THE CONCEPT OF "LATINITAS". A DIACHRONIC APPROACH

Petre Gheorghe BÂRLEA
Universitatea „Ovidius Constanța
gbarlea@yahoo.fr

Abstract:
Today, we find it strange to read in history treaties that "The Romans fought wars against the Latins", as, in the paradigm of our general knowledge, the two entities are one and the same. In reality, the concept of "Latinity" overlapped the concept of "Romanness" only later in history and only partially. Each of the two terms gained different meanings across history and their intersection took on complex forms marked by different manifestation perspectives: geographic-historic; political-military; legal-administrative; linguistic-stylistic; identity-cultural and anthropologic. In the following pages, we propose the creation of an inventory of these perspectives, which are definitory for the concept of "Latinity".

Keywords:
Latinity, Romanness, linguistic determinations, socio-cultural determinations.

1. Historic-geographic meaning

The first attested form of the word *latinitas* is the adjectival one, *latinus, - a, -um*, derived from *Latium*[1] (together with *Latialis, -eris*, an epithet of Jupiter, cf. DELL, *s.v.*), meaning "that which pertains to Latium", "that which is specific to the Latium region".

Initially, the term designated the central western region of the Italian Peninsula, more specifically, the triangular area called "the Roman plain" between the Tyrrhenian Sea, the left bank of the Tiber river in the north-west and the Campania region in the south-east. Here, we are referring to the oldest configuration of the land[2], which spread from the Pontine Marshes (*Pomptinae Paludes*), called by Virgilius *antiquum Latium* and *vetus Latium* by Suetonius.

[1] With unknown etymology, cf. DELL, *s.v.*
[2] With regards to the pre-Roman eras, the first historic information is taken, in principle, from Dyonis of Halicarnas, *Antiquitates Romanae*, I, 9. Cf. Francesca Fulminante, 2014 (cf. electronic version [archive]), pp. 35-60.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

At a subsequent stage, by means of the Roman conquests, the territory extended to the Apennine Mountains, to the Liri river in the north and further to the southern extremity of the Pontine Marshes, this being noted in the writings of historians and poets as *Latium adiectum*[3] or as *novum Latium*.

As of the end of the fifth century, *Latium* underwent many administrative-territorial organizations, the today *Lazio* region being far larger than the ancient one[4].

From this purely geographic-historic meaning, the term quickly evolved to have meanings of an administrative-legal and political connotation, followed by the ethnolinguistic one, especially in its noun form, with the abstraction suffix *-tas*, *Latinitas*.

2. The evolution of the political-legal sense

The starting point for the development of the initial term's semantic field is that of the plural form of the ethnonym *Latinus*, respectively *Latini, -orum.* As in the case of the development of future meanings, evidently, it all started from the natural meaning: "latinii", that is "inhabitants of Latium", its documentation enduring until the Classical Age (cf. Cicero, *De officiis*, 1, 38). Afterwards, however, the ethnic value was doubled and almost completely replaced by the legal and military-political one.

As we specified above, today, we find it strange to say the *Romans* fought against the *Latins*; yet, in the period of the late royalty, in that of the republic and even certain periods of the empire, the two terms did not interchange, as they do now, in our modern manner of thinking.

Latini, the native population of *Latium*, were organized in communities called *populi* and are considered to be the founders of the approximatively 30 citadels in the area, during the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. At a certain time, these were constituted into the *Confederatio Latina*, led by the Alba Longa citadel[5].

As of the end of Regal Rome (509 B.C.), the conflict that had begun between the Latin inhabitants of Rome and its last Etruscan king, Tarquinius Superbus (524-509 B.C.), still supported by Lars Porsena, the first magistrate of the Clusium citadel, led to the creation of the first form of the Latin Confederation, which opposed Rome. These confrontations show how many lines/nations/tribes of different ethnicities were actually populating the *Latium* region alone in the Italian Peninsula:

[3] Strabon, *Geographia*, V, 3, 4.
[4] Lonely Planet, *Italie 6 - Rome et le Latium*, 2014.
[5] Bernadette Liou-Gille, 1996, pp. 73-97 (electronic version [archive]).

