

The Turkish Nominal Syntagmatic Sets 'Ad tamlaması': A Linguistic Approach in Turkish Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*

Vasiliki MAVRIDOU**

Abstract. This paper investigates the second language (L2) acquisition of the Turkish category Ad tamlaması (AT). AT consists an umbrella term which is encountered in Turkish grammars and L2-Turkish coursebooks to refer to three forms of Nominal Syntagmatic Sets (NSS), namely a) N-(n)In N-(s)I(n), b) N N-(s)I(n) and c) N N-(y)¹. This paper is trying to examine whether the apparently formal similarity of these 3 Nominal Syntagmatic Sets Ad Tamlaması (NSS-AT) in Turkish can be correlated with a respective degree of ease in L2 acquisition and simultaneity in L2 teaching or not. The main aim of this paper is to delineate the differences of these three NSS forms by testing them upon 12 morpho-syntactic criteria. The test results will show how much syntactically analytic and semantically transparent each of these sets is. We will conclude that the formal differentiation of the 3 NSS types does not always correspond with functional-semantic differentiation, which has implications on the difficulties these forms create in L2-learners. We will show that in the L2 learning process of the 3 NSS-AT forms, we expect a learning step ahead in the analytic N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) form compared to non-analytic compounds such as the N N-(s)I(n) form and more blurred cases such as the N N-(y) form, which shares properties of both Noun Phrases (NPs) and compounds. From a didactic scope, we come to assume that the traditional interconnection of the three NSS-Ad Tamlaması forms in Turkish L2-teaching and L2-learning methods should be put aside and rather give its place in alternative more anti-holistic approaches which would uncover the hidden syntactic properties of the 3 forms rather than stress the similarities between them.

Keywords: Turkish as second language, L2 Turkish, Nominal syntagmatic sets, Turkish possessives, Turkish compounds

* This study was presented as an oral presentation at the 8th International Congress Of Teaching Turkish As A Foreign Language (ICOTFL22) held in Skopje, North Macedonia on September 15-16, 2022.

** Orcid ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6113-9645>, Dr. University Specialized Teaching Staff, Democritus University of Thrace, Classical and Humanistic Studies, Komotini, Greece, vmavrido@bscc.duth.gr

¹ N = noun/ nominal; () = realization according to phonological rules; I = archigram subject to Vowel Harmony.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper studies the specific aspects and the process of acquisition of Turkish Nominal Syntagmatic Sets Ad tamlaması (NSS-AT) by L1-Greek speaking adults (university students) who learn Turkish as L2. The term Ad tamlaması is widely used in Turkish literature and learning manuals as an umbrella term to describe nominal (syntagmatic) sets which a) consist of at least two members which belong to the category Noun (henceforth symbolized as N) and b) are placed next to each other (for which reason described as syntagmas or syntagmatic). The grammatical combinations of 2 such nouns give rise to 3 forms, namely a) N-(n) In N-(s)I(n) (Form 1), b) N N-(s)I(n) (Form 2) and c) N N-(y) (Form 3), which differ both morpho-syntactically and semantically, as shown in the Table 1 below.

Table 1

The 3 forms of Nominal Syntagmatic Sets Ad tamlaması In Turkish

Form 1	Form 2	Form 3
N-nIn N-sIn	N N-sIn	N N-y
a. kadın-in doktor-u woman-GEN doctor- sInPOSS	b. kadın doktor-u woman doctor-sInCOMP	c. kadın doktor woman doctor
'the woman's doctor'	'gynaecologist, doctor for women'	'female doctor'

The layout of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we discuss the theoretical background for our study. In Section 3 we postulate our research questions and hypotheses. In Section 4 we analyse the 3 NSS-AT forms by testing them upon 12 morphosyntactic criteria. These tests give rise to the similarities and differences between them. In Section 5 we discuss our conclusions in terms of the sequence we assume the NSS-AT forms are potentially learned in L2-Turkish and the corresponding teaching implications this sequence gives rise to.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Traditionally the category of Turkish NSS Ad tamlaması has been treated or taught holistically and uniformly not only in L2-Turkish descriptive grammars for international (i.e. Lewis, 1967) or Greek-speaking students (i.e. Dafnopatidis & Sanlioglu 2011; Zegkinis & Hidiroglu 1995) but also in L2-Turkish language teaching coursebooks (i.e. Yeni İstanbul Yabancılar için Türkçe A1 Seti (2020), Yeni Hitit 1 seti (2009), among others) and scientific studies (Dede, 1978; Özer, 2010, among others).

The traditional tendency towards a unified and holistic approach and teaching of the phenomenon of Ad Tamlaması is mainly dictated by the simplified semiotic assumption

that the above threefold formal distinction of NSS corresponds to a pure threefold functional and semantic distinction. Researchers such as Dede (1978), Lewis (1967) and Özer (2010) treat the 3 forms of the category Ad Tamlaması homogeneously as 3 types of compounds, namely juxtaposed compounds (for N N- (y)), indefinite compounds (for N N-(s)I(n) form) and definite compounds (for N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) form). These researchers focus on the formal similarities of the members of the category Ad Tamlaması.

In the same direction, most coursebooks used in teaching Turkish to foreigners (i.e. Yeni İstanbul Yabancılar için türkçe Ders kitabı A1 (2020), Yeni Hitit 1 Ders Kitabı (2011)) teach 2 of the 3 NSS-AT forms (N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) and N N-(s)I(n)) together focusing mainly on their formal similarities. On the other hand, other studies (see Aslan & Altan, 2006; Bağrıaçık & Ralli, 2013, 2015; Kunduracı, 2013) focus on the special distinctive syntactic and functional features of several forms of the category NSS-AT, specifically the forms N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) and N N-(s)I(n). These studies focus on the nature of the -(s)I(n) morpheme (possessive or compound marker) to determine whether the members of a NSS-AT form can be assumed to be structures/ NPs belonging to Syntax or lexemes/compounds belonging to Morphology. There are several studies which examine only one subclass of the NSS-AT category, such as N N-sI(n) (see Bağrıaçık & Ralli, 2015; Kırkıcı 2009) or N N-(y) (see Bağrıaçık & Ralli, 2013, Bağrıaçık & Andreou 2011) or make a comparative study of two subclasses (for N-(n)In N-(s)I and N N-(s)I, see Aslan & Altan, 2006, for N N-(s)I and N N-(y) see Ketrez, 2018, among others).

In this theoretical context we assume that the purely surface morphological division of NSS-AT into three types stands insufficient to explain the sequence in which these forms are learned in L2-Turkish and the errors made during the learning process. This paper tries to show that the main reason for this situation is that the single term Ad tamlaması underestimates the underlying complex semantic-syntactic interconnection of the 3 forms. This study will show that the morphological differentiation of NSS-AT does not correspond to parallel functional-semantic differentiation, what we assume causes difficulties in the L2-acquisition of these 3 forms.

