

**Use of Address Terms in Urdu as Spoken in Western Uttar Pradesh  
(Specially in Rampur and Adjoining Districts):  
A Sociolinguistic Study**

**Nazish Malik, Research Scholar**

=====  
**Abstract**

Generally, it can be seen that most of the Urdu speakers from the western Uttar Pradesh frequently use address terms in formal as well as colloquial use for everyday conversation. Such usage is considered as an integral feature of socio-cultural aspects in terms of language and society. Such types of usage may be useful for sociolinguistic information especially pertaining to interlocutors, about their relationships and circumstances. In the past few decades such terms are studied in different languages of the world in which scholars have been focussing on identifying different types of 'addresses', for instance, personal names, general and occupation titles, kinship related terms, religion- oriented expressions, honorificity in terms of intimacy, personal pronouns, descriptive phrases, etymologies, etc. This work is an attempt to inquire accurate and proper use of the vast range of choices for addressing individuals of different age groups having various contexts being used by western Uttar Pradesh Urdu speakers. Furthermore, this study also shows a number of culture specific address terms which may not have English or Hindi equivalent.

**Keywords:** Address Terms, Urdu of Western Uttar Pradesh (specially spoken in Rampur and adjoining districts), Interlocutors, Impact of Khadiboli on Urdu.

**Address Terms**

In order to have any sort of communication between an individual and society different sorts of strategies are followed. A vital point which dwells around the study of communicative strategy is how people open up conversation and how do address each other in a particular language.

Different forms of address are the outcomes of distinct socio-cultural scenario of a particular society. Many researchers have defined address terms in different terminology. In Oyetade (1995) had viewed address terms "as words or expressions", which are used 'in interactive, dyadic and face-to-face' settings 'to designate the person being talked to'. Similarly, different people have different viewpoint on this topic. Holmes (1992:1) has mentioned that "examining the way people use language in different social contexts provides a wealth of information about the way language works, as well as about the social relationships in a community." Some researchers like Keshavarz (2001) considers that terms of address are linguistic forms that are used in addressing others to attract their attention or for referring to them in the course of a conversation. They are words or linguistic expressions that speakers use to appeal directly to their addressees (Taavitsainen and Jucker, 2003). Yule (2006) asserts that address term is a word or phrase for the person being talked to or written to. But one point is common in almost all the research done in this area i.e. address terms reflect the socio-cultural hierarchy in the society. The vital point on this topic is, each society has its own way to address and that way of address mirrors the level of social, cultural, economic and other sorts of

hierarchy in a particular society. To address the address terms to lookup the diverse, multicultural and multiethnic nature of Muslim communities in Western Uttar Pradesh. To peep into the issue Mehrotra (1981) expands our horizon where he has elaborated nine different categories of address terms i.e. names, honorifics, titles, situation factors, multiple uses of address forms, greetings, invocation, addressing pets and also avoidance of address terms. People use terms of address to address each other in almost all occasions. There are three reasons for using address terms. First, they are used to attract people's attention, to remind the hearer, one's professional status or the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Second, they are used to show politeness and the difference in social class and the degree of respect on certain occasions. Third, they are used to reflect social information about identity, gender, age, status and the complex social relationships of interlocutors in a speech community (Yang, 2010). Notable among other studies, Brown and Ford (1961) proposed the semantic rules governing address in American English based on varied collection data. They found that the most common forms of address are the first name (FN) and the title plus last name (TLN) in American English. This characteristic was later on expressed as the invariant norm of address (Brown, 1965).

