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**Abstract**

The Latin demonstrative *ipse* had different evolutions across the Romance languages, with Romanian being the one that preserved most of the source-language uses and enriched them with new ones. This article describes the evolution of the forms and functions of *îns*₁, *îns*₂/*ins*, *îns(ă)*₃, *însul*, *nusul*, *dînsul*, *adins*, *însuși*, and of the bound focal particle –și in Romanian. The analysis is based on a rich corpus of old Romanian and non-standard regional varieties of modern spoken Romanian. The most significant phenomena in old Romanian compared to Latin are the proliferation of forms, the preservation of the old uses and the emergence of new ones, semantic enrichments, and a large number of lexical-functional synonymies. During the old Romanian period, the form–function correlations gradually changed, syntactically conditioned variants and differential prepositional object marking emerged, new meanings developed as contextual effects of the focal prototype, the syncretisms with the reflexive and reciprocal pronouns were limited, and the textual deictic was grammaticalized as an adversative conjunction. In modern Romanian, the number of ambiguities has decreased and register differences have appeared. The evolution of the Latin *ipse* in Romanian illustrates a case of poligrammaticalization and polimorfism, which is not singular in the history of the neo-Latin idioms.

1. Preliminary remarks

In classical Latin, *ipse* (*ipsus*) was a demonstrative pronoun and functioned as a (contrastive) noun phrase/sentence focalizer, and sometimes as a reflexive pronoun or, in combination with reflexive pronouns, as a reciprocal. In late Latin it became a synonym of *hic*, and was used as a textual deictic, i.e. a deictic having a sentence as antecedent/subsequent term (Ernout & Thomas, 1959, p. 187–191; Väänänen, 1981, p. 120; Woodcock, 2005, p. 25–26; Baños Baños, 2009, p. 181–182). The subsequent evolution of *ipse* in Romance was divergent: in most Western languages (French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese) it disappeared; in others (Sardinian, partly the Gascon area, and Catalan), it developed into a definite article, while Romanian is the only language which preserved and enriched its forms and pronominal uses (Densusianu, 1938, p. 176; Sala, 2001, s.v.). In present-day Romanian, it displays several contextual functions.

2. From Latin to old Romanian

Compared to Latin, the descendants of *ipse* in old Romanian show the following features described below: the proliferation of forms (§2.1), the preservation of uses (§2.2), the emergence of new uses (§2.3), polifunctionalism (§2.4), and a rich network of lexical–functional synonymies (§2.5).

### 2.1. Proliferation of forms


---
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(1) a. iubeaște vecinul tău ca love.IMP.2SG neighbour.DEF.ACC.M.SG your.M.SG as inși tine (cc².1567–8, 90°)
ÎNS.M.SG you.ACC
‘Love your neighbour as yourself’

b. inși ni le tragem (cc².1581, 285)
ÎNS.M.PL CL.DAT.1PL CL.ACC.F.3PL striv.PRES.1PL
‘we ourselves strive for them’

(2) a. patr-inși (cc².1581, 54)
four=ÎNS.M.PL
‘four fellows’

b. doi ins (cc².1581, 367)
two ÎNS.M.PL
‘two fellows’

(3) Cătră tine alerg; însă fata-mea, [...]
towards you.ACC.2SG run.PRES.1SG ÎNS.F.SG daughter.F.SG=my.ACC.F.SG eu o lasău acasă (cc².1581, DA, s.v.)
I CL.ACC.F.3SG leave.PRES.1SG home
‘I’m running to you; but my daughter […], I left her at home’

(4) a. nu putu grăi cătr-inșii
not can.PS.3SG speak.INF towards=ÎNS.DEF.M.PL
‘he was not able to speak to them’

b. nu e intr-insele alte nemică
not is in=ÎNS.DEF.F.PL any.F.PL nothing
‘there is nothing else in them’

(5) a. Și era Dumnezeu cu nusul
and was God with NUS.DEF.M.SG
‘and God was with him’

b. cu nusa leagă cătușile de with NUS.DEF.F.SG fasten.PRES.3PL chain.DEF.F.PL as o tepenesca (cc².1581, 294)
CL.ACC.F.3SG fix.tight.PRES.3PL
‘and they fasten it with chains and fix it tight’

(6) a. văzu Iisus pre Nathanail viind cătră sine
sec.PS.3SG Jesus DOM Nathan come.GER towards self și grăi dins (VRC.1645, 31)
and speak.PS.3SG DINS.M.SG
‘Jesus saw Nathan coming towards him and spoke to him’

b. o aduseră pre dinsa
CL.ACC.F.3SG bring.PS.3PL DOM DINS.F.SG
la Faraon (BB.1688, DA, s.v.)
at Pharaoh
‘they brought her to Pharaoh’

(7) a. adinsu voi iubosti aibînd (CV.1563–83, 159°)
ADINSU you.PL love.ACC have.GER
‘loving each other’ / ‘having love for each other’

b. iertîndu-vă adinsu voiș (NT.1648, DA, s.v.)
forgive.GER=CL.ACC=DAT.2PL ADINSU you.Ș.N.2PL
‘forgiving each other’
Of all these forms, însui, însii, însi, însi(ă) are the direct descendants of Lat. ipse, while the others are compounds in old Romanian with îns plus the definite article (însul < îns + –ul) or with îns (± definite article) and various prepositions (adins(ul) < ad + îns + (–ul); însui < îns(ul) + –și; nusul < cu nus + –ul < cu + îns + –ul; dînsul < de + îns + –ul). The definite forms were more frequent than the indefinite ones, and însui fully replaced îns by the end of the 18th century (see details in Vasilescu, 2015, p. 330–332).

The etymology of the compound însui (Engl. ‘itself/himself’ used as an intensifier) has been a matter of controversy among the Romanian linguists, who proposed three hypotheses: (i) îns + the dative reflexive ăş ( < Lat. sibi); (ii) îns + the deictic adverbial –şii ( < Lat. sic); (iii) îns + –şi, the clitic form of Lat. ipse (for details see Manoliu-Manea, 1987; Zafi, 2012). The bound focal particle –şii attached to îns and many other semantic subtypes of pronouns (elui, minei, ăşi, sinei, acelaşi, cevaşi, careşi), adverbs (atunecşi, acciaşi) and numerals (iniţiaşi). Most of these forms disappeared during the 18th c., others (iniţiaşi, cevaşi) persisted in some regional varieties of spoken non-standard Romanian, while acelaşi and însui have been completely taken over by the system of modern Romanian. Acelaşi lexicalized as a demonstrative pronoun/adjective of identity (Engl. ‘the same’), inflected for gender, number, and case (NOM=ACC: m.sg. acelaşi; f.sg. aceaşi; p.pl. aceiaşi; f.pl. aceleiaşi; GEN=DAT: m.sg. aceleiaşi; f.sg. aceleaşi; m.pl. aceloraşi; f.pl. aceloraşi) following the pattern of acela ‘that’. It is the functional equivalent of the descendants of Lat. metipse transmitted to the other Romance languages, but not to Romanian. Însui lexicalized and later grammaticalized as an intensifier/focal particle with a full-fledged inflectional paradigm, marking person, number, gender and case oppositions. At the same time, îns gradually lost its function as a focal particle for that of a pronominal substitute (see §2.3 below), while the bound focal particle –şii was gradually eliminated and fossilized in the structure of acelaşi and însui (see also Vasilescu, 2015). The most frequently used term of the paradigm was însui (person 3, singular, masculine, NOM=ACC), which might be the immediate consequence of its complex inflection (the lack of agreement occurring both in old and present-day Romanian), but it might also indicate the stages of its grammaticalization, as hypothesized below:

