The Romanian îns, ins ‘person, human being’
and its roots in Proto-Indo-European
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In the Romanian language there is the noun îns, ins ‘person, human being’ for which the current etymology needs to be revisited. The forms are masc. îns, ins, fem. insǎ, masc. pl. inşi, fem. pl. inse, all meaning ‘person/persons, someone, anyone’, as in expressions like ciţi inşi? ‘how many people?’, tot insul ‘everyone’. Traditionally, this Romanian noun, as well as the personal pronoun insul ‘he’, însa ‘she’, etc., was explained through the Latin demonstrative pronoun ipsé (-a, -um) ipsus, ‘that very, just that, self’. However, since ipsus proper is not to be found in the Romanian language, all the reflexes mentioned above supposed a formation with the preposition in + ipsus (ILR 1969: 300). To verify this etymology we should begin our investigation in the Latin etymological dictionaries.

Tucker in his Etymological Dictionary of Latin (1931) gives for ipsé: “*i- (v. is) + pt- + s-e (*s-o) Old Latin sam, sapso- (= ipsa)”. Wordsworth in his Fragments (1876) states on page 94 that:

Ipsus is not uncommon in Old Latin. It occurs in Plautus frequently, and in Terence (Hee. 455) and Cato, R. R. 70. 2. Even ipsos is found in Festus, Ep. s. v. alius, from the laws of Numa Pompius, ‘Si quisquam alius faxit, ipsos Iovi sner esto.’ (For alius see under TA, Class iii). Corsen derives it from the stems i- and so-, with the enclitic particle pe introduced, as in nus-p-iant, and so ea-p-se, si-rem-p-se; etc. (ii. p. 847);

and on page 112:

Pe- appears in the middle of words in i-p-se, reap-se, vs-p-iam, and at the end in qui-ppe, nem-pe, pro-pe, ipsi-ppe, the latter from Festus, s. v., ‘ipsi neque alii’. It evidently bears the same relation to pa- as ce- to ca-, ka-, and as the Oscans and Umbrians substitute p for k, this may, perhaps, be considered as a dialectic form.

Please note that this author refers to the particle ‘p’, ‘pt’ ‘pe’, as a dialectic, Oscan-Umbrian development.

A. Walde (Walde 1910) on page 392 gives similar attention to the consonant ‘p’ with regard to this Latin pronoun ipse,-a,-um ‘self‘ < is + pse, suggesting an Old Latin ea-pse, ea-psa, or, Old Latin sapso ‘ipsa’, with a particle p also present as in quis-p-iam; in Ossetic the ps>ss as in essuf, esuf ‘there’, and isso ‘hic, is’, conform esto Lat iste, and in Umbrian isso = Lat. ipse.
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Further, we find in Mallory-Adams (2006: 417), that the Latin demonstrative pronoun ās/aïd has its root in the PIE *h₁éi/*h₁ihe₁/*h₁id, and the stressing forms ās-te/ās-ta/ās-tu in PIE *so/*seh₁/*tód.

From these etymological analyses one should notice the difficulties encountered for the explanation of the Latin demonstrative pronoun ipse (-a, -um) ipsus, especially with regard to the particle ‘p’, considered in the end a dialectal development (Wordsworth). These difficulties must be taken into account when discussing the Romanian noun ins and personal pronoun însul ‘he’, însa ‘she’. More importantly, the change of the consonantal Latin group ps into ss that took place in some Romance languages, did not take place in Romanian. The center of this transformation was Italy, and it is considered as a result of an Oscan-Umbrian substrata, a change that probably took place around the Second Century A.D., the time of the Roman colonization in Dacia (ILR 1969: 43).

This Latin demonstrative pronoun ipse (-a, -um), ipsus, considered by the Romanian linguists as the base for the Romanian personal pronouns însul, însa, etc., formed with the preposition in + ipsus, etc., is habitually used with prepositions such as: intr-, as in intr-însul ‘within him’, dintru-însul ‘from him’, printr-însul ‘through him’, etc.; in expressions like: “Că numai oasele-au rămas dintr-însul” ‘Only bones remained from him’ (citation from Coșbuc in DM 1958), thus assuming ‘through him’, etc.; in expressions like: “They themselves’, as found in Deacon Coresi 1581 “că elŭ e însulŭ fiulŭ lui Dumnnezeu”, ‘that he himself is the son of God.’ The same applies to the formal pronoun 3rd pers. sg. dînsul ‘he’, dînsă ‘she’, and pl. masc. dînşii, fem. dînsele ‘they’, probably a compound of de+însul, de+însa, etc.; it should be noted that there are no such formations for 1st and 2nd pers. sg. and pl. In his dictionary, Ciorănescu under ins, (să) finds a relation of the Romanian pronoun dînsul with the Italian desso ‘he himself’, Comelico densu, denso, Friulian zenso, id., which, after Tucker are believed to be formed probably from the Lat. idem ipsus, ipse, with the ps>s s change already complete.

The nominal form ins, insa ‘a person, any person’, is also found in Aromanian nisu, Megleno-Romanian ons; Istro-Romanian āns.

The complex developments for which this noun is responsible in Romanian language and the difficulties met in accepting the traditional etymology through the Latin ipse, -a, -um, ipsus requires a look from a different perspective.

Mallory-Adams in his PIE reconstructed roots, lists at page 409 the form

*₇h₁énsus ‘god, spirit, vital force’; IEW 48 *ansu-; GI 653; BK 369 *an-ah-/*ən-ah-; ON əss ‘god’ [gen. ásir, nom. pl. aesir]; OE əs (gen. pl. ēsa) ‘god’; Goth (as reported by Jordanes) anses ‘half-gods’, Av anhu ‘lord, overlord; life (period) of existence’, ahura- (<*h₁nu-su-ró-) ‘god, lord’, Ahura Mazda ‘the highest of gods’; OInd āsu- ‘powerful spirit’, āsura- ‘divine, mighty; god, lord’.

