

S'títúlix^ws Séliš u Q'ispé:

Territories of the Salish, Kalispel, and Related Indigenous Nationsⁱ

Séliš-Q'ispé Culture Committee, 2023

To understand our people—our history, our culture, and our language—it is important to begin with an understanding of our names, our tribal organization, and our territories. For thousands of years, we have held a deep knowledge of our vast homelands, where we lived traditionally as tribal hunters, fishers, and gatherers. Our way of life and our identity are rooted in this history—in the relationships of respect that the ancestors maintained between people, and which we also sustained with the lands and waters, and the plants and animals. It is our responsibility to continue these relationships for all the generations to come.

Elders have made it clear that each tribal nation held its own specific territory. At least until the past few centuries, there was broad intertribal agreement on the area identified with each of our nations, with any disagreements mainly centered on boundary areas. It is also true that territories sometimes overlapped. In those areas, the boundaries were not rigidly defined.

The introduction of horses around 1700 enabled easier long-distance travel, but even before that time, people ventured beyond their own tribal homelands for subsistence, visiting, trade, and many other reasons. In fact, the right to free travel for peaceful purposes is an old principle in many of our cultural teachings. It is one of the lessons we learn from the *sq^wullm̓t*—the Coyote or creation stories. In these stories, Coyote kills off or transforms the *na'isqélix^w*, the people-eaters or 'monsters,' in order to make the world safe for the *t'isqélix^w*, the human-beings-yet-to-come. In many of those stories, the monsters *are* monsters because they kill passers-by simply because they are passing by. In the future, Coyote says, it won't be that way. Coyote makes it known that in the

world-yet-to-come, people should not be killed for traveling peacefully, whether in their own land or in that of another nation.ⁱⁱ

Many elders have told how, prior to the introduction and dispersion of horses in the 1700s, conflict between native nations was much less frequent. When it did occur, it was more often about reaffirming each tribe’s territory and identity than about one tribe trying to gain control of another’s lands or resources. As a result, most battles resulted in few deaths, compared with the far deadlier conflicts that occurred from the late-1700s through the mid-1800s.ⁱⁱⁱ Those battles, fueled by the introduction of firearms, led our ancestors to relocate our winter camps to the west. But we never relinquished our claims to the old territories east of the Divide, and by the mid-1800s—on the eve of the non-Indian invasion of what is now Montana—we had reestablished a stronger presence in those areas.^{iv}

Séliš

Séliš is pronounced SEH-leesh. It is usually written in English as ‘Salish.’ Listen to Felicite “Jim” Sapiye McDonald (1922-2017) give the correct pronunciation of *Séliš*: <http://www.csksalish.org/index.php/component/rsfiles/download?path=home%252FSelis.mp3&Itemid=101>

In the past, we were commonly known as ‘Flathead.’^v Our territories extend from the Bitterroot Mountains and the present-day border between Montana and Idaho to the Yellowstone, Musselshell, and upper Missouri drainage systems far east of the Continental Divide.^{vi} Frequent use-areas reached even further, at least as far as *Ł?umné Sewtkws* (Bighorn Sheep’s Waters—the Bighorn River).^{vii} Until we lost many of our people to epidemics of smallpox and other impacts during the 1700s, we were organized in at least six very large bands, based in areas that included *Čtmíšé* (Cottonwoods Above the Water—the Helena area) and *Skwumcné* (Waters of the Pocket Gopher—the Big Hole Valley). Other bands were based along *Sqlawqñ Sewtkws* (Beaverhead’s Waters—the Beaverhead and Jefferson Rivers) and near *Sntapqey* (Place Where Something Was Shot in the Head—the Butte area). Our tribe has also been called the Bitterroot Salish, because the Bitterroot Valley has always been a

cherished part of the Séliš homeland. The depth of our ties to the Bitterroot are reflected in the many Coyote story sites, known by place-names such as Čqʔe (Medicine Tree), *Snetetšé* (Sleeping Child Hot Springs), and *Tmsmʔi* (the Lolo area), among others.

