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Dear readers,

Christmas is over and the New Year started. I hope all readers enjoyed their holidays, whether it was Catholic and Protestant Christmas, Orthodox Christmas, Gregorian Calendar New Year, Georgian New Year, Korean Lunar New Year, etc. Same as the varieties of different holidays of one and the same source or of different source with the same meaning, we have a road variety of topics in this issue. Among others, there are a few articles about Dobrudja contributed by co-editor Iulian Mitran who gives a glimpse into the churches of the former Ottoman region. Enache Tuşa rounds up the Dobrudjan contributions with a history on demographics in the area and the colonization of the territory. Nikolay Kuznetsov gives an introduction into Interslavic, a constructed language to simplify the communication among Slavs without the need of English – or in other words: is Interslavic a serious competitor for English in business and science? Our bibliography section in this issue thus is themed to Slavic language, identity and history. A very “hot” topic is the question of demons which is encountered by Dejan Vasiljević. He focusses on the astral world and as expert on witchcraft wants to show what kind of creatures there can be found exactly. Indeed, I am well aware that neither theology nor philosophy will be really happy with this issue as this is often labeled as pseudo-science. But it is a fact that demons are mentioned in all holy books and are treated with several attributes. We don’t want to show agreement or disagreement with this article, but we want to give room for discussion for a topic which is often tabooed. I am not well aware how Christian theology deals with demon explanations in the Bible, but we agreed that even if it is a very controversial matter, as this is part of transmitted tradition, our journal is a fit for this issue as long as it is kept in a scientific manner.

Despite that, enjoy photos of Saudi Arabia taken by Diana Shamaa who lives in the country since more than seven years. Andrei Bontas dives into history and Alexandru Drăgulin contributed a review on political ethics. As chief editor, I contributed two articles, one about the framework and namings within the Chechen Bible, and a paper on which shall serve as introduction into Jewish philosophy.

Timo Schmitz, 12 February 2018
Theodore Mankaphas or Theodore Branas?

Andrei Bontas

The field of Byzantine numismatics is a broad and complicated field, which often presents riddles that puzzle historians and numismatists for years. One of these problems, which some historians and researchers have come to regard as a rather insignificant but appealing conundrum, is continuously attracting interest. Raised by a particular billon *trachy* of a peculiar shape and design, first noticed in 1967 the issue of its proper identification and attribution has since been at the center of many debates. Collectors usually refer to this issue as the "Theodore Mankaphas trachy" and, being a rather rare coin, Byzantine numismatics aficionados and researchers are looking out for new specimens to add to the corpus of known examples.

Presented here is a specimen from a German private collection, which has not been published before neither in local numismatic publications nor international online numismatic forums, together with a foray into its two possible attributions (Fig. 1):

![Fig. 1](image-url)
Specs:

AE30x27mm 2.47g scyphate trachy, of deep concavity (ca. 3mm in depth)

**OBV:** [IC] – [XC]; Christ standing

**REV:** +/Θ/Δ/Ρ in left field – " B / M (or AN/ARN) monogram in right field, both legends running vertically; Emperor standing holding sceptre surmounted by patriarchal cross, wearing stemma (flat crown), divitision and loros.

**REF:** Grierson 1126-7.

**NOTE:** Most of the legend is very well preserved, a rather uncommon feature for this issue, which is often encountered in a bad to mediocre state of preservation.

The two attributions left standing for this interesting type — after the discarding of the Theodore-Peter tentative on account of inconsistencies between the historical data, the figure's importance as a ruler versus the small volume of coins available, especially considering the enormous amounts of typical Bulgarian trachea known from hoards and singular finds, the fact that at the time the regular Bulgarian coinage consisted of "Bulgarian imitatives", coins that followed the known Byzantine types rather than new specifically Bulgarian types, the unlikely representation of the name Theodore although the Tsar reigned under the name Peter and the representation of a singular imperial figure on the reverse although Peter shared the rule with his brother Asen in a traditionally Byzantine fashion — are Theodore Mankaphas or Theodore Branas. Both theories have their merits and their faults:

1. **Theodore Mankaphas** (usurper in Philadelphia, 1188-1189/90 and 1204-1205)

As a magnate of Philadelphia, Theodore Mankaphas seized power there in 1188, during a campaign of Isaac II Angelos in Bulgaria, and soon managed to gather local support all throughout Lydia in Asia Minor. His capital was set at Philadelphia and he managed to rule for almost a year before Isaac finally marched against him and convinced him to step down from his usurpation by granting him the title of **Doux of Philadelphia** and the governorship of the city. He was probably there to meet the armies of Frederick I Barbarossa in April 1190 on their march towards the Holy Land. Soon after, he lost popular support and was deposed by Basil Vatatzes, who then cast him away to the territories controlled by the Turks. Theodore found refuge and gathered troops from the Turks to pillage Chonae, Laodicea,
Aphrodisias and provoke unrest, which prompted another imperial campaign against him, after which he was surrendered and imprisoned. In 1204, following the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins, he resurfaced to recapture power in Philadelphia where he ruled again for around a year until, presumably, joining ranks with Constantine Lascaris and being defeated at Adramyttium by the knights of Henry of Flanders, in March 1205.

According to Nicetas Choniates, Mankaphas minted coins in his own name with a representation of himself in imperial attire, but just during his first usurpation in 1188-1190. Hendy identifies those coins with the issue presented in this paper, rejecting the Bulgarian Tsar Peter attribution on account of the aforementioned historical, scriptural and iconographic inconsistencies. The scarcity of these coins next to the bulk of *trachea* that circulated in Bulgaria around the same time (ca. 1188-1195) to him is evidence that, although the type was present in Bulgaria, the minting place could not have been Bulgaria, especially when we realize that from Veliko Tarnovo, the capital of Peter and Asen’s Bulgarian Empire and main mint, come only 4 or maybe 5 specimens with secure provenance. This line of reasoning is supported also by the fact that it wouldn't have been the first Byzantine usurpatorial coinage to make its way into Thrace and Bulgaria: we also have the examples minted in Cyprus under Isaac of Cyprus, that might have arrived via trading routes, a situation possible in the case of these *trachea* as well.

Although very few finds come from Asia Minor, Bendall and Morrisson note an instance of 6 pieces found together in Izmir, which might lead some to incline that the type circulated as regular coinage in Asia Minor. Furthermore, Hendy notes that none of the specimens he had researched, seen or heard about, had the Slavic Б on the reverse legend, but instead the normal B and that the reading of the legend:

```
+ Θεόδωρος Βασιλεύς ὁ Μαγκαφάς (+ Theodore Basileus Mankaphas)
```

as + Θεόδωρος Βασιλεύς ὁ Μαγκαφάς (+ Theodore Basileus Mankaphas) should be evident.

