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1. Introduction

Similar to the analysis of most Mayan languages, Huastec possessives have traditionally been described as determined by an alienability/non-
alienability contrast (McQuown 1980, Kaufman 1977, Edmonson 1983). In this paper I will show that although such contrast exists and covers an important area of the possessive system, it is not fine enough to handle all the subtleties involved in the Huastec language. The examples in (1) and (2) show the most general pattern. While alienable things, like rattles, require an -i suffix, non-alienable kinship relationships do not take that marker.

(1) nanaa’ u ch’ilch’ul-i-ak
    1SNG A1 rattle-POS
    ‘My rattle’

(2) hahas’ in pulek naana
    3SNG A3 big mother
    ‘his/her grandmother’

1 This paper was first presented at the 1993 annual meeting of the American Anthropology Association. I was specially benefited from insightful comments by Karen Dakin, Verónica Vázquez, Paulette Levy, Thomas Smith from the Seminario de Lenguas Indígenas at the University of Mexico, from Terry Kaufman at the conference and from Roberto Zavala, the editor, for his numerous help and his abrasive mockery. I unfortunately cannot blame them for my own mistakes.

2 Huastec is the northernmost language of the Mayan family. It is spoken in the north of Veracruz and San Luis Potosí, in the north-west of Mexico.

3 The vowel /i/ distinguishes /a/ under the presence of a preceding /l/. I will refer to the possessive -i instead of the more abstract -Vi traditionally used for Mayan linguistics, since the former is the prototypical form.

4 The following abbreviations appear in the text: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, SNG = singular, PL = plural, POS = possessive, POSS = possessive classifier, A = ergative, B = absolutive, AP = antipassive, DET = determiner, NMEZ = nominalizer, GEN = generic, ABS = absolute tens, NEG = negation, HUM = human, ?? = unidentified morpheme.
Although the characterization is in general terms correct, it runs against unsolvable problems, for there are important counter-examples to both -ill alienables and zero inalienables. Notice that a non-alienable kinship relationship may take an unexpected -il marker, while a possessed case lacks a marker for possession:

(3) in chaham-il
    A3 small-POS
    ‘Her son’

(4) non-il kayub
    1SNG-A1 cane
    My cane

In contrast with the alienability hypothesis, I will propose that the zero-il contrast is highly iconic and that it is determined by the level of proximity established between the possessor and the possessed element, the possessee.

The pattern to be observed follows the following general hypothesis:

Intrinsic relationships = zero
Extrinsic relationships = -il

According to that generalization the alienable/non-alienable contrast is but the prototypical manifestation of a proximity organization. Proximity is defined as the degree of natural association attributed to two elements under normal circumstances. Proximity is culture specific. While some things can be alienable and independent in a culture A, in a culture B they can be conceptually dependent. In this paper I will show the criteria by which things in the world can be conceptualized as pertaining naturally to the dominion of some possessee in the Huastec culture.

Seliger (1983) has proposed that given the wide range of possible relations to be found in possessive constructions, it is best to give an abstract

5 I am borrowing that term from Seliger (1983).

6 Although this research focuses on the Veracruz dialects, data from San Luis Potosí indicate the same tendencies.

characterization by which "linguistic possession consists of the relationship between a substance and another substance" where substance A, the possessee, is prototypically animate, human and Ego or close to the speaker, while substance B, the possessee, is non-animate. Langacker (1992) has made the point that this characterization is too abstract to handle certain consistent possessor/possessee asymmetries: the finger’s nail not the nails finger, the boy’s knife not the knife’s boy, etc. He proposes instead that possessive constructions profile a relationship in which one entity is "located" with respect to another, where "to locate" means to establish mental contact. Since the world is populated with a variety of objects, some of which are relatively more salient than others, a basic strategy to locate non-salient objects is in terms of salient ones. The possessee serves as a salient reference point (RP) to direct the viewer’s attention and from there to find a non-salient object located in the RP’s vicinity (its dominion). The nouns being located will vary with respect to two parameters: a) the conceptual dependency of the noun and b) the inherency of the relation between the possessor and its possessee.

Following Langacker I will propose that inherently related and conceptually dependent nouns have a high degree of proximity and thus will take zero marking for possession, while conceptual independence will imply a low degree of proximity. The -il marker on the possessee will iconically reflect such conceptual distance.