### **Review of Literature**

In the past decades, many definitions have been provided by researchers. As a classic study in sociolinguistics, Brown and Gilman (1960) pronominal address system highlighted the semantic power and solidarity in relation to address terms. Since then good numbers of studies, with much broader scope and depth, have emerged. Brown and Ford (1964) focused on intimacy and status, Hymes (1967) studied social distance, Pride (1971) approached formality and informality and Moles (1974) explored confidence and respect. Consequent studies on address terms focused on other languages and support the view that address forms identify and construct cultural beliefs (Evans-Pritchard 1964, Manjulakshi 2004, Koul 1995 among others). Brown and Yule (1989:54) argue that "in different social contexts different terms of address will be used." For example, the terms of address used by a social inferior to a social superior may be different from those between peers (Lyons, 1997). someone often calls a friend with his nickname, such as *Jimmy* for *Jamshed* or *Lalu* for *Loving one*. However, in other formal situation, people tend to address someone else by their titles like Mr., Mrs., Professor and other names which refer to the profession they have. Besides, the addresses of My Love, My Dear, or title, one is usually used to show the intimate relation between the addresser and addressee. According to Fasold (1990), there are two main kinds of address forms: a. using the first name, and b. using the title and last name. However, Fang and Heng (1983) points out other possible options such as use of nickname, pet name, milk name and so on. Address terms have not only been largely examined in several socio-cultural settings (e.g. Good Enough, 1965; Fang & Heng, 1983; Fitch, 1991; Aceto, 2002), following the most frequently mentioned study by Brown and Gilman's (1960) work, but also been studied in social institutions and practices such as politics (Jaworski & Galasinski, 2000; Fetzer & Bull, 2004), and religion (Sequeira, 1993; Dzameshie, 1997; Wharry, 2003).

### **Sceptical of Universals: Specific Languages**

In contrast to these 'universal' approaches, Braun, having dealt with terms of address in numerous languages and cultures in her book, *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Languages and Cultures* (1988: 304), is sceptical of universals in address terms:

"Universals in the field of address may be very few ..., and those which can be found will probably be of a rather trivial nature. One such candidate for a universal is the observation that address is

differentiated in every language... Universals of this kind are not very satisfactory, but address is so varied that, possibly, one may not find anything beyond the most basic type of correspondence.”

Hudson (1980) points out that an important dimension of variation in address terms has to do with cultural patterns that hold for some particular population in general due to their social values, beliefs and customs.

Koul (1995) about Kashmiri language, points out that a study of terms of address in any language plays a very important role in socio-linguistic research. He further continues that these terms are determined by certain factors as social structure, cultural pattern and geographical setting. "The role of human being varies in a particular society according to the requirements of that society the modes of address are determined by socio-economic status, literacy level, caste, age and sex." He continues that the selection of modes of address is influenced by different historical and social factors as well.

Manjulakshi (2004) also notes that terms and modes of address are important in any society for purposes of identification and expression of ideas. To her, the use of these terms depends upon the social rank, age, and the sex of the persons involved in any communicative situation. "The relationship that exists or is perceived to exist between persons addressing and persons addressed to come to control and guide the selection and use of terms and related modes of delivery."

Wardhaugh (2006) also discussed about a variety of social factors usually governs our choices of terms. Among these social factors are the particular occasion, the social status or rank of the other, sex, age, family relationships, occupational hierarchy, transactional status, such as a doctor-patient relationship or priest-penitent, race, and the degree of intimacy.

As far as the scope of the studies is concerned Afful (2006a) notes that studies in sociolinguistics used to be limited to domestic or familial settings. He also thinks that "more recently, studies of address terms (sometimes aided by discourse analysis) are beginning to make forays into other social processes and practices such as politics and religion suggesting the vitality of address terms."

In another study, Afful (2006b) makes a distinction between 'address terms' and 'reference terms' and uses the former as the linguistic expression by which an addresser designates an addressee in a face-to-face encounter. With reference to the social functions of address terms, Afful (2006b) also notes that sociolinguistic studies on address terms tend to show that they are contingent on a number of factors such as socioeconomic status, age, sex, the relationship that exists between interlocutors and the domains of a communicative encounter.

### **Focus in the Present Study**

In the present study, the usage of address terms is collected from Western Uttar Pradesh Region especially from Rampur and nearby Districts which are considered to better reflect social reality by portraying various interpersonal relationships in different situations. The finding indicates that besides the determinants of interpersonal relationship, important role in determining what type of address form is used in Urdu language of Western Uttar Pradesh Region. Here I am talking about Western Uttar Pradesh Region because, in India, Urdu language has its own region-wise spoken quality. Sometimes it is *Lukhnawi*, *Dehlavi*, *Dakkhini*, *Rampuri* and other varieties of Urdu language

we found in India. This contrast in Urdu language is based on impact of regional language like Khadi Boli and Braj Bhasha etc.

