BRIEF COMMENTS ON TWO OF HEBERT'S ARGUMENTS IN "A NOTE ON
ASPECT IN (NICOLA LAKE) OKANAGAN"
Anthony Mattina

At least two of the arguments that H adduces in support of her "aspect hypo-
thesis" in her otherwise very interesting paper, are based on questionable anal-
yses 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 /kʷaĺ 'warm', /čak 'count', and /čaqʷ 'cry'.
Note, however, that if the s of kʷaîst, kʷaîstx, and sənkʷáîstṇ is identified
as the unstressed form of the lexical suffix -us 'fire'; and if the s of tuṁs
is identified as the unstressed form of the suffix -us 'face'; and if the s of
s-c-čk-ásqət-x is identified as part of the suffix -asqət 'day', then the
integrity of -st as a transitive morpheme is maintained. Other examples might show
that my analysis is probably correct: kṗna-nt 'put wood in!', kṗn-ús-ənt 'put wood
on the fire!'; ṇcix-s 'he warms it', ṇcix-s-əs 'he warms it on the fire'; kʷu
kʷaî-ənt 'warm me up!', kʷu kʷaî-əm-st 'warm me up!', etc. (For a discussion of
-nwixʷ 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 ɬʕac-ənt-əm 'he bruised him (on
purpose)' contradicts my characterization of -st- transitives [if it means "on
purpose" then it should be ɬʕac-st-əm],is empty. ɬʕac-ənt-əm is unmarked for
"purpose". The difference between -nt- and -st- can be seen in the following
examples based on the same root:

  nyʕíp k-ɬʕac-st-ən i? sɬaq kən ɬa? c-qʷlíwm. I always manage to smash all the
  berries when I go picking.

  k-ɬʕac-ən i? sɬaq. 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-àsqət c-xlít-st-ṇ. I used to call him every day.

  ?axl-àsqət c-maʕ-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. How-
ever, whatever the effects of that proof might have been, and no matter how in-
appropriate my label, both examples of -t she gives in 57 and 58 are examples of (di-)
transitives (xʷič-əxt 'give something to somebody'; xʷkʷa-nt 'clean something'),
and not of statives, thus again leaving the argument without its feet.