The usage of *basileus* instead of the usual *despotes* in this period is not really explained other than by the fact that an unusual title would not be that impossible considering that we deal with an unusual
issue. Grierson interpreted the legend along the same lines although he misread it as +Θ/Δ/E, perhaps because of the unavailability of better preserved specimens at the time.

2. Theodore Branas (Caesar of the Latin Empire, 1204, Lord of Adrianople, Apros and Demotica after 1205)

Stemming from the Adrianople aristocracy (his father Alexios Branas had been protosebastos for Andronikos I Komnenos and a hereditary magnate in Thrace) and probably also under the influence of his lover, Agnes de France, to whom he would eventually marry in the summer of 1204, Theodore immediately acknowledged the establishment of the Latin Empire of Constantinople and did homage to Baldwin I. For this he was rewarded with the title of Caesar, served as representative and defender of the Greek interests in Thrace and, after the fall of Baldwin, became an ally to Henry of Flanders, as he ruled as regent and then as emperor.

For his services, Geoffroi de Villehardouin notes that he was allowed to rule Adrianople, Apros and Demotica as lord, which he secured as a vassal of the Latin Empire in 1205/6 and defended against Bulgarian attacks.

In his argument for attributing this type to Branas either at Adrianople or Demotica/Didymoteichon, Docev brings into discussion the discovery of an inscription at Kricuva (northern Greece) which mentions a member of the Branas family with the BRANA form, written with A and N in ligature, in a way reminiscent of the monogram legend on the monetary type in question. Thus, considering the condition of most of the preserved specimens (the one pictured in this paper also lacks half of the legend in the right field on the reverse) the legend could actually look like or something similar to:

```
+ B
Θ M
Δ P
```

and read +Θεόδωρος Βράγα (+Theodore Branas), without any titular rank.
The monetary finds, conspicuously and coherently numerous in Bulgaria, could also be an indicator of a local issue rather than one from Asia Minor. In addition, the coins of this type are of similar dimensions to the early Venetian-minted Latin *trachea* of the large module, and the Western feudal system which Henry tried to implement in the Latin Empire – allowing loyal Greek magnates the privilege of lordship and a higher degree of autonomy than under the earlier Byzantine system – could together account for the existence of a presumptive local *baronial* issue for Branas.

**Conclusions**

There is no definitive proof to precisely attribute this type to one of the two probable candidates. Both theories still have their faults and are being debated, with the conventional wisdom inclining towards Mankaphas. This is mainly on the strength of the fabric of the coins, the account of Choniates, the six pieces found together in Izmir and the fact that it seems, at least in one case: the hoard at Stara Zagora\(^{21}\) containing one of the known specimens, that they could not date any later than 1196. On the other hand the vast majority of the ca. 100 discoveries with known provenance come from Thrace\(^{22}\) (although none from the important castles of Adrianople, Didymoteichon or Apros, which were ruled by Branas) and that casts some doubt on the Mankaphas attribution at least from a quantitative perspective.

Unfortunately, the specimen presented here cannot bring any more light on the issue of the reverse lettering, the M and the A(R)N in ligature are both poorly struck and worn out, as most of these coins usually are. Even if less likely and certainly unconventional, the Theodore Branas tentative attribution has its merits and would raise very interesting questions and prospects about the relationship between Greeks and Latins under Emperor Henry and the standing of loyal Greek magnates in Latin-ruled Constantinople. Although Geoffroi de Villehardouin holds Branas in high regard and implies that other crusaders, and most importantly Henry himself, relied on his service and his judgment, there is no mention about any of his possessions minting *trachea*. As stated earlier, it is not impossible considering the normality of local and feudal coinage in the West and the degree of autonomy that the feudal system allowed. If eventually the Branas theory is to be confirmed, then the cultural and institutional implications for the beginning phase of the Latin Empire of Constantinople cannot be overstated: it could open a new door into better understanding the relation between Greeks and Latins in the former Byzantine lands.
Notes

1. M. F. Hendy – *Catalogue of the Byzantine Coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection*, p. 395: "The amount of time and trouble expended on this historically quite insignificant and really rather quirky problem is now rapidly approaching the boundaries of absurdity."

2. D. M. Metcalf – *Classification of Byzantine Stamena in the light of a hoard found in Southern Serbia*, p. 117, no. 928 notes about the first example recorded: "This coin is apparently unpublished. It may prove of considerable interest."

3. Three hypotheses have been put forward: Theodore-Peter of the Vlacho-Bulgarian Empire (1186-1197), Theodore Mankaphas, usurper in Philadelphia in Asia Minor (1188-89 and again 1204/5) and Theodore Branas, Lord of Adrianople and Apros in Thrace (after 1206). Since the Bulgarian hypothesis has been discarded in the 1980s, we are left with two competing views: Mankaphas (according to Hendy) or Branas (according to Docev).


6. Choniates p. 399

7. Hendy p. 393

8. Idem 7 p. 394

9. S. Bendall, C. Morrisson - *Théodore-Pierre, Théodore Branas ou Théodore Mankaphas?* In: *Revue numismatique* p. 179 (2 or 3 mentioned in Jordanov 1984 p. 124 and another 2 found in later excavations at the site, identified from hundreds of other coins of the time, next to 226 from Isaac II Angelos and Alexis III and 519 "Bulgarian imitations").

10. Jordanov, apud Bendall, Morrisson, p. 174, note 19

11. Bendall, Morrisson p. 178

12. Hendy p. 394


14. Grierson's work was published in 1982.

15. Agnes had been married at a very young age to Alexios II Komnenus in 1180 and given the
name Anna. In 1182, after murdering Alexios, Andronikos took her as his wife. She became again a widow in 1185 and in 1193 is tied up to Theodore Branas (cf. Roger de Hoveden 1180, William of Tyre 22.4 and Aubry de Trois-Fontaines 1193).


