Journal of Language Education and Research

Research Article

A Pragmatic Function-Position Analysis of Address Terms:

Tendencies in Turkish

Nuriye Özer[*]   Pınar İbe Akcan[**]

ABSTRACT

This study, with the broader aim of describing the addressing system in Turkish, analyzes the addressing terms as inseparable parts of communication, in terms of their sentential positions, pragmatic functions and function-position mapping properties on the database of Turkish National Corpus and presents the findings within a synthesis of broader literature on different languages. With that purpose in mind, three research questions will be answered. The first one is about the pragmatic functions of address terms in Turkish in the corpus data, the second one is about the interaction of these functions with their sentential positions and third one is about the extent to which the findings of the study and the findings in the literature for other languages. A specified sub-set from the Turkish National Corpus (TNCV3) (Aksan, 2012) was used as the database of pieces of natural language. The three major findings of the study are that Turkish address terms have ten basic functions, these functions occur in four different sentential positions, there are some tendencies in function-position mappings and that although there are Turkish specific aspects, correspondences with the studies especially in English are much more. With its Turkish specific findings, the study will hopefully contribute to the analyses of the addressing systems in languages as a whole.

[*] Research Assistant, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4083-3926, Mersin University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of English Linguistics, nuriyeozer@mersin.edu.tr

[**] Associate Professor, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7033-9227, Mersin University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of English Linguistics, pinaribe@mersin.edu.tr

Introduction

During daily interactions, human beings as social creatures give clues about their cultures, identities, tendencies, feelings, and several additional personal details directly or indirectly by employing some linguistic resources. Address terms in which all such cues are encapsulated can be categorized as one of the important resources in the linguistic system. Dunkling (1990, p.22) defines these terms which as the first information package transferred to hearers as "numerically and attitudinally-marked designators which are used for the benefit of a speaker, an addressee, or a third-party hearer either optionally or necessarily for grammatical, practical, social, emotional, or externally-imposed reasons".

Almost without exception, in every culture, every time and every interaction, plenty of questions arise regarding the potential address terms planned to be directed to the hearer and the speaker has to check many different factors (such as the age, gender, context, degree of politeness, occupational rank, socio-cultural status, power, solidarity, the number of interlocutors, etc.) to choose the most suitable one from a long list of terms and then s/he should monitor the whole process again and again during the communication. It is pointed that speakers tend to use address terms in almost each interaction even when it is not compulsory, such as in a face-to face setting with people who know each other well and can easily understand the addressed one (Lerner, 2003, p.185) or when the directionality of the communication is clear by the help of paralinguistic cues like the body language and gaze (Clayman, 2013, p.292) or in the text messages in which the message is sent to targeted recipient (Asprey & Tagg, 2019, p.83) so, the speakers operationalize this high level mental effort to employ an address term even when it is not needed. While the all-out effort highlights the significance of address terms, there still exists the questions of why we need address terms and what the functions of address terms are.

The primary functions of address terms are well established based on a number of studies. Much of the available literature hold the view that they are used to appeal to or designate target addressees by the addressers (Oyetade 1995; Jucker & Taavitsainen, 2003; Daniel & Spencer, 2009). Some research assigns two functions to these terms as the first, attracting the addressee's attention and second emphasizing the contact between interlocutors (Zwicky, 1974, p.787; Lambrecht, 1996, p.267). Davies (1986, p.93) defines the functions as first identifying the addressee and second indicating the speakers' views of the addressees. Although a consensus seems to exist regarding the primary functions, *the context-based* (Dunkling, 1990), *culturally-marked* (Spolsky, 1998), *extra idiomatic* (Zwicky, 1974), *creativity-based* (Silverstein, 1976), *attitudinally-marked* (Rieschild, 1998), *heterogeneous* (Braun, 1988) and *complex* (Busse, 2006) nature of address terms turns them into multifunctional linguistics units. The chaotic nature caused by virtually infinite possibilities regarding these terms (Ervin-Tripp, 1972, p.215; Stone, 1977, p.491) makes understanding of the functions of each more challenging.

In the literature, there are counterarguments regarding the optionality and syntactic flexibility of the address terms. The view that they are external element of sentence is a well-known claim dominating the field for many years (Levinson, 1983; Panhuis, 1986;

Schooneveld, 1986). These interpretations contrast with that of (Ashdowne, 2002; Moro, 2003, Hill, 2014; Slocum, 2016) who claim that these linguistic devices are integrated into the structure of the sentences. In the same vein, Turkish address terms are also codified as the external elements of the sentence (Özkan & Sevinçli, 2008, p.124; Karahan, 2009, p.36; Balyemez, 2016, p.132). Conversely, there are some studies classifying address terms as the element of sentence (Mehmedoğlu, 2006; Alyılmaz, 2015). In traditional grammar books, as Hill stated (2014, p.1) these terms are seen as insignificant, redundant items. Additionally, in her seminal research, Alyılmaz (2015) asserts that some interpretations create difficulties in defining, teaching, and learning these terms. As can be seen, ambiguities cause the multifunctional aspects of address terms to be ignored. Leech on the other hand says that these terms are "loosely attachable to clause structure" but that doesn't mean they haven't got any function (1999, pp.107-108).

Although there are differences of opinion regarding the syntactic roles of address terms, it seems that there is agreement about their flexible positions within the sentence. They can be used in sentence-initial, sentence-final, and mid-sentential positions or they can stand alone. Berger depicts that although it is intriguing for linguistic analysis, far little attention has been paid to the positioning of these terms which is one of the key factors determining the relative meanings and central functions. (Berger, 2021, p.605). It is also maintained that pragmatic functions of address terms are heavily modulated based on their positions Shiina, 2007b; Zago, 2015).

The above-mentioned discussion highlights the need to advance the understanding of the functions of address terms. In this aspect, the present study aims to find out more about the use of address terms in Turkish with a special interest in their functions, their positions and what pragmatic roles answering the following research questions:

1. What are the pragmatic functions of Turkish address terms in the corpus data[1]?

2. How are these pragmatic functions map with the sentential positions of Turkish address terms in the corpus data?

3. To what extend is the pragmatic function- sentential position mapping of Turkish address terms is parallel with the analyses in different languages in the literature?

Literature review

There exists a considerable amount of literature in different languages on address terms (Chao, 1956; Brown & Gilman, 1960; Lambert & Tucker, 1976; Kroger, Wood & Kim, 1984; Dickey, 1997; Braun, 1998; Sonnenhauser & Hanna, 2013; Wierzbicka, 2017). When it comes to the functions of them, growing body of literature has also investigated the issue. In a corpus-based study, Leech (1999) uses the Longman Corpus of Spoken and Written English and finds that these terms perform three main functions: "summoning-attention, addressee identification and establish or maintain a social relationship between the speaker and the addressee" (p.107). McCarthy and O'Keeffe (2003, p.8) list the

[1] The study makes use of the database constituted for Özer, N. (2019).

functions as "relational, topic management, badinage, mitigator, turn management and summon". Shiina (2007a; 2007b) identifies four discrete functions of them which are the "interpersonal management function, conversational management function (to start an utterance; to close an utterance; to nominate the addressee; to attract attention and to hold the floor), information management function and illocutionary force management function" (2007a; 2007b). Clayman (2010, pp.163-179) examines the address terms used in news interviews and demonstrates that address terms are employed in expressive actions (i.e., foregrounding talk, speaking sincerely) and misaligning actions (i.e. topical agenda departures, action agenda departures, non-conforming responses, disagreement). Additionally, Wilson (2010, p.45) conducts a study on a corpus of conversations of a rugby team and lists the discourse functions of address terms used in this context as the "evaluative statements, control acts and feedback requests". Zago (2015, pp.190-199) reveals that these linguistic devices are used in the service of various functions as "summonses, relational vocatives, adversarial vocatives, emphatic vocatives, turn management vocatives, mitigators, insults, badinage vocatives and vocatives validating the addressee's identity".

As seen, what is known about the functions or functions-positions relationships of the address terms are largely based upon the studies conducted on a certain address term (such as dude, alter, mate) (Rendle-Short, 2010; Heyd, 2014; Parkinson, 2020), address terms used in certain contexts where there is a limited number of interlocutors such as news interviews (Clayman, 2010), political interviews (Rendle-Short, 2007), interactions between a rugby team members (Wilson, 2010), address terms used in certain sentential places in the host sentence (Jefferson, 1973; Lerner, 2003; Clayman, 2012; Clayman, 2013; Berger, 2021), the ones used in movies (Zago, 2015), the ones employed in literary works (Shiina 2007a, Shiina, 2007b) and there are only few studies conducted by the help of the corpus data (Leech, 1999; McCarty & O'Keeffe, 2003).

