PSEUDO-3rd PERSON MARKER AND POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN TURKISH

Aysun Kunduracı
University of Calgary

1. Introduction

In this paper, I argue that the function of the so-called 3rd person singular suffix, *-sI*,[1] is not to mark "3rd person" but to mark only possessum in Turkish. In other words, I propose that Possession, or "Possessedness", must be an independent grammatical category in Turkish. I will frame my analysis in a process-based approach to morphology in which affixes are not lexical items but rule elements belonging to morphology, as in Zwicky 1986, Anderson 1992, Aronoff 1994, Beard 1995, Pounder 2000, and Kunduracı 2013. My analysis will also follow the assumption that morphology is an autonomous component, separate from both lexicon and syntax (e.g. Zwicky 1986, Di Sciullo & Williams 1987, Aronoff 1994, Beard 1995, Göksel 1998, 2007, Pounder 2000, 2006, Sadock 2012, Kunduracı 2013).

In section 2, I will introduce Turkish possessive suffixes in possessive constructions, and will present certain challenges to the analysis of *-sI* as the 3SG suffix. In section 3, I will propose that the Turkish *-sI* marks possessedness without person information in contrast to traditional analyses. Next, in section 4, I will contrast Possessedness with Person as two separate categories. In section 5, I propose the structure for the formation of possessive constructions in Turkish, including the suffixation of *-sI*. In section 6, I will show that not all possessive constructions involve agreement. Finally, section 7 will draw conclusions regarding Possessedness, Person and agreement in Turkish possessive constructions.

2. The Morphology of Turkish Possessive Constructions

In this section, we will see what possessive constructions ("PC"s) in Turkish look like and why the traditional assumption that *-sI* marks the 3rd person is problematic. Turkish PCs comprise a modifier NP with the genitive suffix, *-(n)In*, as the possessor, and a head NP with one of the possessive suffixes, *-(I)m*, *-(I)n*, or *-sI*, as the possessum. I illustrate these in (1):

[1] *-sI* surfaces as *-ı, -i, -u, -ü, -sı, -si, -su, -sü*, and as *-sIn* before case suffixes.

Actes du congrès annuel de l'Association de linguistique 2013.
Proceedings of the 2013 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association.

(1) a. (ben-im) peri-m b. (sen-in) peri-n
I-GEN fairy-1.POSS[2] you-GEN fairy-2.POSS
'my fairy' 'your fairy'

c. (on-un) peri-si
(s)he/it-GEN fairy-*sI*
'her/his/its fairy'

(1a) is an example of a PC with 1st person, (1b) with 2nd person, and (1c) with 3rd person. In all the three PCs, we see that the modifier NPs include the genitive suffix whereas the head NPs the possessive suffixes. Importantly, we also see that the -*sI* suffix is in complementary distribution with the 1.POSS and 2.POSS suffixes, as in (2):

(2) a. ben-im peri(*-si)-m
I-GEN fairy(-*sI*)-1.POSS
'my fairy'

b. sen-in peri(*-si)-n
you-GEN fairy(-*sI*)-2.POSS
'your fairy'

Since -*sI* is in complementary distribution with 1.POSS and 2.POSS suffixes, as demonstrated in (2), it has been treated as the "3rd person possessive" suffix in PCs in all the literature to the best of my knowledge (e.g. Dede 1978, Yükseker 1994, van Schaaik 1996, Kornfilt 1997, Lewis 2000, Göksel & Kerslake 2005). However, I consider certain problems with the interpretation of -*sI* as the "3rd person" suffix in PCs, i.e. morphological marking of 3rd person in Turkish, number agreement in PCs, and morphological behaviour of -*sI* in contrast to 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes. I will address these problems respectfully.