I. îns (focal particle inherited from Latin)
II. –şii (bound focal particle developed in old Romanian)
III. însui (newly created focal particle in old Romanian)
IV. lexicalization of the focalizer însui
V. the development of an inflectional paradigm of the focalizer însui by analogy with the dative forms of the personal/reflexive pronoun (îns + mi/ţi/ne/vă)
VI. grammaticalization of the focalizer însui with a full-fledged pronominal paradigm

An early categorial specialization of the forms descending from Lat. ipse is to be noticed: însi1 and the other forms having it as a lexical base (însul, nusul, dînsul, adins, însui) displayed pronominal features allowing independent, modifier or adverbial uses; îns/iins was a generic noun with several synonyms (îns ‘guy’, om ‘man’, persoană ‘person’, individ ‘individual, fellow’); îns(ă) was a textual demonstrative deictic with conjunction-like functions in old Romanian, only later fully grammaticalized as adversative conjunction (see §2.2–2.3 below).

The inflectional paradigms were regular. Însi1 was inflected for gender and number via desinences and phonetic changes in the root: m.sg. însiO, f.sg. însă, m.pl. însi, f.pl. însie. Însi2 was inflected like motional nouns, shared gender and number desinences with însi1 (m.sg. i/insiO, f.sg. i/insă, m.pl. însi, f.pl. însi) and showed initial vowel fluctuation for the singular (i/i), later fixed as i, which formally differentiated...
the pronoun and the noun. Însuși had the most complex inflectional paradigm, which seemed complete by the end of the period: the desinences and phonetic changes on the first component (m.sg. însu/f.sg. însă/m.pl. însi/f.pl. inse) marked gender and number oppositions, while the suppletive forms of the second component (pers.1 mi/pers.2 ți/pers.3 șți/pers.4 ne/pers.5 vă/pers.6 știi) marked the person-number oppositions (for more examples, see DA, s.v.; Stan, 2013, p. 143; Vasilescu, 2016b, p. 388–391). Însul, nusul, dînsul marked gender and number oppositions through the forms of the definite article in their structure and the consonant alternation /s/ for the masculine singular/plural (m.sg. însul, f.sg. însa, m.pl. înșii, f.pl. insele; m.sg. nusul, f.sg. nusa, m.pl. nușii, f.pl. nusele; m.sg. dînsul, f.sg. dînsa, m.pl. dînșii, f.pl. dînsele). In the beginning, adîns displayed the inflection of ins in its structure, but it later developed into an invariable adverb. Initially a textual demonstrative deictic, îns(ă) had both a masculine form (îns) and a feminine form (însă) in old Romanian (DA, s.v.). The grammaticalization of the feminine form (not the masculine one) as an adversative conjunction seems consistent with a systemic feature of Romanian. It is exactly the feminine form which was selected for other textual deictics with “neutral” function: the demonstratives a(cea)sta, ace(e)a, ceea ce (9), the neutral pronominal clitic o (10), the indefinite pronouns una, alta (11), the numerals a doa, a treia pragmatized as discourse markers (12) (see Pană Dindelegan, 2016b; 2016a, Anexe online, §11.5).

(9)  

a. pentru aceasta încă pohtesc carte  
   for this.F.SG still wish.PRES.1SG letter  
   de la impâratul (DI.1600, XXXIII)  
   ‘for this reason I’m still waiting for a letter from the emperor’

b. Acea ne rugăm  
   that.F.SG CL.REFL.DAT=ACC.1PL pray.PRES.1PL  
   domnilor-voastre (DI.1595, CII)  
   ‘that is what we are asking you’

c. ceaea ce zice  
   that.F.SG what say.PRES.3SG  
   (Cist.1700–50, 33’)  
   ‘what he says’

(10) Ascultă, să o știi că nu  
    listen.IMP.2SG SĂSUBJ CL.ACC.F.SG know.SUBJ.2SG that not  
    căde (Mărg.1691, 44”)  
    CL.IMPERS fall.PRES.3SG  
    ‘Listen, you should know that one should not do such a thing’

(11) și una și alta să dovedește  
    (Cist.1700–50, 58”)  
    and one.F.SG and another.F.SG CL.IMPERS prove.PRES.3SG  
    ‘both one and the other are proven’

(12) Întăi, credința cea direaptă; a doa, nedeajdea;  
    first faith.DEF.F.SG CEL.F.SG right.F.SG A.F.SG second.DEF.F.SG hope.DEF.F.SG  
    a treia, liuboovel cătră Dumnezeu (VRC.1645, 2”)  
    A.F.SG third.DEF.F.SG love.DEF.M.SG towards God  
    ‘First, the right faith; second, hope; third, love of God’

2.2. Preservation of usages

The corpus analysis indicates that the following usages of ipse in Latin have been preserved in old Romanian: independent focalizer (13), adjectival pre-(14a–b) or postposed focalizer (14c–d), or adverbial focalizer (15); reflexive pronoun (16); reciprocal pronoun (17); textual deictic (18).
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(13) a. *înși* va cădea în-*însa*  (FD.1592–604, 543')  

*ÎNȘUS*.M.3SG *AUX.FUT*.3SG fall.INF in=*ÎNS.DEF.SG  
‘he himself will fall in it’

b. *însă* să-l în-*văș*  (Sind.1703, 79')  

*ÎNS*.F.SG *ȘĂSUBJ=CL.ACC.M.3SG teach.SUBJ.1SG  
‘to teach him himself’

c. *fratele acestuia* au murit și numai  

*brother.DEF.M.SG this.one.GEN.M.SG AUX.PERF.3SG die.PPLE and only*  

*înși* au rămas  (po.1582, 157)  

*ÎNSUȘI*.M.3SG *AUX.PERF.3SG remain.PPLE  
‘his brother died and only he survived/and he remained alone’

(14) a. *ca* în-*singularul* lui  (CPr.1566–7, 430)  

*like ÎNS.M.SG body.DEF.M.SG his  
‘like his own body’

b. numai *înșiși* ucenicii  (nt.1648, 112')  

*only ÎNSUȘI*.M.3PL apprentice.DEF.M.PL his  
‘only his apprentices themselves’

c. ei *înși* (CPr.1566–7, 539)  

*they ÎNSUȘI*.M.3PL  
‘they themselves’

d. *trupure* în-*se*  (DPar.1683, III/130')  

*body.N.PL ÎNS.F.PL  
‘the bodies themselves’

(15) să trage *înși*  (a.1620, 44') 2'

*CL.REFL.ACC.3SG originate.PRES.3SG ÎNSUȘI*.M.3SG  
‘he himself comes from’

(16) a. *înși-l* întrebați  (ct.1560–2, 206')  

*ÎNSUȘI*.M.3PL=CL.ACC.3SG ask.PRES.2PL  
‘You should ask him yourselves’

b. *înș* au izbăvit pre înș  (DPar.1683, III/73')  

*ÎNSUȘI*.M.3SG *AUX.PERF.3SG save.PPLE DOM ÎNȘ.M.SG  
‘he saved himself’

