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At least two of the arguments that H adduces in support of her "aspect hypothesis" in her otherwise very interesting paper, are based on questionable analyses of the data. In the next few lines I suggest revision of these analyses.

(1) H finds my description of the Cv -nt- and -st- transitives factually accurate, or at least compatible with her "aspect hypothesis" were it not for one apparent problem: both n and s occur in intransitive forms--and H assumes them to be (part of) the same morphemes found in transitive forms. She gives examples of forms based on three roots, cognate with Cv /k'wil 'warm', /cak 'count', and /caq 'cry'.

Note, however, that if the s of k'wil-st, k'wil-stx, and sängk'wilstn is identified as the unstressed form of the lexical suffix -us 'fire'; and if the s of tum is identified as the unstressed form of the suffix -us 'face'; and if the s of s-c'ck-ásqot-x is identified as part of the suffix -asqot 'day', then the integrity of -st as a transitive morpheme is maintained. Other examples might show that my analysis is probably correct: kpna-nt 'put wood in!', kpn-us-nt 'put wood on the fire!'; nci-8s 'he warms it', nci-s-om 'he warms it on the fire'; k'wil-nt 'warm me up!', k'wil k'wil-om-st 'warm me up!', etc. (For a discussion of -nwix cf my paper "Parallels Between the Colville Transitives and the Pseudo-Intransitives." Proceedings, VIII WECOL, pp. 103-7.)

The corollary argument that the -nt form tšac-nt-om 'he bruised him (on purpose)' contradicts my characterization of -st- transitives [if it means "on purpose" then it should be tšac-st-om], is empty. tšac-nt-om is unmarked for "purpose". The difference between -nt- and -st- can be seen in the following examples based on the same root:

nyəlp k-tšac-st-ən i? sìaq kən łą? c-q'lim wən. I always manage to smash all the berries when I go picking.

k-tšac-ən i? sìaq. I smashed the berries (unspecified whether accidentally, or on purpose, or whatever).

(Note also the following Cv forms, in contradiction to H's starred ones:

?axl-ásqot c-xlīt-st-ṇ. I used to call him every day.

?axl-ásqot c-ma?k-st-ən. I used to break one a day.)

(2) Though, by H's admission, not germanely to the main topic of her paper, she tries to show that the -t I identify as stative is better not so identified. However, whatever the effects of that proof might have been, and no matter how inappropriate my label, both examples of -t she gives in 57 and 58 are examples of (di-) transitives (x'ic'-əxt 'give something to somebody'; x'k'wə-nt 'clean something'), and not of statives, thus again leaving the argument without its feet.