The dilemma posed by the two approaches in teaching the 3 NSS-AT forms in L2-Turkish, that is, a) the holistic Real Uniformity - Homogeneity approach, favoring the interconnected teaching of these forms, on the one hand, and b) the anti-holistic Apparent Uniformity-Non homogeneity approach, which focuses on the distinctive characteristics of each sub-class, on the other, specifies the need of a deeper investigation of the 3 NSS-AT forms. The dilemmatic question whether we should follow the Real Uniformity-Homogeneity or the Apparent Uniformity-Non-homogeneity approach in teaching the 3 forms of NSS-AT in turkish-L2 is hard to answer. The apparently false or, otherwise, covert homogeneity behind a superficial threefold morphological distinction of a simple term such as Ad tamlaması imposes the need for a more detailed investigation of the nature of each form.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

The following research questions and hypotheses are postulated with respect to the learning sequence of the 3 NSS-AT types and the teaching approach we should follow in teaching them in Turkish L2-learners.

Research Question 1:

Is there any (cor)-relation between the nature of the 3 NSS-AT types and the sequence these forms we expect to be learned in L2-Turkish?

Research question 2:

Should the 3 NSS-AT forms in be taught simultaneously in L2-Turkish? What implications arise with respect to teaching these forms in L2-Turkish?

Based on these questions, the following hypotheses are postulated.

Hypothesis 1:

We assume that the 3 NSS-AT forms are not learned simultaneously in the L2-Turkish acquisition process. Rather, we expect discrete stages and a predictable order in the acquisition process. We assumed that we expect the most homogenous NSS-AT form to be a step ahead in Turkish SLA.

Hypothesis 2:

We assume that the 3 NSS-AT forms should not be taught interconnectively in L2-Turkish teaching. The traditional interconnection of the three NSS-Ad tamlaması forms in Turkish L2-teaching and L2-learning methods should be put aside and rather give its place in alternative more anti-holistic approaches which would uncover the hidden syntactic properties of the 3 forms rather than stress the similarities between them.

4. SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF THE 3 NSS-AT FORMS IN TURKISH

In order to draw the separating lines between the 3 NSS-AT forms in Turkish we used 12 morpho- syntactic tests, 6 of which are syntactic and 6 morphological (see Table 2 below). We assumed tha these tests would help us delineate the nature of each NSS-AT form (whether it is syntactic or lexical) which will further help us make assumptions on the learning sequence of these form s in L2-Turkish.

By the term syntactic we refer to criteria which test the degree of analyticality within a specific NSS-AT form and which indicate whether the NSS-AT form in question shares features which resemble to NPs or not. We assumed that positive behavior on such syntactic criteria would indicate a syntactic (analytic) nature of the NSS-AT form which would further mean that its members are syntactic structures produced in Syntax. Such criteria check whether: the nominal terms (head and non-head) of a single NSS-AT can change order or not (criterion 1), the nominal terms (head and non-head) of a NSS can be intervened by a modifier (criterion 2) or the Turkish interrogative word *mi* (criterion

3), a nominal term of a single NSS can be omitted or not in interrogative sentence contexts (criterion 4), in co-ordination structure contexts (criterion 5) or in outbound anaphora cases (Postal, 1969) (criterion 6).

Correspondingly, we used the term morphological to refer to criteria which mainly concern morphological changes to the form of the NSS-AT in question and control whether: the epenthetic or buffer consonant which connects a NSS-AT form with the following suffix would be -y- or -n- (criterion 7), the -(s)I(n) suffix can be omitted from the nominal head of a NSS-AT form in coordination structures (suspended affixation) (criterion 10) or in possessive contexts (Possessive free genitive) (criterion 9), the head of the NSS-AT can be suffixed with a possessive suffix (criterion 9), with a plural suffix (criterion 8), or with productive suffixes (criterion 11), and the possibility of reduplicating every single term (or both terms) of the NSS-AT with /m/ (m-reduplication (criterion 12).

Table 2

Syntactic and Morphological criteria

Syntactic criteria	
1	Fixed Word Order
2	Modifier before (a) head N2 or (b) non-head N1
3	Question word mI questioning the non-Head N1
4	Omission of (a) non-Head N1 or (b) Head N2 in interrogative contexts
5	Omission of (a) non-Head N1 or (b) Head N2 in co-ordination contexts
6	Island to outbound anaphora in terms of the non-Head N1 or the Head N2
Morphological criteria	
7	-n- or -y- as epenthetic/ buffer consonants before case morphemes
8	Plural suffix -lAr on a) non-head N1, b) Head N2 or c) both
9	-sIn morpheme in possessive contexts (Possessive free genitive)
10	Suspended affixation
11	Derivation suffixes (privative suffix -sIz, relational suffix -II, -IIk, -CI) in relation to -sIn morpheme
12	m-reduplication (m-red) a) of non-head (m-N1), b) of head (m-N2), c) the whole NNS-AT (m-N1 N2)

Below we exhibit examples of NSS-AT forms in the 12 criteria tests. For testing we used not only semantically transparent NSS-AT examples such as kadın-in doktor-u (woman-GEN doctor- sInPOSS) > 'the woman's doctor', but also semantically more opaque ones such as Külkedisi (ash+cat-sInCOMP)> 'Cindirella (idiom.)'. Below in Table 3 we present the main NSS-AT used in the testing.

Table 3

Examples used in the testing of NSS-AT in 12 Morpho-syntactic criteria

Form N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Tranlation	Meaning
kadın-in doktor-u	the woman's doctor	transparent
erkeğ-in terzi-si	the man's tailor	transparent
çocuğ-un psikoloğ-u	the child's psychologist	transparent
kadın-in berber-i	the woman's hairdresser	transparent
Form N N-(y)	Tranlation	Meaning
kadın doktor	female doctor	transparent
erkek terzi	male tailor	transparent
çocuk psikolog	child (who is a) psychologist	transparent
demir köprü	iron bridge	transparent
Demir Perde	Iron Curtain	opaque
pamuk etek	cotton skirt	transparent
pamuk prenses	Snowwhite	opaque
Form N N-(s)I(n)	Tranlation	Meaning
erkek terzi-si	tailor for men	transparent
çocuk psikoloğ-u	psychologist for children	transparent
kadın doktor-u	gynecologist\ doctor for women	transparent
kadın berber-i	women hairdresser	transparent
Külkedisi	Cindirella	opaque
hanım böceğ-i	Cockroach	opaque
pamuk şeker-i	Cotton candy	opaque