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

- Etruscans, Ligures, Gales, Umbri, Sabines - north of Rome
- Latins, Volsci, Lucanians, Britians, south of Rome
- Greeks – in the western and meridional lands of the Italian Peninsula, in the Graecia Magna.

As we can see, the actual *latini* were only a small part of this population, *Aequi* and *Hercini*, to be more precise. These are *veteres* or *prisci Latini.* As in the case of Romans, they were characterized by qualities such as sobriety, discipline, courage, simplicity, efficiency. The *Latin league* was disbanded by Rome in 338, after the last wars fought against the non-Romans. At this point in time, almost the entire territory of *Latium* is attached. This means that the denomination *Roman* shall become one with that of *Latin*, and the title of *Latin* shall be granted - legally and politically - to different categories of Rome's subjects. Some of the holders of this new denomination remained Latins of an inferior rank, such as the *Justiniani latini,* the freed slaves, with an intermediary status between *cives* and *barbari.*

When Rome, the most developed of the Latium cities (formed - it is important to specify this - by people coming from Alba Longa and other parts), evolved even more and conquered other cities and their inhabitants (*Aborigenes, Ausones, Hernici, Equii, Etruscans, Falisci, Rutules, Sabines, Volsces*)[6], it gained a rather ambiguous legal status and, in any case, a very unstable one from one historic period to the next. As such, some cities maintained their independence, but their inhabitants had fewer rights than those of Rome. They were granted *jus conubii* (the right to marry Romans), *jus commercii* (the right to merchantry), *jus suffragii* (the right to vote within the Assembly of the Roman People); however, they were not granted *jus honorum* (the right to occupy high positions in the State) or *jus militiae* (the right to be enrolled as full-rights officers in the Roman Army). This legal status was maintained after the disbandment of the *Latin Confederation* (338 B.C.) based solely on political grounds[7]. However, the Roman rulers and conquerors of new territories awarded the same rights (granted, more difficultly when it came to *jus conubii*) to some of the new coloni. In fact, by means of special decrees, the foreigners in Latium, inhabitants of provinces made up of various ethnicities, could gain *the right to Roman citizenship* (even if they did not live in Rome) or the right to marry Romans (*jus conubii*), a right which, for a long time, was no granted even to the oldest of the Latium inhabitants.

Therefore, when Rome became the dominant actor in the region, the term *Latinity* constantly gained other political and legal valences, which, in

[6] M. Cary; H. H. Scullard, 1975, p. 31.
[7] Cf. Vl. Hanga și Al. Suceveanu, în: ECR, *s.v. latinii*.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

the end, were meant to legalize the first ones. To be more precise, the Latins were not "Roman citizens" (*cives romani*), nor were they Veneti (*peregrini*). Sometimes, the old Latins (*Latini veteres, Latini prisci*) could have had a status that was equal or inferior to that of the newly colonized citizens (*Latini coloniari*). On the other hand, there were legal and political differences between *Latinity* and *Romanness* (in the old, etymological sense of the two terms).

Romani were only those who originated from the inhabitants of the *Roma quadrata* city, built on the Palatine Hill in the seventh century B.C., who, in turn, were descendants of the Latins who came from the Alba Longa city in the tenth century B.C., mixed with Sabines and Etruscans in the area.

From the very beginning of Rome's conquest campaign, in the historic age, especially after the wars with the *socii* ("allies" from the east of the Italian Peninsula, also called *foederati*, initially - Samnites, Marsi, Gales, Umbri, Etruscans (in the 90-88 B.C.) -, the right to Roman citizenship was granted to all inhabitants of the Italian Peninsula, in stages and under certain conditions. Furthermore, all sorts of other "Latinity rights" were created and granted, in nuanced forms. After the fall of the last Etruscan king, Tarquinius Superbus, in the year 509, fights took place that lasted nearly three centuries: in the fifth century B.C., the city of Clusium led by the king Porsenna is conquered; between 406 and 396, wars were fought against the Etruscans from the South of Italy, which ended with the Romans conquering the city of Verii (396 B.C.) and so on.

