SPATIAL, TEMPORAL AND STRUCUTURAL USAGES OF URDU *KO*

Tafseer Ahmed
University of Konstanz

Abstract

Urdu is a New Indo-Aryan language which uses case markers to express differing semantic functions. The case marker *ko* marks accusative and dative. It is also used to express a few other spatial and temporal functions. We have studied a variety of semantic usages of *ko* and propose an unifying explantion of all the diverse usages. We assume that it originated as a spatial postposition from a Sanskrit locative. The non-spatial usages of *ko* can be explained in terms of extended meaning of its spatial origin, i.e. *ko* marks a location in a semantic field that is a spatial field by default, but can be thought as temporal or event field in a metaphorical or abstract way.

1. Introduction

Urdu-Hindi is a common term used to describe two closely related Indo Aryan languages i.e. persianzed Urdu and sanskritized Hindi spoken in Pakistan, India and many other countries. [1,2,3] We discuss different semantic usages of the case marker *ko*. We provide a history of case marking in Indo Aryan languages and try to propose a unifying explanation of all the semantic functions of Urdu-Hindi *ko*.

2. History of Case in Indo-Aryan

Old Indo-Aryan languages used morphological inflections to express case. For example, Sanskrit had eight cases whose names, in Latin grammatical terms, are: Nominative, Accusative, Dative, Ablative, Instrumental, Genitive, Locative and Vocative. These are expressed by inflections. In Middle Indo-Aryan (600 BC-1000 AD) almost all case inflections were lost.

New Indo-Aryan languages (1000 AD-present) devised a new method to mark cases. These languages mostly use clitics as case markers. The following table gives examples of different declinations of Sanskrit (an Old Indo-Aryan language) *deva*, meaning *god* (Blake 2001) and case markers of its Urdu-Hindi(a New Indo-Aryan language) equivalent *devtaa.*

Case	Sanskrit (OIA)	Urdu (NIA)
Nominative	devas	devtaa
Ergative	-	devtaa ne
Accusative	devam	devtaa ko
Dative	devaaya	devtaa ko
Instrumental	devena	devtaa se
Ablative	devaat	devtaa se
Locative	devasya	devtaa meN/par/tak
Genitive	Deve	devtaa kaa/kii/ke

It is an intersting exercise to try to establish the origin of the New Indo-Aryan case markers, especially *ko*. The present day clitics originated from Old Indo-Aryan nouns and verbs, and

---

[3] Glosses used in this paper are: Acc=Accusative, Caus=Causative, Dat=Dative, Erg=Ergative, F=Feminine, Gen=Genitive, Inf=Infinitive, Inst=Instrument, Loc=Locative, M=Masculine, Obl=Oblique, Perc=Percative, Perf=Perfective, Pl=Plural, Pres=Present, Sg=Singular. For Urdu transcription, 'a', 'i' and 'u' are used for short vowels and 'aa', 'ii' and 'uu' are used for the long ones. 'ai' is used for open mid front unrounded vowel and 'ui' are for open mid back rounded vowel. Capital letters are used for retroflex consonants except capital 'S' which is used for voiceless palatal fricative. Capital 'N' used after a vowel shows nasalization. Small 'c' is used for voiceless alveolar affricate.

became postpositions and clitics during the passage of time.

According to Beames (1872), Urdu-Hindi *ko* originated from the Sanskrit noun *kaaksha* meaning 'armpit, side'. The locative of *kaaksha* is *kaakshe* which means 'in the armpit', 'at the side'. In Old Hindi, *kaaksha* became *kaakha*. Its accusative was *kaakham*. After a series of changes, it became *ko*. Beames lists early uses of *ko* to mark the recipient goal of ditransitive verbs like *give* and as an object marker of verbs like *seek*.