17. Villehardouin CCXI

18. Villehardouin CCXV

19. Idem 14

20. Docev, apud. Bendall, Morrisson, p. 175, note 22


22. On an additional note to Bendall, Morrisson p. 180 it is stated that 70 pieces were found together in a hoard of uncertain provenance from Bulgaria comprised only of these Theodore trachea, a discovery arguably consistent enough to keep the debate going.
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«This house is mine and mine it isn’t» Tariverde

Germans and their heritage

Iulian Mitran

Tariverde and Cogealac, two rural settlements that are situated a few kilometers inward from lagoon area, both of them having an interesting history, marked by several dramatic shifts within their demographics, along with a post-1990 era which became synonymous with a general desire to mimic urban comfort, which heavily distorted the architectural heritage left behind by past generations. A highly particular note which marked the development of these two settlements was the presence of German settlers, and Kashubians – only in Tariverde, that settled here in the 19th century, leaving a still-visible contribution to the place’s architectural landscape. Tariverde, named Dorotea in the past, has its most iconic building (Saint Peter and Paul Church) erected by the Lutheran Germans that settled about two centuries ago into the village. Nowadays, both Tariverde and Cogealac still preserved certain architectural relics, but the way in which they present themselves today is rather different than in the past. Due to the semi and quasi-urbanization that occurred in both places, by this we specifically point that the settlements started to use various amenities that were usually found in urban centers. Besides the amenities, the newly-constructed home were less caring of the way in which they were contrasting the already-existing structures, thus numerous oddities started to appear as a result of the uncontrolled manner in which the new was pushing for more territory in the detriment of the old. The current paper will analyze the manner in which the architectural landscape of both settlements had evolved over time, the novelties that become more present from the 1900s to the present, and the relics left behind by the German settlers.

Tariverde is situated in the north-eastern corner of Constanța County, in a region with moderate elevations that take the form of a mildly hilly terrain. The settlement is situated just east of Cogealac, was labeled as an “urban-type commune”, concept that was rather indigenous to the USSR, describing those large rural settlements that usually enjoyed some of the amenities that were usually found in urban areas. Besides this, such settlements also had a small niche of craftsman’s shops and somewhat advanced agricultural constructions, such as mills, big brick-built warehouses, and silos. Due to its proximity to neighboring Cogealac, Tariverde shares a rather similar local history which becomes even more obvious when we take a look at some of the demographic records from the past,
or just by simply acknowledging the commonly shared architectural heritage. Besides this, we can talk in both cases about a demographic history that was deeply marked by a high fluctuation of numerous ethnic groups, settling and de-settling the two villages in only a time span of about one and a half century. Nowadays, Tariverde’s landscape is dominated mainly by abode homes with a simplistic layout, made up mainly of a “main layout” which encompasses the three main living quarters, and a few add-ons - rooms that were not part of the original plan and were added on to the main building as time passed and the needs of the owners could no longer be satisfied by the basic layout. Abode-built homes are a trademark of both Romanian and Bulgarian households, as brick masonry has been, for most of the time beyond the reach of many peasants due to its high costs. This was mainly due to the fact that brick was produced in only a few places, besides its actual cost, there were other costs and logistics involved for its transportation to the construction site.

Unlike abode, brick was somewhat more pretentious when it can come to its laying, bricklayers, along with other builders, being hired to do the job. As a result, brick homes were usually associated with higher socially ranked families. They also posed several advantages in comparison with the abode-built counterparts; they were more durable in time had a better change of outstanding natural calamities, especially floods, which were known to affect the area nearby Tariverde from time to time. Even though the home itself was most often built of abode, some of the other buildings present within the compounds of the household were built of flat stone blocks that were brought from the nearby quarries. Flattened pieces of stone were also used for building the fences that surrounded the property, interestingly enough, they are not too widely preferred when it came to the construction of the actual home, which will represent a hotspot for a rural family’s life, especially during the long and cold winters during which numerous indoor activities, mainly carried out by women – such as knitting, sewing and crocheting, the end result consisted of various household goods, some of which were used in decorating the living quarters, others were used in a more practical manner.

The architectural styles vernacular to Tariverde, Cogealac, as well as the neighboring villages, can be described by using a multitude of criteria. Even so, it is important to acknowledge that some of the characteristics will be distributed in a patterned manner depending on the criteria that is being put in use. German vernacular homes will always have a linear layout, the main façade of the building will face the yard’s interior, while the lateral façade will be the one that is facing the roadside. German
homes, especially those built latter on, heavily relied on brick as their main building material. Unlike the homes of the Bulgarians, Romanians, and later of Aromanians, the German ones tended to be more monumental, due to their height and the steep slopes of the gambrel roofs that constituted a highly-distinctive mark. This was in stark contrast with the low slopes of the majority of homes that predated the arrival of the Germans, their overall shape and destination were more adapted to the particularities of the climate and terrain of central Dobruja. A rectangular outline defines the layout of the old vernacular homes from the Tariverde area, the interior is divided among three rooms, two bedrooms and an intermediate room between them that takes the function of a hall. The main façade of the house is dominated by a wooden porch that rests on several wooden pillars that also sustain the roof, to a certain extent. The two lateral walls are usually extended to cover the width of the porch, thus sealing the two ends of the porch, and giving some extra support to the roof that hangs over. The house sits on a low pedestal that is only a few centimeters above ground level.

There are no wood balusters along the length of the porch, the wood pillars lay independently one from the other. Hip roofs are quite common, the gable roof is more noticeable among those vernacular homes that retained their original architecture, as were not subjected to interventions. Tariverde has an unusual layout, being made up of the “main village”, where most of the households are clustered, and a few other households that are situated almost midway on the road between the “main village” and Cogealac. Neighboring Cogealac has a highly homogenous layout, having a round outline layout that is usually found among market-towns in Dobruja. The story of the Tariverde Germans starts with 44 families that came and settled within the village, all of them came from southern Bessarabia, most of which traced their family roots back to Wurttemberg, Prussia, Bavaria and Poland. Almost all were of Swabian stock, with a few Kashubians among them. Kashubians are a Slavic group native to the region around the city of Gdańsk in Poland. As time went by, the Kashubians were slowly assimilated by the Germans. Both communities evolved in a fast pace, the German were particularly fond of the area due to its fertile soil and for the suitable climate which made the agriculture and raising cattle possible. If we take a look at several villages from Dobruja that were settled by Germans we will always come across a “strădă nemțească” (German Street), usually a wide street that crossed the village from north to south, or east to west, depending on each settlement’s layout.
Tariverde in particular had an almost perfect rectangular shape, having the narrow side situated on the east-west axis, while the wide side is situated on the north-south axis. From 1840 to 1940, the village was mainly divided in three rows of homes, each one stretching from north to south. Two main roads, one of which was the strada nemțească— the widest one which usually concentrates the buildings and institutions that are vital for the village, this includes the church, the townhall, along various shops and craftsman shops. Unlike the other streets, the households that were situated on the main street had a few meters of empty space from the exterior fence to the road, trees would be usually planted here in order to shelter the road and to give a decent amount of shade during the summertime. German houses were quite different from the vernacular houses of the region. They tended to be studier, have a more monumental appearance in general and have an average height that exceeded that of homes belonging to non-Germans. The narrow edge of the house would always faces the roadside, the narrow wall facing the roadside would usually have two narrow windows side-by-side, and the upper side of the wall which the roof frame was sitting on would usually have one, or two, narrow windows which made ventilation more efficient. The exterior plastering would usually have a smooth texture, with a coat of white paint on top of it. The windows and the wall’s outline would usually be highlighted with some ornamentation, that would emphasize the already existing geometry. Wood ornamentations could also be seen on the roadside-facing façade.