In Turkish literature, seminal contributions to understanding the address system have been made by König, 1990; Eğit, 1996; Balpınar, 1999; Alyılmaz, 1999; Bayyurt & Bayraktaroğlu, 2001; Hatipoğlu, 2008; Kökpınar Kaya, 2012; Göksel and Pöchtrager, 2013; Alyılmaz, 2015; Doğru, 2018; Alkan Ataman, 2019; Keser and Pachulia, 2021; Dağabakan, 2021; Yıldırım, 2022. There seems to be an agreement that address terms are multifunctional linguistic devices yet there is little practice related to the functions of them.

In line with the above-mentioned research, the primary function of Turkish address terms is seen as calling addressee (Yüceol Özezen, 2004, p.2266; Demirbaş, 2017, p.2155). In her longitudinal research, Özcan examines address terms used by bilingual Turkish- Danish speaking students (2016). As a part of this study, she investigates when and why certain they are employed and finds that first names are employed to attract the addressee's attention, to address the leader of the group, to give instruction, to demand something and to warn (Özcan, 2016, pp.990-991). On the other hand, Özcan remarks that addressers use positive terms to appreciate the good behaviors and negative ones to criticize inappropriate behaviors (2016, p.995). Also, by the help of the neutral ones (i.e., ulan, kız), speakers express surprise, anger, agreement, impatience and again they give

instructions (Özcan, 2016, pp.997-1000). Işık Güler and Eröz-Tuğa (2017) seek to find discursive functions of '(u)lan' in STC and the TNC and the functions of this interjection are listed as: a vocative interjection (also includes addressing to self and determining the positions of the relationships during the interaction), a relationship indexing marker, an expletive interjection, an intensifier, and an emotional interjection. Additionally, Erdal (2016) classifies the usages of u(lan) and shows that u(lan) which can be used in many different functions. It is obvious that there are some gaps in the literature about the Turkish address system and the present study aims to address these gaps.

Methodology

Research design and publication ethics

Firstly, it should be pointed that the study complies with Research and Publication Ethics. In the present study, a corpus-based approach (in which qualitative data is analyzed with the interpretation of the quantitative results) was adopted to determine the functions, the relations between the detected functions and the sentential positions of the Turkish address terms. As Braun asserted, researchers tend to reflect the idealized address terms and they mostly ignore the real usages of them (1988, p.229). In this vein, the corpus is a valuable tool that include naturally-occurring interactions, and it provides unique sets of data enables us to see the real usages of linguistic units. Since the TNC is an open access natural language database, there is no need for ethics committee approval.

Turkish National Corpus (TNC v.3.0) (Aksan, et al., 2012) is a corpus of about 50 million words collected from both written (about 98%) and spoken texts (about 2%) covering a period of 24 years (from 1990 to 2013) designed to represent contemporary Turkish so, it provides a sophisticated and broad enough database to conduct the present study.

Data collection

Since carrying out research on the data extracted from the entire corpus would be quite labor-intensive (Biber, Connor & Upton, 2007, p.15), choosing a set which provides best representation of the target linguistic unit is a must for all corpus-based studies. In this aspect, the data was obtained from the imaginative prose (9.5 million words) and spoken (1 million words) parts of the TNC. These fields including many different types of social relations make the address terms more transparent to elicit and maximize the generated number of address terms. In addition to this, although a quantitative study to estimate the exact number of Turkish address terms has not been done yet, it is still safe to say that there are several thousands of address terms in Turkish. In order to keep the data in a manageable size, a set of nominal address terms was chosen based on the classification presented by Özer and İbe Akcan (2022). The list includes *sayın* (honorific), *aptal* (mockery), *dostum* (familiarizer), *canım* (endearment term), *abi* (kinship and fictive kinship term), *öğretmenim* (title). These address terms which has high frequency in the corpus data were chosen since they are relatively more neutral (there isn't definite age,

gender limitations for the use) and each is an address term reflecting the features of their own groups. Due to the frequency imbalance among chosen terms, they were analyzed under the title of "address terms" as a group that represent the addressing system in Turkish.

Table 1. Sampling Statistics Of The Chosen Address Terms

Address Term	Observed (Spoken Data)	Sampling (Spoken Data)	Observed (Imaginative Prose)	Sampling (Imaginative Prose)
Canım	581	185	3242	250
Sayın	1778	235	1375	227
Dostum	118	83	723	198
Aptal	12	12	736	199
Öğretmenim	18	17	370	157
Abi	622	189	1950	238

A random sample of each address term was generated from the corpus with the confidence level of 90% with an error margin of +/- 5. Each of these terms was searched in the above-mentioned domains of the TNC one by one and 1990 concordance lines were elicited as shown in the Table 1.

Procedure

After the results were checked by hand and eye, the tokens where the target terms were employed for references and other spurious tokens were discarded. After checking 1990 concordance lines, 1008 instances (251 instances for *canım*, 713 instances for *ostum*, 38 instances for *aptal*, 211 instances for *sayın,* 65 instances for *öğretmenim*, and 270 instances for *abi*) were examined. As the next step, functions of Turkish address terms were determined by following the theoretical frameworks proposed by Leech (1999) and McCarthy and O'Keeffe (2003) which are the *foregrounding talk, situational role designation/ setting the tone of the communication, selecting the next speaker, making the listener remain focused, topic shifting/raising other issues, softening the virtual commands, involving non-conforming responses, and disagreements.*

It must be highlighted that in order to determine the pragmatic functions of address terms it is necessary to take the positions of them, the contexts in which they are uttered, the types of relationships interlocutors have, the types of conversation (multiparty conversation or two-party conversation), the numbers of interlocutors participating in interaction and the roles of the interlocutors into account. To give an example, in a multiparty conversation in which the recipient is unspecified, selecting the next speaker function is seen more frequently compared to a two-party conversation. Similarly, the importance of the context to determine the functions and positions of the address terms are pointed in the literature by McCarthy and O'Keeffe (2003, p.7) and Rendle-Short (2010, p.1203). In this aspect, Turkish National Corpus provides researchers with a variety of tools to reach and interpret these variables while determining the functions of address terms. It provides a sufficient discourse of instances and several metadata such as the

domain, media context, interaction types, subject, location, register, gender of authors, years of publications, dialect of speaker, education of speaker, age of speaker, audience, text type, etc. each of which is a valuable variable.

Turning to the positions of the address terms, sentence-initial position is where the address terms precede the host sentence, mid-sentential position is where address terms are seen in the middle of the host sentence, sentence-final position is where address terms follow the sentence and lastly stand-alone position refers to the position of the address terms which stand syntactically free.

There is an immense literature on different linguistic and non-linguistic aspects of address terms, and this is one of the limitations that it was not possible to mention each. Second limitation is that the topic is so sophisticated and multifaceted that extralinguistic variables affecting the use were necessarily left out of the scope. The third is that the data is obtained from the imaginative prose (9.5 million words) and spoken (1 million words) parts of the TNC, so, generalizations over the address terms goes for this language section. Fourthly, an address term can perform more than one function in the same utterance. To set an example, while an address term is uttered to shift the topic of conversation, it can also be in service of selecting the next speaker function. Although McCarthy & O'Keeffe (2003) attempt to designate one function for each vocative, Zago admits that an address term can have more than one function simultaneously (2015, pp.188-189). In this paper, by reproducing the way of McCarthy and O'Keeffe (2003), only the dominant function is attributed per instances to present quantitative results more clearly. It is also worthwhile fifthly to note that there are some instances in which address terms don't take the whole charge of the detected functions by themselves. As stated before, all the above-mentioned variables and address terms come together and perform the related function all together. In a similar way, McCarthy and O'Keeffe propound that an address term employed to change the topic of conversation doesn't always perform this function on its own (2003, p.159). They add that address terms can fulfill some sort of signaling or complementary function in some contexts (McCarthy & O'Keeffe, 2003, p.159). Sixthly, in the present study, there is a need to translate Turkish address terms in English. However, translating the address terms is a controversial issue on its own (Garcez; 1992; Ngo,2006). To avoid the risk of misconception, they were given in Turkish. The denotative equivalences of selected address terms are *canım* (my dear), *aptal* (idiot), *öğretmenim* (my teacher), *sayın* (dear), *ostum* (my friend) and *abi* (brother). It should lastly be noted that some studies discriminate between vocatives and address terms (see Zwicky, 1974; McCarty & O'Keeffe, 2003) but the present study does not and evaluate them as parts of the whole system of address.

