

difficulties encountered in obtaining adequate and precise information on this subject are, it is known, almost insurmountable. Yet the overwhelming balance of the data, and it seems to us even that quoted by Jones himself, indicates that the Indian regards an object as manito, sacred, because it contains a manito, and if the conditions were propitious, he could be "blessed" by it. If a belief in a manito "essence" or "force" exists it is as a characteristic of a manito. That the "essence" exists apart and separate from the manito is, we believe, an unjustified assumption, an abstraction created by investigators.

But there is a vagueness about the nature of the manito which has perhaps led investigators, and even Indians, astray when they attempted to translate the concept into words, for purposes of explanation, and which is paralleled by that which exists in their belief in the transformation of individuals at will, under certain conditions, into animals, trees, immaterial forces (from our point of view), ghosts, etc. The nature of the manito is properly that of a *tertium quid*, from our point of view. The whole question is, is it that from the Indian's point of view? We do not think so; for he does not make the opposition of corporeal and non-corporeal; data obtained through direct sense impressions and that through mediated sense impressions, in anything like our way. To investigate exactly, what, if any, opposition they make in regard to these matters is, perhaps, the most fascinating, as it is certainly the most difficult of ethnological problems.

We have dealt only with the most characteristic and fundamental points of Ojibwa religion, for the space at our disposal will not permit us to discuss more.