Dealing with head-marked and dependent-marked split possessive systems, Nichols (1988) rejects the possibility of a semantic motivation for the alienability contrast, since her typological survey found lexical exceptions. Velázquez (1993) has correctly observed that "semantic motivations for formal patterns do not amount to attributing full predictability to this semantic basis... Numerous generalizations regarding form-meaning correlations have been made and found useful in predicting or constraining possible manifestations of such correlations" (Velázquez 1993: 34-35). Velázquez points out that the fact that alienability seems to be "lexically dependent" is an indication that the phenomenon is determined by lexical semantics. Although I agree with Velázquez I would push for a further step in semantic iconicity and notice that the alienable/inalienable contrast is determined by the gradual organization imposed by the conceptual possessor/possessee distance, i.e., by how naturally the possessee is located within the possessor’s dominion and by the extent to which the possessee conceptually depends on the possessor.
will show that the alienable/non-alienable contrast is a good general representation of some general tendencies which show up naturally as a consequence of conceptual proximity.

2. Basic Structural Information

The characteristic ergative/absolutive system of Mayan languages is also present in Huastec. In this paper I follow the Mayanist tradition by which the ergative (transitive subject) is labeled as group A, while the absolutive (transitive object, intransitive subject) is coded as a B series. In Huastec possessives the pronominal possessor is always identified with the group A, as in (5). The use of a pronoun of the B series would lead to ungrammatical results, as can be seen from (6):

(5) nana'\u201d u pik'ee'-\u201d
ISNG A1 dog-POS
'My dog'

(6) * nana'\u201d in pik'ee'-\u201d
ISNG B1 dog-POS
'My dog'

The possessor may be expressed either as an independent pronoun or as an NP. Depending on illocutionary speech, pronouns may be subject to important apocopeal morphophonemics. The reduced form in (7) is a fairly common change that contrasts with the slow standard isolated form in (5):

(7) nana- u pik'ee'-\u201d
ISNG-A1 dog-POS
'My dog'

Non-pronominal NP possessors follow the possessed noun. NP possessors and independent pronominal possessors are mutually exclusive:

(8) in pik'ee'-\u201d n\u2019u huan
A3 dog-POS DET-HUM Juan
'Juan's dog'

When the independent pronoun is absent, a determiner an > n precedes the ergative marker:

(9) n\u2019u pik'ee'-\u201d
DET-A1 dog-POS
'My dog'

With this information, a closer look at the Huastec possessive system is now achievable.

3. Intrinsic Possession

As can be expected from the introduction, body part possessives and whole/part relationships will not take an-\u201d marker. These results are predicted by both the alienable and the proximity hypothesis.

(10) pu\u2019elik n\u2019u ochos-tal
DEE-A1 listen-AP-NMZR
'My ear is clogged'

(11) * pu\u2019elik n\u2019u ochos-tal-\u201d
DEE-A1 listen-AP-NMZR-POS
'My ear is clogged'

(12) in ak\u2019uam an lak'\u2019em
3A leg DET stoel
'The stoel's leg'

(13) * in ak'am-\u201d an lak'\u2019em
3A leg-POS DET stoel
'The stoel's leg'

7 I. in fact, hypothesize that Nichols' exceptions are analyzable in parallel terms.
The behavior of morphology in whole/part possessive constructions matches iconically the conceptual proximity of the inherent relationship. There is a class of parts marked for -lab (Edmonson’s 1986, Class 2) that cannot be conceived independently from the whole and that cannot occur as bear nouns:

(14)  
* cheap
  'Strength'

(15)  
cheap-lab
Strength-GEN

In the possessive construction neither the generic nor the possessive marker -il may occur.

(16)  
namna’ u cheap
  1SNG A1 strength
  'My strength'

The relationship is maximally intrinsic. The noun can be conceptualized either in abstract terms or as a part of someone. The natural association between strength and some animate not only prevents the use of the -il marker but also predicts that the abstract noun cannot occur independent of the noun that anchors it. This is not an isolated phenomenon in the language, it also covers other noun classes commonly associated with parts. The class of nouns that take the absolutive -tik follow exactly the same pattern:

(17)  
ib-tik
  saliva-ABS
  'Saliva'

(18)  
u i’ll
  A1 saliva
  'My saliva'

8 The underlying form is ibi-tik, there is a morphophonemic fusion of [i] > [i] and deletion of [i].

Although the proximity approach motivates in a natural manner the lack of -il in intrinsic relationships it is obvious that alienability also accounts for those facts.