Results and Discussion

1008 lines as noted were examined to see whether Turkish address terms serve any pragmatic functions or not and ten functions are identified which can listed as following: *attention gathering, conveying the feeling, holding the floor, involving agreement, involving non-conforming utterances and disagreements, making the listener remain*

focused, selecting next speaker, situational role designation/setting the tone of the communication, softening/strengthen the virtual commands, topic shifting.

The following table illustrates the frequencies and percentages of the pragmatic functions of Turkish address terms in the TNC.

Table 2. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Pragmatic Functions Of Address Terms In The TNC

Functions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Involving non-conforming utterances	212	21.03
Situational role designation	136	13.49
Softening the virtual command	116	11.51
Selecting next speaker	116	11.51
Attention gathering	91	9.03
Topic Shifting	89	8.83
Conveying the feeling	70	6.94
Involving agreements	66	6.55
Holding the floor	57	5.65
Making the listener remain focused	55	5.46
Total	1008	100

It can be seen from the data in Table 2 that out of 1008 concordance lines, *involving nonconforming utterances function* (21.03%) are the mostly used ones and it is followed by *situational role designation/ setting the tone of the communication function* (13.49%), *softening/strengthen the virtual commands* (11.51%)*, selecting next speaker* (11.51%), *attention gathering* (9.03%), *topic shifting* (8.83%), *conveying the feeling* (6.94%), *involving agreements* (6.5%), *holding the floor* (5.65%), and lastly *making the listener remained focused* (5.46%). It is obvious that a notable difference is observed between the frequency of *involving non-conforming utterances function* and other detected functions. While *involving non-conforming utterances function* is significantly more frequent than the other ones, other pragmatic functions of these terms distribute in a relatively balanced way.

Table 3 illustrates the frequencies and percentages of positions of address terms.

Table 3. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of Address Terms In The TNC

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Final	471	46.73
Initial	329	32.64
Medial	131	12,99
Stand Alone	77	7.64
Total	1008	100

As in the Table 3, Turkish address terms are prone to appear in *final-sentential, sentence-initial, mid-sentential* and *stand-alone positions* respectively. Similar findings

were reported by previous research in different languages in the literature (see Heyd, 2014: 272; McCarthy & O'Keeffe, 2003).

Analysis of the Functions

Involving non-conforming utterances, and disagreements

21% (212 times) of the detected address terms appear in the function of *involving nonconforming utterances and disagreements* which is the most frequently seen function in the incoming data. Data analysis shows that address terms concur with a great variety of face-threatening acts such as offer, advice, disagreement, reminders, disapproval, apology, criticism etc. These linguistic devices also co-occur with the non-conforming utterances about which the speaker is not sure whether the hearer will like what the speaker is planned to say or not.

The speaker who is aware of the potential face-threatening effects of the utterance on the addressee attempts to tone down the threat by employing an address term. In the literature, several studies have revealed address terms function as a mitigation device in face-threats, non-conforming utterances, and disagreements (McCarty & O'Keeffe, 2003; O'Keeffe, 2006; Clayman, 2010; Clayman, 2013; Tsakona & Sifianou, 2019; Asprey & Tagg, 2019). Clayman also posits that speakers tend to start the utterance with an address term before they express their disagreement with the hearer, or they want to deny something demanded by the hearer (2010, p.161).

These inferences are based on the assumption that address terms are positively-loaded and employed to signal deference when there is a need for mitigation, but they can function at the opposite extreme when they are negatively loaded, and they maximize the weight of the face-threatening act. The usage of address terms is also reported in some different studies (Draper, 2005; Grząśko, 2015).

Example (1) illustrates *involving non-conforming utterances function* of address terms clearly. Speaker İ and M are two friends talking about the likes on social media. Speaker M talks back to speaker İ by repeating the same questions which can be coded as face-threatening. In response to this, the non-conforming utterance which İ is aware that it isn't approved by M and prefaced with an address term *abi*. Also, the phrase *kusura bakmayın ama (with all due respect)* is another proof that the speaker knows the face-threatening potential of the utterance and needs a mitigator.

(1)   İ: Hayır beğendin mi?
          M: Sen benim hangi fotoğrafımı beğendin?
          İ: **Abi** şimdi bak herkes aynı şeyi yapıyo da, kusura bakmayın bi fotoğrafla yazı aynı şey değil. Ya birine verilen emekle ötekine verilen emek aynı mı?
          M: Emek aynı olmayabilir.   (S-BEABXO-0319-2)

          İ: Nope just say did you like it?
          M: Which photo of me did you like? (You didn't like any of them.)
          İ: Abi now think that everyone does the same thing. With all due respect, a

photo and a text aren't the same. Are the efforts made for them same?
M: It is possible that they aren't the same.

Table 4. The Frequencies And Percentages Of Positions Of With Involving Non-Conforming Utterances And Disagreement Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Final	122	57
Initial	61	29
Medial	26	14
Stand Alone	0	0
Total	212	100

Concerning their positions, Table 4 shows that address terms used to involve non-conforming utterances and disagreements are mostly seen in sentence-final position. The significancy of the high frequency of address terms used in final position where the address terms follow the non-conforming utterances is expected since this correlation between the position and the function of address terms used as face-saving devices in the present data shows that the speaker threating the face of the hearer still wants to maintain the relationship. For example, in the utterance "…Yeter artık Üzeyir Abi." the speaker threatens the face of *Üzeyir abi* but also signals deference by pointing that you are still my *abi* (brother).

(2)   Ben süratli diildim be.. Yol kapalıydı.. Yerler buzluydu... Sürat vardu.. Vardu. Yok diyorum **Üzeyir Abi**

.

.

.
Halbusi orda senin gibi usta bir şöfer olsaydı…Yeter artık **Üzeyir Abi.**
                                                                (W-DA16B3A-1040-104)
I didn't drive fast … Road was closed …. Floors were icy… You drove at speed, you did. I said I didn't drive fast Üzeyir Abi

.

.

.
However, there should have been a master driver like you. Enough is enough Üzeyir Abi

Situational Role Designation/ Setting the Tone of the Communication

136 address terms which equals to 13% of total data are employed to perform *situational role designation/setting the tone of the communication function*. In order to designate the role of the addressee or setting the tone of the communication, addressers intentionally employ certain address terms. As Asprey and Tagg (2019, p.86) point, address terms have a role not only in projecting an assumed relationship, but also in performing social identity and in discursive positioning of the interlocutors participated in

communication and those speakers constantly (re)position themselves and other interlocutors. For example, a wife who is annoyed with her husband may employ the address term *beyefendi* to call him which doesn't reflect their intimate relationship but represent the role of the addressee assigned by the addresser. In a study conducted on the parents' adopting children, it is seen that adoptive parents try to construct an identity which is similar to biological parents. In this process, they use address terms which qualify them as parents and designate roles for the children (Bergen, et al., 2006). Additionally, Jaworski and Galasiński (2000) present politicians intentionally use marked address terms to position their opponents and manipulate the listeners' view regarding them.

In their studies, Wood and Kroger also identifies this function and claim that address terms can be used to "set the tone of the interchanges" (1991). In the example (3), speaker B designates the role of a friend to speaker K (or he highlights the predetermined role of speaker K) by using familiarizers and set a friendly tone in the communication.

(3)   B: Ee! **moruk** ne yaptın **oğlum** yaa!
        K: Ne yapıyım **moruk** ya evdeyiz sıcaklarda uğraşıyoruz.
        Sen ne yaptın?
        B: Valla ne olsun **dostum** yorgunum yaa! Çalışıyorsun biliyosun.
        İnan var yaa! hiç takatim yok **birader**.
                                              (S-BEABXO-0080-1)
        B. Ee! moruk what did you do oğlum
        K: What could I do moruk we are at home, we are coping with hot weather
        What did you do?
        B: Well, what can I say dostum. I am tired, very tired. You know I have been working.
        Believe that I have no energy.

