Suspended affixation is a widespread phenomenon in which affixes appended to the rightmost conjunct in a coordinate structure have scope over all the conjuncts. It is particularly robust in Turkish:

(1) Deniz-e gid-ec ek, gün-e te kilzar-t-t-acak, ve eGle-n-ec ek-ti-k.
   "We were going to go to the sea, get baked in the sun, and enjoy ourselves"

Kornfilt (1996) offered an analysis of SA as an instance of coordinated complements of the copula, which she argued allowed post-predicate affixes to attach to a coordinate structure. Kabak (2007) has criticized this analysis, citing two major faults: (a) it overgenerates, because it does not account for the ungrammaticality of

(2) *ev-imiz-i sat-sa ve bir dUkkkan al-sa-y-di-k
   house-POSS1PL-ACC sell-COND AND a shop buy-COND-COP-PAST-1Pl
   "If we sold our house and bought a shop"

and (b) it undergenerates, because it has nothing to say about SA in nominals:

(3) kedi ve kOpek-ler-im-i
   cat AND dog-PL-POSS1SG-ACC
   "my cats and dogs (ACC)"

The present paper argues that Kornfilt was essentially right, though there are further constraints on SA that have not been noticed. Hankamer (2004) has argued that the relational suffix -ki is an ad-phrasal affix, combining with case-phrase (KP) -sized phrases to make larger phrases:

(4) [[o yUksek raf-ta]-ki mavi kitap-lar-da]-ki-ler-de
   THAT high shelf-LOC-ki blue book-PL-LOC-ki-PL-LOC
   'in the ones in the blue books on that high shelf'

If this result is accepted, it seems reasonable to assume that all affixes that occur to the right of (i.e. outside) the -ki suffix are ad-phrasal as well. These include the plural, possessive, and case suffixes that are suspendable in nominal coordinations, and also the post-predicate morphology dealt with in Kornfilt’s analysis. Even Kabak’s overgeneration criticism is answered, because it can be shown that the "copula" in (2) is not the same one as in (1), and is not in fact a possible successor to -ki:

(5) *biz-im-ki-(y)-se-y-di
   we-GEN-KI-(COP)-COND-COP-PST
   TRYING TO MEAN: "If it was ours"

We conclude that Kornfilt’s proposal is essentially correct: SA is the result of coordinated phrases combining with ad-phrasal affixes. But there are some additional principles that need to be stated in order to account for heretofore unobserved restrictions on SA. One is that agreement affixation
can never be suspended, and the other is that coordinated predicate phrases must match in type:

(6) *bozuk yemek ye-diG-im iCin hasta ol-uyor ve doktor-a gid-ecG-im
   rotten food eat-PART-POSS1SG for sick get-PRES AND doctor-DAT go-FUT-!SG
   TRYING TO MEAN:
   "I am getting sick because I ate rotten food and I will go to the doctor"

(7) *hasta ve Ol-cek-ti-m
   sick AND die-FUT-PST-1SG
   TRYING TO MEAN: "I was sick and going to die"

Thus in addition to the ability of ad-phrasal affixes to attach to coordinated phrases, we need some constraints on what phrases may be coordinated. While clauses containing unlike predicates may be coordinated, it seems that predicates containing unlike aspect suffixes may not be coordinated directly.