4. Individuation

There are however other examples for which the alienability analysis may fall short. Consider some phenomena related to bodily manifestations. Depending on the degree of individuation an external manifestation will take an -il marker. A spit has enough individuation to be conceived independent of the human that originated it. Saliva in (18) and spit have thus a contrasting behavior:

(19)  
nan-u ebbul-il
  1SNG-A1 cough-POS
  'My spit'

An apparent counter-example can be found in (20) where a physical manifestation can be possessed without taking an -il marker:

(20)  
nan-u kusar-ill
  1SNG-A1 mucus
  'My mucus'

Yet the nature of mucus differs quite drastically from other bodily manifestations. It is normally associated with the human upper lip. In fact it is not easy to conceptualize it independent from a human body, its massive character and the lack of clear boundaries may impinge on its behavior.

9 Kinship follows the pattern of intrinsic relationships with zero marking strategy as can be seen from example (2). What is problematic for both the alienability and the iconic proximity hypothesis is the fact that among kinship there are only two nouns possessive with -il: SON as in example (2) and WIFE (in freershal 'my wife'). Both cases are exceptional. Although they share the property of establishing a direct segmental relationship, it is also possible that they follow a more general pattern of Haceous by which most derived nouns are possessive with -il.
contrast a spit tends to be conceptually autonomous, as it constitutes a bounded unit. The absence of an -il marker for saliva and mucus is predicted as is the need for -il to mark spit. These are not isolated cases, the independent/autonomous contrast is quite productive in Huaute, as can be seen from another illustrative pair:

(21)  
  u tanišib
  A1 sweat
  'My sweat'

(22)  
  u tanišib-il
  A1 sweat-POS
  'My sweat (that drops from my body)'

As (22) shows high degree of individuation require the use of the -il possessive marker.

A pattern of extension form individuated to out-of-the-ordinary has developed based on the individuation strategy. In relation to sickness, the possessive marking system has specific properties. Notice first that in contrast with Romance and other languages, sickness in general are not nominal and thus cannot be possessed. Examples (23) and (24) show that only a predicable construction with a 1st marker is possible:

(23)  
  nunas' in humatibih
  1SNG B1 cold
  'I have a cold/I am cold'

(24)  
  * nunas' um humatibih-il
  1SNG A1 cold-POS
  'My cold'

Although sickness themselves cannot be possessed, the external non-alienable manifestation of some illness is normally marked for -il in a possessive relationship. So smallpox refers in (25) to the actual skin manifestation in the same manner that ak'ul in (26) signals the physical symptom of some disease:

(25)  
  nun-u pok'-il
  1SNG-A1 smallpox-POS
  'My smallpox'

(26)  
  nun-u ak'ul-il
  1SNG-A1 pus-POS
  'My pus'

Pus and smallpox stand as manifestations of illness conceptualized as out-of-the-ordinary. Since these manifestations are not normally associated with the human body the -il possesive is called for. In contrast, ordinary bodily manifestations which do not have an independent status take a zero marker:

(27)  
  u chit
  A1 urin
  'My urin.'

Individualization determines the use of -il either because the bodily manifestation has independent status or because the relation of some symptom with the body steps out of the ordinary course of events.

With respect to products extracted from animals, a similar behavior is found. In (28) animals together with their meat and flesh are conceptualized as one unit. Since there is a whole/part relationship the marking is still zero:

(28)  
  t'ul' aqich'amal
  meat DET dear
  'The dear's meat'

In contrast with meat, honey can be conceptualized as independent from the bee and therefore in a possessive construction the marker -il is required. The whole/part relationship is no longer preserved. Notice that the -il possessive marker is used regardless of whether the possessor is the bee in a producer/product relationship or a human in an alienable ownership relationship:

(29)  
  in chil'-il a qutupa
  A3 honey-POS DET bee
  'The bee's honey'
(30) nan-\textit{u} chilk-\textit{al}  
\textit{1SNG-A1 money-POS}  
'My honey (in a bottle)'