(17) a. să se aleagă ei  

*ȘĂSUBJ CL.REFL.ACC.3PL choose.SUBJ.3PL they.M  
 ADINS they.ACC  
‘to choose among them’

b. ziseră adins eiș  (cc1.1567–8, 29')  

*say.PS.3PL ADINS themȘ  
‘they said to each other’

(18) Fiiul omenesc merge-va pre zisă  

*son.DEF.M.SG human go.INF=AUX.FUT.3SG DOM say.PPLE.F.SG  
înșă văi de omul acela ce  

*ÎNS.F.SG woc.INTERJ of man.DEF.M.SG that.one.M.SG that  
mă vîndu (ct.1560–2, 161')  
me.ACC sell.PS.3SG  
‘Man’s Son will trust your word, but woe to the one who betrayed me’
2.2.1. Focalizer

The high frequency of the focalizer *îns(uși)* seems to correlate with the content of the text and the persuasive function it has. On the one hand, focalizers were frequently used in religious texts to highlight unexpected/unpredictable actors and events and to impose them into the public consciousness. On the other hand, in legal texts they were used to emphatically assert the propositional content. In both cases, the speaker/writer takes stance with respect to the textual content and projects a rhetorical-persuasive attitude. In all the other textual genres the occurrence of *îns(uși)* is sporadic.

As an independent focalizer in old Romanian, *înși* might be equally interpreted as the focalizer of an empty category (*înși* pro/pro *înși*; *înși* e/e *înși*) (Stan, 2013, p. 143) and a pro-form (for *îns* as a pronominal substitute, see §2.3 below) intensified by the bound focal particle –și. Evolutions in modern Romanian seem to support the latter interpretation: on the one hand, *îns* lost its use as a pronominal substitute, on the other hand –și lost its function as a bound focal particle, while the newly created compound *însuși* lexicalized as focalizer in the position of an external modifier of the D(eterminer) P(hrase).

In old Romanian, the use of *înși* as an adjectival focalizer was more frequent than its use as an independent focalizer (Vasilescu, 2015, p. 341). It combined with [+/- human] nouns and pronouns (see example (14) above). Its ante-position to the (pro)noun was considered an imitation of the Slavonic syntax of the original texts translated into Romanian (Stan, 2013, p. 60–61). Nevertheless, an internal explanation is not to be excluded taking into account the free word order in old Romanian, both in the sentence and inside the DP (see also the position of the adjective, the demonstrative and possessive determiners to the noun).

As an adverbial focalizer, *înși* frequently meant *singur* ‘alone’. In Romanian, this meaning has been considered the reflex of the two meanings of *samŭ* in Slavonic: *înși* as intensifier (Engl. ‘itself’) and *singur* (Engl. ‘alone’) (see, among others, da, s.v.; Stan, 2013, p. 61). Actually, what the texts in the corpus show is that *îns(uși)* was a floating focalizer sharing the free word order with many other sentence constituents in old Romanian, and that it had various contextual meanings (see §2.4 below), not only that of “singur” (Engl. ‘alone’). Consequently, I suggest an alternative interpretation, adopting the concept of convergence, proposed by Hickey (2010, p. 19): the floating intensifier *însuși* generated several contextual meanings, the strongest and most frequent one being ‘alone’ due to its convergence with the Slavonic *samŭ*. *Înși* meant ‘itself, himself, not someone else’ and contextually developed the meaning ‘itself, himself, not someone else, hence alone’.

2.2.2. Reflexive pronoun

The reflexive use of *îns(uși)* is consistent with the cross-linguistic data. From a typological perspective, languages display differences in expressing the reflexive and the intensification meanings (Gast & Siemund, 2006): in what might be called the “syncretic language type”, the reflexive and the intensifier have the same form (in English, for example); in what might be called “the non-syncretic language type”, the reflexive and the intensifier have different forms (in German, the Romance languages, the Slavic languages, among others). Latin pertained to the non-syncretic type, although in late Latin *ipse* was sometimes used instead of a reflexive pronoun. This use was transmitted to old Romanian, where the stressed reflexive pronoun, the (focalized) personal pronoun and the intensifier *însuși* (*sine ≡ elu ≡ eluși ≡ însuși*, Engl. ‘self’ ≡ ‘him’ ≡ ‘himșiț’ ≡ ‘himself’)) were functionally equivalent in some contexts, as exemplified in (19e–f) below.

(19) a.  *Iisus Hristos arată sine aicea* (ct.1560–2, 190°)  
    Jesus Christ show.pres.3sg self here  
    ‘Jesus Christ shows himself here’

b.  *Pre elu se va piaorde* (ct.1560–2, 137°)  
    DOM him cl.refl.acc.3sg aux.fut.3sg lose.inf  
    ‘he will lose himself’
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2.2.3. Reciprocal pronoun

In structures with semantically symmetrical predication, old Romanian presented several strategies to express the reciprocal meaning, directly linked to the Latin ones (details in Vasilescu, 2016a, p. 216–222). One such strategy involved a plural subject and a reciprocity prepositional phrase (*între ei* ‘among them’), as in (20a). The pattern underlied the structure *ad* + *ins* (*adins*), where the reciprocal meaning paralleled the emphatic one (20b). By the middle of the 17th c. the reciprocal meaning faded out (DA, s.v.) and *adins* functioned exclusively as a focalizer (20c) that moved outside the DP and entered various adverbial phrases (Engl. ‘purposely’, ‘deliberately’, ‘with intent’) (20d). For a detailed analysis of *adins* in old Romanian, see Zamfir & Uță Bărbulescu (2016).

(20) a. *ei* َind*ei* َto*cmindu-să* (CII~1705, 86)
   they among *they.ACC* bargain.*GER=CL.REFL.ACC.3PL*
   ‘bargaining among them’

b. *voi* َadinsu* voisi* (DA, s.v.)
   you.2PL *ADINSU* you.și.2PL
   ‘you among yourselves’

c. *adins* eluși așa poruncește (DA, s.v.)
   *ADINS* he.și so order.*PRES.3SG*
   ‘he himself orders that’

d. (mai) (cu) deadins(ul), în deadins, (mai) (cu)dinadins(ul), cu tot dinadinsul, inadins, *intr(u)-adins* (DA, s.v.)
   ‘on purpose’

2.2.4. Between textual deictic and adversative conjunction

As a demonstrative pronoun, the Latin *ipse* allowed a propositional focalizer usage. Hence, it is reasonable to assume that some structures in old Romanian continued this use, as in (18) above, where *ins(ă)* resumes a previous predication to generate, via conventional implicatures, a contrast with the newly introduced predication (sentence1 *însă* textual deictic *sentence2*). *Insă* could show anywhere in the sentence (at the beginning, in the middle, at the end). The occurrence of the feminine form [see 2.1 above] of the textual deictic in contexts where the adjacent sentences stood in an adversative logical relationship triggered its grammaticalization as an adversative conjunction that joined the series *dar, țar, ci* (cf. DA, s.v.). Unlike the other conjunctions’ obligatory front position, the position of the conjunction *insă* is still free in present-day Romanian and reminds of its former function as textual deictic.