In the fourth century B.C., between 340 and 388 B.C. to be more precise, all cities reunited under the *Confederatio Latina* requested rights equal to those of the Romans, supported by never-ending wars against Rome. The Campania population, which was not included in the confederation, also joined the rioters. These conflicts, known throughout history as "The War with the Latins", ended with Rome's victory and the disbandment of the Latin Confederation. As usual, the Romans applied the policy of the well-known *pax Romana*, treating its subject populations differently: some were attached to Rome, naturalizing them as *cives romani*; others were declared "inhabitants of cities of Latin law" (*colonia latina* and/or *municipia latina*), the latter following to receive the Roman citizenship depending on the loyalty and worthiness shown upon exercising their functions. This also implied hierarchies: certain people occupied only minor positions (at municipality level, for example) - *jus Latii minoris*, others became Latins by exerting more significant functions - *jus Latii majoris*[8].

[8] Paul Petit, 1967/1971, p. 140.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

This entire complicated network of political-legal meanings of the concept *latinitas* is reflected within the old, classic and late texts, regardless of the fact that the expressions and the terms are subject to small changes:

- The term *Latini* (accompanied by epithets such as *prisci, veteres*) designates the peoples of *Latium* which had *nomen Latium* by birth, cf. Cicero, *De Republica*, 1, 31; then, the word was used to designate the "Latin league/Latin Confederation" by means of antonomasia.

- The same Cicero attributes the term *Latinii* to those having gained *jus Latii* by birth, from allied ancestors, more often than not, cf. Cic., *Pro L. Cornelio Balbo*, 21; *Pro Sestio*, 30; *Laelius sive de amicitia*, 12)[9].

As Latinity became a political-legal concept used in the strategy of Roman conquests, the term *Latini, Latina* etc. designated various relations between Italy's inhabitants and the Eternal City: Gaius, the father of Roman law, uses in his work, *Institutiones*, 1, 22, the expression *Latini Juniani, "*the Junian Latins", designating the "freed slaves", as shown above, who were granted *Latina libertas*. This "Latin liberty", in turn, meant legal freedom, yet not citizen rights.[10]

3. Linguistic-stylistic meanings

Specialists frequently quote the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4, 12, 17 text, in which the *Latinitas* concept is defined as follows:

„*…quae sermonem purum conservat, ab omni vitio remotum. Vitia in sermone quominus is Latinus sit duo possunt esse: soloecismus et barbarismus.*"

"Latinity is that which preserves pure speech, far from any vice; the vices in speech, which could not exist in Latin, are two: solecism and barbarism". (*Rhet. Her*., 4,12,1)

Although they still maintain the ethnogeographic meanings, the basic forms of *latinus*[3] (which, in the meantime, became a noun, as well), then *latine* (adv.), *latinitas* (noun), by opposing *b**a**rbarus*, they gain predominantly linguistic senses: „(in) correct Latin"; „(in) appropriate/correct language", cf. Cic., *De optimo genere oratorum*, 4; *Brutus sive dialogus de claris oratoribus*, 166[11].

[9] Cf. Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum*; *Brutus* etc.

[10] Cf. Gaffiot, *s.v. Latinus*.

[11] As is the case of any term which suggests a nuance of maximum intensity, it reaches the point of meaning the reverse of the initial concept by means of the auto-antonym: Tacitus uses it with the sense of "bad joke / farce" cf. *Historiae*, 2, 88, and in Horatius' *Epistulae* 1, 9, 11 it appears with the sense of "bold, without shame".

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

The Roman developments, attested by W. Meyer-Lübke, cf. 4.227, begin from this meaning, as is the case of non-Roman languages, as well: Irl. *latein*, *laitnoir*, Brit. *ladin* (cf. Helv. *ladin*), etc. As is expected, a verb appears in the case of derived items, *latinizo, -are*, evidently following the *graecizo, -are* model, cf. Caelius Aurelianus, *Acutarum passionum libri tres*, 2,1,8. The same author uses the verb *latino, -are* in *De chronicis morbis* 5, 4, 77).[12]

Practically, the word *latinus* was very rarely used as a determinant adjective, see Cicero's expression *Latina lingua, De finibus bonorum et malorum*1,10. The orator himself used the actual term, in the form of a noun, *Latinus* (or *Latina*), with the sense of „Latin language (pure)": *in Latinum convertere*, cf. Cic., *Tusculanae disputationes*, 3, 29), or *Latina* „works written in Latin", cf. Cic., *Pro Archia poeta*, 23[13].