2.1 Morphological Marking of 3rd Person in Turkish

This section shows the non-parallelism between the marking of 3rd person and other persons in Turkish, i.e. whereas 1st/2nd persons are obligatorily marked to indicate subjects on finite predicates (3a,b), there is no marking for 3rd person like this (3c):

(3) a. oku-du-m b. oku-du-n c. oku-du
read-PAST-1 read-PAST-2 read-PAST
'I read' 'you read' '(s)he/it read'

[2] I will use "1.POSS and 2.POSS" for 1st person and 2nd person "possessive" suffixes, and "1 and 2" for person agreement suffixes, which do not express possession, on finite predicates.

The question arising from the contrast between (3c) and (3a,b) is why 3rd person is not marked in other domains requiring person marking, such as (3c), if this value, 3rd, is marked in PCs. Namely, it is unexpected that a person value, 3rd, will be marked in an agreement domain, PCs, whereas it is not marked in another agreement domain, predicates. Note for example that Siewierska (2004:127) demonstrates that person agreement in predicates is more usual than agreement in PCs cross-linguistically. This finding, again, emphasizes that the assumption that 3rd person is marked in Turkish PCs needs to be accounted for as the same value is not marked on predicates. The analysis proposed here will provide an answer for this problem.

2.2 Number Agreement in Turkish PCs

This section addresses another category, Number, in the relation of agreement, and highlights the non-parallelism between 1st/2nd person possessors and 3rd person possessors in terms of this category. Importantly, whereas number agreement on possessum is mandatory with 1st/2nd person possessors, as shown in (4a,b), there is no number agreement with 3rd person possessors, as shown in (4c,d), in Turkish:

(4) a. biz-im peri-m*(-iz)
we-GEN fairy-1.POSS-PPL
'our fairy'

b. siz-in peri-n*(-iz)
you (PL)-GEN fairy-2.POSS-PPL
'your (PL) fairy'

c. onlar-ın peri-si(*-z)
they-GEN fairy-*sI*(*PPL)
'their fairy'

d. onlar-ın peri-ler-i
they-GEN fairy-PL-*sI*
'their fairies'

(4a) and (4b) contain plural possessors, 1st and 2nd persons, respectively: *biz* 'we', and *siz* 'you (PL)'. On the possessums in (4a) and (4b), we see the person agreement suffixes *-(I)m* and *-(I)n*, and the person plural suffix, *-Iz*, necessarily following them.[3] With regard to (4c) and (4d), these contain plural 3rd person possessors, *onlar* 'they'; however, there is no agreement in terms of number on

[3] *-Iz* is necessarily suffixed on the possessum following 1st/2nd person possessive suffixes when the possessors are plural. I treat *-Iz* as the "person plural" suffix: PPL.

the possessum, unlike (4a,b). It is important that there is no distinction between the possessums of (4c), which contains a plural possessor, and (1c), for example, which contains a singular possessor. Namely, in (4c), there is no number marking on the possessum for the plural possessor; neither *-Iz* nor the plural suffix *-lAr* can appear here for number agreement. In (4d), we see that *-lAr* may appear on the possessum. However, *-lAr* in (4d) does not mark a plural "possessor"; rather, it only shows a plural "possessum".[4] In other words, in PCs, *-lAr* does not function as an agreement suffix unlike *-Iz*, the person plural suffix, which cannot appear with 3rd person possessors.

The fact that there is no number agreement in Turkish PCs with 3rd person possessors poses a further problem for the interpretation of *-sI* as the 3SG suffix: if *-sI* was a person marker, either *-Iz* or another marker for person plurality would appear with *-sI*. This is, however, not the case.