Even so, the charm of these buildings was usually given by their beatiful proportions and simplicity. As with many still traditionalism-oritented societies from the 19th century, the Tariverde Germans had a strong desider for having a place of worship that they can be proud of, the present church that is referred to by the villagers as the German Church (biserica nemțească) was not the first evangelical church of Tariverde (Stinghe 2007). The first German church can be better reffered to as a prayer house. It had a rectangular layout, with a big bell tower through which you had the main entrance into the building. The architecture of the old church was not different from that of the residential buildings from the rest of the village. The new church was erected during the 1910s, the money was gathered from the crops that were raised on 32 hectares of land that the commune gave to those that wanted to work voluntarily in order to raise money for the new parish building (Stinghe 2007). The church became well known for having the biggest pipe organ from Dobruja, one of the few to be more exact. The evangelical church of Cogealac shared some similarities with the one from neighboring Tariverde, having a similar gothic-inspired architecture. As with the church from Tariverde, the bell tower dominated the main façade, through which you had the entrance into the
prayer chamber. The steep roof was a good indicator of the gothic style, the building was beautifully proportioned and it had an elegant simplicity as a dominant characteristic.

The church was surrounded by a garden which highlighted even more its geometry and white-painted walls. Unlike with most settlements from Dobruja, which had a very badly organized network of streets, Cogealac and Tariverde came off as exceptions, having beautifully designed layouts with a clearly defined village center where all the important institutions were clustered. In the between war period, Cogealac acted as an important transportation and commercial hub for central Dobruja, hosting even a courthouse that dealing with the legal issues of the citizens from the rural settlements nearby.

**Historical references**


The Interslavic Language: Way of Communication Among the Slavic Nations and Ethnic Groups

Nikolay Kuznetsov

The idea of All-Slavic language has a long story because of many similarities among all the Slavic languages and history of Slavic nations. There were many different projects of that kind of auxiliary language for centuries. Today, a more popular conlang is the Interslavic Language Project, that consist of some different languages, each of them shares common politics, vocabulary and grammar. To demonstrate it, we made a short comparative analysis between Interslavic and other Slavic languages. This essay talks about the Interslavic language and author’s experience of using it.

Some historical background

«Because all our Slavic languages derive from that common Proto-Slavic tongue, knowledge of one Slavic language will often allow one to have at least a rough understanding of text written in another Slavic language - but not sufficiently enough to achieve a strong comprehension» wrote V. Merunka and M. Molhanec (Merunka, Molhanec, 2015: 227). That note can explain the idea of the Interslavic language in its origin.

The thought about a common Slavic language is an old and long-life idea. First example of it is the Old Church Slavonic language made by Saint Constantine (Cyrill) and Methodius in the 9th century to christen Slavic tribes. Actually, that language wasn’t the interslavic, but it was the first literature language for the Slavs and was common for all of them (and even for Romanians) for centuries. The Slavic influence on early Romanian culture also was responsible for a great influx of Slavic names, toponyms and hidronyms. Also that influence can be noticed in Hungarian language. Even in the 18th-19th centuries it was used instead of local Slavic languages in Russia and the Balkans. Now, Old Church Slavonic is still used in Russia, Czechia, Serbia, Ukraine, Belarus and Bulgaria in liturgy of the Orthodox Churches.
In the late 17th century Croatian priest and scientist Juraj Križanić made a project for an All-Slavic language (1665) based basically on Russian and Croatian languages with idea of political union of all Slavs under the rule of the Russian Czar, because Alexis Mikhaylovich (ruled 1645-1676) was the most powerful ruler of Slavdom in Križanić’s time. That project was the first that had an idea of creating a special language instead of using already existed ones. Other notable examples of early Pan-Slavic language projects are *Universalis Lingua Slavica* by Ján Herkel (1826), *Uzajemni Pravopis Slavjanski* by the Slovene Matija Majar (1865), and the project of a Czech translator and writer Václav Bambas (1861). In the past, the authors were motivated by the belief that all Slavic languages were dialects of only one single Slavic language rather than separate languages (Merunka, Molhanec, 2015: 227).

Cultural and linguistic similarity of Slavic ethnical groups, that can be easily noticed, led to the idea of a Slavdom Union in 19th century, called Panslavism. One base of that idea was creating a Multi-Slavic State. But this idea failed in practice, what as can see looking on Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. We think the main problem was a domination of one people among the other ones. Modern Panslavism often states, that we do not need to make a political but cultural union because of that very reason. A Cultural Union seems to be more effective than a political one, because culture is independent from the policy of states, what is often against any form of Slavic unity or unity between some particular Slavic nations (e.g. between Russians and Poles, Serbians and Croatians or Russians and Ukrainians). Language is one of the most needful tool to make a cultural unity of Slavdom.

Among almost 70 different interславic languages (Constructed Slavic Languages - site) the most popular now is the Interslavic Language created by Vojtěch Merunka, Jan van Steenbergen, Ondrej Rečnik, Gabriel Svoboda in 2006-2009, firstly as two different independent projects: Neoslavonic (*Novoslověnski*) and Slavic (*Slovianski*), that were united from 2011 to 2017. Our own project of that kind, released in 2012 called Venedian (*Venedski*) (from Latin *Veneti* or *Venedae* for «Slavs»), is now a project that actually states itself as a part of Interslavic language, but in role of a dialect or another literature norm.

**The Interslavic Project**

One of the main problems that Slavic peoples are faced with is a domination of the English language in all spheres (science, culture, economy, diplomacy, international policy and business and even educational system) not only in Europe but all over the world. It makes Slavic languages to be in
danger. Even in Europe, where all languages that are official can be used in the EU, Slavs need to learn English instead of using their national languages. Russian language is the only Slavic language with international status, but it has no big influence in Europe and, because of different reasons it can’t be a common Slavic language in the modern time (Merunka, 2017: 21-22)

Interslavic language can be a tool Slavs can use to incorporate themselves into the European Community even if their countries are not in the EU or similar organizations. Learning English, you can spent too much time, but for Slavs learning some Slavic or Interslavic language would be faster (Ćapalija, 2017: 13), so they can be socialized more effectively. Interslavic language has no political, national or ethnical connotation, but other Slavic languages have. Also, Interslavic language is an easily-learned language for Slavs (because of its grammar and vocabulary), so it makes that language the best way to communicate between Slavs without any language discrimination that might appear if we used any other Slavic language. Interslavic language as the most popular modern project of that kind (with ca. 2000 users (Merunka, 2017: 152)) can be used officially as a bridge-language between both Slavs and Slavs with non-Slavic people. That language is used in scientific studies, on the interslavic conferences (e.g. Conference in Prague in June of 2017), in Mass Media and in conversations between people of different Slavic nations.