TESTING OF NSS-AD TAMLAMASI IN 12 MORPHO-SYNTACTIC CRITERIA

Syntactic criteria

Criterion 1

While in some NSS-AT forms order change of the nominal (head and non-head) terms is allowed (1 and 3), in others there is not such a case (2 and 4):

(1)	(a)	kadın-in doktor-u woman-GEN doctor-sInPOSS 'the woman's doctor'	(b)	doktor-u kadın-in doctor-sInPOSS woman-GEN 'the woman's doctor'
(2)	(a)	kadın doktor-u woman doctor-sInCOMP 'doctor for women, gynaecolog'	(b)	*doktor-u kadın doctor-sInCOMP woman Intended: doctor for women'
(3)	(a)	kadın doktor woman doctor 'female doctor'	(b)	doctor kadın doctor woman 'female doctor'
(4)	(a)	demir köprü iron bridge 'iron bridge'	(b)	*köprü demir bridge iron Intended: 'iron bridge'

Table 4

Behaviour of the 3 NSS forms in Criterion 1

Syntactic Criterion	Form 1	Form 2	Form 3
1	N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	N N-(s)I(n)	N N-(y)
Strict Word order	NO	YES	YES*

*= there are few exceptional cases which behave differently

Criterion 2

While in some NSS-AT forms the head or the non-head can be modified separately (5, 6a, 6c), other NSS-AT can only be modified as a whole (6b, 7c).

- (5) genç kadın-in genç doktor-u
young woman-GEN young doctor-sInPOSS
'the young doctor of the young woman'
- (6) (a) [genç kadın] doktor-u
young woman doctor-sInCOMP
'doctor for young women'
- (b) kadın [*genç doktor-u]
woman young doctor-sInCOMP
Intended: 'young gynaecologist'
- (c) genç [kadın doktor-u]
young woman doctor-sInCOMP
'young gynaecologist'
- (7) (a) [*genç kadın] doktor
young woman doctor
Intended: 'doctor for young women'
- (b) kadın [*genç doktor]
woman young doctor
Intended: 'young female doctor'
- (c) genç [kadın doktor]
young woman doctor
'young female doctor'

Table 5

Behaviour of the 3 NSS forms in Criterion 2

Syntactic Criterion 2	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
a) Modifier before Head N2	YES	No	NO
b) Modifier before non-Head N1	YES	YES	NO

Criterion 3

While in some NSS-AT forms the non-head can be controlled by the Turkish interrogative marker (IM) *mi* and as such the IM in question intervenes between the head and non-head of the NSS-AT (8, 10), in other NSS-AT forms this is not a case (9a, 10b).

(8) kadın-ın mı doktor-u?

woman-GEN doctor-sInPOSS

'the doctor of the woman or of someone else?'

(9) (a) kadın *mı doktor-u (erkek mi)?

woman IM doctor-sInCOMP (man IM)

'doctor for women (or for male)?'

(b) kadın doktor-u mu?

woman doctor-sInCOMP IM

'doctor for women or not'

(10) kadın mı doktor (erkek mi)?

woman IM doctor

'female doctor (or male)?'

(b) Pamuk *mu Prenses? Vs. Pamuk Prenses mi?

Intended: 'the Snowwhite or not?'

Table 6

Behaviour of the 3 NSS forms in Criterion 3

Syntactic Criterion 3	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
Question word mI questioning the non-Head N1	YES	NO	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning

Criterion 4

In some NSS the head or the non-head can be omitted in interrogative contexts (11a, 11b, 12a, 13a,13b) but not in others (12b, 13c, 13d).

- (11) (a) - Kadın-in₁ kim-i₂? - (Ø₁) doktor-u₂
 woman-GEN who who-GEN doctor-sInPOSS
 'The woman's who? -The doctor.'
- (b) - Kim-in doktor-u? - Kadın-in (Ø₂).
 who-GEN doctor-sInPOSS woman-GEN
 'Whose doctor? -The woman's.'
- (12) - kadın₁ ney-i₂? - (Ø₁) doktor-u₂
 woman what-sInCOMP doctor-sInCOMP
 '-What for women?' 'Doctor (for women).'
- ne₁ doktor-u₂? - *kadın₁ (Ø₂)
 what doctor-sInCOMP? woman
 'What type of doctor?' Intended: '(Doctor) for women.'
- (13) (a) - kadın₁ ne₂? - (Ø₁) doktor₂ (b) - ne₁ doktor₂? - kadın₁ (Ø₂)
 woman what? doctor what doctor woman
 'Female what? - Doctor.' 'What kind of doctor? -Female.'
- (c) - Pamuk₁ ne₂? - *(Ø₁) Prenses₂ (d) - ne₁ Prenses₂? - *Pamuk₁ (Ø₂)
 cotton what princess what princess cotton
 'Snow-what? Intended: '-(Snow-)white.' 'What-white?' Intended: '-Snow(-white).'

Table 7

Behaviour of the 3 NSS forms in Criterion 4

Syntactic Criterion 4	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
(a) Omission of non- Head N1 in interrogative contexts	YES	YES in transparent meaning/	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning
(b) Omission of Head N2 in interrogative contexts	YES	NO in opaque meaning NO	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning

Criterion 5

In some NSS-AT the head or the non-head can be omitted when common in co-ordination structure contexts (14b, 15b, 16b, 18b, 20b, 22b) but not in others (17b, 19b, 21b, 23b).

- (14) (a) kadın-ın doktor-u ve erkeğ-in doktor-u
woman-GEN doctor-sInPOSS and man-GEN doktor-sInPOSS
'the woman's doctor and the man's doctor'
- (b) kadın-ın Ø1 ve erkeğ-in doktor-u1
woman-GEN Ø1 and man-GEN doktor-sInPOSS
'the woman's doctor and the man's doctor'
- (15) (a) kadın-ın doktor-u ve kadın-ın psikoloğ-u
woman-GEN doctor-sInPOSS and woman-GEN psychologist-sInPOSS
'the woman's doctor and the woman's psychologist'
- (b) kadın-ın1 doktor-u ve Ø1 psikoloğ-u
woman-GEN doctor-sInPOSS and Ø1 psychologist-sInPOSS
'the woman's doctor and (the woman's) psychologist'
- (16) (a) kadın doktor-u ve erkek doktor-u
woman doctor-sInCOMP and man doctor-sInCOMP