Before the coming of Muslim rulers, the language of Western Uttar Pradesh Region had Khadiboli and Braj Bhasha, a dialect of Hindi language. But when Muslim rulers came to India and ruled over this region, a new language evolved as Urdu. So, the conversation of Muslim communities of this Western Uttar Pradesh Region has an impact of Khadiboli and Braj Bhasha. In this region we can find many address terms derived from Khadiboli and Braj Bhasha.

In Muslim community name(s) given to a person is/are determined by the Muslim culture. The name(s) is/are derived from a multiplicity of service, both modern and traditional; proper names, nick names, titles, pronouns and prefixes are commonly used as they portray the cultural values and changes over time.

The data collected is presented below follows:

### **Personal Names**

In Muslim communities of Western Uttar Pradesh, Urdu interlocutors addressing a person by personal names may happen with the following possibilities.

**By first name (FN) e.g.** *'tauseef', 'burhan', 'ilyas'*

**By last name (LN) e.g.** *'wali', 'abbasi', 'chaudhri'*

**By full formal name** i.e. first and last name (FLN) e.g., *'abdul qadir', 'mohammad ahmad'*

In India, most of the Muslim communities have first and family names and also a middle name. But sometimes they don't have middle name. Different from other cultures calling people by first or given name is not so common in Urdu language. Generally young people and teenagers calling each other and elders calling to children and youngsters with first name (FN). It is not considered respectful to call people by first name (FN). In very formal settings with observable status, a teacher or/and officer may call students or employees by full name. As a result even intimate friend are expected to add an honorific or a term of respect like *'bhai', 'bhaiyye'* (brother) or *'bhai sahab'* before or after the names as *'khalid bhai'* (Khalid brother) *'bhaiyye Taj'* (Brother Taj) *'janab tahir-ul-qadri'* (Mr. Tahir-ul-Qadri.) such expressions often result in more polite behavior that shows respect and formality in interlocutors' speech.

### **Title Terms**

Title is a word or name that describes a person's job. Title refers to given initials of individuals in order to show their social values, ranks, or gender in different circumstances. Here in my study the gender specific titles which muslim community interlocutors make use often in their conversations.

For male addressee –

**General Title (G.T.)-** *'hazrat'*

**GT + Last Name** – *'khan sahib'*

**Or a combination of all of these, e.g.,** *'janab nazim malik sahib'* and *'janab asif khan sahib'*.

**For female addressee** – Females are addressed in the same way but by different title terms.

---

**Language in India** [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com) ISSN 1930-2940 18:8 August 2018

Nazish Malik, Research Scholar

Use of Address Terms in Urdu as Spoken in Western Uttar Pradesh (Specially in Rampur and Adjoining Districts): A Sociolinguistic Study

**General Title (G.T.) – 'mohtarma'**

**G.T. and First Name (F.N.)** can be '*mohtarma nahid*'

**G.T. and Last Name (L.N.)** '*parveen sahiba*'

**Or a combination of all of these, e.g. 'mohtarma nahid parveen sahiba'**

### **Religious Address Terms**

Muslim interlocutors in Western Uttar Pradesh area generally use many address terms which has religious orientation. In religious address terms we have a sign of respect or to convey such tendency.

**General Title – 'hazrat shahid'**

**General Title (GT) and First Name (FN) – 'haji ilyas'**

In such cases when a person who has been done the special religious ceremony of haj, may be addressed by the terms '*haji*' for men and '*hajjin*' or '*hajjan*' for women. In the same way if a person has a religious degree of maulavi in Western Uttar Pradesh is called '*maulavi*' and for woman is '*mullani*' e.g. '*mullani Zahira*'. The use of these address terms is also gender bound.