Honey and meat also contrast in that meat cannot be possessed by humans in an ownership relation. In (31) the reading can only be a whole/part relationship, therefore an ownership interpretation is ungrammatical, as can be seen from the contrast between (30) and (31):

(31) nan-\textit{u} \textit{t\textit{a\textit{ul}}}  
\textit{1SNG-A1 meat}  
'My meat (The meat and flesh of my body)'

* 'My meat (The one that I bought)'

Furthermore, in order to express ownership on a conceptually dependent element, an alternative possessive construction is used. The zero marking on meat to establish the whole/part relationship is preserved but the ownership relation is marked with \textit{k\textit{a\textit{al}}}, a marker extended from the noun 'property' that in its more grammaticalized value is normally used for possession of animals and other elements that cannot naturally be possessed\textsuperscript{10}.

(32) \textit{he\textit{e}} in \textit{t\textit{a\textit{ul}}} an i\textit{chamzr} nan-\textit{u} \textit{k\textit{a\textit{al}}}  
\textit{A3 meat DET DET dear 1SNG-A1 POSS}  
'This dear meat is mine'

These facts show that conceptual independence of the possessed element is more determinant than animacy in the zero/-\textit{di} contrast. The phenomenon observed for meat and honey is corroborated by the possession of fat. Only when fat is conceptualized as independent from pork can it be possessed with the -\textit{di} marker:

(33) nan\textit{as\textit{u}} munte\textit{shuk-\textit{ll}}  
\textit{1SNG A3 fat-POS}  
'My fat (of the body)'

This is in fact a case of lexical specialization. Mano\textit{k}a is a borrowing from Spanish. In order to make reference to the pork's fat, the native word \textit{k\textit{u\textit{n\textit{aa\textit{al}}}}} must be used. Notice that the behavior is still consistent with the iconic proximity principle. The individualized fat takes -\textit{di}, while the conceptually dependent one does not:

(35) \textit{k\textit{u\textit{n\textit{aa\textit{al}}}}} an \textit{olom} fat. DET pork  
'The pork's fat'

5. The Inner/Outer Contrast

The distinction between inherently related elements versus the linkage of independent units has also extended to activities of eating and smoking. The behavior is again consistent: the closer the relation between possessor and posses, the stronger the possibility of having a zero marker, while the occurrence of -\textit{di} will coincide with the degree of possessum/possessor individuation. In this case the contrast depends on the true interaction of the possessor with the cigarette. Zero marking is obtained when the participant is actually smoking a cigarette, otherwise -\textit{di} is required:

(36) nan\textit{as\textit{u}} an \textit{m\textit{a\textit{y}}}  
\textit{1SNG DET tobacco}  
'My cigarette'

(37) \textit{n\textit{u}} \textit{m\textit{a\textit{y}}}  
\textit{DET-A1 tobacco-POS}  
'My tobacco (the plant or in the box)'

In a parallel fashion, a chewing gum will take a zero marker when it is in the possessor's mouth. The -\textit{di} marker occurs when reference is not made to the actual gum, but instead the ragote plant where the gum is extracted from.
(38)  k'asik'  
"Chewing gum"

(39)  n-u  k'asik'  
DET-A1 chewing gum  
"My chewing gum (in my mouth)"

(40)  k'asik' -laab  
chewing.gum-GEN  
"Chewing gum is general"

(41)  nanas  u  k'asik' -laab -il  
ISNG A1 chewing.gum-GEN-POS  
"My chewing gum / my zepote plant"

Although the analysis is correct, some clarifications are at order. Notice that in (40) k'asik' has been derived with the generic -laab. There is a general rule of Huastec, already suggested by Edmundson (1988), by which suffixal derived forms in possessive constructions must be marked by -il. The following contrast follows that rule:

(42)  nanas  u  tanche -taal  pab to alho  
ISNG-A1 deafness-NMZR NEG 77 good  
"My stubbornness is no good"

(43)  hubas  in  tanche -taal -il  
ISNG A3 deafness/NMZR-GEN-POS  
"His deafness"

Notice however that the derivational strategy does not contradict the locative proximity organization of the possessive system. It is always the case that the zero marked entity is in a more intimate relationship to the possessor than the noun marked for -il. The chewing gum is inside the mouth and is not perceptible, in a similar manner stubbornness is somebody’s inner feature that can hardly be dissociated from him. Independent conceptualization of these entities is not naturally obtained. The generic -laab makes the conceptualization an independent one and sets a non-proximal situation for the possessive construction. Deftness can be seen as the physical-plus external-manifestation of the abstract stubbornness, while a zapeotl plant has independent existence from any potential possessor. Thus the occurrence of -il links individual entities to specific owners.