- 'doctor for women and doctor for men'
- (b) kadın Ø1 ve erkek doktor-u1
 woman Ø1 and male doctor-sInCOMP1
 'doctor for women and men'
- (17) (a) Külkedi-si ve ev kedi-si
 ash-cat-sInCOMP and house cat-sInCOMP
 'Cindirella and house cat'
- (b) *Kül-(Ø1) ve ev kedi-si1
 ash-Ø1 and house cat-sInCOMP1
 ? 'Cindi(rella) and house cat'
- (18) (a) ev kedi-si ve ev köpeğ-i
 house cat-sInCOMP and house dog-sInCOMP
 'home cat and home dog'
- (b) ev1 kedi-si ve Ø1 köpeğ-i
 house1 cat-sInCOMP and Ø1 dog-sInCOMP
 'house cat and (house) dog'
- (19) (a) ayakkab-ı ve ayak tırnağ-ı
 foot-container-sInCOMP and foot nail-sInCOMP
 'foot container (= shoe) and foot nail'
- (b) ayak1kab-ı ve *Ø1 tırnağ-ı
 foot1-container-sInCOMP and Ø1 nail-sInCOMP
 ?'foot container (=shoe) and (foot) nail'
- (20) (a) kadın doktor-lar ve erkek doktor-lar
 woman doctor-PL and male doctor-PL
 'female doctors and male doctors'
- (b) kadın Ø1 ve erkek doktor-lar1
 woman Ø1 and male doctor-PL1
 'female (doctors) and male doctors'
- (21) (a) Pamuk Prenses ve Alman Prenses

- cotton princess and German princess
'Snowwhite and the German princess'
- (b) Pamuk *Ø1 ve Alman Prenses1
cotton *Ø1 and German princess
?? 'the cotton and German princess'
- (22) (a) kadın doktor-lar ve kadın psikolog-lar
woman doctor-PL and woman psychologist-PL
'female doctors and female psychologists'
- (b) kadın1 doktor-lar ve Ø1 psikolog-lar
woman1 doctor-PL and Ø1 psychologist-PL
'female doctors and (female) psychologists'
- (23) (a) Pamuk Prenses ve pamuk etek
cotton princess and cotton skirt
'the Snowwhite and the cotton skirt'
- (b) Pamuk1 Prenses ve *Ø1 etek
cotton princess and *Ø1 skirt
'the Snowwhite and *(the cotton) skirt'

Table 8

Behaviour of the 3 NSS forms in Criterion 5

Syntactic Criterion 5	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
(a) Omission of non- Head N1 in co- ordination contexts	YES	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning
(b) Omission of Head N2 in co- ordination contexts	YES	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning

Criterion 6

In some NSS a nominal term (head or non-head) can be omitted because of outbound anaphora (Postal, 1969) (24a,b,) but not in others (25a,b, 26a,b).

- (24) (a) [kadın-ını doktor-u]j o-nuni/*j/k katil-i-y-di
 woman-GEN doctor-sInPOSS (s)he-GEN murderer-sInPOSS-PAST
 'the woman's doctor was her murderer'
- (b) [kadın-ını doktor-u]j Øi/j/k katil-i-y-di
 woman-GEN doctor-sInPOSS Ø murderer-sInPOSS-PAST
 'the woman's doctor was the murderer (of her/ of herself/ of him/ of himself)'
- (25) (a) * [kadın-i doktor-u]j da o-nuni/k/*j ağrı-sı-n-dan muzdarib-miş.
 woman doctor-sInPOSS EMPH her-GEN pain-sInPOSS-ABLAT suffer-
 PAST.3SG
 Intended: 'The gynaecologist too suffered from the pain of her (=the woman)/ him (=the man)/ * her (=the gynaecologist).'
- (b) * [kadın-i doktor-u]j da Ø*i/*j ağrı-sı-n-dan muzdarib-miş.
 woman doctor-sInCOMP EMPH Ø pain-sInCOMP-ABLAT suffer-PAST.3SG
 Intended: 'The gynaecologist too suffered from the pain in her (=the woman)/ *him (=the man)/ * her (=the gynaecologist).'
- (26) (a) [Kül-ikedi-si]j o-nun*i/j/k tabla-sı-n-ı ar-ıyordu.
 ash-cat-sInCOMP he/she/it-GEN tray-sInPOSS-n-ACC look for-PAST.3.SG
 'Cinderella was looking for her/his/its tray'
- (b) [Kül-ikedi-si]j Ø*i/j/k tabla-sı-n-ı ar-ıyordu.
 ash-cat-sInCOMP Ø tray-POSS-EYΦ-ACC look for-PAST.3.SG
 Intended: 'Cinderella was looking for his/ her tray'
- (27) (a) [kadını doktor]j onuni/j/k terzi-si-n-i bekliyor
 womani doctor his/her/its-GEN tailor-POSS3.SG-n-ACC wait-PRES.3.SG
 'The female doctor is waiting for her/ his/ its tailor.'
- (b) [kadını doktor]j Øi/j/*k terzi-si-n-i bekliyor
 womani doctor Ø tailor-POSS.3.SG-n-ACC wait-ENEET.3.EN
 Intended: 'The female doctor is waiting for her/ his/ its tailor.'
- (28) (a) [Pamuki Prensese]j onun*i/j/k/m elbise-si-n-i seviyor.

- cotton princess he/she/it-GEN dress-POSS.3.SG-n-ACC love-PRES.3.SG
 ‘Snowwhite loves his/her/ its dress.’
- (b) [Pamuki Prensesm]j Ø*i/j/*k/m elbise-si-n-i seviyor.
 cotton princess Ø dress-POSS.3.SG-n-ACC love-PRES.3.SG
 ‘Snowwhite loves his/ her/ its dress.’

Table 9

Behaviour of the 3 NSS forms in Criterion 6

Syntactic Criterion 6	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
Island to outbound anaphora in terms of the non-Head N1	YES	NO	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning
Island to outbound anaphora in terms of the the Head N2	NO	YES	YES
Island to outbound anaphora in terms of both non-Head N1 and the Head N2	YES	YES	YES

Below in Table 10 we sum up the behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in all 6 syntactic criteria.

Table 10

Behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in all 12 morpho-syntactic criteria

Syntactic criteria	N-(n)In (s)I(n)	N N-(s)I(n)	N N-(y)
1. Strict Word order	NO	YES	YES
2. Modifier before a) head N2	YES	NO	NO
b) non-head N1	YES	YES	NO
3. Questioning word mI questioning the non- head N1	YES	NO	YES in transparent / No in opaque
4. a) Omission of non- head N1 in interrogative contexts	YES	YES in transparent / No in opaque	YES in transparent / No in opaque
b) Omission of head N2 in interrogative contexts	YES	NO	YES in transparent / No in opaque
5. a) Omission of non- head N1 in interrogative contexts	YES	YES in transparent / No in opaque	YES in transparent / No in opaque
b) Omission of head N2 in interrogative contexts	YES	YES in transparent / No in opaque	YES in transparent / No in opaque
6. Island to outbound anaphora in terms of:			
a) non head N1	YES	NO	YES in transparent / No in opaque
b) head N2	NO	YES	YES
c) whole NNS-AT	YES	YES	YES

Morphological criteria

Criterion 7

Some NSS-AT use the -n- as an epenthetic/ buffer consonant before the case morpheme (29, 30a,b), while others use the -y- in similar cases (30c, 31a,b).