In Christian Latin and the entire late Latin, the term is almost exclusively used with the sense of "pure, authentic form of Classical Latin", as the barbarisms and, in general, the influences of any kind (Greek, Arab, etc.) had become current in speech, and the special, late meanings coloured and deformed the classic, standardized semantic forms. Hieronymus, the most authorized user of the Latin language in the age of the great *Bible* translations, offers the most convincing examples in this respect:

- *Nihil Latinius* (Hier., *Ep*., 58, 3) „nothing more Latin", „in the purest Latin possible";

- *Homo Latinissimus* (Hier. *Ep*., 50,2) „man that masters Latin perfectly, in all of its depths".

Centuries passed until *latinitas*, with the almost generalized sense of "correct, uncorrupted language" was replaced by *urbanitas.* Discussions of the oratorical and literary styles (high, medium, humble), started in the Classical Age, were extended into the late age. Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoriae*, 6,3,101-106)[14] uses *urbanitas* in this respect. Cicero still used it

[12] The use of the terms that mean "to Latinize", "Latin", etc. is imposed in the case of Caelius Aurelianus' texts (fifth century), member of the Methodical School of Medicine, as the respective treaties were adaptations, if not in fact translations from Greek of Soranos of Ephesus' medical writings (II century), cf. Aurelianus Caelius, *On Acute Diseases and On Chronic Diseases*. Edited and translated by I.E. Drabkin, Chicago: University Press, 1950.

[13] A proper noun is also attested in DELL, s.v., *Latinius*. Cf. Tac., *An*., 4, 68; 2, 66).

[14] In fact, the Latin rhetor quoted and completed Domitius Marsus, „*CI. qui* **de *urbanitate*** *diligentissime scripsit, quaedam non ridicula, sed cuilibet seuerissimae orationi conuenientia eleganter dicta et proprio quodam lepore iucunda: quae sunt quidem* ***urbana****, sed risum tamen non habent. CIII. Neque enim ei de risu sed* ***de urbanitate*** *est opus institutum, quam propriam esse nostrae ciuitatis et sero sic intellegi coeptam, postquam urbis*

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

with a general sense, of "politeness", "*bon ton* habits" (Cicero, *Ad familiares*, 3,7,5) or, if speaking about language, it gained the meaning of "spiritual expression". In the case of Cicero, it could also mean, in a general manner, "spirit". Of course, the replacement term, *urbanus, -a, -um,* had the initial form and meaning of "urban", that is "clean (neat)", "civilized", opposed to *rusticus.* In the beginning, it also meant "the spirit of the city", by definition, that of Rome, and Cicero states in *Brutus* 171:

…in vocibus nostrarium oratorum resonat quidam urbanius.

"in the pronunciation of our orators, it sounds somewhat more specific of Rome".

This statement reminds of the specificity of speaking the national languages in all of the modern world's large capitals, including in the Bucharest city from a few decades ago, when many inhabitants pronounced *șease, așea*). In any case, once adopted for clean/careful speech, as a rhetorical term, this *urbanitas*, correspondent of the Gr. *asteio**o**tes*, with all of its derived forms from *urbanus*, respectively *urbane, inurbane,* etc., shall impose itself permanently in the Roman and non-Roman specialized terminology, even if the lexical basis, *urbs,* was replaced within the modern languages by *villa* and *civitas*, cf. *ville, cité*, the derived terms being used only for the architectonic and administrative-territorial structure of such communities.