2.3 Morphological Distinctiveness of *-sI*

This section presents a set of data in which certain suffix combinations are possible with person possessive suffixes but not *-sI*. Unlike *-sI*, 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes are interestingly followed by some derivational suffixes and the plural suffix in Turkish. This fact, excluding *-sI*, will provide another piece of support for my current claim that *-sI* must be distinguished from "person" possessive suffixes. In (5-6), I will illustrate this case with examples containing the derivational suffixes *-lIK* and *-sIz*, and in (7), the plural suffix *-lAr*:

(5) a. abla-m-lık
(elder) sister-1.POSS-*lIK*
'suitable for /
related to my sister'

b. abla-n-lık
sister-2.POSS-*lIK*
'suitable for /
related to your sister'

c. *abla-sı-lık
sister-*sI*-*lIK*
for 'suitable for/related to her/his sister'

[4] Note that I do not assume that *-leri* functions as a single agreement item (3rd person plural possessive marking) as in Kornfilt 1984, 1997:384 and Lewis 2000:37. I rather consider *-lAr* only to be the plural suffix, which is followed by *-sI* in PCs. However, it seems that *-lAr* may mark number agreement in some cases except for PCs. For instance, in *çocuklar ve baba-lar-ı* (child-PL and father-PL-*sI*) 'the children and their father/fathers', there is an ambiguity: the interpretation of a single unique father is possible as well as plural fathers. In a PC domain, however, there is no ambiguity like this, i.e. there is one reading, which includes a plural possessum, and does not show agreement with a plural possessor. The PC *çocuk-lar-ın baba-lar-ı* (child-PL-GEN father-PL-*sI*) only means 'the children's fathers' but not 'the children's father'.

(6) a. abla-m-sız
sister-1.POSS-*sIz*
'without my sister'

b. abla-n-sız
sister-2.POSS-*sIz*
'without your sister'

c. abla-(*sı)-sız[5]
sister(*-*sI*)-*sIz*
'without her/his sister'

Examples in (5-6) demonstrate that some derivational suffixes may follow 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes, but the so-called 3rd person possessive suffix may not appear in such contexts (5c, 6c). Likewise, in contrast to -*sI*, 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes may be followed by -*lAr*, the plural suffix, as shown in (7):

(7) a. anne-m-ler
mother-1.POSS-PL
'my mother and those with her'

b. anne-n-ler
mother-2.POSS-PL
'your mother and those with her'

c. *anne-si-ler
mother-*sI*-PL
for 'her/his mother and those with her'

(7a) and (7b) present examples showing the possibility of -*lAr* immediately after person possessive suffixes. (7c), however, indicates that this is not possible with -*sI*, again. On the basis of examples from (4) to (7), we can claim that the behaviour, or distribution, of -*sI* is distinct from that of 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes. Since the distribution of -*sI* is distinctive, we will have trouble if we desire to list -*sI* as a person possessive suffix just like 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes in the paradigm that these suffixes constitute. Recall also that 3rd person is normally the non-marked person in Turkish, as shown in (3). Therefore, the function of -*sI* in PCs and the problems highlighted in this section remain to be established. Namely, the traditional analysis of -*sI* as the Turkish 3SG suffix must be revisited. The goal of this study is thus to resolve these problems and to show why -*sI* appears in Turkish PCs.

3. Proposal: The Function of -*sI* in Possessive Constructions

The data in §2 underline two important points: 3rd person is not normally marked in Turkish, and the -*sI* suffix is morphologically restricted, unlike 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes. For these reasons, as in Kunduracı 2013, I propose that -*sI* is inflectional like 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes; however, it does not mark a person

[5] Note that the ungrammatical *-*sı-sız* sequence has nothing to do with haplology; Turkish allows sequences involving phonological identity but morphological distinctions. See Haig 2004, for example.

value unlike 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes. It only marks that something is possessed, i.e. "possessum". Therefore, it is the "possessive" suffix in Turkish, not the "3SG possessive".[6] This proposal gives right to another prediction, i.e. Possession, or Possessedness, should be a distinct category from Person, with the values 'possessed' and 'non-possessed'. See also Mel'čuk 1994 for Possessedness ("appartenance") as a category in other languages.

Note that this proposal accounts for not only the appearance of *-sI* in Turkish PCs but also its absence in other contexts. *-sI* appears in PCs as *-sI* is a possessive suffix. However, it cannot appear with the person plural (agreement) suffix, *-lz* (4c), since *-sI* is not a person suffix. Since it is not a person suffix, it cannot appear before the plural suffix and derivational suffixes which may follow person suffixes (5-7). We can now explain why *-sI* appears in PCs and why, at the same time, it is distinct from other possessive suffixes (1.POSS/2.POSS).