There seems to be a corelation between accusative/dative case marker and old Sanskrit locatives in Indo-Aryan languages. Sanskrit locative *kaakshe/kaakham* is supposed to be the origin of accusative/dative case markers of at least four other Indo-Aryan languages i.e. Sindhi (*khe*), Siraiki (*koN*), Bengali (*ke*) and Oriya (*ku*). Butt (2005) has pointed out that at least five other Indo-Aryan languages use words starting with l/n as accusative/dative case markers. i.e. Punjabi (*nuN*), Marathi (*laa*), Gujrati (*ne/neN*), Assamese (*ko/no*) and Napali (*laai*) These are supposed to be derived from Sanskrit locatives *laage* meaning 'stick' (Beames 1872). Butt (2005) working with Aditi Lahiri has also suggested that ergative *ne* can be related to *janniye* meaning 'for the sake of, because of'.

Few of the case markers of other (than accusative and dative) cases also have origin in locatives. For example, Urdu-Hindi and Punjabi ergative *ne* is possibly derived from the locative discussed above. The sindhi ablative *khaaN* is an oblique form of accusative/dative *khe,* derived from the Sanskrit locative *kaakshe* discussed above. The punjabi ablative is *koloN,* which can be assumed to be derived form of Punjabi word *kol,* meaning 'near'.

3. Usages of *ko*

Urdu-Hindi *ko* is widely discussed in the literature. Most of the authors have discussed accusative and dative usages of *ko*. The major issues discussed are the alternation of accusative and nominative case with objects and dative subjects. However, beyond these usages, *ko* has quite a few other functions in Urdu-Hindi. The following examples illustrate the distribution of *ko* as far as we have been able to determine.

(1) anjum=ne   saddaf=ko   dekhaa   (Accusative Object)
    Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Acc see.Perf.M.Sg
    'Anjum saw Saddaf.'

(2) anjum=ne   saddaf=ko   haNsvaayaa   (Accusative Causee)
    Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Acc laugh.Caus.Perf.M.Sg
    'Anjum caused Saddaf to laugh.'

(3) anjum=ne   saddaf=ko   ciTTʰii   dii   (Dative Object)
    anjum.F.Sg=Erg   saddaf.F.Sg=Dat letter.F.Sg   give.Perf.F.Sg
    'Anjum gave the letter to Saddaf.'

(4) omair=ko   iinaam   milaa   (Dative Subject)
    Omair.M.Sg=Dat   prize.M.Sg   touch.Perf.M.Sg
    'Omair got the prize.'

(5) jin=ko   caSm-e-biina   hai   (Dative Subject)
    who=Dat   visionary-eye.M.Sg   be.Pres.Sg
    'who have vision'

(6) nadya=ko   zu   jaanaa   paRaa   (Dative Subject)
    Nadya.F.Sg=Dat   zoo   go.Inf   fall-on.Pres.Sg
    'Nadya have to go to the zoo.'

(7) omair   sair=ko   gayaa   (Adverb)
Omair.M.Sg   walk.M.Sg=to   go.Perf.M.Sg
'Omair went for a walk.'

(8) nadya   caae   banaane=ko   hai   (*ko* marked clause)
Nadya.F.Sg   tea.F.Sg   be.inf.obl=at   be.pres.Sg
'Nadya is about to make tea.' (Lit:'Nadya is at tea making')

(9) saamaan   g^{h}ar=ko   pohoanch   gayaa   (Spatial Adverb)
Luggage.M.Sg home.M.Sg=at   reach   go.Perf.M.Sg
'The luggage reached home.'

(10) chor   raat=ko   aayaa   (Temporal Adverb)
thief.M.Sg   night.F.Sg=at   come.Perf.M.Sg
'The thief came at night.'

4. Analysis of Usages of *ko*

In the previous section, we have seen differing usages of *ko*. These usages, at first glance, seem semantically unrelated, but we can try to find a unified explanation of all these usages. Most of them can be explained by assuming that the primary usage of *ko* is locative. The seemingly different usages are due to different semantic fields, e.g. temporal and eventual, in addition to the spatial field. The primary locative semantic thesis is supported by the fact that *ko* originated from a Sanskrit locative meaning 'in the armpit' or 'at the side'.

The following discussion on the different semantic usages of *ko* provides arguments to support the proposal.

4.1. Basic Spatial Usage

As shown in (11)-(13), *ko* is used to mark locative adjuncts to give semantics of 'towards the point' and 'at the point'.

(11) saamaan   ghar=ko   pohoanch   gayaa
Luggage.M.Sg   home.M.Sg=at   reach   go.Perf.M.Sg
'The luggage reached (at) home.'