Now, the concept of *latinitas* and *urbanitas* suffers a paradoxical change. Vulgar Latin was spoken, in principle, by the popular masses in the urban environment[15]. The language spoken in the rural environment was, naturally, on an inferior level on the diastratic hierarchy, *lingua rustica* having special characteristics noted in the texts of the comedians, of satire poets and Latin grammarians. However, the final centuries of the Western Roman Empire and a millennium of survival of the Easter Roman Empire were characterized by the displacement of the economic life's center of gravity towards the life of the village, the feudal system, as Justinian's reign (527-565) ended - according to certain historians - the Roman rule in Eastern

*appellatione, etiam si nomen proprium non adiceretur, Romam tamen accipi sit receptum. CIV. Eamque sic finit: "**urbanitas** est uirtus quaedam in breue dictum coacta et apta ad delectandos mouendosque homines in omnem adfectum animi, maxime idonea ad resistendum uel lacessendum, prout quaeque res ac persona desiderat", cui si breuitatis exceptionem detraxeris, omnis orationis uirtutes complexa sit.*" A little bit lower, he quotes the meaning that Cato attributed to the word in question: CV. "*Vrbanus homo {non} erit cuius multa bene dicta responsaque erunt, et qui in sermonibus circulis conuiuiis, item in contionibus, omni denique loco ridicule commodeque dicet. Risus erit quicumque haec faciet orator*".

[15] Cf. A. Meillet, 1923, pp. 227 *sqq.*

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

Europe, replacing Antiquity (therefore, slavery) with the Middle Ages (so, with the "feudalization of the agricultural production relations")[16]. Consequently, the term *urbanitas* is filled with the positive meanings of the speech of the few still remaining in the urban settlements, and also with the negative connotations of the "precious" manner of expressing oneself, still popular, *recte* "strange". And, furthermore, *urbanitas* can also mean a general behavioural affection, a predisposition toward sophistication, toward speculations which bring to mind the old sense of "irony", even more so "bad joke", which was attributed to the term *urbanitas* (and to the old term, *latinitas*).

However, *latinitas* becomes the mark of expression of the majority of the rural community population, already organized in feudalities, etc. Especially the neo-grammar, biology, psychology linguists (such as H. Paul and W. Mayer-Lübke – neo-grammarians; J. Vendryes, A. Meillet, S. Pușcariu, R. Menéndez-Pidal – promotors of the phonetic „laws", human laws, in general; then the „Wörter und Sachen" current – Rudolf Meringer, Hugo Schuchardt, Max Wagner, G. Giuglea, etc.) speak of the peasant character of popular Latin as of a plus value: a language that is "simpler, more natural and more spontaneous than before".[17]

a) However, the relation with classic Latin is taken into account by the researchers of the popular Latin's evolution in association with the social-economic changes that occurred within the Empire. In principle, the disappearance of the old social classes, more specifically, of the Roman aristocracy, which had passed through complicated processes both in the West, under the Germanic kingdoms, and in the East under the pressure of the Byzantine social system, made it so that the influence of classic Latin decreased dramatically, so that "popular Latin may evolve freely", being marked by the influence of other factors. This is the moment in time when the disintegration of dialects and provincial forms occurs. For the West, the loudest example is that of Galilei, where three different popular idioms develop in the same province - the French group; the Provencal group; the French-Provencal group, these being divided in turn into sub-groups - depending on the organization of the Germanic kingdoms, respectively the Visigoths and Burgundy. For eastern Latin, the examples of the Dalmatian language and of Daco-Romanian come to mind...

Of course, the cultural factor cannot be neglected in the case of any of these forms of popular Latin. Researchers less indebted to the biology currents, such as Walter von Wartburg, show that, in the older period of Latin,

[16] I. Iordan-M. Manoliu-Manea, 1965, p. 39.
[17] *Ibidem*, p. 37.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

there were significant differences from one region to the next in the Roman provinces, depending on the influence of classical culture; examples of such extremes are Spain - where traditional Latin culture was best kept (from the written one - of the elites, to mythology and spoken legends), respectively Dacia - with the most modest influences exerted in mythological-folkloric traditions. The other provinces occupy intermediary places, on different levels, between these extremes[18].