This proposal does not contradict the general morphological situation regarding 3rd person in Turkish: it is not marked. It also accords with another fact, i.e. there is no specific pronoun for 3rd person; rather, the demonstrative *o* 'that' is used. This case might be important in the following way: if we assume that person agreement necessitates pronominal motivation, for example, the fact that Turkish even has no "pronoun" for 3rd person implies that this value, 3rd, will not be marked by morphology. In other words, what is expected in Turkish PCs is indeed lack of 3rd person marking, as in other agreement domains, rather than marking this value like other person values.[7] [8]

Considering the above discussion, it is indeed expected that the 3rd value of Person will not be marked in Turkish PCs since this value is not marked on finite predicates, and it is missing in the paradigm of pronouns. Therefore, the Turkish *-sI* must be the possessive suffix only, without corresponding to Person, as I claim here.[9] If Turkish had a 3rd person suffix, it would occupy the position that *-sI* appears in. This must be the reason for misinterpreting the possessive suffix as the 3SG suffix.

4. Possession vs. Person

I claim that Possession must be regarded not only as a relation but also as a separate grammatical category, which is independent from the Person category. If this is correct, we will predict that each of these, Possession and Person, may

---

[6] Now we can show *-sI* as "POSS" in PCs.

[7] Note also that the plural form of *o* is *on-lar* 'they', which contains the plural suffix *-lAr*, unlike the plural forms of the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which are monomorphemic: *biz* 'we', and *siz* 'you'.

[8] The reader could refer to Nikolaeva 2005 for a discussion of person agreement in possessive constructions.

[9] One might question where the 3rd person interpretation comes from if *-sI* is not a person suffix. The answer is very simple in fact: 3rd person interpretation in PCs comes from the absence of 1st and 2nd person possessors.

be marked separately. There is actually cross-linguistic evidence for this claim. In Carib, for example, *-rI*, the possessive suffix, may appear with all persons, as exemplified in (8):

(8) a. i-pa:sa-rï
3SG-cheek-POSS
'his cheek'

b. _-to:pu-ru
1SG-stone-POSS
'my stone'

(from Hoff 1962:160, 163 respectively)

Likewise, in Dëne Sųłiné, there is a possessive suffix, *-é*, which may be used with all persons, as illustrated in (9):

(9) a. se-dzın-é
1-day-POSS
'my birthday'

b. be-yú-é
3-equipment-POSS
'her/his equipment'

(from Saxon & Wilhelm 2011, (18) and (6), respectively)

The case in Carib and Dëne Sųłiné, illustrated above, is important in that it shows that possessum marking may be independent of person marking. Even though possession and person marking may involve morphological cumulation across languages, with the above examples, we see that it is also possible that these are marked separately, i.e. without cumulation. Though not directly, this fact supports the current proposal that the Turkish *-sI* is a possessive suffix and not relevant to person.

There is, however, a potential problem with this analysis: if *-sI* is only a possessive suffix in Turkish, we would expect it to be able to appear with other person suffixes, as in Carib and Dëne Sųłiné. This is, however, not the case in Turkish. The sequences involving *-sI* and a person suffix are not attested, as in *peri(*-si)-n* (fairy(*-*sI*)-2.POSS) 'your fairy' (see (2)). My resolution for this problem is as follows: 1.POSS/2.POSS suffixes are cumulative, i.e. they correspond not only to person but also to possession. This means that *-sI* and these suffixes are in a paradigmatic contrast since all have something to do with possession. Therefore, they cannot cooccur due to a slot competition, and *-sI* is overridden since it is less specific, i.e. *-sI* corresponds only to possession.