2.3. New usages

Compared to Latin, the uses of *ins(ul)/insuși* as a pro-form and *ins/ins* as a noun were an innovation of old Romanian.
2.3.1. Personal pronoun
A DP/sentence focalizer in Latin, *ipse* developed in old Romanian along two complementary paths: a newly created form *însuși* (< *îns* + –și) was undergoing a lexicalization and grammaticalization process as intensifier (see §2.2.1 above), while the direct descendant of *ipse*, Rom. *îns*, was gradually losing its focal function developing into a pronominal substitute, a synonym of the 3rd person singular personal pronoun (*el/ea – însul*). With this function, it only accidentally occurred as the argument of a verb (21), but it was highly frequent in P(repositional) P(hrases) as the complement of the head preposition, realized in three phonologically and lexically constrained variants: following prepositions ending in the consonant cluster *ntr* (*intr-însul*) ‘in it’ / *dintr-însul* ‘out of it’ / *printr-însul* ‘through it’, etc., as in (22a–b); following the preposition *de* (*dînsul*) < *de* + *îns(ul)* ‘of/about it’), as in (22c); following the preposition *cu* (*cu nusul*) < *cu* + *îns(ul)* ‘with it’), as in (22d–e). This is what I herein call differential prepositional object marking: a dedicated pronominal form (*însul*) occurred in PPs, distinct from the ones which regularly occurred as arguments of verbs (*el ‘he’, ea ‘she’*).

(21) a. *veacilor munci înși* (cc².1581, 315)
   ‘we carry with us labours as old as centuries’

   (22) a. *Beați toți dentr-ins* (CCat.1560, 11v)
   `drink.of.it, all.of you’

   b. *Domnul minie-se spr-insa* (CPrav.1560–2, 2v)
   ‘God gets angry with her’

   c. *Domnul auzi-mă-va cind voiu* (PB~1651, 5v)
   ‘God will hear me when I call him out’

   d. *Și mina lu dânsul era cu nusul* (CT.1560–2, 113v)
   ‘and God’s hand was with him’

   e. *ce grăiești cu nusa?* (cc¹.1567–8, 22v)
   ‘what are you talking with her?’

This evolution was strongly influenced by the emergence in Romanian of the bound focal particle –și adjoined to words from various morphological classes (see §2.1 above). In a pronominal system with parallel strong and clitic forms, it is highly probable that *îns* and –și were both reflexes of the Lat. *ipse*, the former, the strong form, and the latter its clitic counterpart. Initially, the two forms probably functioned as independent strong focalizer and clitic focalizer, respectively; later, after –și fossilized in the newly created lexemes *însuși* ‘itself/himself’ and *același* ‘the same’, the clitic might have disappeared and been compensated by *însuși*, which thus enhanced its position in the system of Romanian. This process allowed *îns(ul)* to change its focal particle function into a mere substitute, an alternative term to *el ‘he’ or ea ‘she’*, differentially selected: *însul* in PPs, *el/ea* in verb argument positions. Nevertheless, the rule of differential prepositional object marking did not apply strictly.
2.3.2. Generic noun
The nominal use of ins/ins (om, persona, individ, Engl. ‘guy’, ‘man’, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘fellow’) was an innovation of old Romanian compared to Latin. This use was attested since the earliest texts in the 16th c. throughout the whole period. See examples in (2a–b) above. The masculine form was the most frequent one, and it occurred in the context of definite or indefinite quantifiers. The form has been connected to the Albanian vetє (DA, s.v.).

2.4. Polisemy
The focal particle însuși developed various secondary meanings through contextually generated conventional implicatures. Basically, it functioned as a purely focal particle “exactly X” (23a), but it also acquired the meaning of a contrastive focal particle “X, not Y” (23b), a cumulative focal particle “even X” (23c), a focal particle of uniqueness (“only X, nobody else”) (23d), a focal particle of non-causation contrasted to similar events controlled by an external agent (“by itself, nobody else caused the action”) (23e), metalinguistic focal particle, synonym to “in itself” (23f), a synonym of the prefix-like segment (Rom. “prefixoid”) auto ‘self’ (23g).

(23) a. Însă aceasta mînă ce mă vîndu,  
\[\text{INS.F.SG this.F.SG hand.F.SG that CL.ACC.1.SG sell.PS.3.SG} \]
\[\text{cu noi iaste la masă (ct.1560–2, 171')} \]
with us is at table  
‘the very same hand that has sold me is with us at this table’

b. veđețî minile meale și picioarele meale  
\[\text{sec.IMP.2.PL hand.DEF.F.PL my.F.PL and foot.DEF.NEUT.PL my.FEM.PL} \]
\[\text{că însuși eu sint (ct.1560–2, 179')} \]
that INSUMI.M.1.SG I am  
‘Look at my hands and my feet and see that it is me!’

c. cu credința însăș să mă sămînță  
\[\text{with faith.DEF.F.SG INSĂŞ.F.3.SG evening.DEF seed} \]
\[\text{luo (cc1.1567–8, 87')} \]
take.PS.3.SG  
‘She herself faithfully took that seed in the evening’

d. doamne, nu grijești că sora mea  
\[\text{Lord.VOC not care.PRES.2.SG that sister.DEF.F.SG my.F.SG} \]
lăsatu-m-au însămi  
\[\text{let.PPLE=CL.ACC.1.SG=aux.PERF.3.SG INSĂMI.F.1.SG} \]
să slușesc? (cc1.1567–8, 234')  
SĂSUBJ serve.SUBJ.1.SG  
‘God, you don’t care that my sister left me all alone to serve?’

c. Ușile, iale înseși sănchiseră  
\[\text{door.DEF.F.PL they.F.PL INSȘI.F.3.PL CL.REFL.ACC.3.PL=shut.PS.3.PL} \]
‘the doors closed by themselves’

f. Țara Ardealului nu este o țară  
\[\text{country.DEF Ardeal.DEF.GEN.F.SG not is A.F.SG country.F.SG} \]
însuși, ci „Ardealul” este și se cheamă  
\[\text{INSȘI.M.3.SG but Ardeal.DEF.M.SG is and SEIMPERS call.PRES.3.SG} \]
mijlocul țării (apud DA, s.v.)  
\[\text{middle.DEF.NEUT.SG country.GEN.F.SG} \]
‘The country of Ardeal is not a country properly, but “Ardeal” is and is called the middle of the country’
2.5. Contextual synonyms

From the earliest texts preserved in Romanian, ins(uși) had various synonyms: chiar ‘clearly, right’ < Lat. clarus (24a), numai ‘only’ < nu mai / Lat. non magis (24b), singur ‘alone’ < Lat. singulus (24c), tocmai ‘exactly’ < Slav. туква (24d), unul ‘one’ < Lat. unus (24e).

(24) a. din chiar pornirea sa (Prav.1646, 214)
   from right will.DEF.SG his.DEF.SG
   ‘of his own will’
   b. aceasta a numai Iisus Hristos [...] au dobîndit (cc¹.1567–8, 114°)
   this.DEF.PL only Jesus Christ AUX.PERF.3SG attain.PPLE
   ‘only Jesus Christ attained that’
   c. îndrăgește priiatnicul tău, ca tine
   love.IMP.2SG friend.DEF.M.SG your.DEF.M.SG like you.ACC.2SG
   singur (CPr.1566–7, 406)
   alone
   ‘love your friend like yourself’
   d. sufletele tocma care-s ale lor (Ev.1642, 60)
   soul.DEF.PL indeed that=are AL.FEM.PL their.GEN
   ‘the souls which belong to them, indeed’
   e. nimea nu e bun, numai dumnezeu unul
   nobody not is good only God.DEF.M.SG one.DEF.M.SG
   ‘nobody is good, but God alone’

Cumulative, redundant uses were frequent (25); several idioms functioned as intensifiers due to their concrete meanings referring to self through a pars-pro-toto relationship (26a–b).

