« I dimostrativi in anticopersiano », in : Michele Bernardini, Natalia L. Tornesello, eds., *Scritti in onore di Giovanni D'Erme*. Napoli, Università degli studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", 2005, pp. 383-426.

Rüdiger Schmitt

Édition électronique

URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/abstractairanica/24272>

DOI : 10.4000/abstractairanica.24272

ISSN : 1961-960X

Éditeur :

CNRS (UMR 7528 Mondes iraniens et indiens), Éditions de l'IFRI

Édition imprimée

Date de publication : 15 mai 2008

ISSN : 0240-8910

Référence électronique

Rüdiger Schmitt, « I dimostrativi in anticopersiano », in : Michele Bernardini, Natalia L. Tornesello, eds., *Scritti in onore di Giovanni D'Erme*. Napoli, Università degli studi di Napoli "L'Orientale", 2005, pp. 383-426. », *Abstracta Iranica* [En ligne], Volume 29 | 2008, document 15, mis en ligne le 15 septembre 2008, consulté le 27 septembre 2020. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/abstractairanica/24272> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/abstractairanica.24272>

Ce document a été généré automatiquement le 27 septembre 2020.

Tous droits réservés

« I dimostrativi in anticonpersiano »,
 in : Michele Bernardini, Natalia L.
 Tornesello, eds., *Scritti in onore di
 Giovanni D'Erme*. Napoli, Università
 degli studi di Napoli "L'Orientale",
 2005, pp. 383-426.

Rüdiger Schmitt

- 1 This important study contains a (more or less) synchronic analysis of the Old Persian demonstrative pronouns and adverbs. As in pragmatics, the A. distinguishes between esophoric and endophoric functions depending on whether reference is made to something within or outside the text. Cases of both « situational deixis » (pp. 389-97) and « textual deixis » (pp. 398-421) are discussed in great detail. Concerning the latter, anaphoric recognitional (or anamnestic) and real deictic functions are kept apart, and the various types of constructions showing topicalisation and a resumptive pronoun are fully described. The article contains a great deal of substantial comments on single words and passages such as DB I 28 f. (what does *idā* mean here?), DB II 30 f. and its variants or DB V 22 f. (where the A. rightly questions the reading *i* [ma⁵⁹]) and rather prefers a [va⁵⁹], although that would seem to be incompatible with the remaining traces !), but a normalized form *mṛtiya* (as we often read here) is evidently wrong. On the whole, this is a thorough syntactic study, and one would like to have many more such, in order to make research on Old Persian syntax and stylistics progress and to update the relevant parts of Kent's *Old Persian Grammar*.

INDEX

Thèmes : 2.1. Langues anciennes

AUTEURS

RÜDIGER SCHMITT

Laboe