Qlispé

Qlispé is roughly pronounced Kah-lee-SPEH. This word is usually written in English as ‘Kalispel.’ Listen to Shirley Trahan (b. 1944) give the correct pronunciation of *Qlispé*:

<http://www.csktsalish.org/index.php/component/rsfiles/download?path=home%252FQlisp3.m4a&Itemid=101>

We have also been referred to as the ‘Pend d’Oreille’ (French for “something hanging from the ear”), after the round shell earrings that are worn by both men and women. We were originally organized in at least twenty-seven distinct bands throughout a vast area that encompasses the drainage systems of the Flathead, Middle Clark Fork, lower Clark Fork, and Pend Oreille rivers, and adjoining areas, from what is now western Montana, through northern Idaho, to eastern Washington. The largest Kalispel band of western Montana was called the *Stqetkʷmsčih̄t*, meaning People of the Broad Water, in reference to Flathead Lake.^{viii} The people based in more upstream locations have been known as the upper Kalispel or upper Pend d’Oreille; those located further downstream have been known as the lower Kalispel or lower Pend d’Oreille. Often, the downstream tribe and bands, in what is now northern Idaho and eastern Washington (including where the Kalispel Reservation is located), have been called the Kalispel; while the upstream tribe and bands, including the area around Flathead Lake, the Flathead River, and the Flathead Indian Reservation, have been called the Pend d’Oreille. All are part of the *Qlispé* Nation.

Tuńáxn and Smeúseʔ

Until the late 1700s, the Northern Rockies was also home to two other related Salish-speaking nations, the *Tuńáxn*^{ix} and the *Smeúseʔ*.^x The *Tuńáxn* held large territories along the Rocky Mountain Front, including the Sun River and Dearborn River drainage systems, while the *Smeúseʔ* were based primarily in the Blackfoot River valley. Both

ENDNOTES

i We use the term “tribe” in the sense of a people who have long-standing, shared cultural ways, language, and history. We also at times use “nation” or “tribal nation.” All convey that we are sovereign indigenous nations with certain territories, which we have held and defended throughout our history. A broad context for these terms is provided by the National Congress of American Indians in their online publication, “Tribal Nations and the United States: An Introduction.”

http://www.ncai.org/tribalnations/introduction/Tribal_Nations_and_the_United_States_An_Introduction-web-pdf , pp. 6 and 16, accessed 10 Dec. 2018. See also <https://networks.h-net.org/node/8585/discussions/1398057/help-native-american-terminology> , accessed 10 Dec. 2018.

ii See, for example, the story of Coyote and Mole battling the *natisqélix*^w (monster — literally, “people-eater”) and his grizzly-dog. The monster inhaled and killed anyone who simply happened to be traveling through the Bitterroot Valley. Coyote killed the monster, and in the process also said that killing unwitting people from a great distance would not be the proper way for warriors to conduct themselves. Published or publicly available versions of this story may be found in Eneas Pierre, Agnes Vanderburg, and Sophie Adams, *Salish Folk Tales*, as told to Kathryn Law, interpreted by Agnes Vanderburg (Billings, MT: Montana Indian Publications, 1972); Pierre Pichette, *Coyote Tales of the Montana Salish*, as told to Harriet Miller and Elizabeth Harrison, Exhibition of U.S. Department of the Interior, Indian Arts and Crafts Board (Rapid City, S.D.: The Tipi Shop, 1974); Michel Revais, “Pend d’Oreille Tales,” as told to James A. Teit, *Memoirs of the American Folk-Lore Society* 11 (1917): 114-118; Louisa McDermott, “Folk-Lore of the Flathead Indians of Idaho: Adventures of Coyote,” *Journal of American Folk-Lore* 14, no. 55 (Oct.-Dec. 1901), pp. 242-243; and McDermott, “Ethnology and Folklore, Selish Proper.” M.Sc. Thesis, University of California-Berkeley, 1904, “Folklore” section, pp. 55-59.