(25) a. elu numai insuși singur (cc¹.1567–8, 7°)
   he only INSUȘI.M.SG alone.M.SG
   ‘him and only him’
   b. tocma și pre sine insuş (Ev.1642, 57)
   indeed also DOM self INSUȘ.M.SG
   ‘he himself included, indeed’
   c. el unul singur {iaste} îmblătoriu intru noi (cc¹.1567–8, 41°)
   he one.DEF.M.SG alone.M.SG is walking among us
   ‘he himself and no one else is walking among us’

(26) a. eu [...] insum, cu mena mea (DRH,B.1645, 82)
   I INSUMI.M.1SG with hand.DEF.SG my.DEF.SG
   ‘I myself, with my own hand’
   b. El insuş cu limba sa (DRH,B.1645, 247)
   he INSUȘI.M.SG with tongue.DEF.SG his.DEF.SG
   ‘He himself, with his own mouth’

Overall, in old Romanian insuş was more frequent than any of its synonyms (a quantitative approach in Vasilescu, 2016b, p. 392).
3. From old Romanian to modern Romanian

In the passage from old Romanian to modern Romanian, the number of lexical units, formal variants and systemic syncretisms decreased as forms became ever more functionally specialized and register-marked. Present-day Romanian preserved înșiși, înșă, dinsul, ins, adins, într-/printr-/dintr-/etc.-insul, but lost ins1, ins2, and nusul, and shows 1:1 form–function correlations: înșiși – focal particle; înșă – conjunction; înșul, dinsul – pronouns; ins – noun; adins – adverb (in adverbial idioms). Combinatorial restrictions changed compared to old Romanian and each lexical unit originating in Lat. ipse has a particular register distribution in present-day Romanian.

3.1. The focal particle înșiși

In the first half of the 20th c. the independent use of înșiși (sometimes ambiguous between a pronominal and an adverbial reading) was still attested (27a–c), but it became ever rarer by the end of the century. At the same time, at the beginning of the 20th c. înșiși in its adjectival use frequently combined with [–animate] nouns (28a–i), but tended to be an external modifier of [+human] nouns/pronouns exclusively, even though the [–animate] context was not totally excluded (29). It has preserved some of the semantic values it had in old Romanian (see §2.4 above)—contrastive focalizer, cumulative focalizer, focalizer of uniqueness (a detailed analysis in Zafiu, 2013)—, but lost the non-causative and metalinguistic focalizer value, replaced by singur (‘alone’, ‘itself’) and propriu-zis (‘properly’, ‘in itself’), respectively; for the prefix-like value (Rom. “prefixoid”) it was replaced by auto in present-day Romanian. Ever more frequently, it combines with the strong reflexive pronoun (sine) forming an intonational unit (30); in the clitic chain [se ... pe sine], pe sine disambiguates the anaphoric function of the reflexive clitic, and înșiși functions as a focal particle of the strong reflexive. The syntagms [personal pronoun + înșiși] tend to grammaticalize for the emphatic reflexive value (31). For the structural features and the use in present-day Romanian, see Vasilescu (2008, p. 218–222; 2013, p. 404–407); Zafiu (2013, p. 287–294).

(27) a. HB a venit înșiși
   HB aux.perf.3sg come.pple înșișlm.3sg
   in România [1935] (apud Iordan, 1947, 313)
   in Romania
   ‘HB came himself to Romania’

b. renunțăm de a vorbi
   give.up.pres.1pl de a inf speak.inf
   înșine [1936] (apud Iordan, 1947, 313)
   înșiñem.1pl
   ‘we give up speaking ourselves’

c. despre una din călătoriile sale vorbește
   about one.f of travel.def.f.pl his.f.pl speak.pres.3sg
   înșiși [1937] (apud Iordan, 1947, 313)
   înșișlm.3sg
   ‘he himself speaks about one of his travels’

d. fără ca înșiși s-o
   without that înșișlm.3sg s=cl.f.3sg
   guste [1937] (apud Iordan, 1947, 313)
   taste.subj.3sg
   ‘without tasting it himself’

c. marile spirite înșile
   great.def.f.pl minds.neut.pl înșiñel.m.3pl
   [1937] (apud Iordan, 1947, 313)
   ‘the great minds themselves’
(28) a. În sînul însuși al limbii
in bosom.DEF.M.SG ÎNSUȘI.M.3SG AL.M.SG language.DEF.GEN.F.SG
Romanian.DEF.GEN.F.SG
‘right in Romanian’

b. se schimbă uzul
c. in însăși limba latină

d. însesi sunetele

e. pe a noastră însăși

f. „coraș” însuși are, în popor,

ș. sintaxa oricărei limbii este, prin ea

(29) Brexitul arată ceva mai grav decît
Brexit.DEF.M.SG show.pres.3SG something more serious than
Brexit.DEF.M.SG ÎNSUȘI.M.3SG
‘The Brexit shows something more serious than the Brexit itself’

(30) un bărbat s-a căsătorit cu

(31) a. Iohannis, împiedicat de el însuși
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b. *îndepărtarea lui Grindeanu de el însuși*  
(alienation.DEF.LUI Grindeanu from he.ACC îNSUȘI.M.3SG)  
‘Grindeanu’s alienation from himself’

c. *Donald Trump, costumat în el însuși*  
(Donald Trump dress.up.PPLE.M.3SG in he îNSUȘI.M.3SG)  
‘Donald Trump, dressed up in himself’

*însuși* is quasi-absent in non-standard Romanian, yet not excluded. In the subdialectal corpus¹ investigated, there is only one occurrence (32).

(32)  
*el î... nu prea [Є] se-ngrije*  
he not really CL.REFL.3SG=take.care.IMPERF.3SG  
*pe el însuși personal*  
DOM he.ACC îNSUȘ.M.3SG personally  
‘he wasn’t really taking care of himself’

There are several possible convergent explanations for these register differences. First, *însuși* incorporates the conventional implicature “invalidation of expectations”, which indicates an argumentative-persuasive stance of the speaker/writer in relation to the listener/reader, which might explain the occurrence of *însuși* in argumentative-persuasive genres, but its absence in spoken non-standard Romanian texts, produced in various communication situations where both the interviewer and the respondents normally take a neutral stance. It seems that, both in old Romanian and in contemporary Romanian, *însuși* is more than a focal particle: it is a stance-taking marker. This discursive function makes the difference to the synonyms of *însuși* and explains register selections [see §2.5 above, and examples (35)–(38) below]. Second, spoken varieties prefer either intonational focalization, as the propositional turn indicates (33), or the syntactic strategy of explicit opposition between terms (34).