5. Structure of Turkish PCs and *-sI* Suffixation

In this section, I will propose a structure showing the formation of PCs in Turkish, including the process of *-sI* suffixation. In the system I will propose, there are three steps which are involved in the formation of PCs and the suffixation of *-sI* in PCs. To be more precise, PCs involve phrase-formation by syntax, which maps onto an associative semantic rule, which is followed by the suffixation of the genitive case suffix, and one of the possessive suffixes, as

shown in Figure 1. I illustrate this system with the PC *orman-ın peri-si* (forest-GEN fairy-POSS) 'the forest's fairy':

[*orman peri*]	*Step1* →	Syntactic Operation & Semantic Association: OF(x, y)[10]
{ [*orman-<u>ın</u> peri*] }	*Step2* →	Morphological Operation: Inflection of Possessor
{ [*orman-ın peri-<u>si</u>*] }	*Step3* →	Morphological Operation: Inflection of Possessum

Figure 1. The Formation of Possessive Constructions with 3rd Person in Turkish

In this figure, Step 1 involves the structural combination by syntax and the meaning combination by semantics, which map onto each other and result in the NP *orman peri* with an OF semantics between the two elements. I treat OF as a type of association ("ASN") function (see Kunduracı 2013), which applies to two arguments, possessor and possessum above. In this respect, ASN functions are distinct from the semantics of ordinary NPs, which I call ascription, following Giegerich 1999.[11] In the next step, Step 2, the possessor, which is the modifier NP of the PC, is marked by the genitive suffix by case inflection. This results in the formation *orman-<u>ın</u> peri*. Finally, in Step 3, the possessum, which is the head NP in the PC, is marked by *-sI*, which is another type of inflection. Then we get *orman-ın peri-<u>si</u>*.

As we see, the sytem I propose in Fig. 1 involves the assumption that morphology is an autonomous component and may follow syntax, as in Beard 1995, Pounder 2000, Sadock 2012, Kunduracı 2013.[12] Importantly, both *-sI* and the genitive suffix are added by morphology, following the syntactic and semantic combinations. This means that neither suffix is responsible for either the syntactic structure or the semantic relationship between the two NPs, possessor and possessum. Rather, these suffixes are only formal (morphological) markers of PCs.[13]

---

[10] Following Kunduracı 2013, I assume that the relation of association is a semantic function with two arguments. Association functions involve some specific types, one of which is OF ('belonging to'). PCs may involve other association functions as well as OF, e.g. FROM ('source'), FOR ('purpose'). See Kunduracı 2013 for a list of association functions.

[11] See, for example, Heim & Kratzer 1998 for semantic analyses of ordinary NPs.

[12] However, this does not mean that all morphological operations necessarily follow syntax; there are also morphological operations applying before syntactic operations.

[13] Note that this analysis can be extended to other languages as well. In Jamaican Creaole PCs, for example, possessor and possessum are determined by the order in the PC (Ultan

With this system, we can also account for the fact that Turkish possessive suffixes, including *-sI*, may be omitted in PCs in casual speech, as exemplified in (10):

(10)	a.	sen-in	peri_	b.	Kaan-ın	peri_
		you-GEN	fairy		Kaan-GEN	fairy
		'your fairy'			'Kaan's fairy'	

(10a) shows that the 2.POSS suffix may be omitted, similarly (10b) shows that the possessive suffix, *-sI*, may be omitted. This fact supports the current claim that possessive suffixes cannot be responsible for the syntactic structure, i.e. these are morphological markers. Meaning and structure of PCs must be obtained before possessive suffixes are added (by morphology).