In this section I have shown a variety of nouns for which an alleliability analysis would predict only one output. I have shown that Huastec culture allows to have alternate conceptualizations of related elements and I have suggested that this flexibility depends on the degree of inherent proximity of the established relationship. The question remains as to whether this analysis will give a satisfactory explanation for obvious alleliable things that do not take the -il suffix.

6. Extensions from Ego

There are some nouns for which an -il marker in possessive constructions should be expected. These are well bounded count nouns that in other cultures are normally conceptualized as alleliable. Yet they have a fundamental disentangling feature: they constitute clear extensions from ego, i.e. they are things naturally associated with human beings in Huastec culture. The most obvious example is kimas: 

(44)  nanas  u  kimas  
ISNG A1 house-POSS  
"My home"

(45)  * nanas  u  kimas -il  
ISNG A1 house-POSS -il  
"My home"

The inherent relationship of humans with respect to their home makes the -il marker inadequate for this construction type. Huastec has the word aqen for
the house as a building. Under no circumstance can the building be possessed:

(46)
\[ \text{wnte atta} \]
\[ \text{go/2PL house} \]
\[ 'Let us go to the house' \]

(47)
\[ * \text{in atta=ji nz hum} \]
\[ \text{A3 house DET/HUM Juan} \]
\[ 'Juan's house' \]

I will leave for another paper the pragmatic conditions for things to be possessed in Huastec culture. Suffice it to say here that while home is an extension from ego, the building itself is conceptualized as extraneous from the human being and thus cannot be possessed.

A similar phenomenon is found with respect to other house items. Huastec has two words for BED: the everyday sleeping item waltal and the one especially made for delivering a newborn or to take care of a sick person, cheey. Interestingly enough, the possessive marking system follows an ego-extension pattern. While waytal does not take -dl in possessive constructions, cheey does:

(48)
\[ \text{wyal 1 waytal} \]
\[ \text{2PL A2/PL bed-NMZ} \]
\[ 'Our bed' \]

(49)
\[ \text{halaat} \text{ in cheey=dl} \]
\[ \text{ISNG A3 sick.bed-POS} \]
\[ 'Her sick bed' \]

Other extensions from ego behave in exactly the same manner. The natural correlation of the possessed element with respect to the possessor makes the -dl marker redundant. Canes are natural extensions for elder people as they

11 The borrowing hall from Nahuatl is also used with the meaning 'house as a building'; it shares with ena the same restrictions to be possessed.

become helpful in walking and bags are part of the Huastec traditional clothing. The absence of the -dl marker in (50-51) is thus predicted:

(50)
\[ \text{nu kowayab} \]
\[ \text{DET.A1 cane} \]
\[ 'My cane' \]

(51)
\[ \text{nanaa 'a mordal} \]
\[ \text{ISNG A1 bag} \]
\[ 'My bag' \]

The examples seen so far support an iconic pronunciation interpretation that follows the direction of an alienable/non-alienable contrast but goes far beyond those boundaries. The flexibility observed depends basically in cultural prototypic representations of the Huastec everyday life, endeavors and traditional activities. Natural expectations for things to be associated determine zero marking in possessive constructions. Body parts are inherently related to the possessor in much the same manner that a part depends on the conceptualization of the whole. As soon as things tend to individuate, i.e. to have independent existence, the possibilities for -dl to occur increase. Yet, for some independent entities, the cultural link to the Huastec man obviates the need for the possessive suffixal marking.

Another determining parameter of individuation is the internal/external character of the possession in relation to the possessor. Recall that things inside the body tend to get zero marking while those externally identifiable are marked for -dl (small pot, psu, etc.). I have not mentioned the realm of emotions since it presents problems for the analysis. It seems intuitively correct that an internal/external approach would offer a systematic explanation; although this is correct, the analysis is still quite speculative. The following section focuses on these issues.