(12) nadya   laahaur=ko   gayii
Nadya.F.Sg lahore.M.Sg=at   go.Perf.F.Sg
'Nadya went to lahore.'

(13) kamraa   andar=ko   hai.
room.M.Sg   inside.M.Sg=at   be.Pres.M.Sg
'The room is (towards) inside.'

ko in this usage has the sense of endpoint. All the other usages of *ko* can be explained as extended usages of the spatial meaning.

4.2. Extension to Other Domains

Many of the case markers came from spatial nouns and verbs. These case markers have a core locative meaning that is extended to a different semantic domain. Before discussing *ko*, we take the example of possession and part-whole relationship that is expressed by a spatial preposition. Being present at some location is considered as possession. In English, possession can be expressed by the locative preposition "in" and the verb "be":

(14)   There are two windows in the room.   (English)

Similarly in Urdu-Hindi, possession can be expressed with locative postposition *paas* meaning 'near'. This is shown in (15).

(15) sadiq=ke   paas aik   kitaab   hai.
     Sadiq.M.Sg=Gen   near one   book.F.Sg   be.Pres.Sg
     'Sadiq have a book' (Lit:'Near Sadiq, is a books.')

Urdu also has a locative usage of this postposition *paas* that gives its literal meaning *near*.

(16) daryaa=ke   paas aik   iimaarat   hai.
     river.M.Sg=Gen   near one   building.F.Sg   be.Pres.Sg
     'There is a building near the river.'

Similarly, *ko* has many extended usages apart from the core locative one. Mohanan (1994) suggested that accusative, dative and locative *ko* has the same semantic configuration but different semantic fields. Croft (1991) surveyed case markers of 40 languages and observed that in many languages, ablative forms are used for antecedent oblique functions (causer, instrument etc.) and allative forms are used for subsequent oblique functions (recipient, beneficiary etc.). Differing semantic usages of Urdu *ko* is an example of locative goal used for subsequent functions.

In the next sections, we will explain the (extended) usage of *ko* to mark endpoint in temporal, mental and eventual domains.

4.3. Extension to Temporal Domain

ko is used to mark a point of time e.g. day of the week, or part of the day. This usage is shown in (17) and (18).

(17) cor   mangal=ko   aayaa.
     thief.M.Sg   Tuesday.M.Sg=at   come.Perf.M.Sg
     'The Thief came on tueday.'

(18) cor   raat=ko   aayaa
     thief.M.Sg   night.F.Sg=at   come.Perf.M.Sg
     'The thief came at night.'

In this usage, the semantic feature of *ko* is a point in temporal semantic field (in place of an endpoint in spatial field). The part of the day usage can alter with locative postposition *meN* meaning 'in'. Compare the following sentence with (18).

(19) chor   rat=meN   aayaa
     thief.M.Sg   night.F.Sg=Loc-in come.Perf.M.Sg
     'The thief came during/at night.'

4.4. Extension to Causal Domain

When *ko* marks an argument of argument structure, the endpoint semantics is extended to the causal domain. *ko* marks the arguments that receives something either physical or abstract.

4.4.1. Dative Subject

The core endpoint semantics of *ko* is extended to the recipient when it marks a participant of argument structure. In (20) and (21), *ko* marks the indirect objects of ditransitive verbs.

(20) anjum=ne   saddaf=ko   ciTT^hi   dii
     Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Dat   letter.F.Sg   give.Perf.F.Sg
     'Anjum gave the letter to Saddaf.'

(21) anjum=ne   saddaf=ko   ciTT^{h}i   likhii
      Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Dat letter.F.Sg   write.Perf.F.Sg
      'Anjum wrote a letter to Saddaf.'

In (20), the *letter* reaches the indirect object *Saddaf* marked with *ko*. In (21), she is the intended goal of the object *letter*.