It is obvious that Turkish speakers use this function as a strategy to manipulate their interlocutors. Example (4) depicts a dialogue taken place during a policy inquiry. A policewoman questions the criminal, and the criminal addresses the policewoman using the address term *sayın polis teyzeciğim*. He attributes three different roles to the policewoman at the same time. He positions the policewoman as someone close to him by using a combination of a kinship term (*teyze*) and *diminutive+1st person possessive suffix* which is directly related to *endearments* while he still accepts her institutional role (*title-polis*) and her superiority (*honorifics -sayın*).

(4) Cancun'a niye gittiniz? Bilmiyorum. Nasıl yani? Beni o kadın götürdü, **Sayın polis teyzeciğim**. Orada ne yaptınız?   (W-EA16B3A-0570-851)
     Why did you go to Cancun? I don't know. How come? That woman took me, Sayın Polis teyzeciğim What did you do there?

Table 5. The Frequencies And Percentages Of Positions Of With Situational Role Designation - Setting The Tone Of The Conversation Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Final	95	70

Initial	28	21
Medial	10	7
Stand Alone	3	2
Total	136	100

Considering the situational role designation/setting the tone of the conversation, Table 5 clearly shows that these address terms are used mostly in the *sentence-final position* 70% (95 times) which is followed by sentence-initial position 21% (28 times), *mid-sentential position* 7% (10 times) and lastly *stand-alone position* 2% (3 times). It seems that there is a weak relationship between the positions of address terms and the function *situational role designation,* and the high frequency of *sentence-initial address terms* is the result of the address terms' tendency to be in sentence-final and sentence-initial positions (see Heyd, 2014: 272; McCarthy & O'Keeffe, 2003).

Softening/Strengthening the Virtual Commands

Out of 1008 address terms, there are 116 instances *softening the virtual commands* (11.51%). Address terms function as mitigators both in the *involving non-conforming utterances* and the *softening/ strengthening the virtual command*s but their significantly high frequency in the data make the coding them as two different pragmatic functions obligatory.

In Turkish, address terms can be employed to *soften or strengthening the virtual commands*. While address terms as mitigators lessen the face-threatening effect arising from virtual commands, they increase the effectiveness of the commands as directive speech acts by decreasing the hearers' cognitive efforts on face-saving and direct them to the target tasks. On the other hand, negative address terms co-occurring with virtual commands strengthens the face-threatening degree of the utterance as in the example (5). In this vein, this combination decreases the effect of illocutionary force of directives.

(5) "Ödevimi yetiştirememiştim, onun için özür diliyorum."dedim. Bana bak, **Aptal Hamdi**, şimdi beni iyi dinle…

(W-UA16B1A-1201-203)

I said that "I couldn't finish my homework, I apologize for it" Look at me, Aptal Hamdi, listen to me carefully…

In example (6), there is an interaction in which the tension between interlocutors is rising. It is seen that the addresser is inferior to the addressee which makes him feel obliged to mitigate his commands by employing an address term.

(6) Kesme **Abi** paramı. Hakkını veriyorum. Bir de hak deme **Abi**. Ağrıma gidiyor. Bu tantanayla paramı bırakmam sende. Ne? Ne dedin?

(W-KA16B1A-0700-1320)

Don't encroach my money abi. You got yours. Don't say it abi. I take it to heart. I won't give up my money because of this discussion. What? What did you say?

Table 6 illustrates that address terms employed to soften or strengthen the virtual commands mostly appear in *sentence-final positions* (i.e., 58.6%). Turkish speakers tend to prefer using address terms as mitigating devices after the hearer heard the whole command. Moreover, *sentence-initial address terms* are employed frequently to make the target interlocutor prepared for the coming commands. Concerning this function, *sentence medially positioned address terms*' percentage is 8.6 % of all total occurrences.

Table 6. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Softening/ Strengthening The Virtual Commands

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Final	68	58.6
Initial	37	31.9
Medial	10	8.6
Stand Alone	1	0.9
Total	116	100

As can be seen, there is only one instance of stand-alone address term which is used as a reminder of the previously uttered command to make the hearer carry out the command as depicted in the example (7).

(7)   M: Oğlum git ders çalışsana

            .
            .
            .
        M: **İbrahimcim.**
        R: İşte.
        M: **Canım**
                                        (S-BEABXO-0392-70)

        M: Oğlum go study your lesson
            .
            .
            .
        M: İbrahimcim.
        R: Here it is.
        M: Canım

Selecting the next speaker

Sometimes speakers choose the one who will take the turn immediately after themselves by addressing the target participant. There are a wide range of verbal and nonverbal devices to select next speaker and in line with the previous studies (Sacks et al. 1974; Lerner, 2003; Shiina, 2007; Clayman, 2010; Tsakano & Sifionou, 2019) the present study shows that Turkish address terms can be used to select the next speaker.

It is also seen that the function of address terms appears mostly and works more effectively in multiparty conversations to avoid the ambiguity as to who will take the turn next or who is the target collocutor that the previous speaker addressed. As Özcan stated (2016, p.987), speakers distinguish the selected interlocutors from the other ones and put him/her in the center of attention by the help of an address term used to select next speaker. In the following example, speaker A is male, speaker N is female and speaker P is a seller in the bazaar. It represents a multiparty interaction in which four different interlocuters participate. Speaker P selects Speaker A as the next speaker by using the address term *abi* although speaker N tries to maintain the communication. Speaker A doesn't give any verbal response which can be seen as the failure of the act.

(8)   A: Bir kalite kontrolü yapayım bakayım.
        P: \<B>**Abla** bu ilaçsız. Şöyle üstündeki tozu alsan yeter.
        N: O zaten yer de onun için, yıkamadan da yer.
        P: Kaç kilo olsun **abi**?
        N: Bir mi olsun? İki olsun.
        M: İlaçsız mı
        N: İlaçsızmış

                        (S-BEABXh-0138-193)

        A: Let me do a quality check
        P: \<B>Abla it is chemical-free. Removing the dust on it is enough like this
        N: He eats in any way, he eats then without cleaning
        P: How many kilos do you want abi?
        N: One? Two kilos.
        M: Is it chemical-free?
        N: He says like that

It is seen in Table 7 that when Turkish address terms used in *the selecting next speaker function*, they appear in *final positions* 61% (71 times). This finding is expected since speakers need to complete their own utterances before they transfer the turn to other speakers. Another evidence supporting the high frequency of *sentence final position* of address terms is that these address terms mostly co-occur with interrogative sentences in the elicited data. Additionally, 29% (34 times) of all address terms in this category are seen in *initial positions* followed by *medial positions* 7% (8 times) and only 3% of them are used in *stand-alone position*.

Table 7. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Making Listener Remain Focused

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Final	71	61
Initial	34	29
Medial	8	7
Stand Alone	3	3

Attention-gathering

In the calculation of the percentages, it was seen that 9.03% of all the incoming data referred to *the attention gathering function* of Turkish address terms. As mentioned before, *the attention-gathering function* is the primary function of addressing. In this function, addresser informs the addressee that he/she is the receiver of the message. Using an address term to call the receiver's attention is the most basic way of declaring "Hey, I am talking to you!". It is detected that Turkish speakers use these terms to attract the attention of the target interlocutor when they want to emphasize the significance of their messages, when they realize that the receiver has half an ear on the given messages, when the receiver ignores the sent message, when they want to be sure whether they are still in an interaction or not or when they direct their messages to the receiver for the first time. Here the address terms can be employed to gather the attention of the target hearer as an invitation to communication. Following example taken from a parliamentary meeting makes the discussion clearer. It is possible that during a parliamentary meeting, there are hundreds of members following pre-set parliamentary procedures to communicate. In such a context, sending their messages to the target interlocutors can be risky for the speaker. That is why speaker SE prefers using the address term *sayın başkan* until he is sure that the target addressee receives his message.

(9)   SE: **Sayın Başkan...**
         Sayın Başkan...
         TE: **Sayın Ergin**, bir saniye müsaade eder misiniz.
         Yapılması gereken şu: Sayın Başbakan milletvekillerini...

                                                    (S-ACABQq-0425-798)

SE: Sayın Başkan
Sayın Başkan
TE: Sayın Ergin, could you excuse me for a second?
That is what should be done: Sayın Başkan'deputies...