See also the story of the Medicine Tree. In this case, the *natisqélix*^w was a gigantic bighorn sheep who killed anyone who was traveling through the southern end of the Bitterroot Valley. Coyote tricked the ram-monster into impaling its horns in a pine tree, whereupon Coyote cut off its head. Published or publicly available versions of this story may be found in Salish-Pend d’Oreille Culture Committee and Elders Cultural Advisory Council, *The Salish People and the Lewis and Clark Expedition* (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 2005, rev. ed. 2008), pp. 73-75 and 173, Pichette, op. cit., *Coyote Tales of the Montana Salish*; W.H. McDonald, *Creation Tales from the Salish* (Billings, MT: Montana Indian Publication Fund, 1973); Duncan McDonald, “Indian Legend: How Missoula Got Its Name,” *Bitterroot Journal* (Victor, MT) 4, no. 1 (Jan. 1978), p. 25; McDermott, op. cit., “Folk-Lore of the Flathead Indians of Idaho,” pp. 240-251; and Ella E. Clark, *Indian Legends from the Northern Rockies* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1977).

Another illustrative example can be found in the origin story—as well as the historical use—of the Lolo Trail, which crosses the Bitterroot Range, connecting the Bitterroot Valley in present-day Montana with the Clearwater River drainage system in present-day Idaho. In Salish, the trail is known as *Naptnišá(qs)*, meaning Trail to the Nez Perce (the *Saáptni*). In Nez Perce, it is called *K’uysey’ne’iskit*, meaning Bison-hunt Trail. (The Nez Perce name for the trail was very roughly recorded by Meriwether Lewis as “Cokahlarishkit” in his journal entry for July 3, 1806. See

<https://lewisandclarkjournals.unl.edu/item/lc.jrn.1806-07-03#lc.jrn.1806-07-03.01>, accessed 1 Jan. 2019.)

In Salish, the Bitterroot side of the trail—Lolo Creek and present-day Lolo, Montana—is called *Tmsmtí*, meaning No Salmon. The Idaho side—the Lochsa-Clearwater drainage—is called *Ep Smtí*, meaning Has Salmon. Both names refer to Coyote’s failed attempt to bring salmon over the mountains and into the Bitterroot Valley. The story, and the trail, might be seen as establishing both the boundary between the *Séliš* and the Nez Perce, the difference between our two peoples and two distinct territories, and also the connectivity between them. And in fact, there is extensive documentation, in both oral histories and in the written record, of *Séliš* parties traveling west through the pass through the Bitterroot Mountains and into the Clearwater River system, for many reasons, including the simple subsistence purpose of harvesting salmon. (The Lewis and Clark journals accounts of the Lolo Trail reflect the frequent travels of tribal parties far beyond their own territories. *Séliš* people told Lewis on 10 Sept. 1805 that the previous year, in 1804, tribal people had traveled all the way to the Pacific Coast.

<https://lewisandclarkjournals.unl.edu/item/lc.jrn.1805-09-10> , accessed 1 Jan. 2019.) When our ancestors

made this journey, we knew were passing into or through Nez Perce country. Yet we did so often, and without worry (the Nez Perce were a traditional ally). And likewise, the Nez Perce, the *Saáptní*, often traveled east over the trail on their way to the great camas grounds near present-day Potomac, and from there on toward the buffalo plains. See *The Salish People and the Lewis and Clark Expedition*, op. cit., pp. 58 and 60, and Haruo Aoki and Nez Perce Elders, *Nez Perce Dictionary*, University of California Publications in Linguistics 122 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), p. 292.

iii In 1908-1909, elders of various tribes, including the *Séliš* and *Qlišpé*, related rich information on this subject to the ethnographer James Teit. Relaying what elders told him, Teit wrote, “Before the advent of the horse people could not travel great distances, carrying all their equipment with them, therefore before the horse came the people were scattered in bands here and there each with head quarters at one or two definite localities, the area controlled and used by each band not being of very great extent, and intercommunication between bands some distance apart was very limited. . . They were more sedentary than at a later date . . . At this time there was not much war, and strangers from a long distance were hardly ever seen. Neighboring tribes visited each other more or less, generally in small bands, and occasionally did not return home until the following year.” Franz Boas papers, American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA (Collection B61), folder “Tribal territories and boundaries.” Hereinafter APS B61. (SQCC has copies of the quoted documents, which we have marked as documents number 5 and 7 from the cited folder.)