(33)  
a. *Cerneala o făceam noi*  
ink.DEF.F.SG CL.F.3SG make.IMPERF.1PL wc.NOM  
‘we used to make the ink ourselves’

b. *Cărâte bucățile de mine acolo*  
carry.PPLE.F.PL piec.DEF.F.PL by me there  
la arina boierească  
(Moldova & Bucovina, 230)  
at yard.DEF.F.SG manorial.F.SG  
‘the pieces carried by me there at the boyard’s yard’

c. *Am auzit eu de la părinții mei*  
AUX.PERF.1SG hear.PPLE I from parent.DEF.M.PL my.M.PL  
‘I heard it myself from my parents’

(34)  
*Bănui-ți tu, nu eu*  
regret.IMP.2SG=CL.REFL.DAT.2SG you not I  
‘regret it yourself, not me’

Third, the complex inflexion of *însuși* might explain the speakers’ preferences for the synonym lexical focalizers *chiar* ‘even’, *singur* ‘alone’, *unul* ‘one’, *cu ochii mei* ‘with my own eyes’, especially in non-standard Romanian (35)–(38).

¹The phonetic transcription of the texts used in examples was simplified and presented as literary transcription, considering that the phonetic features marked in the original transcript are irrelevant for the phenomena under discussion in this article.
(35) a. Eu chiar eu am născut la una noaptea (Muntenia, 242)
   I right I AUX.PERF.1SG give.birth.PPLE at one night.DEF
   'I myself gave birth at one o'clock at night'
b. Chiar mie (Muntenia, 243)
   right me.DAT
   'right to me'
c. Povestea chiar frati-su ei (Moldova & Bucovina, 123)
   narrate.IMPERF.3SG right brother=her.M.SG her.GEN.F
   'her own brother used to tell that story'
(36) a. Atunci o ieșit ei singuri (AD I, Bacău, 27)
   then AUX.PERF.3SG=PL come.out.PPLE they.M alone.M.PL
   'then they came out all alone'
b. El singular, să știe, ar face
   he alone.M.SG SĂSUBJ know.SUBJ.3SG AUX.COND.3SG do.INF
   ceva (GN, Bucovina, 31)
   something
   'if he knew, he himself would do something'
c. Am mers singuri și-am văzut (AD I, Basarabia, 41)
   AUX.PERF.1PL go.PPLE alone.M.PL and=AUX.PERF.1PL
   văzut sec.PPLE
   'We went alone and we saw'
d. il taie el singur (Porțile de Fier, 198)
   cl.acc.m.3sg cut.pres.3sg he alone.m.sg
   'he cuts it all alone'
c. Eu singur vi l-oi lega (GN, Maramureș, 88)
   alone.m.sg cl.dat.2pl cl.acc.m.sg=aux.fut.1sg
   tie.inf
   'I myself will tie it for you, all alone'
f. ea singură [...] bate (Dobrogea, 306)
   she alone.f.sg beat.pres.3sg
   'she alone beats'
g. el singur [il] săpa, uda (Oltenia, 376)
   he alone.m.sg cl.acc.m.sg dig.imperf.3sg water.imperf.3sg
   'he alone used to dig it and water it'
(37) a. Ca pe mine pe una (GN, Maramureș, 51)
   like DOM me.acc DOM one.f.sg
   'like myself'
b. Eu una l-am omorît (GN, Maramureș, 106)
   I one.f.sg cl.acc.m.3sg=aux.perf.1sg kill.pple
   'I myself killed him'
(38) i-am văzut eu cu ochii
   cl.acc.m.3pl=aux.perf.1sg see.pple I with eye.def.m.pl
   mei (AD I, Săcele, 43)
   my.m.pl
   'I saw them with my own eyes'
3.2. The adversative conjunction însă

There are relatively clear-cut pragmatic differences among the adversative conjunctions in present-day Romanian: dar and însă (Engl. ‘but’) invalidate expectations; ci (Engl. ‘but’) induces corrections to and substitutions in the propositional content; iar (Engl. adversative ‘and’) marks the thematic contrast (Zafiu, 2005, p. 3–5). Însă, unlike dar, signals the argumentative stance of the speaker (probably what Spiță, 2003, p. 253 calls a “supplementary emphatic function”), preserving the meaning it inherited from its old Romanian etymon însă/însăși (see DA, s.v. and §2.2.4 above).

Moreover, there is a register difference between dar and însă. Dar (and its regional synonyms da, numa, fără) is generally preferred in the non-standard uses, while însă is generally preferred in standard uses (Zafiu, 2005, p. 3, note 9). Nevertheless, însă occurs in non-standard uses too, more frequently in Oltenia, Muntenia, and Moldova (Teiuș, 1980, p. 119–120). It is noteworthy that the samples in the corpus (39) occur in the speech of partly educated informants who have/had frequent/long term contacts with out-groups. The tautological use (40) could indicate that speakers do not interpret însă as a marker of the adversative relationship between constituents, but rather as a textual deictic, emphatically resuming its antecedent.

(39) a. in timpul liber însă/ se-netreținea
   in time.DEF free ÎNS.F.SG CL.REFL.3SG=socialize.IMPERF.3SG
   cu noi (Moldova & Bucovina, 251)
   with us
   ‘in his spare time he used to socialize with us’

b. însă două oale se punea
   ÎNS.F.SG TOWO.F POT.F.PL CL.IMPERS PUT.IMPERF.3SG
   prima dată (Muntenia, 150)
   first.F time.F
   ‘but the first time, two pots were counted’

c. asistam de multe ori la... diferite
   witness.IMPERF.1SG DE many.F.PL time.F.PL at various.F.PL
   scandaluri care era/ însă nu aveam voie [...] scandal.neut.PL which were ÎNS.F.SG not have.IMPERF.1SG permission
   să mă... vir (Moldova & Bucovina, 118)
   SÅ[subj] CL.REFL.ACC.1SG get.involved.subj.1SG
   ‘I used to witness many scandals, but I was not allowed to interfere’

d. Acum însă le zicem jupini și domni
   now ÎNS.F.SG CL.DAT.3PL tell.PRES.1PL boss.PL and sir.PL
   și rid ei de noi (GN, Buzău, 226)
   and mock.PRES.1PL they.M DE us
   ‘but now we call them boss and sir and they mock us’

e. Asta însă nu îi spunea lui
   this.F.SG ÎNS.F.SG not CL.DAT.3SG tell.IMPERF.3SG LUI.DAT
   frate-său (GN, Constanța, 369)
   brother=his.M.SG
   ‘but he wouldn’t tell that to his brother’

f. nu mai lucrează/ însă înainte bătrînii
   not more work.PRES.3PL ÎNS.F.SG before old.people.DEF.M.PL
   lucrau (Dobrogea, 247)
   work.IMPERF.3PL
   ‘they don’t work anymore, but old people used to work before’
3.3. The noun ins

In present-day Romanian, the noun ins (Engl. ‘guy’, ‘man’, ‘person’, ‘individual’, ‘fellow’) occurs especially with its masculine plural form (însi) combined with a quantifier, both in standard (41) and non-standard (42) uses. One peculiar occurrence, dînsul (otherwise a personal/politeness pronoun, see §3.4 below) for ins, was spotted in a transcript (43), probably a formal confusion due to the infrequent use of the singular form ins.

