizing alternative knowledge systems.

This phenomenon is not exclusive to the west. In ancient India, religious reformers, such as the Buddha rejected dominant Vedic cosmologies and ritualism, which were often linked to social hierarchies, for instance the caste system. Instead, Buddhist teachings emphasized personal faith and moral conduct, distancing themselves from ritual-based efficacy. This intellectual move contributed to a shift in how religion was defined, not as a means to manipulate the natural world but as a path to spiritual liberation. Such redefinitions echoed in Western modernity, where religion came to be associated with internal, personal faith and magic and with irrational superstition (Benavides, 1997).

Taken together, these cases highlight how the division between magic and religion is not a natural or universal one, rather, it has been created and reinforced by institutional actors seeking to assert control over belief and practice. This raises important questions about the supposed objectivity of these categories and calls for a reassessment of how they are used in academic and popular discourse.

Cultural Fluidity and Syncretism

Ethnographic studies reveal that many societies do not perceive magic and religion as fundamentally separate categories. Among the Piaroa of South America, for instance, shamans integrate spiritual invocation with agricultural guidance and healing rituals, suggesting that religious, magical, and political functions often coexist without contradiction (Winkelman, 1990). In colonial India, tantric practices merged with mainstream Hindu and Buddhist traditions, resisting rigid categorization by western observers (Urban, 2005). Such cases illustrate that the dichotomy between magic and

religion is not a global phenomenon, however, a western construct projected onto diverse cultural realities.

Colonial Disruption

Colonial rulers often created strict rules to control local people. For instance, British laws in India punished traditional healers and magical practices using "anti-superstition" laws. These laws pushed aside local knowledge and spiritual traditions. They also turned complex beliefs into simple labels, such as superstition or heresy, which weakened native ways of understanding the world. However, if we look at history, it can be seen that magic and religion were often closely connected. In many early societies, people did not separate religious beliefs from magical actions. Both were part of the same way of thinking based on rituals, unseen forces, and the wish to connect with or influence the spiritual world.

It was primarily with the rise of institutional religions and later colonial powers that clearer distinctions were imposed, often as part of efforts to consolidate power, eliminate local authorities, or align faith with political structures.

Western scholars, such as Geertz (1975) argued that particularly during the Enlightenment, imposed western intellectual thought an evolutionary model that treated magic as a primitive forerunner to religion, which, in turn, was expected to give way to scientific rationalism. However, this model is increasingly critiqued as ethnocentric and historically inaccurate. Magic, far from being an irrational leftover, often reflects coherent cosmologies and moral frameworks that explain not just fear or uncertainty but existence itself.

In many ancient and contemporary societies, what outsiders may label "magic" is deeply embedded in religious life. For instance, the use of charms, ritual healing, or prayer circles may serve both practical and spiritual purposes. The classification of such acts as magical or religious is influenced more by external judgment than internal logic.

Furthermore, Versnel (1991) adds that ancient sources themselves reflect ambiguous boundaries. In Greco-Roman contexts, curse tablets (defixiones) were used to invoke supernatural help against adversaries, often through coercive or manipulative wording. These were contrasted with "legitimate" prayers that appealed to major deities using moral justifications. While modern scholars might call the former magical and the

latter religious, ancient practitioners saw both as viable modes of divine communication. The decline of public belief in magic during the 17th century was not due to a universal realization of its falsehood, however, it was due to broader socio-political and religious reforms. The rise of science, rationalist thinking, and centralized religious control recast magic as illegitimate, associating it with fraud, devil-worship, or ignorance. However, beliefs in supernatural intervention, such as miracles, divine retribution, or sacred relics persisted within mainstream religion. This reveals that the boundary was not between belief and disbelief but between sanctioned and unsanctioned belief.

Ultimately, belief systems whether magical or religious—are not simply social tools to manage anxiety. They shape moral orders, cosmologies, and community structures. The classification of one as legitimate and the other as irrational is less about theological difference and more about who holds the power to define orthodoxy.

Rationalization and Knowledge Progression

The Enlightenment reconceived magic's mnemonic and analogical techniques as remnants of unscientific reasoning. Thinkers, such as Francis Bacon and Isaac Newton helped shape a new epistemological landscape in which knowledge had to be demonstrable, replicable, and free from metaphysical speculation. Robert Boyle, for instance, distinguished alchemical transmutation, often associated with secrecy and symbolic transformation, from reproducible chemical experimentation, presenting the latter as grounded in objective, measurable outcomes (Hesselbach et al., 2012). This shift towards systematized observation marked a turning point in defining legitimate knowledge.