In his published work, Teit elaborated on what the elders told him: “Before the introduction of the horse there were very few wars, and peace generally prevailed among all the tribes. The Flathead are said to have had a few short wars long ago with some of the Shoshoni tribes, but as a rule the two tribes were on the best of terms. They had no wars with other Salishan tribes, nor with the Nez Perce and Kutenai. Once long ago a war party of Snake attacked the Flathead in Bitterroot Valley, but they were driven off with considerable loss and never came back. The Pend d’Oreilles and Kalispel also had very few wars long ago . . . In very ancient times there were no wars with the Blackfoot. Wars with the latter and with the advancing eastern tribes began about 1700 or 1750 and continued almost constantly until near the end of buffalo hunting (1880-1884).” James Teit, “The Flathead Group,” part of Teit’s larger report, “The Salishan Tribes of the Western Plateaus,” ed. Franz Boas, in *45th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*, 1927-28 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1930), 359-360.

iv That history will be related in greater detail in Volume 1 of our forthcoming atlas.

v “Flathead” is now generally regarded as an outdated misnomer that arose in the fur-trade era, although the term persists in the name of the reservation, as well as numerous other geographic and political features in the area: Flathead Lake, Flathead River (and its various branches), and the Flathead National Forest, among many others. For one examination of the name’s origins, see Albert Partoll, “The Flathead Salish Indian Name in Montana Nomenclature,” *Montana: the Magazine of Western History*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1951), pp. 37-47. See also “The Name ‘Flathead,’” Appendix II in Alan P. Merriam, *Ethnomusicology of the Flathead Indians* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 350-352.

vi In 1908-1909, elders of various tribes, including the *Séliš* and *Qlišpé*, related rich information on tribal territories to the ethnographer James Teit, who was conducting fieldwork on behalf of Franz Boas. Elders told Teit that the *Séliš* “have been in their late habitat [the Bitterroot Valley and upper Clark Fork River areas] a long time.” APS Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes,” SQCC photocopied document #8. In other writings, Teit emphasized *Séliš* territories east of the Divide:

“According to Flathead and Pend d’Oreille informants, long ago the Flathead tribe lived wholly east of the Rocky Mountains, where they occupied a large tract of country. They were in several large detached bands, who made their headquarters in certain places in the western part of their country, near the mountains, where conditions were best for wintering. Occasionally parties went west of the divide, into what are now the counties of Ravalli and Granite in Montana, but they never crossed the Bitterroot Range. Parties also went a considerable distance east in the summertime, some of them ranging around Bozeman and farther to the north. According to some informants, the former boundaries of the Flathead tribe were the Rocky Mountains on the west and south, and the Gallatin, Crazy Mountain, and Little Belt Ranges on the east. Their approximate northern boundary seems to have cut across the Big Belt Range near its center,

following some hilly country north of Helena, between the Rocky Mountains and Little Belt Mountains.”

James Teit, "The Flathead Group," part of Teit's larger report, "The Salishan Tribes of the Western Plateaus," ed. Franz Boas, *45th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1927-28* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1930), 303-304.

In other raw notes, Teit noted information provided by elders:

“The Flathead claim their old country included all the Big Hole; all the Beaver Head & Jefferson & the Madison Gallatin except the heads. Their eastern line crossed the heads of the Yellowstone & Shield Rivers, and the head of the Musselshell.”

APS Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes,” notes to accompany “Map (1) - Montana,” with the heading “Boundaries of Ind. Tribes. in Montana, Idaho, Eastern Washington & B.C according to information gathered from Salish tribes 1909.”