In these examples, *ko* is marking a recipient. According to Grimm (p.c.), who has decomposed thematic roles into basic semantic properties (Grimm 2005), *ko* has the semantic features of a Canonical Recipient. Recipients are *sentient*. They undergo a *qualitative change* relative to the state of affairs before the onset of the event (i.e., come into possession of somebody) and they are the *endpoint* of the transfer event, i.e., a direct action. *Volitionality* (whether a recipient desires the event to occur or not) is left underspecified for Urdu-Hindi *ko*. We can say that the recipient is a location which is the goal or destination of the object.

Indirect Objects are not the only example of dative recipients. Dative Subjects involve receiving of both physical and abstract objects. In (22) and (23), Dative Subject is receiving physical and event nominal objects.

(22) omair=ko   inaam   milaa.
      Omair.M.Sg=Dat   prize.M.Sg touch.Perf.M.Sg
      'Omair got the prize.'

(23) omair=ko   thapaR/ghuuNsaa paRaa.
      Omair.M.Sg.dat   slap/punch.M.Sg   fall-on.Perf.M.Sg
      'Omair received a slap/punch.' (Lit: To Omair, salp/punch fell on.')

Urdu-Hindi usually has a nominative case or ergative case marker on the subject. In (24), verb *milnaa* meaning 'touch' or 'meet' is used with non-sentient nominative subject and non-sentient dative object.

(24) daryaa   samandar=ko   milaa.
      river.M.Sg   sea.M.Sg=Dat   touch.Perf.M.Sg
      'The river met/touched the sea.'

This traditional or canonical configuration changes, if the recipient is sentient. Sentences (13), (22) and (23) having the same verb *milnaa* show a reanalysis of the construction in which the sentient recipient becomes subject. The processing pressure in the human mind favors the subjecthood of the sentient i.e. human argument (Butt, Grimm and Ahmed 2006).

Dative Subject constructions have few other semantic usages. We will explain these usages as the (sentient) recipient receiving abstract pysch experiences in the next section (4.5).

4.4.2. Affected Agents (of Causatives)

The recipient semantics of *ko* can also be seen in Urdu-Hindi causatives. Saksena (1982) in her work on causatives introduced the concept of *affected agents*. Affected agents are subjects of intransitive and ingestive transitive verbs. Verb *parhnaa* meaning 'read/learn' can have affetced agent as shown in (25).

(25) saddaf=ne   sabaq   paR^{h}a
      Saddaf.F.Sg=Erg   lesson.M.Sg learn.Perf.M.Sg
      'Saddaf learnt the lesson'.

These subjects are affected by the action. We can also say that these are the recipient of the action. The affected-agent is marked with *ko* in (26) which is the causative of the above sentence. The syntax is similar to the indirect object of a ditransitive verb. i.e. *ko* is signaling the receiving

of the lesson.

(26) anjum=ne   ustaad=se   saddaf=ko   sabaq   paR^hvaayaa
      Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   teacher.M.Sg=Inst   Saddaf.F.Sg=Dat   lesson.M.Sg teach.caus.Perf.M.Sg
      'Anjum caused the teacher to teach the lesson to Saddaf.'

Other verbs having an unaffected agent do not allow *ko* with the causee, as that argument is not a recipient of the action. *paR^hnaa* and few other verbs allow both affected and un-affected agents. The subject in (27) is an unaffected agent.

(27) saddaf=ne   xabreN   paR^hiiN
      Saddaf.F.Sg=Erg   news.F.Pl   read.Perf.F.Pl
      'Saddaf read the news.'

(28) anjum=ne   saddaf=se/ko*   (tv=par)   xabreN   paR^hvaaiiN
      Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Inst/Dat*   tv=Loc-on   news.F.Sg   read.caus.Perf.F
      'Anjum caused Saddaf to read the news (on TV).'

In (28) which is the causative counterpart of (27), a causee with *ko* is not possible, because news reading is not an event of receiving. In its place, instrumental case marker *se* representing the source is used. The usage of *ko* for affected i.e. receiving agent in causatives is another example of goal and endpoint semantics of *ko*.

4.5. Extension to Mental Domain

In 4.4.1, we have seen the usage of *ko* to mark dative recipient that (usually) receives a physical object. This dative usage of *ko* is extended to the mental domain where the sentient agent receives an experience. Semantic properties like experience, (mental) state and involition are attached to these constructions. These extended usages can be explained as a metaphorical extension of the recipient semantics discussed above.