This is how Dr. Merunka sees the possibility to use Interslavic language (Merunka, 2017: 22-23):

«Modern people are travelling much more than in the past. Six Slavic languages are official languages of the European Union member states. Apart from the long time separation of Slavic nations, Slavic people still feel their mutual cohesiveness and affinity. This is often well manifested during tourism, business and social events, when Slavic people from miscellaneous nations tend to speak together not in English but in some randomly assembled common interslavic language, which is sufficient for many situations. The Neoslavonic edition of the Interslavic language is therefore an original and professional response to this phenomenon as follows:

1. A universal common auxiliary language usable in business, international transport (information texts and labels in trains, buses, planes, ...), marketing (product manuals and description), tourism (info leaflets, news, ...) and social events. Neoslavonic was intended for use as an auxiliary tool in scientific and research groups of people from Slavic countries, such as scientists at CERN labs.»
2. An auxiliary language tool to facilitate rapid knowledge acquisition of Slavic languages using a receptive method, by which a person is able to gradually receive some real Slavic language using his/her native Slavic language background combined with Neoslavonic grammar. During this learning process, Neoslavonic is step-by-step gradually replaced by the knowledge of the new adopted language.

3. An auxiliary language demonstrating cultural and historical reality for interested people in experimental archeology in order to bring together enthusiasts from various Slavic nations.

4. A practical usable auxiliary language for multinational Slavic groups in tourist destinations, historical and cultural places and exhibitions and religious communities (Slavic Orthodox Church for example).

5. A practical tool to demonstrate the similarity of today’s Slavic languages for teaching and learning purposes. This covers also historical themes where Interslavic imitates the original Old Slavonic language (e.g. movies, theatre).

Speaking about modern Interslavic as an instrument of communication, we need to ask people who use it in their lives. We made two polls in a Facebook public group dedicated to the Interslavic language community. They were started on January 13, 2018 and the results were taken on January 18, 2018. First question was «How often do you use the Interslavic language? ». We’ve got 24 answers, 10 (41,7%) out of them are for «just fan», 5 (20,8%) - for «not often per month», 4 (16,7%) - for every day, 3 (12,5%) - for «3 or 4 times per week» and 2 (8,3%) - for «1 or 2 times per week». So, we could say that about 70% of respondents use Interslavic rarely, and only 30% more often. Second question was «Have you ever been in situations when you can’t understand the Interslavic language both writing and speaking? ». We’ve also got 24 answers, 15 (62,5%) answered «no» and 9 (37,5%) said «yes», motivating it by differences in vocabularies used by opponents. But, we could say that the Interslavic language works well between the people of Slavic nations and ethnic groups.

Results of polls are just an example of the modern situation and don’t represent opinions of all users of the language, but we can judge about the success of the Interslavic project and problems it is faced with. First of all, language confirms that Slavic languages are familiar one to another (Kuznetsov, 2017: 18), but we can see, that there are not so many ways to use it often, that could be a problem for the language community and its development in perspective.
Comparison between the Interslavic and Old Church Slavic languages

To demonstrate similarities and differences between both Interslavic and Old Church Slavic languages we chose the Lord’s Prayer, translated into Interslavic by V. Merunka (Merunka, 2017: 157):

«Отче наш, иже еси на небесах, да свети се има Твое, да прииде царствво Твоє, да буде воля Твоя jako на небеси, i на землji. Хлеб наш насыщень даждь нам днесь и остави намъ дльгы нашѧ, яко i мы оставляемь длъжникомъ нашимъ. И не введи насъ въ напасть, нъ избави ны отъ неприязни. Яко Твое есть царствие и сила и слава въ вѣкъ. Amen.»

This text in Old Church Slavic (version of 1057) looks like: «Отче нашь иже еси на небесехъ, да свѧтитсѧ имѧ твое, да придеть царствие твое, да будеть воля твоя яка на небеси и на землі. Хлѣбъ нашь насыщень даждь намъ днесь и остави намъ дльгы нашѧ, яко i мы оставляемь длъжникомъ нашимъ. И не введи насъ въ напасть, нѣ избави ны отъ неприязни. Яко твое есть царствие и сила и слава въ вѣкъ. Аминъ.» or romanized as «Otče naš’ iže jesi na nebeseh, da světitsë imę tvoje, da pridet’ carstvije tvoje, da bǫdet’ volia tvoja jaka na nebesi i na zemli. Hlěb naš’ nasѫstęny dažd’ nam děněs’ i ostavi nam dǫlgy našę, jako i my ostavlęjem dlǫžńikom našim. I ne vôvedi nas vǫ napast’, nǫ izbavi ny ot neprijazni. Jako tvoje jest’ carstvije i sila i slava vǫ věk. Amin.».

In both texts we underlined common words, that have no big differences in grammar. Speaking about both texts we should talk about the evolution of phonetics between both languages. For example, Old Church Slavonic had specific sounds: ъ /ę/ (nasal e), ѫ /ǫ/ (nasal o), ѣ /ě/ (yat), ь /ĕ/ (short e), щ /št/ - that presented in Interslavic as: e, u, ě, u, e, č.

We can notice that the vocabulary of both languages is mostly common. Despite that, phonetics of Interslavic differs from the Old Slavic one. It has evolved connecting with modern Slavic languages. Also, grammar is more standardized and simpler than in the Old Slavonic. We can’t see this in that examples, but if we will compare the grammar of both languages, we will notice it. So, we could say that the Neoslavonic version of the Interslavic language can be truely called a heir-language for the Old Church Slavonic (Merunka, 2017: 20) because of its vocabulary and basics of grammar and phonetics.
Comparison between the Interslavic and other native Slavic languages

To make comparison between the Interslavic and other native Slavic languages we used one fragment (Article 1 of the UN Declaration of Human Rights) officially translated to 11 Slavic languages and Interslavic. First of all we should demonstrate that text «All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience, and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. »

That article is translated by Dr. V. Merunka into Interslavic (Merunka, 2017: 38) as «Vsi ljudi sut rodženi svobodni i rovni v svojih dostojenstu i pravah. Oni sut obdarjeni razumom i svěstju, i trěba jest jim postupati drug s drugom v duhu bratstva. » in Latin script or «Вси люди сут роджени свободни и ровни в својих достојенству и правах. Они сут обдарјени разумом и свѣстю и трѣба јест јим поступати друг с другом в духу братства.» in Cyrillic.