- (29) [kadın-ın doktor-u]-n-u
 woman-GEN doktor-sInPOSS-n-ACC
 ‘the woman’s doctor (Accusative)’
- (30) (a) kadın doktor-u-n-u
 woman doctor-sInCOMP-n-ACC
 ‘the doctor for women, the gynaecologist’
- (b) Külkedi-si-n-i
 ash-cat-sInCOMP-(n)-ACC
 ‘Cinderella (Acc.)’
- (c) ayakkab-ı-y-ı
 foot-case-sInCOMP-(y)-ACC
 ‘the foot-case (=shoe) (Acc.)’
- (31) (a) demir köprü-y-ü
 iron bridge-(y)-ACC
 ‘I passed over the iron bridge.’
- (b) tahta kafa-y-a
 wood head-(y)-DAT
 ‘wooden headed (idiom.)’

Table 11

Behaviour of the 3 NSS forms in Criterion 7

Syntactic Criterion 7	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
-n- or -y- as epenthetic/ buffer consonant before case morphemes	-n-	-n-	-y-

Criterion 8

This criterion checks whether: (a) the head, (b) the non-head and/ or (c) both terms can simultaneously take the number suffix -lAr. Since the neutral order for all nominals -NSS included- is to display the plural suffix -lAr on the head, with regard to condition (a) we check whether the plural suffix -lAr is placed within or outside the range of -(s)I(n). In conditions (b) and (c) we test whether (and under what conditions) the plural suffix -lAr can appear (b) on the non-head or (c) on both constituent terms of the NSS at the same time.

In some NSS-AT the -lAr suffix is placed on the head following -sIn, that is within the range of -sIn (32a,c, 33a,b), while in others before -sIn (34). Other NSS-AT can have the plural morpheme on the non-head (32b, 33c) while others not (. Other NSS-AT sets can have the plural morpheme on both head and non-head elements at the same time, while in others this is not the case.

- (32) (a) kadın-in doktor-lar-ı
 woman-GEN doctor-PL-POSS.3
 'the woman's doctors'
- (b) kadın-lar-in doktor-u
 woman-PL-GEN doctor-POSS.3
 'the women's doctor'
- (c) kadın-lar-in doktor-ları
 woman-PL-GEN doctor-sInPOSS.3.PL
 'the women's doctors'
- (33) (a) kadın doktor-u
 woman doctor-sInCOMP
 'gynaecologist'
- (b) kadın doktor-lar-ı
 woman doctor-PL-sInCOMP
 'gynaecologists'
- (c) *kadın-lar doktor-ü
 woman-PL doctor-sInCOMP
 Intended: 'gynaecologist, doctor for women'
- (d) kadın-lar gün-ü
 woman-PL day-sInCOMP

- ‘Women’s Day’
- (34) [[ayak] [kab]-ı]N-lar
 foot-case-COMP-PL
 ‘shoes’

For the behaviour of N N-(y) members we can see the Table 12 below.

Table 12

Examples of Grammatical and ungrammatical cases of plural suffixation on non-head and/or head in N N-(y) forms

O1 O2	O1 O2-lAr	O1-lAr O2	O1-lAr O2-lAr
kadın doktor ‘female doctor’	kadın doktor-lar ‘female doctors’	*kadın-lar doktor Intended: femal doctors	*kadın-lar doktor-lar Intended: ‘female doctors’
pamuk etek ‘cotton skirt’	pamuk etek-ler ‘cotton skirts’	pamuk-*lar etek Intended: ‘cotton skirts’	pamuk-*lar etek- *ler Intended: ‘cotton skirts’
Pamuk Prenses ‘Snowwhite’	Pamuk Prenses-ler ‘Snowwhites’	Pamuk-*lar Prenses Intended: ‘Snowwhites’	Pamuk-*lar Prenses-*ler Intended: ‘Snowwhites’

Table 13 exhibits the behaviour of all 3 NSS-AT types in criterion 8.

Table 13

Behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in Criterion 8

Syntactic Criterion 8	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
a) Plural suffix -lAr on non-head N1	YES	YES	YES
b) Plural suffix -lAr on Head N2	YES	NO* ²	NO
c) Plural suffix -lAr on both non-head N1 and Head N2	YES	NO*	NO

*= There are exceptional cases

² In general pluralization of the non-head is grammatically unacceptable for N N-(s)I(n) Ad tamlaması (see 33c). However, there are exceptional cases (see 33d).

Criterion 9

This criterion tests whether the head of a NSS can be suffixed with a possessive suffix or not. Specifically, we test the possibility of the coexistence of an already existing $-(s)I(n)$ suffix on the head of a NSS (be it possessive in $N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)$ or compositional in $NN-(s)I(n)$) with an additional 'possessive' $-(s)I(n)$ suffix which is 'reasonably' required in a wider possessive context, where $-(s)I(n)$ is controlled by agreement by a Genitive-possessor.

- (35) Ali'-nin [çocuğ-un araba-sı1]-(*sı2)
 Ali-GEN child-GEN car-POSS1.3.SG-*POSS2.3.SG
 Intended: 'the car of Ali's child'
- (36) (a) bebek araba-sı (b) [Chicco [bebek araba-sı](-*sı)]
 baby car-sInCOMP Chicco baby car-sInCOMP-(*-sInCOMP)
 'baby stroller' Intended: 'Chicco baby stroller'
- (37) (a) ayakkab-ı (b) Hasan-in [ayakkab-ı]-sı
 foot-case-sInCOMP Hasan-GEN foot-case-sInCOMP-sInPOSS.3.SG
 'shoe' 'Hasan's shoe'
- (38) benim [kadın doktor]-um
 I-GEN woman doctor-sInPOSS.1.SG
 'my gynaecologist'

Table 14

Behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in Criterion 9

Syntactic Criterion 9	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
Possessive Free Genitive	NO	YES (if $-(s)I(n)COMP$ is there)	NO

Criterion 10

In some NSS forms the $-(s)I(n)$ suffix can be omitted from head in coordination structures (suspended affixation) (39b, 42b), whereas in other NSS forms this is not the case (40b, 41b, 43b). This criterion is based on a particular property of Turkish which many scholars call 'suspended affixation' or 'clustering with suspended (omitted)

markers' (see Hankamer, 2008; Kharytonava, 2011; Kornfilt, 1997; Tat, 2013, pp. 40-1). According to 'suspended affixation' with regard to nouns (Kornfilt 1997, p. 122), Turkish allows common grammatical suffix omission from the first noun in cases where two nouns are in conjunction and share suffixes such as number, possessive or case. The property suggests that the common suffix is 'suspended' to appear only in the last noun.