It is revealed that the functions of address terms are dominantly used in formal communication when it is compared with the informal ones in which there is nearly no need to call the receiver's attention (except the conversation openings) since there are limited number of interlocutors in such contexts. When Brown and Gilman's (1960) power and solidarity notions are taken into account, it is clear that informal contexts are related to the solidarity dimension and formal contexts are related to the power dimension and there is a power struggle in formal contexts such as it is in the parliamentary one and the interlocutors in these contexts want to control others and make other interlocutors listen to them which increase the frequency of the use of address terms as attention getting devices.

Table 8. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Attention Gathering Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Initial	51	56
Stand Alone	30	33

Medial	5	5.5
Final	5	5.5
Total	91	100

From Table 8, it is obvious that *sentence-initial address terms* (56%) are mostly used to perform *attention gathering functions of address terms* which is followed by *the stand-alone ones* (33%), *sentence-final ones* (5%) and *mid-sentential ones* (5%). The findings of the present study regarding the address terms' sequential positions are consistent with those of Shiina (2007a) and Lerner (2003) who reveal that as an attention getting device, address terms are dominantly used in the sentence-initial position. The frequency of the *stand-alone address terms* also indicates that speakers don't risk their messages until they are sure that the receiver is listening to them.

Topic shifting

The present study shows that address terms are used mostly in topic boundaries and the speaker shares new information or he/she shifts the topic of ongoing communication. The same function is also reported in the studies of Wilson and Zeitlyn (1995), McCarthy and O'Keeffe (2003), Busse (2006), Clayman (2010), Prévost (2011).

To give an example, there is an extract in example (10) illustrating speaker C having a talk with his close friend speaker Ö. While they are talking about their mutual friend Cengiz (line 3 and 4), speaker Ö changes the topic and starts to talk about a singer by signaling the topic-shifting by the use of the address term.

(10)　C: Kaç kere şey değiştiricen. Onun için hiç uğraşmaya gerek yok.
　　　　Bin Mersin'den in Bolu'da.
　　　　<D 7> Aramadı Cengiz.
　　　　Ö: Aramadı ya, niye aramadı ben de anlamadım.
　　　　Abi bu Atiye çok sağlam.
　　　　Bu şarkıyı söyleyen Atiye var ya, kız çok tatlı ya.

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(S-BEABXW-0058-2)

　　　　C: How many times will you change it? There is no need to make an effort for it.
　　　　Get on the bus from Mersin and then get off the bus in Bolu.
　　　　<D 7> Cengiz didn't call.
　　　　Ö: Yes, he didn't call, I cannot understand why he didn't call.
　　　　Abi Atiye is terrific.
　　　　Atiye who sings that song, the girl is so sweet.

In the example (11), the speaker shifts the topic by an address term as a strategy not to answer the question while he has some other thing on his mind. Firstly, the speaker attempts to gain some time by holding the floor by the help of *canım, hayatım* and then *bir tanem* prefaces the topic shift:

(11)   Beni seviyor musun? **Canım Hayatım. Bir tanem** (Yahu bu ne biçim koku? Üstüme sinecek; inşallah Zeynep'in kullandıklarındandır.) Bu ne güzel parfüm...

(W-FA16B3A-0393-19)

Do you love me? 'Canım Hayatım Bir tanem' (Man! what kind of frangrance is that? I will be scented with it. I hope it is one of Zeynep's frangrance). What a beautiful frangrance …

Table 9. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Topic Shifting Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Initial	76	85
Medial	8	9
Final	5	6
Stand Alone	0	0
Total	89	100

As shown in Table 9, address terms used to shift the topic are mostly employed *sentence initially* (85%) which is nearly ten times more than *the medial position* (9%) and fifteen times more than *final position* (6%).

Conveying the feeling

6.94% of all address terms are used to convey the feeling of the speakers. In this function, Turkish speakers generally direct address terms to react to something done or said by previous speakers. The data shows that all kinds of feelings such as anger, interest, love, concern, affection, contempt could be conveyed through the address terms.

In Turkish, the same address term can convey feelings standing at opposite ends. Moreover, all the address terms are intrinsically related to feelings. The complex relationship between address terms and feelings makes determining *the conveying the feeling function* challenging. The function of address terms is exemplified in example (12), the extract taken from a TV show in which the presenter invited an old friend of the guest (speaker S) to express her gratitude using and repeating the address terms *canım benim* and *hayatım benim*. McCarthy and O'Keeffe (2003) also reveal that interviewers create pseudo-intimacy by using these terms in media discourse which is also helpful to explain the following example:

(12)   S: Evet bu özel günde Fahrunisa Hanım bizi yalnız bırakmadı
S: **Canım benim**
S: Kapı açılsın ve Fahrunisa Hanım içeri girsin. Ama kimle?
S: **Canım benim,** çok teşekkür ederim **hayatım benim**

(S-ADBBAo-0443-31)

S: Yes Mrs. Fahrunisa doesn't leave us alone in this special day
S: Canım benim
S: Open the door and let Mrs. Fahrunisa come in. But with whom she will coming?

S: Canım benim thank you very much hayatım benim

There are also some examples in which addressers warn the hearers who have done something unwanted by the help of conveying the feeling function of stand-alone address terms as it is in the following example:

(13) Seni de tanıştırmıştım hatta o kızla. Sen ne bileceksin ama?
Ne okursun ne bişey bilirsin. "**Abi...** Sinirlendirme insanı."
Tamam tamam.

(W-UA16B4A-0909-823)

I even introduced you to that girl. But what would you know? You neither know nor
read anything. "*Abi...* Don't make me angry." Okay okay.

Table 10. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Conveying The Feelings Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Stand Alone	38	54
Initial	17	12
Final	16	23
Medial	6	4
Total	70	100

As it is clear from the Table 10 that Turkish address terms with *conveying the feelings function* are mostly seen in *stand-alone position* 54% (38 times) and *sentence-final address terms* are the second most frequent ones with 23% (16 times) which is followed by *the sentence-initial ones* %12(17 times) and *mid-sentential usages of them* 4% (6 times). Turkish speakers' use this function in the stand-alone position shows that address terms intrinsically loaded with emotions are capable to convey them on their own too. It is clear that stand-alone address terms reflect intense feelings when compared to the other positions in which they appear which is presented in example (14):

(14) …yüreğindeki fırtına dalgalanıverdi: "**Reha**" dedi, **Canım Reha'cığım benim...**
Seni çok seviyorum... Seni çok, pek çok seviyorum..."

(W-EA16B1A-0856-32)

… the storm in her heart surged: 'Reha' she said, Canım Reha'cığım
benim'.
I love you so much… I love you very much

Involving agreement

Evidently, *involving agreement function* accounts for 6.5% of all instances. Turkish address terms indicate agreement on their own or they can be seen with other agreement statements such as the *approval, appreciation,* or *recognition* (especially as a signal of receiving the message of the speaker). The following example illustrates two close friends

talking about the latest sports news and speaker S employs an address term (*dostum*) immediately after an approval marker (orası öyle). In example (15), the address term involving the agreement marker strengthens the impact of the partial approval (*%100* is another indicator showing the speaker's want to maximize the effect of his agreement).

(15)   R: **Lan** UEFA bile ne diyo ne demiş biliyon mu ya iki iddaname niye gönderiyosunuz.
S: Haa.
R: Birbirinden farklı iki iddaname. Oynanmış bilader onların üstüne belli yani.
S: Yani %100 orası öyle **dostum**.
R: Boşver Aziz iyi yaptı böyle konuşmaklan **bilader**.
S: Aynen. Yapacak tabi ya hakkını arayacak tam bir Fenerbahçeli.
<D 6> Aziz Yıldırım **dostum** konuşurken okumuyor değil mi?

(S-BEABXO-0086-8)

R: Lan do you know what UEFA said? They said that why did you send two submissions.
S: Yes.
R: Two submissions which are different from each other.
It is clear that these documents are forged bilader
S: Yes, I agree 100 percent dostum
R: Never mind. Aziz did the best by talking like this bilader
S: Exactly. He will do, he will claim his rights. He is a perfect fan of Fenerbahçe.
<D 6> Aziz Yıldırım dostum doesn't read a text while he is speaking, does he?

