

## **Morphopragmatics of address terms in Turkish: Examples from pet-, infant-, child- and adult-directed speech**

In this study, we compare and contrast the morphopragmatic (Dressler & Marlini Barbaresi 1994) structure of address terms in pet- (PDS), infant- (IDS), child- (CDS) and adult- (ADS) directed speech. Following Mattiello et al. (2021) and Dressler et al. (2022), we hypothesize that pet-directed speech is asymmetrical because pets, in contrast to humans, are nonverbal, and this asymmetry results in different realization of morphology. We draw our data from Turkish, an agglutinating language, where address terms can bear diminutive (e.g., *Ali-cik* ‘Ali-DIM’), hypocoristic (e.g., *Ali-ş* ‘Ali-HYP’) as well as possessive markers (*Ali-m* ‘Ali-POSS&1sg’) and various combinations of them (e.g., *Ali-ciğ-im* ‘Ali-DIM-POSS&1sg’) and are used along with morphologically bare forms (e.g., *Ali*). So Turkish provides a good venue for the study of morphopragmatic density of address terms.

Participants included 25 pet owners, 14 parents of non-verbal infants (0;3-0;11), 20 parents of verbal children (1;2-3;0) and 15 adults. Spontaneous speech of participants were recorded and transcribed following the conventions of CHILDES. Terms of address were targeted and coded for analysis.

The results suggested that PDS and IDS had more address terms and more morphopragmatic markers of endearment and affection than CDS and ADS. In both PDS and IDS 62% of address terms were morphologically complex vs. 45% in CDS and 30% in ADS. In terms of the frequency of morphopragmatic markers, PDS was similar to IDS and less similar to CDS and ADS.

These results are in line with Mattiello et al. (2021) and Dressler et al. (2022) that predicted that the asymmetrical speech situation in PDS would be similar to nonverbal IDS. Just as predicted, CDS and ADS, where speakers actively participated in conversations, had different distribution of morphopragmatic markers than PDS and IDS. Therefore asymmetry in communication was reflected on the morphopragmatic density of address terms in Turkish.

## **References**

- Dressler, W. U. & Merlini Barbaresi, L. (1994). Morphopragmatics. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dressler, W. U., E. Mattiello, K. Korecky-Kröll, S. Noccetti, I. Dabašinskiene, L. Kamandulyte- Merfeldiene, & V.V. Kazakovskaya (2022). Communication with diminutives to young children vs. pets in German, Italian, Lithuanian, Russian, and English. *Stem-, Spraak- en Taalpathologie* 27: 53-68.
- Mattiello E., Ritt-Benmimoun V., Dressler W.U. (2021). Asymmetric use of diminutives and hypocoristics to pet animals in Italian, German, English, and Arabic. *Language & Communication* 76, 136–153.