- (39) (a) kadın-in doktor-u ve psikoloğ-u
 woman-GEN doctor-nInPOSS.3.SG and psychologist-POSS.3.SG
 'the woman's doctor and psychologist'
- (b) kadın-in doktor-Øi ve psikoloğ-ui
 woman-GEN doctor- and psychologist-POSS.3.SG
 'the woman's doctor and psychologist'
- (40) (a) kadın doktor-u ve kadın psikoloğ-u
 woman doctor-COMP and woman psychologist-COMP
 'doctor for women (gynaecologist) and psychologist for women'
- (b) kadın doktor-Øi ve kadın psikoloğ-ui
 woman doctor-Ø and woman psychologist-COMP
 Intended: 'doctor and psychologist for women'
- (41) (a) Külkedi-si ve ev kedi-si
 ash-cat-COMP and house cat-COMP
 'Cindirella (idiom.) and house cat'
- (b) Külkedi-*(Øi) ve ev kedi-sii
 ash-cat-Ø and house cat-COMP
 ? Intended: 'Cindirella and house cat'
- (c) Kül-*(Ø2) ve ev kedi2-si
 ash-Ø and house cat-COMP
 ? Intended: 'Cindi(rella) and house cat'
- (42) (a) benim pamuk eteğ-im ve deri çanta-m
 I-GEN cotton skirt-POSS.1.SG and leather bag-POSS.1.SG
 'my cotton skirt and my leather bag'
- (b) benim pamuk etek-Ø1 ve deri çanta-m1
 I-GEN cotton skirt-Ø and leather bag-POSS.1.SG

- (43) (a) benim Parmak Çocuğ-um ve Pamuk prenses-im
 I-GEN finger child-POSS.1.SG and cotton princess-POSS.1.SG
 'My Hop-o'-My-Thumb and my Snowwhite'
- (b) benim Parmak Çocuk-*(um) ve Pamuk prenses-im
 I-GEN finger child-*(POSS.1.SG) and cotton princess-POSS.1.SG
 Intended: '(My) Hop-o'-My-Thumb and my Snowwhite'

Table 15

Behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in Criterion 10

Syntactic Criterion 10	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
Suspended affixation	YES	NO	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning

Criterion 11

Some NSS allow a productive suffix (such as -sIz, -II, -IIk and -CI) on the head of a NSS whereas others do not. We assume that possibility of suffixation with such suffixes is an indication of lexicalization for the NSS in question. Lexicalization is even stronger when the productive suffix is found within the range of -(s)I(n) in the form [Productive Suffix (II, IIk, sIz, CI) + (s)I(n)].

- (44) *kadın-in doktor-u-suz hastane
 woman-GEN doctor-POSS.3.SG-ΣTEP hospital
 Intended: 'Hospital without the doctor of the woman'

- (45) *kadın-in doktor-luğ-u
 woman-GEN doctor-ΣΥΣX-COMP
 ?? Intended: 'The property of being the doctor of the woman'

- (46) (a) elma koku-su
 apple smell-COMP
 'scent of apple'
- (b) elma koku-(*su)-lu çay

- apple scent-(*COMP)-REL tea
'tea with apple scent'
- (47) (b) kadın doktor-luğ-u
woman doctor-REL-COMP
'gynaecology'
- (48) (a) taş köprü stone bridge
'stone bridge'
(b) taş köprü-lü köy stone bridge-REL village
'village with stone bridge'
- (49) (a) kadın doktor woman doctor
'female doctor'
(b) *kadın doktor-luk
- (50) (a) kız kardeş girl sibling
'sister'
(b) kız kardeş-lik girl sibling-REL
'the property of having a sister'

Table 16

Behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in Criterion 11

Syntactic Criterion 11	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
Derivation suffixes (-sIz,- II, -IIk, -CI) in relation to - (s)I(n) morpheme	NO	YES	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in opaque meaning

Criterion 12

This test is based on a special property of Turkish, the so-called m-reduplication (Göksel & Kerslake, 2005, p. 99) or 'compounds involving doublets with -/m/' (Kornfilt, 1997, p. 482). The property suggests that Turkish can produce nominal two-term sets where the N2 is a morphological repetition of N1 with parallel replacement of the initial phoneme with an /m/ sound. The meaning of the set is 'and the like, something so similar' (Kornfilt, 1997, p. 482).

The last criterion tests whether a NSS-AT can -m-reduplicate every single (or both) of its constituent terms with an echo of /m/ sound. Semantically transparent NSS

can m-reduplicate every single (or both) of its constituent terms (see 51a,b,c, 52a,b,c) whereas semantically opaque ones can only m-reduplicate the NSS as a whole (see 53a,b,c).

(51) kadın-ın doktor-u

- (a) kadın-ın m- adın-ın doktor-u
 woman-GEN m-red-woman-GEN doctor-POSS
 'the doctor of the woman or something of this sort'
- (b) kadın-ın doktor-u m- doktor-u
 woman-GEN doctor-POSS.3.SG m-red-doctor
 'the doctor or something of this sort of the woman'
- (c) kadın-ın doktor-u m-adın-ın doktor-u
 woman-GEN doctor-POSS.3.SG m-red-woman-GEN doctor-POSS.3SG
 'the woman's doctor or something of this sort'

(52) kadın doktor-u

- (a) kadın m- adın doktor-u
 woman m-red-woman doctor-COMP
 'the doctor for women or something of this sort'
- (b) kadın doktor-u m- doktor-u
 woman doctor-COMP m-red-doctor-COMP
 'the doctor or something of this sort for women'
- (c) kadın doktor-u m-adın-ın doktor-u
 woman doctor-COMP m-red-woman doctor-COMP
 'the gynaecologist or something of this sort'

(53) Külkedi-si

- (a) Kül-*m-ül -kedi-si
 ash-m-red-ash-cat-COMP
 Intended: 'Cindi-or sth of this sort-rella'
- (b) Külkedi-si * m-edisi
 ash-cat-COMP m-red-cat-COMP
 'Cindirella or something of this sort'
- (c) Kül kedisi m-ülkedisi

ash-cat-COMP m-red

'Cindirella or something of this sort'

Table 17

Examples of N N-(y) form NSS in the m-reduplication test

	m-red of N1	m-red of N2	m-red of N1 N2
pamuk etek	pamuk m-amuk etek	pamuk etek -m- etek	pamuk etek m- amuk etek
Pamuk Prensens	Pamuk m-amuk Prensens	Pamuk Prensens *m- rensens	Pamuk Prensens m- amuk Prensens

Below we see the behaviour of all NSS-AT forms in the Criterion 12.

