In a Nutshell  I argue that the nominalizers in Turkish are subject to the same strict ordering hierarchy that other predicative markers are subject to, which accounts for the cases of affixation blocking with nominalizers.

General Picture  Predicative markers in Turkish are strictly ordered, which can be accounted for by a Functional Head Hierarchy in the style of Cinque (1999, 2002 et seq.). The strongest evidence for the hierarchy comes from the copula $i$ (Kornfilt 1996), which can be optionally realized as an affix or a clitic and host the markers that follow it (as in (1b) and (2b)). Only a limited number of markers can follow the copula and those that can do this assume a different function when they occur in a pre-copula position (3).

(1) a. Gel-meli-Ø-di-Ø.  (2) a. Gel-miş-Ø-ti-Ø.
   come-OBLG-COP-PST-3
   ‘(S)he was supposed to come.’

b. Gel-meli i-di-Ø.  b. Gel-miş i-di-Ø.
   come-OBLG COP-PST-3  come-PFV COP-PST-3
   ‘(S)he came.’

(3) a. Gel-se-y-di-Ø  her şey farklı ol-ur-du-Ø.
   come-CNTF-COP-PST-3 everything different be-MOD-PST-3SG
   ‘If (s)he had come, everything would have been different.’

   come-PFV COP-COND-3 (s)he-ACC visit do-OPT-1PL
   ‘If (s)he has come, let’s visit her/him.’

On Nominals  The pre-copula markers cannot be hosted by nominal predicates (4b), unless hosted by the auxiliary of (4d). This suggests that the copula marks an affixation border that verbal and nominal predicates share, in that a nominal stem can only host the copula and the higher markers that follow it (4c).

(4) a. Gel-ecek-Ø-ti-m.  c. Hasta-y-di-m.
   come-PROS-COP-PST-1SG  sick-COP-PST-1SG
   ‘I was going to come.’

   sick-PROS-COP-1SG  sick AUX-PROS-1SG
   Int: ‘I will be sick.’

The nominalizers in the language (namely -mA, -I¸s, -AcAk, and -DIk) do not allow temporal aspects on the verbal stem (5a), but this is allowed when the auxiliary is inserted (5b). The nominalizers allow dynamic & alethic modals, negation, and frequency/manner aspects on the verbal stem, but whatever comes next must be hosted by the auxiliary.

   come-IPFV-NMLZ-POSS.3SG-ACC know-IPFV-1SG
   ‘I know that (s)he is coming.’

b. Gel-iyor ol-duğ-u-nu  bil-iyor-um.
   come-IPFV AUX-NMLZ-POSS.3SG-ACC know-IPFV-1SG
   ‘I know that (s)he is coming.’
Proposal I claim that the auxiliary *ol is inserted in order to repair hierarchical violations (6), because it resets the hierarchical cycle due to the introduction of another CP domain. The auxiliary can successfully host even the lowest functional heads in the hierarchy.

    go-PFV-OBLG-1SG  
    ‘I must have gone.’

  b. Git-miş *ol-mah-yim.  
    go-PFV AUX-OBLG-1SG  
    ‘I must have gone.’

Following Demirok (2018), I assume that -mA selects predicates of events as its complement, whereas -DIk and its non-past counterpart -AcAk take propositions. The latter duo obligatorily involves an agreement projection, whereas -mA and -Iṣ (which also selects predicates of events) optionally undergo agreement, depending on the presence of an embedded subject.

Since the adverbial aspect of Cinque’s hierarchy does not work in Turkish (Wilson & Saygın 2001; Cinque 2017), I adopt the following simplified version by Payne (2018): VP < Manner (M) < Frequency & Degree (FD) < Tense & Aspectual (TA) < Epistemic (E) < Evaluative/Speaker Oriented (ESO).

Adverbial tests show that embedded clauses constructed with -mA, -AcAk, and -DIk allow M, FD, and TA adverbs, whereas -Iṣ only allows M and FD adverbs. Based on this evidence, I propose that -Iṣ is located in the Nominalizer spot. The other three are located in the Nominalizer spot (which has an intersection with the temporal zone) in the hierarchy, for which a simplified version is provided in (7).

(7)  Simplified hierarchy for the predicative markers in Turkish:  
     Verb < Manner/Frequency Aspects < Ability < Negation < Possibility < AgrL  
     < Nominalizers1 < Tense anterior < AgrR < Nominalizers2 < Temporal Aspects < AgrL  
     < Nominal Boundary < Q < Copula < T < Evidentials < Epistemic Modals < AgrZ  
     < Speaker-Oriented Modals

Conclusion I have argued that the nominalizers in Turkish are subject to the strict ordering hierarchy that all markers must obey. Tests show that the nominalizers have differing properties, for which I have proposed a hierarchy-based explanation.
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