We will see this phrase in languages grouped by branches. For each other language we underlined words, that are cognates with the words of Interslavic vocabulary used for translation of that article; also, we marked by numbers words that are: 1 – common for all Slavic languages; 2 – common for branch; 3 – taken from another branch; 4 – taken from other languages but didn’t use in translation.
### In East Slavic Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian (Romanization)</th>
<th>Всє люди родються свободними і рівними в своїй гідності та правах. Вони [суть] наділені розумом і совістю і повинні діяти у відношенні одного в дусі братерства.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian (Romanization)</td>
<td>Всі люди народжуються вільними і рівними у своїй гідності та правах. Вони [суть] наділені розумом і совістю і повинні діяти у відношенні одного в дусі братерства.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarusian (Latin script)</td>
<td>Усе людзі нараджаюцца свободнымі і роўнымі ў сваёй годнасці і правах. Яны [суць] надзелены рэзумам і сымленнем і павіньны ставіцца адзін да аднага ў дуку брацтва.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. In Belarusian soft Old Slavic consonants /t'/, /d'/, /r'/ evolved to /ts'/, /dz'/, /r/.
2. In Ukrainian and Belarusian there are prosthetic consonants /h/, /v/, /j/ before vowels.
3. Old Slavic vowel /æ/ (ѣ) evolved in Russian to /je/, in Ukrainian to /i/, in Interslavic to ě.
4. Old Slavic vowel /o/ (ѫ) evolved in East Slavic to /u/, in Interslavic to u.
5. Old Slavic vowel /e/ (ѧ) evolved in East Slavic to /ja/, in Interslavic to e.
6. Old East Slavic vowel /о/ between consonants evolved in Ukrainian to /i/.
7. Belarusian vowel /o/ without accent evolved to /a/. 
In West Slavic Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Wszyscy ludzie rodzą się wolni i równi pod względem swej godności i swych praw. Są oni obdarzeni rozumem i sumieniem i powinni postępować wobec innych w duchu braterstwa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Všichni lidé rodi se svobodní a sobě rovní co do důstojnosti a práv. Jsou nadáni rozumem a svědomím a mají spolu jednat v duchu bratrství.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Všetci ľudia sa rodia slobodní a sebe rovní, čo sa týka ich dôstojnosti a práv. Sú obdarení rozumom a majú navzájom konať v bratskom duchu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Soft Old Slavic consonants /t'/, /d'/, /r'/ are written as ci/ć, dzi/dź, rz in Polish, t, d, ř in Czech and t, d, r in Slovak.

2. Old Slavic vowel /æ/ (ѣ) evolved in Polish to ja, in Czech to iand ě, in Interslavic to ě.

3. Old Slavic vowel /о/ (ѫ) evolved in Polish to /ą/, in Czech to ou or ų, in Interslavic to /u/.

4. Old Slavic vowel /ě/ (ѧ) evolved in Polish to /ę/, in Interslavic to /e/.

5. Old East Slavic vowel /о/ between consonants evolved in Polish to /u/, written as ó.

In South Slavic Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbian (Latin script)</td>
<td>Сва људска бића рађају се слободна и једнака у достојанству и правима. Она су обдарена разумом и свешћу и треба једни према другима да поступају у духу братства.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>Sva ljudska bića rađaju se slobodna i jednaka u dostojanstvu i pravima. Ona su obdarena razumom i svešću i treba jedno prema drugima postupaju u duhu bratstva.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>Vsi ljudje se rodijo svobodni in imajo enako dostojanstvo in enake pravice. Obdarjeni so z razumom in vestjo in bi morali ravnati drug z drugim kakor bratje.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Всички хора се раждат свободни и равни по достоинство и права. Те са</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As we can notice, vocabulary consist of similar words that are common for all Slavic languages, not only for some of them, with no words, that do not exist in any Slavic language. We understand that this short texts can’t demonstrate fully all similarities and differences between languages, and that we need to study lexicon of all languages, but this is not the main goal of that paper, this is only a demonstration how to answer on that question.

**A personal experience with the Interslavic language**

If I’d speak about my own experience with the Interslavic language, I’d say that I began to use it since 2012, when I started my work on the Venedian language, which now is a special literature dialect of that project. The sphere of using Interslavic language by me is communication and writing of articles about Interslavic language. Basically, now it is my third working language after Russian and English. As a Russian, I can say, that the Interslavic language is an easily-understood language that can be used to communicate with others Slavs. For example, I use it to communicate with people from Czechia,
Poland, Bulgaria and Serbia. Also, the Interslavic language can be used as a tool to understand texts written in other Slavic languages no matter in Latin or Cyrillic script.
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Tracking from Adam and Eve to the Amalekites in the 2012 Chechen translation of the Holy Bible – Where does specific terminology come from?

Timo Schmitz

The Chechens are a dominantly Muslim ethnic group in the Northeastern Caucasus, where they live in the Republic of Chechnya, Novolasskiy and Khasavyurt in Dagestan as well as Eastern Ingushetia. The Chechens had Christian communities in the past but when Imam Shamil founded his Imamate, many Christians went to Georgia, where they paradoxically converted to Islam years later (as it is often assumed that they did not leave for religious reasons, but due to massive droughts), so that Islam and Chechen-ness became connected and Islam an important part of identity. As such, it is interesting to analyze how specific Bible terms are translated in a Chechen Bible translation, or in other words, what does the Bible look like in a specific Non-Christian’s language. This paper only takes the Christian framework in general, the beginning of the Genesis (in Chechen: Doladalar) and the origin of the Chechen name for the Book of Leviticus (Chechen: Amaljar) into account, as analyzing larger parts – or even the whole Bible – would be a complex issue in itself.