### **Occupation-bound Terms**

Occupation bound terms are very common in Muslim communities of Western Uttar Pradesh address system. Interlocutors frequently use address terms which refers to particular career or occupation, status is probably as many as the occupations themselves.

**Only job Title (JT) e.g. 'daktar'**(doctor), '*injiniar*' (Engineer), '*manejar*'(manager).

**Combination of GT and JT e.g., for male 'daktar sahab'**

For female '*daktanni Sahiba*'

**A combination of Job Title (JT) and Last Name (LN) e.g. 'doctor Malik'**

**A combination of GT, JT and LN e.g. 'doctor Malik Sahab'**

**A combination of GT, JT, FN, and LN e.g. 'Janab doctor Zaheer Malik Sahab'**

### **Kinship or Family Relative Terms**

In India most of the Muslim families have same address terms to indicate the family relationships but in Western Uttar Pradesh there is an impact of Khadiboli on Urdu language interlocutors. You will see this impact of Khadiboli in my given examples i.e. given below-

**Address Terms for Father – 'abba', 'baba', 'babu', 'papa', 'abbi', 'abbu', 'achchey sahab', 'adda', 'abbajan', etc.**

**Address Terms for Mother – 'amma, 'ammi, 'apa', 'mammi', 'ammijan' etc.**

=====  
**Language in India [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com) ISSN 1930-2940 18:8 August 2018**

Nazish Malik, Research Scholar

Use of Address Terms in Urdu as Spoken in Western Uttar Pradesh (Specially in Rampur and Adjoining Districts): A Sociolinguistic Study

**Address Terms for Brother** – *'bhaijan', 'bhaiyya', 'bhai', 'veeran'* etc. and also by their FN and LN

**Address terms for sister** – *'baji, 'apa', 'bajiya', 'bahen', 'bhinno', 'appi', 'api', 'apiya'* etc. and also by their FN and LN.

**Address Terms for Mother's Sister** – *'khala', 'khalajan', 'khalaammi', 'khalabi'* etc. and also by their FN + *'khala'* e.g. *'raziya khala'*.

**Address Terms for Mother's Brother** – *'mamu', 'mamma', 'mamujaan', 'mama', 'mamu sahab', 'mamu jani'* etc. and by their FN + *'mamu'* e.g. *'saleem mamu', 'saleem mama'*.

**Address Terms for Father's Brother** – Here we have two categories if father's brother is younger than father interlocutors call him *'chacha', 'chachu', 'chachcha'* etc. But in second category if father's brother is elder than father interlocutors call him, *'bade papa', 'tau', 'taya', 'bade abba', 'taya abba'* etc.

**Address Terms for Father's Sister** – *'phuphi', 'phuphijan', 'bua', 'phuphu', 'phuphi sahib'*.

In day to day conversation when we interact with each other face to face we don't address like you the son of Mr. X or Y, Z or daughter of something but where honorificity is involved then we address cousin brothers and sisters like *'burhan bhai', 'shririn api', 'nazreen apa', 'apa jan'*, whereas we address or introduce about someone then we add extra kinship information like, son of X, daughter of X for example – *'mamu zad bhai'*

**Address Term for Grandfather** – *'dada', 'dadajan', 'dadu', 'daddu'* etc.

**Address Term for Grandmother** - *'dadi', 'daddo', 'dadijan', 'dadibi',* etc.

### **Honorifics or Terms of Formality**

The use of honorifics is a common trait of most oriental languages. In Urdu language we use when a speaker wishes to show respect to the addressee. In Urdu, as in other oriental languages like, Arabic, Persian, Turkish etc. there are numerous types of oppositional expressions which could be used in order to honor or dignify the addressed person. This honorific or honor names includes a collection of religious, cultural, ideological, occupational as well as pet names. In Urdu language honorifics may be used in several forms like before, after, with and without the name of the addressee for example –

*'Janab', 'Hazrat', 'Sarkar', 'maulana sahib', 'maulavi sahab', 'massab'* (Sir)

As we have mentioned in the above examples *'janab'* it is possible to be used for both the purposes with the FN.