Intellectual salons during the Enlightenment became critical arenas where the legitimacy of borderline practices, such as magnetism, astrology, or mesmerism was debated. Pattie (1994) expanded the idea by explaining that the 1784 Royal Commission led by Benjamin Franklin and Antoine Lavoisier discredited Mesmer's "animal magnetism" as a delusion, signaling a broader move towards rational empiricism and institutional oversight. Rather than outright rejecting all magical thinking, Enlightenment discourse repackaged certain phenomena under new scientific terms thus, electricity and magnetism moved from mystical curiosity to physics.

Methodological Legitimacy

Scientific legitimacy increasingly depended on the ability to isolate, quantify, and reproduce phenomena under standardized conditions. Secrecy, symbolic interpretation, and the charisma of individual practitioners became signs of pseudoscience or fraud. The Royal Society's efforts to codify experimental procedure through peer review, empirical verification, and the open exchange of data redefined what counted as credible knowledge.

This process, however, was not neutral. Many practices labeled as "magic" or "superstition" were excluded not because they were demonstrably false, however, because they failed to conform to emerging institutional norms. Theories that had been central to natural philosophy, such as the doctrine of sympathies or hermetic correspondences, were dismissed not on empirical grounds alone, however, due to changing rhetorical and methodological expectations.

While the Enlightenment fostered innovation, it also facilitated epistemic gatekeeping. Rationalization allowed science to position itself as the only valid way of knowing, sidelining competing traditions. Yet, as modern scholars point out, this did not fully erase magical thinking; instead, it pushed it into new cultural spaces, from romanticism and occult revivals to contemporary alternative medicine. Rationalization, therefore, was not merely about replacing magic with science, it was about recoding and redistributing the boundaries of legitimate knowledge.

Legitimation, Exclusion, and Epistemic Violence

Accusations of magic and superstition have historically targeted marginalized groups. European witch hunts disproportionately implicated women, reflecting gendered power dynamics (Levack, 2013).

In early modern Europe, medical licensing marginalized midwives and herbalists, channeling women's healing work into patriarchal institutions. Epistemic violence also accompanied missionary efforts: Catholic and Protestant missionaries condemned indigenous medicinal and ritual knowledge as diabolical, erasing local epistemologies (Thomas, 2009).

Gender and Knowledge Authority

Feminist historians argue that the relegation of women's healing traditions to the category of superstition constituted a form of epistemic oppression that sustained male-dominated scientific professions.

Discussion

The six thematic domains identified in this study reveal that the classification and separation of magic, religion, and science are not neutral or universally accepted but are deeply tied to historical processes of power and legitimacy. These themes help understand how human beings, across cultures and time periods, have developed complex systems to deal with uncertainty, organize knowledge, and establish authority.

The theme of *Fear and Control* shows that fear of illness, natural disasters, or misfortune was a common motivator for both magical and religious practices. Across societies, people created rituals and belief systems to cope with uncertainty and feel a sense of protection and control. However, the way fear was managed—through magic, prayer, or science as well as shaped by each society's cultural logic.

The theme of institutional boundary-making and authority determines how religious and political leaders created clear divisions between magic, religion, and later, science. These separations were often made official through laws and religious rules. They were not based on real differences but on deciding what kind of belief or practice was "acceptable". Resultantly, magic was often seen as dangerous or false, especially when it was outside the control of powerful institutions.

The theme of cultural fluidity and syncretism reflects that in many non-western cultures, the line between magic and religion is not clear. For instance, shamans in South America or tantric healers in India often combine both spiritual and religious practices. This shows that the idea of separating magic and religion is mostly a western concept. Colonial powers forced strict categories on local traditions to control people. In doing so, they erased or replaced rich local belief systems.

The theme of rationalization and knowledge progression discusses that during the Enlightenment, new ways of thinking about knowledge became popular. People started trusting methods that used observation, experiments, and repeated results. This helped the growth of science but

also caused people to reject older ways of knowing. Many practices that were once respected were now called superstition or fake science because they did not follow new scientific methods.

The theme of legitimation, exclusion, and epistemic violence shows how certain groups were pushed aside in the name of defining "truth". Women, local healers, and indigenous people were called witches, frauds, or heretics even when their knowledge had value, such as healing which was ignored. This process was not only about facts, however, about who had the power to decide what counts as true or real.

Together, these themes show that the lines between magic, religion, and science are always changing. They are not fixed but influenced by fear, power, and control. Sometimes, fear is used to increase control. At other times, science is used to exclude traditions that don't fit the dominant way of thinking. These struggles still happen today—in arguments about traditional medicine, spiritual healing, or local ways of knowing.

Understanding these patterns helps take a more open and careful approach to knowledge. It encourages us to question western views and pay attention to how different cultures understand the world. By doing this, we can have more fair and respectful conversations across different disciplines and communities.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This thematic analysis shows that magic, religion, and science are not separate or natural opposites. Instead, they are shaped by history, culture, and power. Over time, these systems have changed—sometimes overlapping, sometimes separating—depending on who is in charge and what is considered "true" or "real".