Now I will show the morphological operations involved in Step 2 and Step 3. My analysis is framed within a process-based approach to morphology (e.g. Zwicky 1986, Anderson 1992, Aronoff 1994, Beard 1995, Pounder 2000, Kunduracı 2013), and I use the Process & Paradigm framework, Pounder 2000, 2004, 2006. Fig. 2 represents the processes, or morphological operation, taking place in the suffixation of the genitive suffix in Turkish:

Step 2:

SR < 'x' → Possessor;	'SR' >;	'OP'	Sc: NP
FR < *x* + *-(n)In*;	'FR' >		Oc: Slot 3

Figure 2. The Suffixation of the Genitive Suffix in Turkish

The morphological operation represented in Fig. 2 involves the mapping of a semantic rule, SR, and a form rule, FR, onto each other. The SR expresses the possessor argument of the semantic function OF applying in Step 1 in Fig. 1 (see above). The FR suffixes the genitive suffix as case inflection. The mapping of these two rules constitute the first part of the morphological operation. In the second part, 'OP' means that this operation has a place within the entire morphological system. Finally, Sc, stem condition, expresses that this operation applies to NPs, i.e. it takes NP stems. Oc, operation condition, expresses that the genitive suffix occupies Slot 3 in the inflectional paradigm, as do other case suffixes.[14]

Now I turn to Fig. 3, which represents the suffixation of *-sI* as a process, again, in the final step of PC formation:

1978:16), rather than morphological markings. Such PCs too involve the OF function, which shows that it is not necessary to ascribe the meaning of PCs to individual suffixes.

[14] In Turkish, Slot 1 is for number inflection, Slot 2 is for possessive suffixes; thus Slot 3 is for case suffixes, e.g. *kitap-lar-ım-dan* (book-PL-1.POSS-ABL) 'from my books'.

Step 3:

SR < 'x' → Possessum;	'SR' >;	'OP'	Sc: NP
FR < *x* + *-sI*;	'FR' >		Oc: Slot 2
	Rc: s → ∅/ C --		

Figure 3. The Suffixation of the Possessive Suffix in Turkish

The SR in Fig. 3 expresses the other argument, possessum, of the semantic function OF applying in Step 1 in Fig. 1. This rule maps onto the FR, which suffixes *-sI* to NP stems. The FR has a rule condition, Rc, expressing that the consonant of the suffix is not added after consonants. The morphological operation has a stem condition determining NPs as the stem types which this operation may apply to. The operation condition, Oc, expresses that Slot 2 is reserved for *-sI* in the inflectional paradigm.

Having proposed a formation involving syntax, semantics, and morphology for Turkish PCs with 3rd person, and a process suffixing *-sI*, I will now turn to PCs with 1st/2nd person possessors. I assume that PCs with 1st/2nd persons involve the same steps shown in Fig. 1. There is, however, a distinction in the final step: Step 3 in the formation of PCs with 1st/2nd person possessors involve "agreement", which PCs with 3rd person lacks. In Fig. 4, I show the last step in the formation of the PC *sen-in peri-n* (you-GEN fair-2.POSS) 'your fairy', which contains the second person pronoun:

...

{ [*sen-in peri-n*] }	*Step 3* →	Morphological Operation:
↑_____ ↲		Possessum Inflection
		&
		Agreement

Figure 4. Final Step in PCs with 1st/2nd Persons

Fig. 4 indicates that the relation of agreement will take place when we have either the 1st or the 2nd person possessor in a PC. The value determining agreement above is '2nd', the Person value of the possessor, which is the controller.[15] I assume that this value is transmitted to the possessum, which is the target of agreement. This relation, agreement, is expressed by the 2.POSS suffix. Recall that 1.POSS and 2.POSS suffixes correspond to both possession and

[15] I follow Corbett (2001, 2006) and Cysouw (2011), who treat agreement as a "relation". I use Corbett's terms of agreement.

person information, which makes them agreement suffixes, unlike *-sI*. In §6, I will support this claim with some data from other languages.

6. Possession without Agreement

In this section, I will present some examples to support the claim that Turkish PCs with 3rd person does not involve agreement, unlike PCs with 1st/2nd person possessors. Based on my claim that the possessive *-sI* does not mark 3rd person, there will be no value marked by *-sI* for the category Person in PCs with 3rd person. Since there is no such value for agreement, there is also no agreement. This claim is justified by the fact that there is no number agreement in PCs with 3rd person possessors either, as shown in §2. This means that there is neither person nor number agreement in PCs with 3rd person possessors in Turkish.