A study by Rendle-Short (2010) presents the familiarizer *mate* can be used in a similar function. He adds that even though it is not necessary to use, speakers tend to employ an address term (mate in that study) even after a minimal agreement statement like the one in the above-given example. He justifies this tendency as the interlocutor's intent to elongate the previous utterance. Based his thesis, it could be said that Turkish speakers employ address terms in the environment of agreement statements to prove their sincerity. It can be coded as a must by the speakers since some of the approval markers in Turkish implies indifference to interlocutors such as *aynen, aynen aynen, tabi tabi* (see also Kaynarpınar, 2021; Kaynarpınar & Uçar, 2021; Parlar, 2022). That is to say, speakers intend to strengthen and verify their agreement and prove their sincerity by using the address terms that stretch out the short statement.

Table 11. Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Involving Agreement Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Final	47	71
Medial	17	26
Initial	2	3
Stand Alone	0	0

Total	66	100

The address terms co-occurring with agreement statements are dominantly in *final position* 71% (47 times), 26% of these address terms (17 times) are seen in *the medial positions* and 3% (2 times) of them appear in *initial positions* as depicted in Table 11. The sentential positioning of address terms also accords with the above-mentioned findings of the present study. It is observed that Turkish speakers too mostly express their agreements by the help of short utterances, and they want to sustain the illusion that they contribute to the interaction talking more (see also Rendle-Short, 2010).

Holding the floor

Out of the 1008 address terms, 5.6% of them perform *the holding the floor/ foregrounding the talk function*. The present study also shows that Turkish speakers use address terms to hold the floor until they guarantee that they finalize what they want to say. During the conversation, interlocutors use some other expressions to hold the floor while they search for an appropriate term or maintain the flow of communication.

Below mentioned extract in example (16) is elicited from a chit chat between two close friends. They talk about a machine sweeping the city streets and speaker SE employs address term *abi* to hold the floor. It seems that the speaker fails to remember something he has planned to say, and he utters the address term in order not to risk the losing the turn.

(16) SO: Hele ki haftasonu
SE: Süpürüüyolar ama.
Hafta sonuna, Pazar günü akşam..**Abi**..yaa! Şey, bi tane makinesi var, o sahili süpürüyor
yaa!.
İL: Hıı işte.

$\qquad$ (S-BEABXw-0397-328)

SO: Especially weekends
SE: But they sweep it.
At the weekends, Sunday evening … Abi… Well, there is a machine for it, it sweeps
the beach.
İL: Hıı, just like that.

Table 12. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Holding The Floor Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Final	24	42
Initial	18	32
Medial	13	23
Stand Alone	2	3
Total	57	100

As seen in Table 12, address terms to hold the floor are mostly used in *final positions* in the host sentences 42% (24 times), 32% (18 times) of all instances used in this function is seen in *the initial positions* which is followed by *medial positions* 23% (13 times) and lastly *stand-alone position* is the least one as 3% (2 times).

Making the listener remain focused

Address terms used to make the listener remain focused appear in the corpus data 55 times and that corresponds to a 5.45% of the total. To maintain a smooth conversation, firstly, the speakers should gather the attention of the target hearer and then they should try to maintain the hearer remained focused during the communication. The present data shows that Turkish speakers use these terms for this purpose as a secret message saying "Hey, I am still talking with you." It is also revealed that *making the listeners focused function* overlaps with *the holding the floor/foregrounding the talk function*. Under the title of *making the listener remain focused function*, address terms are used to awaken the listener when the speaker talks too much, when the speaker intends to highlight a certain part of his/her message or when the speaker summarizes what they have said.

The following dialogue provides a typical example of *making listener remain focused function* of address terms. In example (17), speaker Ö talks about his experience of taking a flight and, during his long speech, he utters *abi* many times to make speaker C remain focused. At the beginning of the dialogue, speakers don't use any address terms but when speaker Ö understands that he talks too much at the end of his speech, he needs to use one.

(17)   C: Almanya'ya mı?
         Ö: Kemerlerinizi bağlayın dedi.He Almanya'ya 2 saatte.
         Biz 9000 fitte gittik onlar 15000 biz 9000 fitte gittik.
         Ya bindim ilk defa bincem tamam mı, neyse hostesler mostesler geldi işte, kontrol ettik
         Kayışınızı bağlayın az sonra kalkıyoz falan dedi.
         Kaptan ben kaptan dedi. 30 saniye sonra kalkıyoz dedi.
         Yavaş yavaş gidiyo işte 30 saniye sonra kalkışımız var dedi.
         Lütfen kemerlerinizi bağlayın.
         Neyse **abi** bağladık.
         Durdu durdu, a**na koyim pervanelerini bi çalıştırdı var ya anasını s**im geriye yaslanıyorum tamam mı, düz yolda bir ilerliyo a**na koyim ben böyle.
         Abi havalandı a**a koyim, içim bi hoş olmaya başladı benim.
         Çıktı çıktı çıktı.
         <B> Hay a**na koyim 9000 fit.
         Çok pis oldum be.

                                                                          (S-BEABXW-0058-1)

         C: To Germany?
         Ö: She said tighten your seatbelt. Yes, I flied to Germany. It took 2 hours.
         We were at 9000 flight level; they were at 15000 we were at 9000.
         Oh! I got on the plane. It would be my first, is that all right? Anyway, hostesses came, they said that we controlled it, fasten your seatbelts, the plane would take off in just a moment
         Captain said that I was captain. After 30 seconds he/she said that the plane was taking off.

It was moving slowly you see he said that the plane would take off after 30 seconds.
Please fasten your seatbelts
 Anyway, *abi* we fastened our seatbelts.
He waited and waited and then suddenly he started the engine, damn it! I was leaning back capice? He went straight in really fast wa, f.ck it!
The plane ascended continually
<B> f*ck it 9000 flight level
I felt really awful.

Table 13. The Frequencies And Percentages Of The Positions Of With Making Listener Remained Focused Function

Positions	Turkish National Corpus	
	f	%
Medial	27	49
Final	18	33
Initial	10	18
Stand Alone	0	0
Total	55	100

When they are used in this function, address terms are placed in *medial position* (49%) rather than *initial* (18%) or *final positions* (33%) as seen in Table 13 There is one likely cause for the difference between medial position and the other ones that the address terms are used in the long speeches to keep listener awake.

Table 14. Function – Position Mappings In Turkish

Frequency of Corpus Occurrence (Rank)	Functions	Positions	Frequency of Position Occurrence (%)
1	Involving non-conforming utterances	Final	57
2	Situational role designation	Final	70
3	Softening the virtual command	Final	58.6
4	Selecting the next speaker	Final	61
5	Attention gathering	Initial	56
6	Topic Shifting	Initial	85
7	Conveying the feeling	Stand-alone	54
8	Involving agreement	Final	71
9	Holding the floor	Final	42
10	Making the listener remain focused	Medial	49

Table 14 summarizes the findings related to the function- position mapping in Turkish address terms. The first row shows the frequency of corpus occurrence of each function, the third row shows their sentential positions and the fourth row shows the percentage of their position occurrences.

Conclusion

The goal of this study is to reach a better understanding of the pragmatic functions of Turkish address terms by the help of the natural data form the Turkish National Corpus v.3.0 (Aksan, et al.,2012) which provided us with tremendous insights on the topic. As a result of the analysis, it is revealed that Turkish address terms are used in service of many different functions such as *involving agreement, attention gathering, conveying the feeling, holding the floor, involving non-conforming utterances, making listener remain focused, selecting next speaker, situational role designation, softening/strengthening the virtual command* and *topic shifting*. The dominance of *involving non-conforming utterances* and *softening the virtual commands* which can consolidate with each other shows that Turkish speakers intend to remain in touch with others even under undesired conditions and as well as they are sensitive to the face needs of others to maintain their relationships. Turkish address terms can be used in many different contexts and bring plenty of interpretations to these contexts. They are effective linguistic devices used in many different functions since they simultaneously minimize the effort of both the addressee and addresser to carry through the intended acts. Here the complex and *janus-face nature* (Pauletto, Aronsson, & Galeano, 2017) of Turkish address terms should be reasserted.