b) Christian Latin, which some researchers such as Vejko Väänänen, Einar Löfstedt or Christine Mohrmann consider to be decisive for the transformation of popular Latin into modern Roman language, did not bring any significant contribution to the evolution of the *latinitas* idea, except with regards to the cultural-theological aspect. The Christian Latin spoken by the first Christians is a special diastratic - stylistic, pragmatic – version of the popular Latin from the first centuries of Roman Christianity, therefore from the first three centuries of the Empire, impregnated with numerous archaisms and vernacular structures, then with Greek forms and Hebrew-Aramaic forms and, finally, marked by known internal innovations, in the sense of semantic changes, of morpho-syntactical simplifications due to the profoundly expressive and imagistic character of this version of Latin.

When the great writings of Latin Christianity appeared, *Vulgata*, Jerome's translations and epistles, Aurelius Augustinus' exegeses, the poems of Ausonius, Claudianus and Commodianus, Prudentius' poems and the texts of apologetics Tertulianus, Arnobius, Minucius Felix and Ciprianus, the Latin used was the classic one rather than the popular one. It corresponded to the return of the classical culture's values in the European intellectuals concerns and through them and the clerics of the great Latin-Roman communities (especially the Latin-Hispanic ones), scholarly influences started to exert upon the languages/dialects. The phenomenon is that of re-Latinization, evidently stronger in the western world, and weaker and with a later occurrence (in the Enlightenment era) in the eastern world.

Unfortunately, in the old ages, the eastern Christianity did not gain much from the Church fathers' writings in Greek either, the influences of the latter – very small – coming especially from Slavonic and Slavic, as is generally known.

4. The modern concept of "Latinity"

Strictly at linguistic level, setting aside all other details, the following aspects should be considered:

[18] Walter von Wartburg, 1967.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

a) The concept of *latinitas* does not apply to ethnic groups, but only to the linguistic structure: Roman peoples were not born Romans, but from the amalgamation of native and Venetic peoples, into which Roman colonists were completely absorbed; in the language, however, all pre-Latin and post-Latin contributions (sublayer, superlayer, adlayer, various influences) merged into the basis of popular Latin - this is a fundamental truth in its simplicity.

b) *Latinitas occidentalis* and *Latinitas orientalis* walked hand in hand for a long time and still maintain numerous common elements, despite the division of the old Roman Empire and the very different historic evolution of its two parts. The specific elements of oriental Latin are offered, as is the case of other medieval and modern linguistic contacts, by the internal and external conditions of the historic development, etc.

However, a few questions with difficult answers are still being asked today:

a) When do we cease to speak of *Latinity* and when do we begin to speak of *Romanness*?

b) What is the situation today? What is the difference between these concepts?

Only specialists – historians, linguists – make the necessary differences. Otherwise, everyone speaks of *Latinity* in a general sense, with the known ethnolinguistic connotations.

The factors that produced the differentiations within popular Latin and then between Roman languages are considered to be *time* and *space* (the latter rather being an element of proximity)[19]. In other words, *the historic factor* (the period in which certain provinces were conquered, the degree of integration of their populations, etc.) combines with the *ethnic factor* (how many populations and languages were at the time of the Roman conquest[20]).

In general knowledge, it is not noted that the language could not be unitary not even within a sole former Roman province, for example. Each Latinized *area* (we expressly use an ambiguous term) took on the popular Latin in the state in which it was at the time of the conquest, on the one hand, however, filtered through the native inhabitants' own speech particularities, on the other hand. With regards to this last aspect, we refer to what is called *the basis of articulation*, that is the own manner of phono-morphological adaptation of the adopted language to the possibilities of one's own linguistic

[19] Cf. Ferdinad de Saussure, 1922/1995, pp. 267 *sqq*

[20] Iorgu Iordan and Maria Manoliu-Manea also quote Al. Philippide, who, in *Originea românilor*, I, shows that there were over 300 different populations in Easter Europe, attested only within the period between the first conquest in the area and the moment in which eastern popular Latin took on a Romanian aspect. We referred to the modern edition, Iași, Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza", 2014.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

system. In the more recent research, this also includes the *basis of audition*[21]. We are dealing with phenomena which we can verify now as well: each population learns English and pronounces it in its own way, depending on its own phono-morphological system, sometimes even semantically, etc.