Magic was often seen as dangerous when it challenged the authority. Religion gained respect when supported by institutions. Science became dominant when its methods were formalized and widely accepted. However, all these systems are part of how societies make sense of the world.

Rather than asking which system is more correct, it is more useful to ask how each one works in a society—how it gives meaning, who it includes or excludes, and how it changes over time.

Future research can be conducted on this by studying how technology, global healing, or new belief systems continue to mix or redraw these boundaries. This kind of study helps better understand the many ways human beings try to explain life, deal with uncertainty, and search for meaning.

Conflict of Interest

Data Availability Statement

The data associated with this study will be provided by the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding Details

References

Bartlett, F. C. (1937). Witchcraft, oracles and magic among the Azande, Nature, *140*, 338–340

Bell, C. M. (1997). *Ritual: Perspectives and dimensions*. Oxford University Press.

Benavides, G. (1997). Magic, religion, materiality. *Historical Reflections/Réflexions Historiques*, *23*(3), 301–330.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.

Bremmer, J. N. (1999). The birth of the term'magic'. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, *126*, 1–12

Dear, P. (1995). *Discipline and experience: The mathematical way in the scientific revolution*. University of Chicago Press.

Geertz, H. (1975). An anthropology of religion and magic, I. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, *6*(1), 71–89.

Gieryn, T. F. (1983). Boundary-work and the demarcation of science from non-science: Strains and interests in professional ideologies of

scientists. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(6), 781–795. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095325

Hesselbach, R. A., Petering, D. H., Berg, C. A., Tomasiewicz, H., & Weber, D. (2012). A guide to writing a scientific paper: A focus on high school through graduate level student research. *Zebrafish*, *9*(4), 246–249.

Kotansky, R. D. (2019). Textual amulets and writing traditions in the ancient world. In D. Frankfurter (Ed.), *Guide to the study of ancient magic* (pp. 507–554). Brill.

Lloyd-Jones, H. (1995). [Review of *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da omero all' eta ellenistica. scritti in onore di bruno gentili* by R. Pretagostini]. *The Classical Review*, *45*(2), 417–427.

Levack, B. P. (2013). *The witch-hunt in early modern Europe*. Routledge.

Mair, L. (1970). [Review of *Witchcraft and sorcery; A witch in my heart: A play set in Swaziland in the 1930s*, by M. Marwick & H. Kuper]. *Man*, *5*(4), 722–722. https://doi.org/10.2307/2799145

Manning, M. C. (2014). Magic, religion, and ritual in historical archaeology. *Historical Archaeology*, *48*(3), 1–9.

Mansour, R. (2017). Monotheism between evolutionary phenomena and built-in human instinct. *EPH-International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *2*(1), 8–12.

Martin, R. P. (2018). Hesiodic theology. In A. Loney & S. Scully (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of Hesiod* (pp. 125–141). Oxford University Press.

Pattie, F. A. (1994). *Mesmer and animal magnetism: A chapter in the history of medicine*. Edmonston Publishing.

Simpson, G. (1967). [Review of *the social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*, by P. L. Berger & T. Luckmann]. *American Sociological Review*, *32*(1), 137–138. https://doi.org/10.2307/2091739

Stark, R. (2004). Religion, magic & science. In R. Stark (Ed.), *Exploring the religious life* (pp. 1–20). JHU Press.

Stoler, A. L. (2020). Carnal knowledge and imperial power: Race and the intimate in colonial rule. In S. Howe (Ed.), *The new imperial histories reader* (pp. 177–194). Routledge.

Tarbet, D. W. (1978). [Review of *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*, by M. Foucault & A. Sheridan]. *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, *11*(4), 509–514. https://doi.org/10.2307/2737970

Thomas, K. (1975). An anthropology of religion and magic, II. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, *6*(1), 91–109.

Thomas, N. (2009). *Entangled objects: Exchange, material culture, and colonialism in the Pacific*. Harvard University Press.

Urban, H. B. (2005). *Tantra: Sex, secrecy, politics, and power in the study of religion*. Motilal Banarsidass Publisher.

Versnel, H. S. (1991). Some reflections on the relationship magic-religion. *Numen*, *38*(2), 177–197.

Wei, D. (2021, October 29–31). *Primary source analysis of Malleus Maleficarum* [Paper presentation]. Proceedings of 4th International Conference on Humanities Education and Social Sciences, Xishuangbanna, China.

Whitford, D. M. (2008). The Papal antichrist: Martin Luther and the underappreciated influence of Lorenzo Valla. *Renaissance Quarterly*, *61*(1), 26–52.

Winkelman, M. J. (1990). Shamans and other" magico-religious" healers: A cross-cultural study of their origins, nature, and social transformations. *Ethos*, *18*(3), 308–352.