Table 18

Behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in Criterion 12

Syntactic 12	Criterion	Form 1 N-(n)In N-(s)I(n)	Form 2 N N-(s)I(n)	Form 3 N N-(y)
m-rediplucation:		YES	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in transparent meaning	YES
a) of non-head (m- N1)				
b) of head (m-N2)	YES		YES in transparent meaning/ NO in transparent meaning	YES in transparent meaning/ NO in transparent meaning
c) both thewhoe NNS-AT (m-N1 N2)	YES		YES	YES

Below in Table 19 we sum up the behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in all 6 morphological criteria.

Table 19

Behaviour of the 3 NSS-AT forms in all 6 morphological criteria

Morphological criteria	N-(n)In (s)I(n)	N N-(s)I(n)	N N-(y)
6. Island to outbound anaphora			
a) in terms of non head N1	YES	YES	YES
b) in terms of head N2	NO	NO	NO
c) in terms of whole NSS	YES	NO	NO
7. -n-or -y- as epenthetic/ buffer consonant before case morpheme	-n-	-n-	-y-
8. plural suffix -lAr			
a) on non-head N1	YES	YES	YES
b) on head N2	YES	NO	NO
c) on both N1 and N2	YES	NO	NO
9. Possessive Free Genitive	NO	YES (if sInCOMP is present)	NO
10. Suspended suffixation	YES	YES in transparent/ NO in opaque	YES in transparent/ NO in opaque
11. Derivation suffixes in relation to sIn	NO	YES	YES in transparent/ NO in opaque
12. m-reduplication:			
a) of non-head (m-N1)	YES	YES in transparent/ NO in opaque	YES
b) of head (m-N2)	YES	YES in transparent/ NO in opaque	YES in transparent/ NO in opaque
c) the whole NNS-AT (m-N1 N2)	YES	YES	YES

Conclusion

Based on the behavior of the 3 NSS-AT forms on the 12 criteria, we concluded that:

(a) The N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) form constitutes a homogeneous group whose members behaved uniformly in every condition exhibiting no internal semantic or syntactic gradation between them. The behavior of this form in the above criteria suggests semantic transparency and structural analyticity that advocate a predominantly syntactic nature of these NSS-AT. We assume that the nature of N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) form is entirely syntactic in the sense that they behave as analytic structures with transparent meaning which share features with NPs. We thus assume that the locus of the production of the N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) form is Syntax.

(b) The N N-(s)I(n) form members did not behave uniformly and exhibited semantic and morphosyntactic gradation. Although we assume that all N N-(s)I(n) form members are considered as compounds, some N N-(s)I(n) members behave more or less as non-lexicalized compounds being semantically transparent and structurally analytic (i.e. kadın doktor-u (woman + psychologist-COMP) > 'child psychologist', kadın berber-i (woman + hairdresser-COMP) > 'women's hairdresser'), whereas others behave as lexicalized/ idiomatic compounds being semantically opaque and structurally non-analytic (i.e. Kül kedi-si (ash+cat-COMP) > 'Cinderella'). Despite the internal - mostly semantic - distinction, we accept that given that all members of the N N-(s)I(n) category have morphological properties and as such are lexemes generated to Morphology. We assume that the suffix -(s)I(n) functions as a 'real-authentic' compound marker in the non-lexicalized N N-(s)I(n) form cases whereas as a non-real/ pseudo compound marker in the lexicalized cases.

(c) The N N-(y) form also did not behave uniformly in the 12 criteria. It covers a wide range varying from i) structurally analytic and semantically transparent members (similar to NPs) belonging to Syntax (i.e. çocuk psikolog (child + psychologist) > 'child psychologist'), ii) non-lexicalized, semantically transparent compounds belonging to Morphology (i.e. patlıcan dolma (eggplant + stuffed) > 'stuffed eggplant(s)') and iii) fully lexicalized (idiomatic), structurally non-analytic and semantically opaque compounds generated at Morphology (i.e. Pamuk Prenses (cotton+princess) > 'Snowwhite').

5. DISCUSSION & CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the following section, we discuss the findings by making reference to the research questions posed in Section 3. In this study we investigated the nature of 3 forms of Nominal Syntagmatic Sets-Ad Tamlaması (NSS-AT) in Turkish, namely a) N-(n)In N-(s)I(n), b) N N-(s)I(n) and c) N N-(y). Ad tamlaması consists an umbrella term which is encountered in Turkish grammars and L2-Turkish coursebooks to refer to three forms which are traditionally taught as a whole (see L2-Turkish grammars such as Lewis (1967), Dafnopatidis & Sanlioglu (2011), Zegkinis & Hidiroglu (1995), among others, but

also L2-Turkish language teaching coursebooks (i.e. Yeni İstanbul Yabancılar için Türkçe A1 Seti (2020), Yeni Hitit 1 seti (2011), among others) and scientific studies (Dede 1978, Özer 2010, among others). Our aim was to examine whether the apparently formal similarity of these 3 NSS-AT forms in Turkish can be correlated with a respective degree of ease in L2 acquisition and simultaneity in L2 teaching or not. The research questions we tried to answer concern a) whether there is a relation between the nature of the 3 NSS-AT types and the sequence these forms are learned in L2- Turkish, and b) whether the nature of the 3 NSS-AT forms can give rise to any implications with respect to teaching these forms in L2-Turkish.

With regard to Research question 1, we had assumed that the nature of every form would give answers to the question of the learning sequence of these 3 forms in the sense that more homogeneous forms would be easier to learn. The testing of the 3 NSS-AT forms under 12 morpho- syntactic criteria brought into surface that there are important differences between them beyond their apparent formal similarity. We concluded that the distinction between the three NSS-AT types seems to be superficial in the sense that it hides the complex semantic-syntactic interconnection between them. The testing results revealed that, in terms of homogeneity within its members, the N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) form appeared to be the most compact category, followed by N N-(s)I(n) and last the N N-(y) form. We assumed that this sequence has implications in the learning process of these NSS-AT forms in L2-Turkish, in the sense that we expect a learning step ahead in the analytic N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) form compared to non-analytic compounds such as the N N-(s)I(n) form and the N N-(y)form which shares properties of both Noun Phrases (NPs) and compounds. In other words, we expect that the N-(n)In N-(s)I(n) type is the one mastered first, followed by the N N-(s)I(n) form which is learned second and the N N-(y) type which is learned last. This constitutes a potential sequence which comes out of the semantic-syntactic differences between these 3 NSS forms.