4.5.1. Experience

Dative Subject constructions are used with psych verbs and to express experience. The following examples are similar to (22) and (23), but here the received object is an experience.

(29) omair=ko   xabar   milii
      Omair.M.Sg=Dat   news.F.Sg   touch.Perf.F.Sg
      'Omair got the news.'

(30) omair=ko   bhuuk   lagii
      Omair.M.Sg=Dat   hunger.F.Sg stick.Perf.F.Sg
      'Omair felt hungry.' (Lit: ' To Omair, Hunger came.')

Among these, Landau (2005) proposes that experiencers are (mental) locations and that an experiencer of a pysch-predicates is a locative of some sort. The reception semantics can be extended to give the notion of experience with human mind as goal, i.e. the human (mind) is the location of the experience.

The dative subject used with verb *hona* 'be' expresses experience (mental) states.

(31) sadiq=ko   xushi   hai
      Sadiq.M.Sg=Dat   happiness.M.Sg   be.Pres.Sg
      'Sadiq is happy.' (Lit: ' To Sadiq, is happiness.')

(32) sadiq=ko   buxaar   hai
      Sadiq.M.Sg=Dat   fever.M.Sg   be.Pres.Sg
      'Sadiq has fever.' (Lit: 'To Sadiq, is the fever.')

One can claim that in the above examples, the subject *Sadiq* is merely the location of the happiness or fever and it does not seem to resemble a recipient or goal. We cannot make a strong point in favor of recipient from examples of Urdu. But we can find help from another Indo-Aryan language Marathi. In Marathi, the dative case marker of subjects alternates with locative markers to give the meaning of non-integral and integral part respectively (Pandharipande 1990).

(33) tyala   himmat   ahe   (Marathi)
      3P.M.Sg.Dat   courage.Sg   be.Pres
      'He has courage.' (Courage is non-integral-part/temporary-quality of him.)

(34) tyacyat   himmat   ahe   (Marathi)
      3P.M.Sg.Loc   courage.Sg   be.Pres
      'He has courage.' (Courage is integral-part/permanent-quality of him.)

Pandharipande suggested that the Marathi Dative NP construction is spatial. In it, the dative marks a recipient that does not have the property for eternity, but received it at some point of time.

We can assume that Urdu counter-part of this dative construction has similar i.e. recipient or non-integeral part semantics. Even, if we disagree with this argument, then the Dative Subject with *hona* meaning 'be' verb still can be related with "point" feature i.e. the dative subject is a metaphorical point where the experience is located.

4.5.2. Volition

We have discussed in 4.4.1 that dative *ko* of Urdu is underspecified for the volitionality of the recipient. But, we find constructions with recipient *ko* and non-finite verb that exposes involition of the subject. Butt and King (1991) discussed an alternation of ergative and dative case markers in Lahori Urdu as.

(35) nadya=ne   zu   jaanaa   hai.
      Nadya.F.Sg=Erg   zoo.M.Sg   go.Inf.M.Sg   be.Pres.3.Sg
      'Nadya wants to go to the zoo.'

(36) nadya=ko   zu   jaanaa   hai.
      Nadya.F.Sg=Dat   zoo.M.Sg   go.Inf.M.Sg   be.Pres.3.Sg
      'Nadya has to go to the zoo.'

For two of the above sentences, only (36) is supposed to be grammatically correct, traditionally. But in modern Urdu-Hindi, ergative case marker is alternating or replacing the traditional use of dative case marker in this construction.[4]

Butt and King (1991) and Mohanan (1994) have argued that the ergative is associated with volitionality or the feature [+conscious choice]. Butt (2005) argued that one can receive both pleasant or unpleasant objects/events. This can be seen in (37) in which getting cold is unpleasent an involitionary event.