The second example is *'massab'* which is being used in Urdu for specific purpose. We do not use it with the name or before name whenever we use it alone or after the first name. Example – *'massab'* (Sir), *'Rashid massab'* (Rashid Sir)

**Note:** In Indian culture we have a pattern of saying like '*imtiyaz massab*' where name of the concerned person precedes the honorific terms, i.e. '*massab*', '*master sahib*' whereas in British and American culture we have opposite use of combination.

### **Terms of Intimacy**

Urdu speakers of Western Uttar Pradesh region consider the household naming on the basis of a character or feature, like – e.g. '*Gudia*', '*dulari*' is a name which is common among the Muslim community on the basis of cuteness.

**Note:** In this, we have division on the basis of gender, like for boy – *dulara* and for girl '*dulari*'.

In pet names e.g. '*para*' for any male and '*pari*' for any female.

In Western Uttar Pradesh especially in Muslim culture the use of '*para*' (m) and '*pari*' (F) for the purpose of showing their love whenever our elders call us they use these address terms very frequently to show their intimacy.

### **Personal Pronoun**

In Western Uttar Pradesh interlocutors with the possibility to consider in addressing the other sides with pronoun as:

*'aap'*(You), *'tum'*(You), *'tu'*(You) (second person singular)

The use of above mentioned pronoun in Urdu language the use of '*aap*' as a pronoun is for elder person in honorific address terms for, male and female both. The use of (pronoun) '*tu*' and '*tum*' is used for general/informal conversation for both male and female. (Second person singular). In Western Uttar Pradesh Urdu language speakers, may choose for third person singular '*wo*' to address instead of he and she.

### **Descriptive Phrases**

One more category apart from above discussed category so far Urdu interlocutors use descriptive phrases as courtesy expressions to address others. That terms like '*Izzat maab*'(Honorable Sir), '*aali janab*'(Respected Sir), '*azizoaqarib*'(Friends and Relatives), '*khwatino hazrat*(Ladies and Gents)', etc.

These above honorific terminologies/address terms may have structure like –  
Adj + Adj, Adj + N, N + N etc.

### **Zero Address Terms**

When an Urdu speaker is in doubt as to how address people s/he may avoid the difficulty by not using any term. For example, '*salam*', '*shabbakhair*', '*Allah hafiz*', '*khushaamadid*'.

As a common strategy to start a polite conversation, addressers may use greetings to capture the attention of the recipient by saying '*salam*' (hello). Alternatively, addressors may use attention like '*Allah hafiz*' (good buy).

With respect to the above observations based on present study reflecting that cultural richness of Address terms used in Urdu on one hand and on the other hand it may also be said that Urdu

language has got a large number of address terms under each hierarchy which is presented in the above data.

### To Conclude

This study may be considered as the pioneer for the researcher working on Address term with special reference to Urdu language. This study also justifies the vast lingual potentiality of Urdu, whereas in this study some terminologies has been presented which is because 'Khadi Boli' effect like- 'paare viran' instead of 'Pyaare Bhai'. One more aspect of change in acceptance about some casually speaking words like- 'bhaiyye' has got acceptance for elders closely related to youngster's age.

Abundance in the use of honorific term like - aap, janab, mohtaram, etc. shows the curtsy towards elders to welcome them at most of the times.

Present study also reveals the fact that Urdu is very rich in kinship terms, individual terms and other than non-relative or social relations.

Abbreviations used in the data above:

**G.T.**- General Term

**F.N.**- First Name

**L.N.**- Last Name

**J.T.**- Job Title

---

### References

Afful, J. B. A. (2006a). Address terms among university students in Ghana: A case study. *Journal of Language and Intercultural Communication*, 6(1), 76-91.

Afful, J. B. A. (2006b). Non-kinship address terms in Akan: A sociolinguistic study of language use in Ghana. *Journal Of Multilingual And Multicultural Development*, 27(4), 275-289.

Beg, M. K. A. (1988). *Urdu Grammar: History and Structure* (Vol. 18). New Delhi: Bahri Publications.