Note that it is not unusual that PCs may lack agreement, as I claim here. In Tundra Nenets, for example, person agreement on the possessum is mandatory with pronoun possessors as in (11a), whereas agreement does not take place otherwise (Nikolaeva 2005:223). There is no person agreement in (11b), unlike (11a):

(11) a. pidør^{o} te-r^{o}
you.SG.NOM reindeer-2.POSS
'your reindeer'

b. Wata-h ti
Wata-GEN reindeer
'Wata's reindeer'

(from Nikolaeva 2005:223, (1a) and (1b), respectively)

Similarly, in Tauya, person agreement takes place only with inalienable possession as shown in (12a), unlike (12b), where there is no agreement, as noted in Siewierska 2004:138:

(12) a. ya-neme
1SG-head
'my head'

b. wate ne-pi
house 3SG-GEN
'his/her house'

(from MacDonald 1990:129, 131, respectively)

The cases in Tundra Nenets and Tauya, illustrated above, show that PCs may be formed without agreement. This supports the above claim that agreement does not take place in Turkish PCs with 3rd person in contrast to other persons.

7. Conclusions

In this paper, I argue that the so-called 3SG possessive suffix is only the possessive suffix in Turkish: it has nothing to do with the category Person, contra previous analyses. Thus, it is the pseudo-3rd person marker. I have proposed that the Turkish *-sI* marks only possessum: it is the possessive suffix. This claim gave rise to another proposal: Possessedness is a grammatical category in Turkish. Note that with this analysis, we can account for *-sI* in noun-noun compounds in Turkish, e.g. *orman peri-si* (forest fairy-*sI*) 'forset fairy' as well as *-sI* in PCs. Namely, we can establish a natural link between PCs and compounds based on "possession" rather than "person". See Kunduracı 2013 for an analysis of Turkish noun-noun compounds with an autonomous morphological approach.

In addition to Possessedness, this study has also addressed the categories Person and Number, and the relation of agreement. I will conclude that Turkish PCs can only involve agreement if there is a person value available for this relation, i.e. 1st or 2nd, but not 3rd. Therefore, unlike 1.POSS and 2.POSS suffixes, which are person possessive, thus, agreement suffixes, *-sI* is not an agreement suffix in Turkish. I have also shown that Turkish PCs with 3rd person do not show number agreement either. From this we conclude that number agreement depends on person agreement in Turkish, i.e. without person agreement, number agreement will not take place. I assume that we will find more interesting facts about person and number if this problem, i.e. person condition on number agreement, is investigated across languages.

Another conclusion concerns the way person and possession are marked, i.e. whether there is morphological cumulation or not. In this paper, I have shown that morphological cumulation of person and possession is not obligatory in PCs, as in the case of Turkish *-sI*, Carib *-rI*, and Dëne Sųłiné *-é*. Recall that these affixes correspond to possession without person.

Since the analysis proposed here is based on an autonomous approach to morphology, in contrast to syntactic or lexicalist approaches, we will also have some theoretical conclusions. I have proposed that the formation of possessive constructions involves morphological operations following syntactic operations. This means that morphology may operate not only presyntactically but also postsyntactically. Note that in this way, we are able to account for why possessive suffixes are necessary and why they may be omitted, at the same time. A syntactic analysis, for example, would assign a structural position to possessive suffixes and thus would have problems with their omission. A lexicalist analysis, on the other hand, would assign specific meanings to possessive suffixes, 'possession', for example, and would have trouble accounting for the semantic relation, OF, maintained in PCs in the absence of possessive suffixes. With a morphological analysis, however, we are able to account for both the presence and absence of these suffixes, without stipulations.

The general conclusion is that even though possession (or possessedness) frequently cooccurs with person and agreement, it is indeed independent from both of these.

References

Anderson, S. R. 1982. Where is morphology? *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 571-612.