---

[4] Bashir(1999) studied Urdu TV dramas and found following examples of ergative marker with non-finite verb.

meN=ne   Dinar=pe   jaanaa   t^{h}aa.
1P.Sg=erg   dinner.M.Sg=loc-on   go.inf.M.Sg   be.past.3.M.Sg
'I was supposed to go to the dinner'   (PTV drama *Tanhayian*)

aap=ne   ....   koii   aisii   baat   nahiin   puucnii.
2P.Sg=erg   any   such   matter.F.Sg   not   ask.Perf.F.Sg
'You won't ask (me) anything like this'   (PTV drama *Aanch*)

(37) Nadya got a cold/prize.   (English)

Similarly in (36), one can not know whether *Nadya* likes to receive the zoo going event or not. It is underspecified for volition.

As Urdu-Hindi case marker *ne* has agentive reading, it is used to introduce volition or conscious choice, as in (35). As *ko* construction is alternating with it, it seems to contrast with *ne* to express involition and [-concious choice] as in (36) in contrast to (35).

Constructions having verb *paRnaa* with nonfinite verb also gives the meaning of involition. It is shown in (38).

(38) omair=ko   zu   jaanaa   paRaa
     Omair.M.Sg=Dat   zoo   go.Inf   fall-on.Perf.M.Sg
     'Omair had to go to the zoo.' (Lit: 'To go to the zoo, fell on to Omair.')

This construction seems to be metaphorical extension of (23). Dative *ko* is underspecified for volition in this construction. The semantics of the verb provides the involition, as an event is "falling" on the subject. The sudden reception of the event cannot be avoided and subject receives it involitionally. Hence, the construction is interpreted as being internally involitional.

4.6. Extension to Event arguments

4.6.1. *Purpose*

ko is used with clausal adjuncts to express purpose/reason of the action. It can be seen in (39).

(39) log   sair/faryaad/ayaadat=ko   gaae
     People.M.Pl   walk/complaint/visiting-sick-person=at   go.Perf.M.Pl
     'People went for a walk/complaint/visiting-sick-person.'

In the same construction, *ko* can also be used with an infinitival verb phrase.

(40) log   Tehelne=ko   gaae
     People.M.Pl walk.Inf=at   go.Perf.M.Sg
     'People went for a walk.'

This usage is similar to the real spatial usage discussed above. The spatial domain provides a metaphor in which subject is not traveling towards a location but towards an event. This metaphorical location (event) is marked with *ko*. The semantic feature of this usage is the same as above i.e. the (metaphorical) location is an endpoint of the event.

4.6.2. *Immediate Future*

An interesting usage of *ko* is to express immediate future. In this construction, *ko* expresses the beginning of work in immediate future. This is shown in (41).

(41) nadya   caae   banaane=ko   hai
     Nadya.F.Sg   tea.F.Sg   make.Inf.Obl=at   be.pres
     'Nadya will make tea(in immediate future)'(Lit:'Nadya is at the act of tea making')

This usage has the semantic feature of endpoint. Metaphorically, the subject is very near to the event marked with *ko*. Here, *ko* has the semantics of very near or almost there. Hence, *ko* provides a reading of immediate future to this sentence.

4.7. Unexplained Usages

We have described a unified locative explanation of different usage of Urdu-Hindi *ko* above. There are two semantic usages that are not completely explained under the properties taken here.

4.7.1. Modal Cahiiye

We have discussed dative recipient and its extended usages in 5.1 and 5.2. Another example of extended dative usage is a construction that shows need or obligation.

(42) nadya=ko   ye   kitaab   cahiiye.
       Nadya.F.Sg=Dat   this   book.F.Sg   want.perc
       'Nadya need this book.'

(43) baccoN=ko   baRoN=ka   adab   karnaa   cahiiye.
       Child.Pl=Dat   Elder.Pl.Gen respect.M.Sg do.inf   want.perc
       'Children should respect the elders.'

Cahiiye is the percative form of verb *cahna* meaning 'want'. Percative forms are usually used in imperative sentences with nomimative subject (Platts 1909). But in (42) and (43), *cahiiye* is used as a modal. In these sentences, the combination of *ko* and *cahiiye* gives sense of need or obligation. As *ko* is underspecified for volition and Urdu-Hindi modals usually have different meanings than their main verb counterparts, we can assume that modal *cahiiye* is giving the feature of need or obligation in this construction.

4.7.2. Accusative ko

An important usage of *ko* is that it acts as an accusative case marker. Accusative *ko* is connected with a sensitivity to animacy and definite/specific interpretations. It can be seen in (44) and (45).