(41) a. *La 113 înși ne aducea cite o piine* (S)  
    at 113 ins.m.pl cl.dat.1pl bring.imperf.1pl each one.f bread.f  
    ‘they used to bring us one loaf of bread for each of the 113 persons’

b. *Din mașina oprită au coborit cinci*  
   from car.def.f.sg stop.iple.f.sg aux.perf.3pl descend.iple five  
   insi, toți cu cefe de bivol (MG)  
   ins.m.pl all.m.pl with neck.f.pl of ox  
   ‘five guys with ox-like necks descended from the car which had stopped there’

c. *chem în ajutorul meu pe acești*  
   call.pres.1sg in help.def.neut.sg my.m.sg dom this.m.pl  
   unul sau doi înși (BF)  
   one.def.m.pl or two.m ins.m.pl  
   ‘I call these one–two guys to help me’

a. *Trei înși, beți turtă, merg în patru labe* (BZ)  
   three ins.m.pl drink.iple.m.pl cake walk.pres.3pl in four paw.pl  
   ‘three guys, as drunk as a fiddler, are crawling on the ground’

(42) a. *trei/ patru/ cinci înși* (Muntenia, 151)  
   three four five ins.m.pl  
   ‘three–four–five guys’

b. *Am fostu vo cinci, șase înși* (Tîrnave, 55)  
   aux.perf.1pl be.iple around five six ins.m.pl  
   ‘We were around five–six guys’

c. *doi înși* (Bistrița-Năsăud, 75)  
   two ins.m.pl  
   ‘two guys’
The examples above indicate a register-induced difference in the meaning of ins: while in non-standard uses ins preserved the neutral connotation it had in old Romanian, in standard uses it mostly occurs in negatively connotated contexts, triggering a depreciative implication or projecting negative emotions.

3.4. Dînsul – personal deictic, social deictic

The lexical unit dînsul has been preserved in present-day spoken Romanian, both standard and non-standard, but has undergone a process of functional differentiation.

In old Romanian it functioned as a pronominal substitute, initially after the preposition de, later it generalized in the P(repositional) P(hrase), and by the end of the period it functioned outside the PP (dlr, sv.). Until the end of the 19th c. and during the first decades of the 20th c. it occurred as a personal deictic in standard Romanian (44), as well as in several regional varieties of Romanian (45a–f), more frequently in Moldavia and the North-East of Dobrogea (Rusu, 1984, p. 220–221). Dînsul and el had parallel uses (45g). Notice example (45a), where dînsul occurs with an archaic form, without the incorporated definite article (–ul).

(43) Apoi își fac oricare cite o gaură în pămînt
then CL.REFL.DAT.3PL make.PRES.3PL anyone each a hole in ground
și tată dînsu are cite o botă în mină [...] (Maramureș, 149)
and every dînsu has each a cudgel in hand
‘then each digs a hole in the ground and each one (each guy) has a cudgel in his hand’
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d. Am fost vreo nouăzeci de inși (AD I, Transilvania, 51)
   ‘We were around ninety guys’

e. Atuncea facem o adunare/... șapte/ opt/ zece
   then make.PRES.1PL a reunion seven eight ten
   inși (Portițe de Fier, 174)
   ‘then we gather seven–eight–ten guys’

f. evan doi inși (Bistrița-Năsăud, 75)
   ‘we were two guys’

g. și-am fost doi inși (Moldova & Bucovina, 21)
   and=aUX.PERF.1PL be.PPLE two.M INS.M.PL
   ‘and we were two guys’

h. mai mulți inși (Dobrogea, 499)
   more many.M.PL INS.M.PL
   ‘several guys’

(44) a. Hîrtia e răbdătoare, căci pe dînsa poți
   paper.DEF.SG is patient.DEF.SG because on dînsul.DEF.SG can.PRES.2SG
   scrie ce vrei (Budai-Deleanu, apud DLR, sv.)
   write.INF what want.PRES.2SG
   ‘Paper is patient, because you can write whatever you want on it’

b. Cucoana Caliopi a primit tustrele râvașele
   Mrs. Caliopi AUX.PERF.3SG receive.PPLE all.three letter.DEF.F.PL
   și a râmas încintată
   and AUX.PERF.3SG remain.PPLE delighted.DEF.SG
   de dînsule (Negruzzi, apud DLR, sv.)
   by dînsul.DEF.PL
   ‘Mrs. Caliopi received all three letters and was delighted with them’
c. Înaintea tribunii, cu spatele spre in.front.of stand.DEF.GEN.F.SG with back.DEF towards
dinsa (Caragiale, apud DLR, s.n.) DÎNSUL.F.SG
‘In front of the stand with their backs to it’
d. raporturile acestor manifestări intre relationship.DEF.NEUT.PL this.GEN.PL manifestation.PL among
dinsele (Philippide, 1894, p. II) DÎNSUL.F.PL
‘the mutual relationships of these manifestations’

(45) a. Mai avea un singur fecior care mai era still have.IMPERF.3SG one single son who still was
pe lîngă dins (HS, Moldova, 46) near DÎNS.M.SG
‘he still had one son around’
b. Lupul a ieșit cu oaia wolf.DEF.M.SG AUX.PERF.3SG go.OUT.PPLE with sheep.DEF.F.SG
pe poartă/ am fugit după dinsul on gate AUX.PERF.1SG run.PPLE after DÎNSUL.M.SG
cu cîini (Moldova & Bucovina, 52) with dog.PL
‘The wolf went out the gate with the sheep, I ran after him with dogs’
c. Fac o casă/ cu două camere [...] bătut make.PRES.1SG a.F.SG house.F.SG with two.F.ROOM.F.PL fix.PPLE
tablă/ sau carton/ pe dinsa (Moldova & Bucovina, 49) tin or cardboard on DÎNSUL.F.SG
‘I build a house with two rooms, I fixed tin or cardboard on it’
d. pînă cînd curățam eu cepurile until when clean.IMPERF.1SG I spigot.DEF.NEUT.PL
de la dinsul (Bistrița-Năsăud, 81) from DÎNSUL.M.SG
‘until I cleaned its spigots’
e. s-a-îmburdat cruzea
pe dinsul (GN, Oaș, 58) on DÎNSUL.M.SG
‘the cross fell on him’
f. Intră-n casa străinu/ Și dă enter.PRES.3SG=in house stranger.DEF.NOM.M.SG and give.PRES.3SG
mîna cu dinsu hand.DEF with DÎNSUL.M.SG
‘the stranger enters the house and shakes hands with him’
g. Și potrivim și-l culcăm lemnul să and fix.PRES.1PL and=CL.ACC.M.SG lean.PRES.1PL stick.DEF.M.SG SĂSUBJ
dâm cu el cît mai sus [...] sau nu dâm cu hit.SUBJ.1PL with it as high SĂSUBJ not hit.SUBJ.1PL with
dinsul jos. Dacă dâm cu dinsu-n jos, DÎNSUL.M.SG low if hit.PRES.1PL with DÎNSUL.M.SG=downwards
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Then (Oltenia, 162)

‘And we fix and lean the stick to hit with it as high as we can, to avoid hitting with it at the lower part. If we hit with it at the lower part, then it pulls us after it’

After the second half of the 20th c., *dînsul* began to function as a social deictic (politeness pronoun for the 3rd person) in standard Romanian, shaping the grammatical system as a two person and four/three degrees of politeness: *tu – dumneata – dumneavoastră – domnia voastră; el – dînsul – dumnealui – domnia lui; voi – dumneavoastră – domniile voastre; ei/ele – dînsii/dînsle – dumnealor – domniile lor* (Vasilescu, 2008, p. 212–218; 2013, p. 401–402). Rarely, *dînsul* is used as a social deictic in non-standard varieties, especially in the Southern areas, by young persons constantly exposed to standard spoken and written Romanian in school and in the media.