Anderson, S. R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aronoff, M. 1994. *Morphology by itself: Stems and inflectional classes*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Beard, R.1995. *Lexeme-morpheme base morphology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Corbett, G. G. 2001. Agreement: Terms and boundaries. In *Proceedings of the 2001 Texas Linguistic Society Conference: The Role of Agreement in Natural Language*, ed. W. Griffin, 109-122. Austin, Texas: Texas Linguistic Society.

Corbett, G. G. 2006. *Agreement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cysouw, M. 2011. Very atypical agreement indeed. *Theoretical Linguistics* 37: 153-160.

Dede, M. 1978. A syntactic and semantic analysis of Turkish nominal compounds. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Michigan.

Di Sciullo, A. & E. Williams 1987. *On the definition of word*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Giegerich, H. 2009. Compounding and lexicalism. In *The Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, eds. R. Lieber & P. Štekauer, 178-200. Oxford: Oxford University Press.178-200.

Göksel, A. 1998. Word size. In *Proceedings of the First Mediterranean Conference on Morphology*, eds. G. Booij, A. Ralli & S. Scalise, 190-200. Patras: University of Patras.

Göksel, A. 2007. Morphology and syntax inside the word: Pronominal participles of headless relative clauses in Turkish. In *Proceedings of The Fifth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, Frejus, 15-18 September 2005.

Göksel, A. & C. Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Haig, G. 2004. Constraints on morpheme repetition in Turkish? In *Current Research in Turkish Linguistics*. eds. K. Imer & G. Dogan, 3-12. Gazimagusa: Eastern Mediterranean University Press.

Heim, I. & A. Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hoff, B. 1962. The nominal word-groups in Carib: A problem of delimitation of syntax and morphology. *Lingua* 11: 157-164.

Kornfilt, J. 1984. The stuttering prohibition and morpheme deletion in Turkish. In *Proceedings of the Turkish Linguistics Conference,* eds. E. Erguvanlı-Taylan & A. Aksu-Koç, 295-307. Istanbul: Boğaziçi University Publications.

Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish grammar*. London: Routledge.

Kunduracı, A. 2013. Turkish noun-noun compounds: A process-based paradigmatic account. Ph.D Dissertation, University of Calgary.

Lewis, G. 2000. *Turkish grammar*. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

MacDonalds, L. 1990. *A grammar of Tauya*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mel'čuk, I. 1994. *Cours de morphologie générale* 2. Montréal, Paris: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Nikolaeva, I. 2005. Modifier-head person concord, In *Morphology and Linguistic Typology*: *Online Proceedings of the 4th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*. http://mmm.lingue.unibo.it, eds. G. Booij, E. Guevara, A. Ralli, S. Sgroi & S. Scalise.

Pounder, A. 2000. *Processes and paradigms in word-formation morphology.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pounder, A. 2004. Haplology in English adverb-formation. In *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics II*: *Lexis and Transmission*, eds. C. J. Kay, C. A. Hough, & I. Wotherspoon, 193-211. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pounder, A. 2006. Broken forms in morphology. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistics Association*, eds. C. Gurski & M. Radisic.

Sadock, J. M. 2012. *The modular architecture of grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saxon, L. & Wilhelm, A. 2011. Dene [Athabaskan] possessive compounds and the architecture of the grammar. Poster presented at the 8th Mediterranean Morphology Meeting, Cagliari, September 14-17.

Siewierska, A. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ultan, R. 1978. Toward a typology of substantival possession. In *Universals of Human Language* 4, eds. J. H. Greenberg, 11-50. Stanford CA: Standford University Press.

van Schaaik, G. 1996. *Studies in Turkish grammar*. Turcologica 28. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Yükseker, H. 1994. Possessive constructions in Turkish. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. ed. L. Johanson, 458-477. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Zwicky, A. M. 1986. The general case: Basic form vs. default form. In *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of Berkeley Linguistics Society* 12, eds. D. Feder, M. Niepokuj, V. Nikiforidou, M. van Clay, 305-314. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.