(44) anjum=ne   saddaf=ko   dekhaa
       Anjum.F.Sg=Erg Saddaf.F.Sg=Acc see.Perf.M.Sg
       'Anjum saw Saddaf.'

(45) anjum=ne   kashtii   dekhii
       Anjum.F.Sg=Erg boat.F.Sg   see.Perf.F.Sg
       'Anjum saw a/the boat.'

In (44), the object *kashtii* meaning *boat* is neither animate nor specific, hence it is in nominative case. Allen (1951), McGregor (1972), Masica (1991), Butt (1993), Mohanan (1994) and Singh (1994) among others have discussed this issue in detail.

It is not immediately apparent that this use of ko could be connected to a spatial use. However, Mohanan (1994) has argued that the accusative is used for logical objects towards which an action or event is directed. That is, it can again be seen to mark the endpoint or goal of an action.

Boundedness is another way of analysing the accusative *ko*. The nominative object gets incoporated with the verb. It, like mass nouns, does not bound the event. While accussative *ko* marked objects bound the event or the object is end point of the event. So the specific objects put a bound on the event.

5. Case Markers/Postpositions alternating with *ko*

We have discussed locative semantics of Urdu-Hindi *ko*. We have also seen the examples in which *ko* alternates with locative case markers and postpositions. We have also seen the alternation of ergative *ne* with dative *ko* for volition and conscious choice. Two other case markers either replace or alternate with Urdu-Hindi *ko*.

5.1. Instrumental

A few verbs like *milnaa* and *kehnaa* have noun phrases marked by the instrumental/ablative case marker *se*. But in old texts, we can find examples having *ko* marking for these noun phrases. For example, the following sentence is taken from an old text (Online Urdu Dictionary, Beta version).

(46) buR^haa   baap   **beTi=ko**   milnaa   caahtaa   hai
     Old.M.Sg   father.M.Sg daughter.F.Sg=Dat   meet.Inf   want   be.Pres.Sg
     'Old father wants to meet the daughter.'

In current usage, this sentence is as in (50):

(47) buR^haa   baap   **beTi=se**   milnaa   caahtaa   hai
     Old.M.Sg   father.M.Sg daughter.F.Sg=Inst   meet.Inf   want   be.Pres.Sg
     'Old father wants to meet the daughter.'

The reason for the change of case marker is the change in semantics of the verb. *Milna* literally means 'touch' as in (24). The sentence having *ko* (46) gives the sense of a visit, when the father moves and visited the daughter. The other sentence having *se* gives sense of an interactive meeting in which both arguments are particiapating. Another example of this replacement/alternation is:

(48) ali=ne   **beToN=ko**   kahaa
     Ali.M.Sg=Erg   son.M.Pl=Dat   say.Perf.M.Sg
     'Ali said to the sons.'

(49) ali=ne   **beToN=se**   kahaa
     Ali.M.Sg=Erg   son.M.Pl=Inst   say.Perf.M.Sg
     'Ali said to the sons.'

Sentence (48) is taken from examples of old Urdu texts in Beg (1998), while (49) is more widely used today.

5.2. ke-liye(Purpose)

The postposition *(ke) liye* can be used in place of *ko*. It is shown in (50) and (51).

(50) anjum   sair=ko   gaaii
     Anjum.F.Sg walk.F.Sg=at   go.Perf.F.Sg
     'Anjum went for a walk.'

(51) anjum   sair=ke   liye   gaaii
     Anjum.F.Sg walk.F.Sg=gen   for   go.Perf.F.Sg
     'Anjum went for a walk.'

Both of the above two sentences are semantically equivalent that can be used interchangeably. Similarly, all three of the following sentences means 'Anjum asked Saddaf to come'.

(52) anjum=ne   saddaf=se   aane=ko   kahaa
     Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Inst come.Inf.Obl=at   say.Perf.M.Sg

(53) anjum=ne   saddaf=se   aane=ke   liye   kahaa
     Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Inst come.Inf.Obl=gen for   say.Perf.M.Sg

(54) anjum=ne   saddaf=se   aane=ka   kahaa
     Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Inst come.Inf.Obl=Gen say.Perf.M.Sg

But *(ke) liye* and *ko* are not replaceable in all usages. For example, the following sentence with a beneficiary marked with *(ke) liye* can not have *ko* in its place.