Braun, F. (1988). *Terms Of Address: Problems Of Patterns And Usage In Various Languages And Cultures* (Vol. 50). Mouton de Gruyter.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1989). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R., & Gilman, A. (1960). *Pronouns of Power and Solidarity* In TA Sebeok (Ed.), *Style In Language* (pp. 253-276).

Brown, R., & Ford, M. (1961). *Address In American English*. *Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 62(2), 375-385.

Brown, R., & Ford, M. (1964). Address in american english. In DH Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society*. New York: (pp. 234-244).

---

**Language in India** [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com) ISSN 1930-2940 18:8 August 2018

Nazish Malik, Research Scholar

Use of Address Terms in Urdu as Spoken in Western Uttar Pradesh (Specially in Rampur and Adjoining Districts): A Sociolinguistic Study



- Evans, P., & Edward E. (1964). *Nuer Modes Of Address*. In DH Hymes (Ed.), *Language in culture and society*. New York: (pp. 221-227).
- Fang, H., & Heng, J. H. (1983). *Social Changes And Changing Address Norms In China*. *Language in Society*, 12(4), 495-507.
- Fasold, R. (1990). *Sociolinguistics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Fitch, K. L. (1991). *The Interplay Of Linguistic Universals And Cultural Knowledge In Personal Address: Colombian Madre Terms*. *Communications Monographs*, 58(3), 254-272.
- Holmes, J. (1992). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London.
- Hudson, R. A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. New York.
- Hymes, D. H. (1967). *Models Of The Interaction Of Language And Social Setting*. *Journal of social issues*, 23(2), 8-28.
- Keshavarz, M. H. (1988). *Forms Of Address In Post-Revolutionary Iranian Persian: A Sociolinguistic Analysis*. *Language in society*, 17(4), 565-575.
- Keshavarz, M. H. (2001). *The Role Of Social Context, Intimacy, And Distance In The Choice Of Forms Of Address*. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 5-18.
- Koul, O. N. (1995). *Personal Names In Kashmiri*. In ON Koul (Ed.), *Sociolinguistics: South Asian perspectives*. New Delhi: Creative Books.
- Leech, G. (1999). *The Distribution And Function Of Vocatives In American And British English Conversation*. In Hasselgard, H. & Oksefjell, S. (Eds.). *Out of Corpora: Studies in Honour of Stig Johansson*, 26, 107. Amsterdam: 107-118.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Manjulakshi, L. (2004). *Modes Of Address In Kannada: A Sociolinguistic Study Of Language Use In Mysore District*. *Language in India*, 4.
- Mehrotra, R. R. (1981). *Non-Kin Forms Of Address In Hindi*. *International journal of the sociology of language*, 1981(32), 121-138.
- Moles, J. A. (1974). *Decisions And Variability: The Usage Of Address Terms, Pronouns, And Languages By Quechua-Spanish Bilinguals In Peru*. *Anthropological linguistics*, 442-463.
- Oyetade, S. O. (1995). *A Sociolinguistic Analysis Of Address Forms In Yoruba*. *Language in society*, 24(4), 515-535.
- Pride, J. B. (1971). *Formal and Informal Language: An Inaugural Address Delivered on 18th March 1971*. Victoria University of Wellington.

Sequeira, D. L. (1993). *Personal Address As Negotiated Meaning In An American Church Community*. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(3), 259-285.

Wardhaugh, R. (2006). *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 5th ed. Oxford.

Zhang, H. (2002). *Bilingual Creativity In Chinese English: Ha Jin's In The Pond*. *World Englishes*, 21(2), 305-315.

---

Nazish Malik  
Research Scholar  
Department of Linguistics  
Aligarh Muslim University  
Aligarh 202002  
Uttar Pradesh  
India  
[nazish8c@gmail.com](mailto:nazish8c@gmail.com)

---

**Language in India** [www.languageinindia.com](http://www.languageinindia.com) ISSN 1930-2940 18:8 August 2018

Nazish Malik, Research Scholar

Use of Address Terms in Urdu as Spoken in Western Uttar Pradesh (Specially in Rampur and Adjoining Districts): A Sociolinguistic Study