Teit said that the tribal people he consulted in 1908-09 did not remember the names and locations of some of the bands, but that they did know about most of the original bands, and they were located on both sides of the Continental Divide: “one was on a river near Helena, one near Butte, another smaller one somewhere east of Butte, and one somewhere in the Big Hole Valley. The Big Hole and Helena bands are said to have been large. There are traditions of two other bands, making probably six in all, but I did not learn the localities in which they had their headquarters.” Teit, “The Flathead Group,” 309-310. Teit also records this information from elders in APS Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes,” SQCC photocopied document #7: “There are indications that the Flathead in ancient times were in three or four (or possibly more) divisions. One probably had head quarters near Helena, another near Butte, and another in the Big Hole Valley[.]”

The anthropologist and archaeologist Carling Malouf, based on his many years of research and interviewing Séliš elders in the 1940s and 1950s, concluded that four of the six Séliš band locations from “several hundred years ago” were known, and he defined them as “(1) Helena Valley (2) Three Forks (3) Big Hole Valley (4) Jefferson Valley.” Malouf emphasized that “from any center the people extended their quest for subsistence and materials into adjoining areas. Undoubtedly, some traveled as far south as Yellowstone National Park while others are known to have wandered as far east as Billings.” Carling I. Malouf, “Historical and Archaeological Sites and Objects,” pp. 10-17 in Leo K. Cummins, ed., “Impact Assessment: Forest Land of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Montana” (unpublished MS, April 1974, copy available in Salish Kootenai College McNickle Library, Tribal Collection, call number CSKT SD 144 .M9 J6 1974).

Elders told Malouf that they regarded the Three Forks area as “the “earliest known center of Flathead life.” Carling I. Malouf, “Prehistoric Montanans, Indian Tribes of Montana,” in *The Montana Almanac 1959-60 edition*, (Missoula: Montana State University, 1958), p. 111. Earlier elders, relating information to the ethnographer James Teit in the early twentieth century, placed the original Séliš homeland a little downstream from Three Forks, closer to Helena along the upper Missouri River. Teit wrote that some elders told him that the tribal name, Séliš, was “derived from an old name of the country, or a district in their country, named because situated on the upper Missouri, close to the place where the river emerges from the mountains.” This would be the area now known as “Gates of the Mountains,” along the Missouri River just northeast of Helena. Teit, “The Flathead Group,” p. 297, FN 6.

Teit's rough notes were communicated to Franz Boas in letter form, mailed to Boas from the field (now archived at the APS). They generally accord with the documents published, under Boas's editorship, years after Teit's death, but on a number of points there are minor differences. For example, Boas—particularly in the map of tribal territories that he published in the *41st Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1919-1924* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1928), pp. 881-882—demarcated the eastern boundary of the Séliš as west of the Musselshell and Yellowstone drainages. The elders who spoke to Teit, however, either said those areas were Séliš, or were jointly used by the Séliš and *Snuwe* (Shoshone). In a letter to Boas, Teit noted that Coeur d'Alene elders also noted that in the time before horses, “The Shoshones and Flatheads at one time time [before horses] were friendly and occupied all the country from Missoula and Helena down to the Yellowstone Park.” Teit to Boas, 4 Jun. 1909, APS Teit letters. In fact, numerous documents in the Teit collection at the American Philosophical Society note that elders said Séliš territory extended to the Yellowstone: “the Yellowstone. The eastern part of this territory also belonged to the Shoshoni and the Western part to the Salish.” James Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes,” SQCC photocopied document #9. In that same body of records, for his notes accompanying “Map (1). Boundaries of Ind. Tribes. ~~Montana~~”

in Montana, Idaho, Eastern Washington & B.C according to information gathered from Salish tribes 1909,” Teit writes, “The Flathead claim their old country included all the Big Hole; all the Beaver Head & Jefferson & the Madison Gallatin except the heads. Their eastern line crossed the heads of the Yellowstone & Shield Rivers, and the head of the Musselshell.” In a letter to Boas dated 4 Jul. 1909, Teit wrote, “It seems that long ago before the introduction of the horse a good part of the upper Missouri & Yellowstone River was occupied by Salish & Shoshone who were usually at peace although intermittent wars occurred between the tribes or bands of the tribes.” Teit letters, APS.