(55) anjum=ne   saddaf=ke   liye   gaaRi   xariidii
     Anjum.F.Sg=Erg   Saddaf.F.Sg=Gen for   car.F.Sg   buy.Perf.F.Sg
     'Anjum bought a car for Saddaf.'

What is the reason of overlapping semantic usages of these two case markers in (50)-(51) and (52)-(54)? Dative markers usually mark both goals and beneficiaries. *ko* marks the goal and

(optionally) some of the beneficiary usages. *(ke) liye* is the marker that marks all the beneficiary usages. Does *(ke) liye* replaced beneficiary usages of dative *ko*? This remains subject to further investigation.

6. Summary/Conclusion

We have analyzed different semantic usages of Urdu-Hindi *ko* that includes accusative object, dative subject and purpose of an event etc. These seemingly diverse usages can be connected to a core locative meaning. The locative usage has expanded towards other usages by involving different semantic fields. Through analysis of the differing semantic usages, we found the following three main usages of *ko*:

- Point in space as in temporal usage.
- Non-sentient endpoint in space as in spatial, purpose and immediate future usages.
- Sentient recipient as in dative and its extended usages.

It can be speculated that *ko* has entered in the language as a marker of endpoint or goal and after some time, it started marking other usages too. Further analysis of diachronic data remains to be conducted to confirm or reject this hypothesis.

7. References

Allen, W.S. 1951. A Study in the Analysis of Hindi Sentence-Structure. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*.

Bashir, Elena. 1999. The Urdu and Hindi Ergative Postposition *ne*: Its changing role in the Grammar. In *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*, ed. Rajendra Singh. New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Beames, John. 1872–79. *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*. Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. Republished 1966.

Beg, Mirza Khalil A. 1988. *Urdu Grammar: History and Structure*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.

Blake, Barry. 2001. *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Second Edition.

Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 1991. Semantic Case in Urdu. *In Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Lisa Dobrin, Lynn Nichols, and Rosa M. Rodriguez, 31–45.

Butt, Miriam. 1993. Object Specificity and Agreement in Hindi/Urdu. In *Papers from the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicgo Linguistic Society*, 80–103.

Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 2005. The Status of Case. In *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, ed. Veneeta Dayal and Anoop Mahajan. Berlin: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Butt, Miraim. 2005. The Dative-Ergative Connection, In Patricia Cabredo-Hofherr (ed.) *Proceedings of the Colloque Syntax-Semantique Paris (CSSP) 2005*.

Butt, Miriam , Scott Grimm and Tafseer Ahmed. 2006. Dative Subjects. Presntation at *NWO/DFG Workshop on Optimal Sentence Processing*, Nijmegen. http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/tafseer/usages%20of%20ko.pdf

Croft, William. 1991. *Syntactic Categories and Grammatical Relations: The Cognitive Organization of Information*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Grimm, Scott. 2005. *The Lattice of Case and Agency*. MSc Thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Landau, Idan. 2005. *The Locative Syntax of Experiencers*. Ms.http://www.bgu.ac.il/~idanl/files/psych.July05.pdf

McGregor, R.S. 1972. *Outline of Hindi Grammar: With Exercises*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mohanan, Tara. 1994. *Argument Structure in Hindi*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Pandharipande, R. 1990. Experiencer (Dative) NPs in Marathi, In M. K. Verma and K. P. Mohanan, eds., *Experiencer Subjects in South Asian Languages*, CSLI, Stanford, CA, 161–180.

Platts, John T. 1909. *A Grammar of the Hindustani or Urdu Language*, Crosby Lockwood and Son, London. republished 2002. Sang-meel Publications, Lahore.

Singh, Mona. 1994. *Perfectivity, Definiteness and Specifity: A Classification of Verbal Predicates in Hindi*. Doctoral dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Saksena, Anuradaha. 1982. *Topics in the Analysis of Causatives with an Account of Hindi Paradigms*, University of California Press.