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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 explanation 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.¹²³ 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Sanskrit (OIA)</th>
<th>Urdu (NIA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>devas</td>
<td>devtaa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>devtaa ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>devam</td>
<td>devtaa ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>devaaya</td>
<td>devtaa ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>devena</td>
<td>devtaa se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>devaat</td>
<td>devtaa se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>devasya</td>
<td>devtaa meNpar/tak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Deve</td>
<td>devtaa kaa/kii/ke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is an interesting 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

---

¹ This research is supported by the DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) via the SFB 471, Project A24.
² The author is thankful to Miriam Butt and Scott Grimm for their help in the analysis of data and pointing out the mistakes.
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 correlation 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), Gujarati (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
   Anjum.F.Sg=Erg Saddaf.F.Sg=Acc see.Perf.M.Sg
   ‘Anjum saw Saddaf.’

(2) anjum=ne saddaf=ko haNsyaayaa
   Anjum.F.Sg=Erg Saddaf.F.Sg=Acc laugh.Caus.Perf.M.Sg
   ‘Anjum caused Saddaf to laugh.’

(3) anjum=ne saddaf=ko ciTT$h_i dii
   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
   Omair.M.Sg=Dat prize.M.Sg touch.Perf.M.Sg
   ‘Omair got the prize.’

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

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

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

(16) daryaa=ke paas 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 Tuesday.’

(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\(h\) dii
    Anjum.F.Sg=Erg Saddaf.F.Sg=Dat letter.F.Sg give.Perf.F.Sg
    ‘Anjum gave the 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 psych 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 affected agent as shown in (25).

(25) saddaf=ne sabaq paR^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^b vaayaa
    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^b naa* and few other verbs allow both affected and un-affected agents. The subject in (27) is an unaffected agent.

(27) saddaf=ne xabreN paR^b iiN
    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^b vaaiiN
    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-integral part semantics. Even, if we disagree with this argument, then the Dative Subject with \textit{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 \textit{ko} of Urdu is underspecified for the volitionality of the recipient. But, we find constructions with recipient \textit{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 unpleasant an involinionary event.

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

meN=ne Dinar=pe jaanaa i'aaya.
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 .... koi itai 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)
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 bc.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 Cahiyye

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 cahiyye.
    Nadya.F.Sg=Dat this book.F.Sg want.perc
    ‘Nadya need this book.’

(43) baccoN=ko baRoN=ka adab karnaa cahiyye.
    ‘Children should respect the elders.’

_Cahiyye_ is the percative form of verb _cahna_ meaning ‘want’. Percative forms are usually used in imperative sentences with nominative subject (Platts 1909). But in (42) and (43), _cahiyye_ is used as a modal. In these sentences, the combination of _ko_ and _cahiyye_ 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 _cahiyye_ 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 analyzing the accusative _ko_. The nominative object gets incorporated with the verb. It, like mass nouns, does not bound the event. While accusative _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).
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=ne sair=ko gaaii
   Anjum.F.Sg=Erg go.F.Sg=at go.Perf.F.Sg
   ‘Anjum went for a walk.’

(51) anjum=ne sair=ke liye gaaii
   Anjum.F.Sg=Erg say.Perf.M.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 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 car.F.Sg=Gen say.Perf.M.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.
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