vii The reach of the *Séliš* east at least to the Bighorn River, and the documentation of its Salish name, comes from a wide range of sources, including Qlišpé elder Pete Beaverhead (SQCC OHA audio tape 18, side 1, 28 Feb. 1975) and *Séliš* elder Victor Vanderburg (1868-1939), in Claude E. Schaeffer papers, Glenbow Archives, microfilm reel 5, frame number 898 counting backwards from 0. Vanderburg also told Schaeffer of the *Séliš* going beyond the Bighorn, “into the country of the Musselshell, Powder and east of the Bighorn rivers.” See also Felix Barnaby in .S334, The Papers of Claude E. Schaeffer, 1901-1969, Division of Anthropology Archives, American Museum of Natural History, New York, Box 1, folder 2, pages II-49 to II-52, story of three Salish men on raid against “the Crow Indians along the Big-Horn river.” See also James Teit to Franz Boas, 4 Jun. 1909 (<https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/islandora/object/text:121546#page/1/mode/1up>, accessed 1 Jan. 2019) and Teit to Boas, 4 Jul. 1909, APS Teit letters. Elder Joe Vanderburg (Victor’s grandson) more recently recorded the *Séliš* name for the Powder River country, *Npǫʷmí* (Place of Powder). SQCC wi, 24 Jul. 2018. See also Malouf, “Prehistoric Montanans, Indian Tribes of Montana,” in *The Montana Almanac 1959-60 Edition*, (Missoula: Montana State University, 1958), pp. 106-117; “Full Blood Flathead Indian Montana Study Group,” Arlee, Montana, “Minutes of Meetings,” transcribed by Mrs. C.C. Wright, pp. 3-4, document in SQCC archives; see also Richard Waverly Poston, *Small Town Renaissance: A Story of the Montana Study* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), Chapter 16, pp. 165-183.

viii Elders told James Teit that the Upper Kalispel or “Pend d’Oreille” tribe consisted of at least two “divisions,” each of which consisted of a number of “bands.” Of all the divisions, “probably the Flathead Lake people were the most important,” being based at “the earliest recognized main seat of the Pend d’Oreilles.” There were at least 13 bands within the Upper Kalispel or “Pend d’Oreille” tribe. The elders said that the Lower Kalispel tribe was organized in three “divisions,” each of which also consisted of numerous bands. There were at least 14 bands within the Lower Kalispel tribe. All told, the *Qlišpé* Nation had at least 27 discreet bands, each based at various locations in the Flathead, Middle Clark Fork, lower Clark Fork, and Pend Oreille drainage systems. Teit, “The Flathead Group,” pp. 311-313. The evidence in Teit, as well as the SQCC OHA, the records of Claude Schaeffer, and other sources, suggests that the surviving lists of bands is incomplete; there may have been at least 45 bands. See also SQCC internal report, “The Qlišpé Nation: traditional tribal organization, bands, and population,” 2019.

Note also that there are minor differences between Teit’s published work and some of his field notes regarding the exact number of “main divisions” within the “Pend d’Oreille” and the “Kalispel,” and the number of bands within each of those “divisions.” See APS Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes,” SQCC photocopied document #7.

ix Many observers have noted the similarity of the names of the *Tuńáxn*, the Salishan people of the Rocky Mountain Front, and the *Ktunaxa*, the Kootenai or Plains Kootenai. However, the evidence, including close analysis of the surviving words of the *Tuńáxn* language or dialect, confirms that these were two separate tribes, who spoke two different languages and held two different although neighboring territories. Sources include Mose *Čxawte* (Chouteh), SQCC OHA tape 211, side 1 (8 Feb. 1979) and tape 98, side 1 (15 Feb. 1977); James Teit, “The Flathead Group,” part of Teit’s larger report, “The Salishan Tribes of the Western Plateaus,” ed. Franz Boas, *45th Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1927-28* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1930), pp. 306 and 310, Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes,” in Franz Boas papers, American Philosophical Society, SQCC photocopied document #8, and Teit to Boas, 22 Dec. 1909, APS Teit letters. Also at <https://diglib.amphilsoc.org/islandora/object/text%3A121551#page/1/mode/1up>; Edward S. Curtis, *North American Indian, volume VII: The Yakima, the Klickitat, the Salishan tribes of the Interior, the Kutenai* (Norwood, MA: The Plimpton Press, 1911), especially pp. 44 and 119-120; Peter and Mary Red Crow, in Claude Schaeffer papers, Johnny Arlee typescript of Schaeffer notes (copy in SQCC OHCA). Elders told