7. Emotions

As can be expected, emotions follow the pattern of sickness. Emotions take the B (absolutive) group marking to form predicative constructions, of the type shown in (52):

(52)
The abstract form khithe-tenab ‘happiness-GEN’ makes generic reference to the feeling of happiness, yet when used with the possessive -di, the meaning of the abstract noun gains concreteness and individualisation: it refers to specific independent situations with which the possessor hopes to relate.

A radically different behavior is found with internal features of human beings. Not only is there a whole/part relationship between an abstract property and its possessor, but also human attributes lack the boundedness and separability characteristic of individualisation. The lack of a suffix -di is thus consistent with the general organization of the possessive system.

In a similar manner liking tendencies and dreams exist within the self and are hard to dissociate from some experience. The zero marking of the possessive construction is thus predictable.

Other emotions, such as anger, follow exactly the same zero marking pattern:
A more difficult case to explain is the use of the root non-derived form for happiness with the possessive -il:

(61) nun-ut khitlih-ut
    ISONG-A1 happiness-POS
    ‘My happiness’

Based on the external/internal hypothesis we should expect that the internal quality of this feeling made the possession to be expressed with the zero marker. I hypothesize that -il highlights not only the feeling but also the external set of physical manifestations with which it is normally associated. Although speculative, this interpretation is supported by some data. Notice that other emotions whose external manifestation is quite prominent also take -il marking:

(62) nanaa’ = ts’ích-il
    ISNG A1 laughter
    ‘My laughter’

While laughter can be recognized due to their external manifestation, inner attributes and emotions of human beings can only be inferred from other actions. The external/internal distinction motivate naturally the zero/il marking contrast.

Still, it is puzzling that happiness and anger follow different marking strategies. I do not have a conclusive answer to this issue, except to suggest that common expectations may play a crucial role in Huastec culture. While it is common for happiness to be expressed overtly, anger is an emotion supposed to be held back. If this is true then anger is internally preserved while happiness and laughter constitute external manifestations for which an -il marker is predicted\(^\text{12}\).

\(^{12}\) I should clarify that getting different marking patterns for positive and negative meanings is not uncommon at all. Greenberg (1977) has proposed a universal by which negative meanings are marked in contrast with positive meanings. Typological and language acquisition evidence has been offered in support of Greenberg’s proposal (Clark and Clark 1978). However the Huastec phenomenon does not fully match that.

8. Conclusions

In this paper I have shown that an alienable/non-alienable approach does not fully explain the Huastec possessive system. I have shown instead that there is an iconic organization determined by the conceptual proximity of the possessor with respect to the possessor. The proximity organization is a gradual one: sickness and emotions are too intrinsic to ego to be possessed. Personal attributions and extensions from ego pair up with (body) parts, since they share the basic feature of being definable and yet they are conceptually dependent of their reference point. This intermediate character makes them best candidates to get zero marking. External manifestations of sickness and emotions have a lower degree of dependency since they have enough definition to be abstracted away from the possessor. This is the bottom line for the -il marker to occur. Any entity with at least this level of definition/individuation departs from the zero marking pattern, unless an inherent cultural relationship overwhelms individuation to make an extension from ego relationship—with a zero marking pattern. The contents of this scalar organization are summarized in Chart 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non-alienable</th>
<th>alienable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sickness &gt; personal attrib</td>
<td>external manifest. &gt; individualized &gt; independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td>of sickness elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whole/part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensions from ego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non- &gt; zero marking &gt; -il marking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

general tendency, since it is the positive, not the negative meaning that get the -il marker.
Besides the scale of propositional sense, a crucial point is the mismatch between allexiological and / marking. The possessive system is particularly sensitive to individualization. As soon as some symptom of individualization is prominent the / marking is required. However the conceptual proximity of two elements, as determined by cultural factors, overrules the determinancy of individualization.

This paper suggests that the exceptions of a general pattern are not strong arguments to reject analyses based on semantic motivation, as Nichols has suggested. I agree with Velarde in rejecting a full predictability requirement for semantic analysis. Yet I believe that a fine grain approach to semantic, cognitive, pragmatic and cultural issues will increase the degree of semantic predictability of semantic analyses of formal patterns. In the case of Huastec possession not all cases have been solved, yet the amount of phenomena that have been naturally accommodated sets the ground to believe that the semantic organization of a language is quite far from the world of uncontrollable variability.
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