To answer the second research question of the study, sentential positions of address terms were analyzed in relation with their pragmatic functions. They were dominantly seen in the *final positions* followed by *initial, medial,* and *stand-alone positions*. As is revealed by other researchers, (Wood and Kroger, 1991; Leech, 1999; McCarthy and O'Keeffe, 2003; Shiina, 2007; Clayman,2010) address terms' functions greatly depend on their positions in the sentences. It is also found that certain functions correlate with certain positions. *Softening/strengthening the virtual commands, selecting next speaker, situational role designation/setting the tone of conversation, holding floor functions, involving the non-conforming utterances and disagreements* correlate with final positions. On the other hand, *topic shifting* and *attention gathering functions* correlate with *initial positions*. *Making the listener remain focused* function of address terms correlates with *mid-sentential position*. On the other hand, *conveying the feeling function* correlates with *stand-alone position*. About the sentential organization of Turkish address terms, it can conveniently be said that they are purposefully placed within the conversation (Jefferson, 1973, p.71) which means that these so-called flexible terms are not as flexible as claimed in the literature. It is also seen that the pragmatic functions of address terms directly relate to their positions, context, speakers' intention, types of relationships (multiparty, two-party, etc.), the distance between interlocutors and the attributed or designated roles of interlocutors. In this respect, the analysis of the functions of address terms is hoped to contribute to the interpretation of address systems in general and its variables. In theoretical vein, the study also aims to help fill the gaps regarding the functions of address terms in the literature by the analysis of a unique set of data gathered from the Turkish National Corpus v.3.0 (Aksan, et.al., 2012) which may not reflect the whole system in Turkish despite its representativeness. In their seminal studies, Brown and Gilman similarly highlight that they just intend to make a semantic analysis of address terms, but the study takes them to sociology, literature, and psychology (1960, p.253). So, these

linguistic units are multifaceted to repeat once more. It is hoped that the findings will be worthwhile for other study area such as education, translation studies, sociology, psychology, natural language processing. It is also worth noting that Heritage (2013: 4), commenting on previous studies, asserts that the system behind most of the addressing patterns is so basic that it is possibly be universal cross-linguistically. Our findings based on a comprehensive review of literature and a broad database on Turkish address terms is in a strong support of this claim. Although address terms have culture-specific aspects this study may contribute to the universal view. Lastly, the study attempts to explain the addressing system in Turkish, there are still mysteries surrounding why they aren't used and when Turkish speakers prefer not using them. To develop a full picture of functions, further studies on zero address terms in Turkish and an analysis of the terms within the conversation analysis perspective will also be valuable.

References

Aksan, Y., Aksan, M., Koltuksuz, A., Sezer, T., Mersinli, Ü., Demirhan, U. U., Yılmazer, H., Atasoy, G., Öz, S., Yıldız, İ. & Kurtoğlu, Ö. (2012). Construction of the Turkish national corpus (TNC*). Proceedings of the Eight International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation* (pp. 3223–3227). European Language Resources Association.

Alkan Ataman, H. (2019). Kutadgu Bilig'de hitaplar ve göreceli seslenişler. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi, (45)*, 287-306. https://doi.org/10.21563/sutad.636245

Alyılmaz, C. (1999). Ünlemlerin seslenmeleri kuvvetlendirici işlevleri. *Türk Gramerinin Sorunları II.* Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 534-540.

Alyılmaz, S. (2015). Türkçenin söz diziminde seslenmeler ve seslenme öbekleri**.** *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi, 54*, 31-50.

Ashdowne, R. (2002). The vocative's calling. The syntax of address in Latin. In I. Hartmann & A. Willi (Eds.), *Oxford university working papers in linguistics, philology, and phonetics* (pp. 143–161). Oxford University.

Asprey, E., & Tagg, C. (2019). The pragmatic use of vocatives in private one-to-one digital communication. *Internet Pragmatics*, *2*(1), 83–111. https://doi.org/10.1075/ip.00024.asp

Balpınar, Z. (1996). The use of pronouns of power and solidarity in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 288-293.

Balyemez, S. (2016). *Dil bilgisi üzerine açıklamalar.* Pegem Akademi.

Bayyurt, Y. & Bayraktaroğlu, A. (2001). The use of pronouns and terms of address in Turkish service encounters. In A. Bayraktaroğlu & M. Sifianou (Eds.), *Linguistic politeness: A Case of Greek and Turkish* (pp. 209-240). John Benjamins.

Berger, L. (2021). Positioning and functions of nominal address in roman comedy. In A. M. M. Rodriguez (Eds.), *Linguisticae Dissertationes. Current Perspectives on Latin Grammar, Lexicon and Pragmatics Selected Papers from the 20th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* (pp. 605-620). Ediciones Clásicas.

Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). *Discourse on the move: Using corpus analysis to describe discourse structure*. John Benjamins.

Braun, F. (1988). *Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures*. Mouton De Gruyter.

Brown, R. & Gilman, A. (1960). The Pronouns of power and solidarity. In Sebeok, T. A. (Ed*.), Style in Language* (pp. 253-276). Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Busse, B. (2006). *Vocative constructions in the language of Shakespeare*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chao, Y. (1956). Chinese terms of address. *Language*, *32*(1), 217-241.

Clayman, S., E. (2010). Address terms in the service of other actions: The case of news interview talk, *Discourse & Communication*, *4*(2), 161–183. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481310364330

Clayman, S., E. (2012). Address terms in the organization of turns at talk: The case of pivotal turn extensions, *Journal of Pragmatics*, *44*(13), 1853–1867. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.08.001

Clayman, S., E. (2013). Agency in response: The role of prefatory address terms. *Journal of Pragmatics 57,* 290–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2012.12.001

Dağabakan, F., Ö. (2021). Türkçe ve Almanca dijital ortamlarda kadınların kullandıkları hitap ifadeleri. *Diyalog Interkulturelle Zeitschrift Für Germanistik*, *9*(2), 591-610. https://doi.org/10.37583/diyalog.1030753

Daniel, M., & Spencer, A. (2009). The vocative–an outlier case. In A. Spencer & A. L. Malchukov (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of case* (pp. 626-634).Oxford University Press

Davies, E., E. (1986). English vocatives: A look into their function and form. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia, 19*, 91-106.

Demirbaş, M. (2017). Türkiye Türkçesi ağızlarında seslenme sözleri. *Uluslararası TürkçeEdebiyat Kültür Eğitim*, *6*(4), 2154-2181.

Dickey, E. (1997). Forms of address and terms of reference. *Journal of Linguistics, 33*(2), 255-274.

Doğru, F. (2018). Seslenme sözleri ve genel Türkçe sözlüklerdeki görünümü. *Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 19*(1), 135-150. https://doi.org/10.17494/ogusbd.458087

Draper, P. (2005). Patronizing speech to older patients: A literature review. *Reviews in Clinical Gerontology, 15*(3-4), 273-279.

Dunkling, L. (1990). *A Dictionary of epithets and terms of address*. Routeledge & World Publishing.

Eğit, Y. (1996). Günümüz Türkçesinde hitap biçimleri. In A. Konrot (Ed.), *Modern studies in Turkish linguistics: Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics, 12-14 Ağustos 1992* (pp. 27-38). Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Erdal, M. (2016). N'aber lan? In Hauenschild, M. Kappler & Barbara, Kellner-Heinkele (Eds.), *Eine hundertblättrige Tulpe – Bir Èadbarg lÁla. Festgabe für Claus Schönig* (pp. 74-86). Klaus Schwarz.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1972). Sociolinguistic rules: Alteration and co-occurrence. In J. Gumperez, & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in Sociolinguistics* (pp. 213-250). Basil Blackwell.

Garcez, P. M. (1992). English into Brazilian Portuguese: The problems of translating address in literary dialogue.lha do Desterro, 28, 155-165.

Göksel, A., & Pöchtrager, M. (2013). The vocative and its kin: Marking function through prosody. In Noel, A. H., Sonnenhauser B., Vocative! *Addressing between system and performance* (pp.87-108). De Gruyter Mouton.

Grząśko, A. (2015). On the semantic history of selected terms of endearment. *Linguistics Beyond and Within,* 104-118. https://doi.org/10.31743/lingbaw.5626

Hatipoğlu, Ç. (2008). Analysis of the social meanings of the second person pronoun 'sen' in Turkish. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 15-29.

Heritage, J. (2013). Turn-initial position and some of its occupants. *Journal of Pragmatics 57*, 331–337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2013.08.025

Heyd, T.(2014).Dude, alter! A tale of two vocatives. *Pragmatics and Society, 5*(2),271 –295. https://doi.org/10.1075/ps.5.2.05hey

Hill, V. (2014). *Vocatives: How syntax meets with pragmatics.* Brill.

Işık Güler, H, Eröz-Tuğa, B. (2017). Sözlü Türkçe Derlemi ve Türkçe Ulusal Derleminde (U)lan'ın edimbilimsel bir incelemesi. *Dil ve Edebiyat Dergisi, 14*(2), 37-60.