As of the Middle Ages, the concept of *Latinity* returns to its ethnolinguistic component, acquiring a degree of generality and a diffuse character, which is accentuated up to this day. Nowadays, beyond the circle of specialists – historians, linguists, anthropologists – no one differentiates *Romans* and *Latins*. On the contrary, the term *Latin* is granted to all Roman peoples (of which, sometimes, the eastern ones are omitted - Romania and the Republic of Moldova). Given that the ethnic structure of a people is given by a conglomerate of influences imposed by history and the geography of its genesis, not even the Italians are "pure" Latins.

The other branches have reached the same status with actual Roman-Latins, all of them being called *Latins*, and not just those in the Italian Peninsula, but those in the Iberic Peninsula, the entire area of the former Gaul, Dacia, etc. as well, even though the Celtic, Celtic-Iberic, Germanic, Thracian-Dacian, Slavic, Arab elements were not at all neglectable in the genesis of these peoples. Moreover, their descendants are also *Latins*, forming an entire continent by means of geographic discoveries and migrations: Latin and Central America, whose existence eluded even the Romans. Latinity in Northern Africa and in the west and south of Asia is no longer discussed today, except for within circles of initiates in old social history and diachronic linguistics of these continents.

In modern *media*, in movies and current literature, the term *Latinity* has gained new ethnic and linguistic values, with visible identity-cultural, as to not say racial, connotations. Labels such as "Latin blood", etc., designating a human mould, usually a Hispanic characterized rather negatively, have started to attract exuberance, disorder, sentimentalism, etc. and at linguistic level, humorous sonorities.

In other words, the ethnolinguistic component returns onto the history spiral, however, with other conceptual traits than the old ones.

Bibliography

CARY, M.; SCULLARD, H. H., 1975, *A History of Rome: Down to the Reign of Constantine*, New York: St. Martin's Press.

[21] The idea appears in Iorgu Iordan and Maria Manoliu-Manea's book, p. 25; however, a development of the entire theory of the basis of articulation can be found in Al. Gafton, in DICE, 15-2, 2018, pp.7-110.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)

ERNOUT, Alfred; MEILLET, Antoine, 1932/2001, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots* (DELL). Édition augmentée, par Jacques André, Paris: Klincksieck.

FULMINANTE, Francesca, 2014, *The Urbanisation of Rome and Latium Vetus: From the Bronze Age* (cf. versiunea electronica [archive]).

GAFFIOT, Felix *et. al*., 2000, *Le grand Gaffiot: Dictionnaire latin-français*, Paris: Hachette.

GAFTON, Al., 2018, „Le lieu d'articulation et les habilités articulatoires dans une perspective évolutive", în: DICE, 15-2, 2018, pp.7-110.

HANGA, Vl. și SUCEVEANU, Al., „Latinii", în: Dumitru Tudor (coord.), 1982, *Enciclopedia Civilizației Romane* (ECR), București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, *s.v.*

IORDAN, Iorgu; MANOLIU-MANEA, Maria, 1965, *Introducere în lingvistica romanică*, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

LIOU-GILLE, Bernadette, 1996, «Naissance de la ligue latine: mythe et culte de fondation», in: *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, n° 1, 1996, pp. 73-97 (cf. versiunea electronică [archive]).

MEILLET, Antoine, 1923/1977, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, Paris: Klincksieck.

PETIT, Paul, 1967/1971, *La paix romaine*, Paris: Presse Universitaire de France.

PHILIPPIDE, Alexandru, 1923-1928/2014-2016, *Originea românilor*, I-II, Iași: Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza".

SAUSSURE, Ferdinad de, 1922/1995, *Cours de linguistique générale*, Paris: Payot.

WARTBURG, Walter von, 1967, *La fragmentation linguistique de la Romania*, éd. revue et augmentée. Trad. par J. Allières et G. Straka, Paris: Klincksiek.

BDD-A30379 © 2019 Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:57:40 UTC)