Teit that the *Ktunaxa*, the Plains Kootenai, adjoined the *Tuńáxn* on the north, reaching from the Browning area to about Fort McLeod in Alberta. In the area of the present-day Blackfoot Reservation, bands of *Tuńáxn* and *Ktunaxa* overlapped and were intermarried. Teit wrote in one of his raw notes, “Probably their [*Ktunaxa*] hunting territory east of the Rockies extended north at least as far as the present southern limits of the Stony.” APS Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes,” SQCC photocopied document #7. Elders also told Teit that *Ktunaxa* territory extended and eastward to the Sweetgrass Hills, where they bordered the Plains Shoshone, with whom they often fought. Teit to Boas, 13 May 1913, APS Teit letters.

Teit also noted “that Blackfoot tradition agrees with the early distribution of tribes as stated by Salish, and Kootenay,” Teit stated. “Particularly does it agree with the Salish information.” APS Teit, “Annotated Maps and Notes.” In his 1910 ethnography, “Material Culture of the Blackfoot Indians,” Clark Wissler wrote:

“The Piegan claim that before the white man dominated their country (an uncertain date probably 1750-1840) the Blackfoot, Blood, and Piegan lived north of Macleod; the Kootenai in the vicinity of the present Blood Reserve; the Gros Ventre and the Assiniboine to the east of the Kootenai; the Snake on the Teton River, and as far north as Two Medicine River; and the Flatheads on the Sun River. These traditions were so definite and consistent that consideration must be given to them.” Clark Wissler, “Material Culture of the Blackfoot Indians,” in *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*, Vol. V, ed. Clark Wissler, pp. 1-176 (New York: Trustees of the American Museum of Natural History, 1910), p. 17.

Each of these sources are further supported by the information recorded about the northern plains in the journals of early fur traders such as David Thompson. Thompson wrote, “All these Plains, which are now the hunting grounds of the above Indians [Blackfoot et. al.], were formerly in full possession of the Kootanaes, northward; the next the Saleesh and their allies, and the most southern, the Snake Indians and their tribes.” Thompson, ed. Tyrell, 327-328, quoted in Theodore Binnema, *The Common and Contested Ground: A History of the Northwestern Plains from A.D. 200 to 1806* (Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History and Classics, University of Alberta, 1998), 140.

Further evidence comes from studies of our music. Alan P. Merriam, in his 1967 book, *Ethnomusicology of the Flathead Indians*, investigated the “Plains culture traits now manifested by the Flathead,” and tried to square it with “the usual assumption that these traits appeared relatively late in Flathead history.” Merriam noted that “the music of the Flathead is not Salish; it is Plains type, and very few, if any, ‘Salish’ traits appear in it.” Merriam may have held some assumptions of what Séliš traits were, exactly, but he did bring to bear an important general principle of musicology: “The music evidence from a wide range of world cultures indicates that music tends to have continuity across time.” His conclusion was blunt: “To put it in its simplest form, what we know of Flathead music does not support the generally prevailing view [that the Séliš were latecomers to the Plains]. . . It is clear that all the known evidence concerning the prehistory and early history of the Flathead points to occupancy of the Plains as far back in time as they can presently be traced.” Alan P. Merriam, *Ethnomusicology of the Flathead Indians* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967), p. 147, 149, 150, 147 and 152.

× Teit, “The Flathead Group,” 304, 308, and 307.

^{xi} Linguists disagree to some extent on the exact count, but the Salish language family includes three to five sub-families or branches, 23 languages, 33 dialects, and nine sub-dialects. See “Salishan Languages,” by Sarah G. Thomason, University of Michigan, <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~thomason/papers/salish.pdf>, accessed 28 Dec. 2016.