Jaworski, A., & Galasiński, D. (2000). Vocative Address Forms and Ideological Legitimization in Political Debates. *Discourse Studies, 2*(1), 35–53.

Jefferson, G. (1973). A case of precision timing in ordinary conversation: overlapped tag-positioned address terms in closing sequences. *Semiotica 9*, 47-96.

Jucker, A. H. & Taavitsainen, I. (2003). Introduction. In Taavitsainen, I., Jucker, A.H. (Eds.), *Diachronic perspectives on address term systems* (Pragmatics and Beyond New Series 107) (pp.1-25). John Benjamins.

Karahan, L. (2009). *Türkçede söz dizimi.* Akçağ Yayıncılık.

Kaynarpınar, F. (2021). *Approval markers in Turkish: A corpus-driven study.* [Unpublished master thesis]. Mersin University.

Kaynarpınar, F. & Uçar, A. (2021). Türkçede etkileşim belirleyicisi olarak tabi. Paper presented at 20. Uluslararası Türk Dilbilim Kurultayı, Anadolu University, Eskişehir.

Keser, B., & Pachulia, L. (2021). Gürcüce-Türkçe nezaket ve hitap kullanımındaki benzerlikler ve farklılıklar. *Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *19*(2), 155-170. https://doi.org/10.18026/cbayarsos.872333

Kökpınar Kaya, E. (2012). An analysis of the addressing terms used in Turkish society in the interface of alienation and intimacy. *Studia Uralo-Altaica*, *49*, 303–309.

König, G. (1990). Türkçe'de Sen/Siz adıllarının ikinci tekil şahıs için kullanımına toplumdilbilimsel bir yaklaşım. In A. S. Özsoy & H. Sebütekin (Eds.). *IV. Dilbilim Sempozyumu Bildirileri, 17-18 Mayıs 1990, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi* (pp. 175-184). Boğaziçi Üniversitesi.

Kroger, R., O., Wood, L., A. & Kim, U. (1984). Are the rules of address universal? III: comparison of Chinese,Greek and Korean Usage. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology 3*, 273-284.

Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G., R. (1976). *Tu, Vous, Usted: A Social-Psychological Study of Address Patterns*. Newbury House.

Lambrecht, K. (1996). On the formal and functional relationship between topics and vocatives. Evidence from French. In A. Goldberg (Ed.). *Conceptual structure, discourse and language* (pp. 267-288). CSLI Publications.

Leech, G. (1999). The distribution and function of vocatives in American and British English conversation. In H. Hasselgård and S. Oksefjell (Eds.), *Out of corpora: Studies in honour of Stig Johansson* (pp. 107– 118). Rodopi.

Lerner, G. (2003). Selecting next speaker: The context-sensitive operation of a context-free organization. *Language in Society*, *32*(2), 177-201. https://doi.org/10.1017/S004740450332202X

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy M, & O'Keeffe A (2003). "What's in a name?" Vocatives in casual conversations and radio phone-in calls In Leistyna, P. & Meyer, C. (Eds.), Corpus analysis: Language structure and language use (pp. 153–185). Rodopi.

Mehmedoğlu, A. (2006). *Türkiye Türkçesinde cümle ögelerine yeni bir bakış*. Değişim.

Moro, A. (2003). Notes on vocative case. A case study in clause structure. In J. Quer & J. Schroten (Eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory* (pp. 247– 261). John Benjamins.

Ngo, T. (2006). Translation of Vietnamese Terms of Address and Reference. *Translation Journal,10*(4), 1-5.

O'Keeffe A. (2006). *Investigating media discourse*. Routledge.

Oyetade, S., O. (1995). A sociolinguistic analysis of address terms in Yoruba. *Language in Society, 24*, 515-535.

Özcan, F., H. (2016). Choice of address terms in conversational setting. *Journal of Human Sciences*, *13*(1), 982-1002.

Özer, N. (2019). *Adress terms in Turkish: A corpus-based analysis*. [Unpublished master thesis]. Mersin University.

Özer, N. & İbe Akcan, P. (2022). Türkçede hitap ifadeleri: Anlam ve sözcük türü temelinde bir ulamma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Türkoloji Araştırmaları Dergisi, 7*(1),382-407. https://doi.org/10.32321/cutad.1000242

Özkan, M. & Sevinçli, V. (2008). *Türkiye Türkçesi söz dizimi.* 3F Yayınları.

Panhuis, D. (1986). The vocative is outside the sentence. *Studies in language, 10*(2), 443-447.

Parkinson, J. (2020). On the use of the address terms guys and mate in an educational context. *Journal of Pragmatics, 161*(3),81-94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.03.003

Parlar, Z. (2022). Gündelik dilin yeni jokeri: Aynen. *The Journal of Turkic Language and Literature Surveys (TULLIS), 7*(1), 32-57. https://doi.org/10.30568/tullis.1090503

Pauletto, F., Aronsson, K., & Galeano, G. (2017). Endearment and address terms in family life: Children's and parents' requests in Italian and Swedish dinnertime interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics, 109*, 82-94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.12.014

Prevost, S. (2011). A propos from verbal complement to discourse marker: A case of grammaticalization? *Linguistics 49*(2), 391–413. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2011.012

Rendle-Short, J. (2007). Catherine, you're wasting your time: Address terms within the Australian political interview. *Journal of Pragmatics 39*, 1503-1525. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.02.006

Rendle-Short, J. (2010), 'Mate' as a term of address in ordinary interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *42*, 1201–1218. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2009.09.013

Rieschild, V. R. (1998). Lebanese Arabic reverse role vocatives. *Anthropological Linguistics*, *40*(4), 617–641.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn taking in conversation. *Language, 50*, 696-735.

Schooneveld, C.-van. (1986). Is the vocative a case? In J. Johansen & H. Sonne (Eds.), *Pragmatics and linguistics* (pp. 179-186). Odense: Odense University Press.

Shiina, M. (2007a). Positioning and functioning of vocatives: Casework in historical pragmatics (1). *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters Hosei Universtiy 55*, 17-32.

Shiina, M. (2007b). Positioning and functioning of vocatives: Casework in historical pragmatics (2). *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters Hosei Universtiy 56*, 29-48.

Silverstein, M. (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural descriptions. In K. H. Basso & H. A. Selby (Eds.), *Meaning in anthropology* (pp. 11-56). University of New Mexico Press.

Slocum, P. (2016). *The syntax of address.* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Stony Brook University.

Spolsky, B. (1998). *Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press.

Stone, G. (1977). Address in the Slavonic languages. *The Slavonic and East European Review, 55*(4), 491-505.

Tsakona, V. & Sifianou, M. (2019). Vocatives in service encounters: evidence from Greek. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia, 51*(1), 60-89. https://doi.org/10.1080/03740463.2019.1594578

Wierzbicka A. (2017). Terms of address in European languages: a study in crosslinguistic semantics and pragmatics. In K. Allan & C. A, KecskesI (Eds.), *Pragmemes and theories of language use* (pp. 209–38). Springer International Publishing.

Wilson, J., A. & Zeitlyn, D. (1995). The distribution of person-referring expressions in natural conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 28*(1), 61-92.

Wilson, N. (2010). Bros, boys and guys: Address term function and communities of practice in a New Zealand rugby team. *New Zealand English Journal*, *(24),* 34–54.

Yıldırım, N. (2022). Yunus Emre'nin eserlerinde seslenme ifadeleri. *Dil Araştırmaları*, *16*(30), 93-114.

Yüceol Özezen, M. (2004). Türkiye Türkçesi günlük konuşma dilinde seslenme biçimleri üzerine gözlemler- genel sınıflandırma. *V. Uluslararası Türk Dil Kurultayı Bildirileri II (20-26 Eylül 2004)* (pp.2265-2276). Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.

Zago, R. (2015). "That's none of your business, Sy": The pragmatics of vocatives in film dialogue. In M. Dynel and J. Chovanec (Eds.), *Participation in Public and Social Media Interactions* (pp.183-207). John Benjamins

Zwicky, A. (1974). Hey, whatsyourname! In M. La Galy, R. A. Fox, & A. Bruck (Eds.), *Papers from the tenth regional meeting of the Chicago linguistics society* (pp. 787–801). Chicago Linguistics Society.