And in an earlier work he specifies: “This *₇h₁énsus has long been thought to be related to *₇h₁en(h₁)- ‘breath’ (and thus might mean ‘spirit’ or ‘inspirator’ or the
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like’ (Encyclopedia 1997: 330). From this investigation we can observe that phonetically and semantically the Romanian ins could be related to the PIE *h₂énsus ‘god, spirit, vital force’, ins meaning just that, ‘human being, breathing person’. Moreover, its use in forming the reflexive pronoun to express ‘the self’, connoting the spirit within oneself, on a larger scale, the sense of ‘spirit, life, vital force’, as originally attributed to in the Indo-European vocabulary, and as attested also in Jordanes (Getica) anses ‘half-gods’, perhaps ‘heroes’ or ‘persons of importance’ that require respect, a semantic nuance which may explain the polite pronoun dînsul, dînsa, showing a possible influence of the Gothic language over the Dacian-Romanian.

In religious texts written in Medieval Latin we find the form ens ‘human being’, present participle of esse, cognate with Greek ὄν, present participle of εἰμί, infinitive εἶναι ‘be’; this concept is used in philosophical discourse as ens a se ‘being from itself’, or ‘the uncaused Being’ who is God, a concept comparable with that of the PIE *h₂énsus. A relation between this PIE root and Medieval Latin form is not yet recognized, although the general consensus is that the Latin ens is made up by philosophers under the Greek language influence. Apart from the semantic connections, the possibility of the Medieval Latin to influence the Romanian form ins is minimal, since the most influential theologian Thomas Aquinas wrote in the 13th Century his De Ente et Essentia [‘On Being and Essence’] in which he discussed the Catholic meaning of ens, ablativente, while the Romanian form îns is attested fully developed in medieval religious literature as for example at 1581 in Deacon Coresi, Carte cu Învăţătură: “şi veniră cătr’însulŭ” ‘and they came towards him’, or, “Aceasta amu însuşŭ ştie” ‘This he himself knows’, proving that it was well established in language at that date in the current form.

The Romanian reflexive pronoun însumi, însuţi, însuşi, etc., could very well be formed as însu (human being) + mi (I myself), însu-ţi (yourself), însu-şi, însi + ne, însi + vă, însi + şi, meaning ‘in my spirit, within myself’, etc. To support this formation process we could take a look at the reconstructed IE personal and reflexive pronoun, e.g. *h₁eğ ‘I’, emphasized as in *h₁eğ-óm ‘I myself’, showing an enclitic particle -óm; for second personal pronoun we have an enclitic particle *-te, as in Alb –tê, etc.; the 1st dual ‘we two, us two’, e.g. Grk nó ‘we two, us two’, Toch B wene ‘we two’, Alb ne ‘us’; the 2nd person plural enclitic *wos, e.g. Lat vos, Skt vas. (Mallory-Adams 2006: 416-417) Thus, in accord with the IE structure the Romanian reflexive pronoun însu-mi, însu-ţî, etc., could be a compound form: ins ‘the self, human being’ and the IE pronominal system, with stressing enclitic particles as reconstructed by Mallory-Adams.

Recent studies in comparative linguistics, particularly in some isolated IE languages from the Caucasian area in relations with languages from the South East European region could help clarify some unexplained Romanian isoglosses. In particular, in recent studies of the Burushanski language, we find the noun insa:n ‘human’, considered a loan word from Urdu insaan ‘human’ (Munshi 2006), which shows a very interesting relation to the Romanian ins ‘person, human being’. On the same note, the last studies of Ilija Ćasule on the relations between Burushanski, Macedonian, Romanian, and Albanian, (Ćašule 2012a and Ćašule 2012b) bring to our attention a few Romanian isoglosses with uncertain etymologies, that are considered from a common substrata, as for example, Romanian baci ‘older shepherd’, Albanian baç ‘elder brother, uncle’, Burushanski bač ‘goat house, sheep
house’, Macedonian bačilo ‘pen, enclosure in the mountains’; or, Romanian ciucă, ‘peak of mountain’, Albanian çukë ‘id’, Burushanski čok ‘sharp (mountain) peak’, Macedonian čuka ‘stony mountain peak’.

Concluding, the Romanian noun îns, ins shows a strong persistence of an archaic concept of the spirit, thriving in the Romanian cultural heritage, together with other such archaic notions, as that of ‘the self’, m. sine, f. sinea < PIE *séwe, Skt svá ‘one’s own’, Toch A šîn ‘one’s own’ Toch B šañ ‘one’s own’, Latin sē ‘him-/her-/itself’, OHG sih ‘him-/her-/itself’, Germ sein, subject of philosophic discourses, among which that of the famous Constantin Noica serves as a good example.

References

Čašule 2012b: Ilija Čašule, Macedonian and South Slavic Lexical Correspondences with Burushanski, Balkanistica, 25:1, p. 221.

Abstract

The Romanian noun ins, ins, meaning ‘person, human being’ has traditionally been explain through the Latin demonstrative pronoun ipse (-a, -um) ipsus, ‘that very, just that, self’, in spite of the phonetic difficulties. This paper offers a new perspective on the subject, relating the Romanian isogloss to the Proto-Indo-European form *h₂énhus ‘god, spirit, vital force’ as reconstructed by Mallory-Adams in their latest work. Recent studies of isolated Indo-European languages, such as Burushanski, may bring new and interesting perspectives in comparative linguistics.