From a didactic scope, that is with regard to Research question 2, we come to assume that the traditional interconnection of the three NSS-Ad tamlaması forms in Turkish L2-teaching and L2- learning methods should be put aside. The traditional tendency towards a unified and holistic approach and teaching of the phenomenon of Ad Tamlaması was mainly dictated by the simplified semiotic assumption that the above threefold formal distinction of NSS corresponds to a pure threefold functional and semantic distinction. However, the formal differentiation of the NSS-AT does not seem to correspond in a 1-to-1 relation to functional/semantic differentiation which we assume to have implications in the L2 teaching of these forms.

In this respect, we contradict traditional approaches which treat the category of Turkish NSS-Ad tamlaması holistically and which are encountered not only in L2-Turkish descriptive grammars (i.e. Lewis 1967, Dafnopatidis & Sanlioglu 2011, Zegkinis & Hidiroglu 1995, among others) but also in L2-Turkish language teaching coursebooks (i.e. Yeni İstanbul Yabancılar için Türkçe A1 Seti (2020), Yeni Hitit 1 seti (2011), among others). We thus go against researchers such as Dede (1978), Lewis (1967) and Özer

(2010) who treat the 3 forms of the category Ad Tamlaması homogeneously as 3 types of compounds, focusing on the formal similarities of the members of the category Ad tamlaması. In the same direction, we are not in favour with the line followed by most coursebooks used in teaching Turkish to foreigners (i.e. Yeni İstanbul Yabancılar için türkçe Ders kitabı A1 (2020), Yeni Hitit 1 Ders Kitabı (2009)) which suggests the NSS-AT interconnective teaching.

Rather, we postulate the suggestion that the traditional holistic Real Uniformity - Homogeneity approach, favoring the interconnected teaching of these forms, should give its place in alternative more anti-holistic approaches which would uncover the hidden syntactic properties of the 3 forms rather than stress the similarities between them. To this aim we propose the anti-holistic Apparent Uniformity-Non homogeneity approach, which focuses on the distinctive characteristics of each NSS-AT form. These assumptions should be experimentally tested in the future.

References

- Aslan, E., & Altan, A. (2006). The Role of -(s)I in Turkish Indefinite Noun Compounds. *Dil Dergisi*, 131, 57-76.
- Bağrıaçık, M., & Ralli, A. (2013). Bare N(ominal) N(ominal) concatenations in Turkish: Compounds or syntactic fallacies? Στο N. Hathout, F. Montermini, & J. Tseng (ed.), *Morphology in Toulouse*. Selected proceedings of Décembrettes 7, Toulouse, 2-3 December 2010 (p. 35-56). Munich: Lincom Academic Publishers.
- Bağrıaçık, M., & Andreou, M. (2011). Lexical categories and bare nominal concatenations in Turkish. *2nd Patras International Conference of Graduate Students in Linguistics, Proceedings* (σσ. 33-46). Patras, Greece: University of Patras Publications.
- Bağrıaçık, M., & Ralli, A. (2015). NN-sI concatenations in Turkish: construct state nominals and phrasal compounds. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* (p. 13-24). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Presented at the 8th Workshop on Altaic Formal Linguistics (WAFL8-2012).
- Dede, M. A. (1978). *A syntactic and semantic analysis of Turkish nominal compounds*. PhD Dissertation. University of Michigan.
- Dafnopatidis, V., & Sanlioglu, H. (2011). *Τουρκική γραμματική στα ελληνικά [Turkish Grammar in Greek]*. Athens: Perugia.
- Göksel, A., & Kerlslake, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Hankamer, J. (2008). *Ad-phrasal affixes and suspended affixation*. Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the SLA Annual Meeting.

- Ketrez, F. N. (2018). Acquisition of an agglutinating language under adverse neonatal conditions. Στο A. Bar -On, & D. Ravid (Eds.), *Handbook of Communication Disorders: Theoretical, Empirical and Applied Linguistic Perspectives*. Handbooks of Applied Linguistics 15. Mouton De Gruyter.
- Kharytonava, O. (2011). *Noms composés en tyrc et le morphème -(s)l*. PhD Dissertation. Ontario: University of Western Ontario.
- Kırkıcı, B. (2009). İmparator Çizelgesi vs. İmparatorlar Çizelgesi: [On the (Non)-Use of Plural Non-Head Nouns in Turkish Nominal Compounding]. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (1), 35-53.
- Kunduracı, A. (2013). *Turkish Noun-Noun Compounds: A Process-Based Paradigmatic Account*. PhD Dissertation. Calgary University.
- Lewis, G. L. (2000 (1967)). *Turkish Grammar* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Özer, S. (2010). *Morphological Priming in Turkish Nominal Compound Processing*. MA Thesis. Middle East Technical University.
- Postal, P. (1969). Anaphoric islands. *Linguistic Society*, 5, 209-239.
- Tat, D. (2013). *Word Syntax of Nominal Compounds: Internal and Aphasiological Evidence from Turkish*. PhD Dissertation. Arizona: University of Arizona.
- Uzun, E. (ed.) (2011). *Yeni Hitit 1 Yabancılar İçin Türkçe Ders Kitabı*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi.
- Yılmaz, M. Y. (ed.) (2020). *Yeni İstanbul. A1 Uluslararası Öğrenciler İçin Türkçe Ders Kitabı*. İstanbul: Kültür Sanat Basımevi.
- Zegkinis, E., & Hidiroglu, P. (1995). *Τουρκική γραμματική [Turkish Grammar]*. Thessaloniki: Vaniis.

Scientific, ethical and citation rules were followed during the writing process of the study titled “The Turkish Nominal Syntagmatic Sets 'Ad tamlaması': A Linguistic Approach in Turkish Second Language Acquisition and Teaching”. It has been committed by the authors of this study that no falsification has been made on the collected data and the “Sakarya University Journal of Education Journal and its editor” has no responsibility for all ethical violations. All responsibility belongs to the authors, and that the study has not been sent to any other academic publication medium for evaluation.

Statement of Contribution of Researchers to the Article:

Vasiliki Mavridou planned and modeled the whole study. Vasiliki Mavridou performed the data analysis of the study and contributed to the interpretation of the results.

Conflict of Interest Statement

There is no conflict of interest

Statement of Financial Support or Acknowledgment:

No financial support was received from any institution for this study. No Acknowledgment.