In 2012, the Russian Institute for Bible Translation (Institut Perevoda Biblii) published a full text Bible in Chechen language, called “Delan Јозанаш” (Делан Йозанаш). The word ‘delan’ (делан) means holy or divinely, which also includes the word for God, which is ‘dala’ (дала). The term itself does not refer to any specific God. It originates out of Vaynakh mythology where Dala was the highest divinely Being, which was identified with the sun in contrast to the moon or god of darkness. The word later transformed into the meaning of God in general and was used by the Vaynakh Christian communities to identify their God and is still used by Muslim Chechens to refer to Allah. In addition, the word ‘dala’ is part of several proverbs and idioms, such as ‘dela reza хуьлда хьан’ (дела реза хъулда хван), a way to show politeness or gratitude. Therefore, ‘delan’ literally means ‘of God’ or “God’s”, and the word ‘holy’ implies that it is something given by God or which is God’s source. A literal though not proper English way to translate the term also might be “God-ish” since something which is given by God includes God in everything and all. The word “jozan” (Йозан) literally means book or notebook, and therefore the Bible literally is translated as ‘the Book of God’ or ‘the book that includes all of what is
God’. The ending –aş normally indicates a plural, but this might not be a surprise here, since the Bible as a full work consists of several books in itself. The term ‘jozan’ also implies that it is something official (jozanan mott), which has an authoritative status. The Old Testament is called ‘tovratan teptarş’ (торватан тептарш), including the word ‘tovrā’ (твора) referring to the Holy Book of the Jews. Like in ‘Delan’, the ending ‘-an’ shows origin, thus ‘of the Torah’. In the book of Genesis, the origin or ‘sxadalar’ (схьадалар), the divinely seizure or the taking into the creative process is described. The ‘doladalar’ (доладалар) consists of the word ‘dola’ which means ‘care’ and ‘dalar’ which might be translated with the Russian word ‘končina’ (кончина). It seems that both words are compound words, however, the first one seems to be a neologism for ‘beginning’ or ‘start’. The 2012 Chechen Bible uses sub-headtitles within the books, for instance “Adam a, ħava a” (Адам а, Хьава а) which means Adam and Eve. Both, Adam and Khava are typical Chechen names until today, and the word ‘adam’ means ‘man, human-being’. A foot note informs about the origin of the word, writing “адам – лейхойн маттах, зуда бохург стаг бохучунца цхьаьна доьзна ду”. However, there is the common belief that Adam comes from adamah (אֲדָמָה) meaning “earth” referring to the fact that God created humans out of earthly mud, and a direct meaning for human-being or man in Hebrew through the connection of adam does not exist, though adam literally means ‘red’, and thus might either refer to blood or bloody or the red color of wet mud. Eve in Hebrew is called חַוָה being pronounced Khawâ in Biblical Hebrew (with the strong kh sound and a long a). It was adopted into Arabic Khava (حَـواء), the name in Chechen thus has a Judeo-Muslim continuity (cp. Greek Εὕα and Old Latin Heva).

So we can see that Chechens either use vocabulary from traditional concepts such as the mythological word for God and then re-interprete it into another religion’s framework, as ‘dala’ is not only re-interpreted as Christian God, but is also used by Muslims to simply refer to God in general. Some vocabulary has traditional roots in Hebrew and Arabic. As both languages are Semitic languages, it is sometimes not clear, whether the translator adopted the name from Hebrew or whether the translator used the Arabic equivalent, especially in Adam and Eve that are almost the same in both languages, and even exist as such as names in Chechnya till today. Sometimes it seems that the term was taken from Arabic, such as the name Ibrahīm is used in the Chechen Bible instead of Abraham. In other cases the origin is not really traceable, e.g. Isaac is called Isqā (see Gen. 22:6-8), while in Hebrew and Arabic the term Ishaq is used. Till today, Chechens bear the name Iśa (Иса), which probably refers to the Arabic cognate of Jesus who is called Isa in the Quran. In the Chechen Bible, Jesus is called Isa (Ийиса) as well, and thus it goes back to the Arabic root, rather than Hebrew Yeshua (ישוע) or Yehoshua (יהושע). The Gospel of Mark is called “Mark” (Марк) in Chechen, which is
neither Latin (Marcus), nor Hebrew (מרקוס) nor Greek (Μᾶρκος), and thus probably derived from Russian. The Gospel of Luke is called “Laka” (ЛАКА) which stands for itself and shows no direct relation neither to Russian, nor Arabic or Biblical languages. The Gospel of Matthew is called “Mattay” (Маттай), which shows a relation to Greek Matthaios (Ματθαῖος). Jesus’ parents Joseph and Mary are called ‘Jusup’ (Юсуп) and ‘Marjem’ (Марем), both probably Chechenized versions of the Hebrew-Aramaic names Yosep and Mariam, though the first also shows close relatedness to Arabic ‘Yusuf’.

Finally, many technical terms can be described through indigenous words, the Holy mother is called ‘nana’ (НАНА) which means ‘mother’ (ср. Mat. 1:18), and also other Christian words might be described by literally translating them through Chechen words.

To put it in a nutshell, the Chechen Bible uses names mainly from Hebrew and Arabic, but also sometimes shows Greek or Russian cognates in rare cases such as the Gospel of Matthew and Gospel of Mark. Natural phenomena and relationships among the people can be described through normal Chechen language, specific terms might be literally translated by creating compound neologisms or using words from mythology that get re-interpreted in a Christian context.

Concerning the writing style, the Bible uses the prestigious elder standard orthography as it was used in the Soviet Union and which is still official until today. However, this prestigious high writing style is hardly found in Chechnya nowadays itself. After two wars, Chechen language suffered a lot: first, as there was the try to switch the language to Latin alphabet in the 1990s which did not work as the new government policies were contested by other factions between 1991 and 1996 which led to the fact that Latin and Cyrillic was used next to each other to write Chechen. In between 1997 to 1999, the official government did not control most of its area, which had also an impact on the language policy. During the war periods, most schools were defunct and people left the country. In addition, during the phase of independence as well as after the takeover by Russian forces, Russian was the mainly written language, while Chechen is the daily spoken language, but also used for entertainment, folklore, music, etc. As a result, a modernized orthography appears nowadays. While the traditional orthography writes ‘tahana’ (today), ‘muha’ (how), ‘dika’ (good), the modern orthography writes these words ‘tahan’, ‘muh’, ‘dik’, as the ‘a’ in the end is silent and not pronounced.

The books’ names itself are translated into Chechen, and thus ‘Doladalar’ – the finishing of the creation – stands for the Genesis, ‘Aradaqqar’ (Арадаккхар) means Exodus, ‘Amaljar’ (Амалъяр) for the Leviticus (which is probably a reference to the Amalekites, which is not certain since they are
never mentioned explicitly by name but Lev 27:29 and 27:19 indirectly refer to the Amalekites when there is talk that the enemy shall be put to death; and other reference makes no sense, especially since the Chechen Bible talks about an Israelite tribe ‘Dalla Amaljaran’ – lit.: the Amalian generation), ‘Lelar’ (Лелар) refers to Numbers though the Chechen name literally means ‘motion’. ‘Karlabâqqina’ (Карлабаъккхина) refers to Deuteronomy.