(46) a. **Dînsul [judecătorul] a fost întrebat** (Muntenia, 583)

*he was asked*

b. [tovarășa învățătoare] m-a pus să povestesc lecția [...] M-a pus dînsa

‘[the teacher] asked me to tell the lesson. She asked me to repeat after her’

c. merge dînsul acoło cu noi (Oltenia, 365, 35 years old)

‘he goes there with us’

The evolution of *dînsul* from a positional variant of the personal pronoun (after prepositions) to a social deictic (pronom of politeness) might have gone through the following phases:

I. The phase of the semantic–cognitive opposition. After the form generalized in all the syntactic positions alternating with *el*, the initial syntactic opposition (+/− preposition) developed into a semantic-cognitive opposition, i.e. cognitive distance to the referent (dînsul) vs. cognitive proximity to the referent (*el*), supported by similar systemic oppositions in old Romanian (demonstrative of proximity/of remoteness – *acea*/*acea*; proximal demonstrative of identity/remote demonstrative of identity – *această*/*aceală*).

II. The phase of strategic politeness. The semantic-cognitive distance was converted into social distance/hierarchy, and *dînsul* began to function as a social deictic, which marks deference in relation to a non-interlocutor human referent.

3.5. **Adins** – adverb

The adverb *adins* is used in regional varieties of modern Romanian (47), as well as in colloquial standard Romanian (48a–b); standard usage rather resorts to neologisms such as *intenționat* ‘intentionally’, *special* ‘purposely’, *în mod expres* ‘expressly’, *deliberat* ‘deliberately’.

(47) Și *n-ar fi într-adins* (Făgăraș-Transilvania, 408)

‘and it wouldn’t be on purpose’

(48) a. **Repere în adins falsificate** (Roșu, 2012, 22)

‘landmarks deliberately falsified’
b. Parcă cineva vrea în adins răul as.if somebody want.pres.3sg in ADINS bad.def.m.sg
acestei localități (InfoV)
this.gen.f.sg town.def.f.sg
‘as if somebody deliberately wants evil for this town’

3.6. Insul

Însul, a syntactically and phonologically conditioned variant in present-day Romanian (after prepositions ending in ntr), was frequent until the beginning of the 20th c. (49); it was progressively eliminated from standard Romanian, but still occurs in non-standard varieties (50). In standard Romanian the personal pronoun or the demonstrative is largely used (in el/acesta ‘in it/in this one’; din el/din acesta ‘from it/from this one’; printre ei/printre aceștia ‘among them/among these ones’, etc.).

(49) Mintea noastră păstrează aducerea aminte a tuturor fenomenelor de limbă, care au vreodată printr-insă (Philippide, 1894, 1)
‘our mind remembers all the language phenomena it has ever been exposed to’

(50) a. nu avea voie să intr-e-ntr-insă (Moldova & Bucovina, 118)
‘he was not allowed to enter there’

b. Și-ntr-insii că intra (AD I, Tulcea, 18)
and=in=INSUL.m.pl that enter.imperf.3sg

c. Lumea toată să se-nchina/ world.def.f.sg all.f.sg sâ-subj cl.refl.acc.3sg=worship.subj.3sg
Celuia ce-ntr-insă vine (Maramureș, 189)
that.one.dat.m.sg that=in=INSUL.f.sg come.pres.3sg
‘Let the whole world worship he who enters it’

4. Conclusions

Romanian is the only Romance language that has preserved the formal descendant of the Lat. ipse and its uses (focal particle in the NP/PP, reflexive pronoun, reciprocal pronoun, and contrastive discourse deictic). Nevertheless, both the forms and the uses have slightly changed during the old and modern period.

The most significant phenomena in old Romanian (see §2 above) compared to Latin are the proliferation of forms and the emergence of new functional correlations. In modern Romanian (see §3 above) the most important changes concern the apparition of new lexical-grammatical syncretisms backed by new functional correlations and register preferences.

The following table synthetically presents the evolution of ipse from Latin to old Romanian and then to modern Romanian.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Usages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>*ipse</td>
<td>1. nominal and sentence intensifier (focal particle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. reflexive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. reciprocal pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. demonstrative pronoun expressing contrast at discourse level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Romanian</td>
<td>ins₁</td>
<td>1. intensifier (focal particle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. reflexive pronoun/anaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ins₂/ins</td>
<td>phonologically conditioned pro-form (&lt; ntr + insul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dinsul</td>
<td>syntactically conditioned pro-form (&lt; de insul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nusul</td>
<td>syntactically conditioned pro-form (&lt; cu insul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adins</td>
<td>1. syntactically conditioned pro-form (&lt; ad insu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. strategy to express the reciprocal meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>însuși</td>
<td>1a. pre- or postposed intensifier (focal particle) of a DP [+/- animate], with various contextually acquired meanings: focalization, contrastive focalization, cumulative focalization, singularity/uniqueness focalization, focalization of non-causativity, metalinguistic focalization, a synonym of the prefix-like particle auto; 1b. independent (free-standing) intensifier; 1c. adverbial intensifier; 2. reflexive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(possible)</td>
<td>bound intensifier attached to lexemes from various classes (pro-forms, demonstratives, indefinites, numerals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Romanian</td>
<td>insuși</td>
<td>pre- or postposed intensifier (focal particle) in a DP, most frequently [+human], sometimes also [–human], with various contextual meanings: focalization, contrastive focalization, cumulative focalization, uniqueness focalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ins</td>
<td>generic noun used in negative/disphoric contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>însă</td>
<td>conjunction, functionally distinct from the others in the adversative series (dar, iar, însă, ci)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dinsul</td>
<td>social deictic, expressing an intermediate degree of politeness with respect to the non-speaker/hearer participant in the interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adins</td>
<td>colloquial; standard Romanian and high registers prefer its synonyms intenționat, special, in mod expres, deliberat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Romanian</td>
<td></td>
<td>pre- or postposed intensifier (focal particle) in a DP, most frequently [+human], sometimes also [–human], with various contextual meanings: focalization, contrastive focalization, cumulative focalization, uniqueness focalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ins</td>
<td>generic noun, frequently used, neutral context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>însă</td>
<td>conjunction, rarely used, especially in redundant syntagms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dinsul</td>
<td>pro-form, often expressing cognitive distance; a strong tendency towards acquiring a social deictic function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adins</td>
<td>colloquial; standard Romanian and high registers prefer its synonyms intenționat, special, in mod expres, deliberat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard Romanian (sub-dialectal Romanian)</td>
<td></td>
<td>rarely an intensifier; preferred synonyms chiar, singur, numai unul, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andra Vasilescu

The evolution of *ipse* from Latin to present-day Romanian illustrates a case of poligrammaticalization (Diesel, *apud* Zamfir & Uța Bărăulescu, 2016, p. 420) and polymorphism (Sornicola, *apud* Zamfir & Uța Bărăulescu, 2016, p. 420), which is not the only one in the evolution of Romanian (see also Dinică, 2017, in the present volume).
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