Concerning the name of the Book of Leviticus as mentioned above, we are not exactly sure where the Chechen name comes from and we can only make assumptions. Bible Chechen can be tricky at some points, since there are almost no Chechen Christians, and therefore almost no experts on the Bible in Chechen language on special terminology. However, the commentary in the Chechen version makes reference that the Book is named after the ‘Israelites of the Amalian generation’, which most possibly is a reference to the Amalekites. Neither Amalek, nor the Amalekites are mentioned by name in Leviticus, but might be a back reference to either Exodus or Deuteronomy. In Exodus, Amalek is shown as symbol of evil and it is in Lev. 27: 29 that “No person devoted to destruction may be ransomed; they are to be put to death.” (NIV). The symbol of ransom and destruction most possibly might be a reference to the Amalekites as symbol of evil. In addition, Deut. 25:17-19 show reference to this. Last but not least, one has to keep in mind that Leviticus is the book of law, mainly for priests, but not the less dedicated to morality.
Ethno-demographic changes that occurred in Dobruja as a result of the colonization policies implemented between 1878 and 1940 (I)

Enache Tușa

Known in antiquity as Schytia Minor, and later, after the fifteenth century as Dobruja (Ciorbea 2008), the region is characterized by a highly complex demographic evolution which was in part determined by the various states that ruled the land and colonized on its territory various groups (Neagu 2004). As a result of the various historical variables, Dobruja became subjected to a series of colonization policies that were imposed by the Romanian administration after 1878. During the centuries when the region was under Ottoman rule, the demographic landscape became increasingly Ottomanized, which in fact proved to be reversible, as we can notice in the present. The name Dobruja came into use after 1420, as it is stipulated the historical sources, before that the territory was known as Podunavia or Terrarum Dobrotich, as it is stated by Anca Popescu. As with some other cases, the region’s name is given by that one of its former rulers.

The manner in which Dobruja was politically and militarily organized closely followed the prerogatives stipulated by the Ottomans. The measures that were imposed through the Peace of San Stefano (3rd of March 1878) and the Treaty of Berlin (June-July 1878) impose a series of actions, some involving compensations that the Ottoman Empire had to give to the Russian Empire in order to pay for a part of the losses that the latter part suffered, this included ceding Dobruja to Romania. From a basic perspective, in 1878 Dobruja was in the middle of a territorial reconfiguration within the region, the changes closely following the desires of the Russian Empire that were protected through a series of treaties (Ciachir 2011).

The province was negotiated between the Great Powers which wanted to consolidate their influence within the Black Sea region and the Balkans, coming to the point in which the territory that was granted to Russia to be split between Romania and Bulgaria. This partition was made with the purpose, which was not officially declared by the Great Powers, to win the sympathy of the two newly created states (Bulgaria and Romania) and to make them willing to cooperate within the quest
of fulfilling some European interests, especially those that were more closely aligned to the likings of the Germans. This can be proved through the place chosen to host the Peace Congress from 1878. The northern part of Dobruja, from the Mouth of the Danube to Silistra, was granted to Romania, while the southern part was given to Bulgaria in order to stimulate the newly-founded state to give support toward its support for sustaining the European interests in the region. Dobruja was ceded to Russia by the Ottoman Empire as part of the post-war reparations, the Russians reserved their right to give the territory in exchange of the three counties from southern Bessarabia (Ciorbea 2008). As a result of the treaty, Romania incorporates Dobruja’s territory which counted approximately 15,000km² which was inhabited by numerous ethnic groups that were listed in various surveys, some of which are to be analysed in detail in the following paragraphs. Once the territory of Dobruja became assimilated within Romania’s borders, several administrative reforms were put into play: organizing the local administrative institutions in a systematic manner, to consolidate the public power within the region and to colonize the territory with Romanian-speaking groups. Romania’s intention to modernize the newly-acquired territory can be noticed through the first reforms that the administration applied after 1887.

The social and political changes that occurred within this territory had the main goal of irreversibly changing the ethnic and demographic landscape, as well as the institutions and administrative structure from Dobruja. The start of the colonization policies was marked in 1878, and it is important to mention that it was the first series of policies of its kind drafted and implemented by the authorities from Bucharest. Throughout its long history, Dobruja was subjected to long-term rule from foreign powers, as it is the case of the Roman and Ottoman eras (Jelavich 1999). Under the Ottomans, the territory was mainly colonized with Islamic groups, most of which were Turks and Tatars, a few Christian groups, mostly representing Greeks, Armenians, Gagauzians, Lipovans (Russian Old Believers), Germans. Beginning with 1878, Dobruja came under Romanian administration, a moment that marked the start of the colonization of Romanians in the new territory, the colonization lasting until the second half of the twentieth century. The changes that the colonization of Romanians had on the territory were easy to spot in various aspects of social life, having a great deal of complexity.

The central administration from Bucharest, as well as the local institutions, had to manage a series of problems that were directly linked to the colonisations: the transportation and the settlement of people into temporary households, guaranteeing the needed amenities for a decent life, the creation of permanent settlements and granting agricultural land to the colonists.
After 1878, Dobruja’s two main subdivisions (north and south), administered by two different states (Romania and Bulgaria), were subjected to massive colonisations as a means to successfully integrate the new territory within the state’s borders. Consequently, Bulgaria Bulgarianized Southern Dobruja in its attempt to wipe out the legacy left by the Ottomans. Things were similarly done by the newly-created Romanian state, which Romanianized Northern Dobruja. The cultural influences that were present in the Balkans contributed to the crystallization of a highly unique human geography within the region which, in fact, led to the birth of a unique sense of ethnic identity among the region’s people which is sometimes characterized by a specific type of collective memory. The inhabitants of Dobruja which became Romanian citizens accepted more willingly, or not, the new political authority from the region. The current paper is keen on analysing the specific type of ethnic and demographic changes that occurred in Dobruja from the last decades of the nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth century. It must be taken into account the fast pace that characterized the demographic changes which occurred in this region. Especially for the time period that we are studying, usually significant demographic changes take centuries to occur within a community. In Dobruja’s case, the situation was quite the opposite, the dominant group, represented by collective formed by the Turks and Tatars, switched places with the Romanians, the latter one becoming the dominant group in less than fifty years. Its status as an independent state which it gained after 1878 gave the possibility for the Romanian administration that was placed in Dobruja to create a stable ground for development and for the spread within the region of Romanian culture. The present study is interested in highlight the specific characteristics of success of the colonisation in such a short time span, taking into consideration that the territory was Ottomanized for almost 500 years. We are also interested in pointing out the way in which the colonisation policies were perceived by the ethnic groups that had Dobruja as their homeland prior to the Romanian annexation and chose to stay after it became fully in effect. Basically, we are talking about a succession that took place between two political and social systems: one that was represented by the Ottoman Empire, having most of its laws derived from the Quran and the Romanian system represented by a secular state that was inspired from the Western World, and was subsequently imposed in Dobruja (Oswell 2006). The continuity between these two systems was closely overseen by the Western powers that intervened at San Stefano and Berlin, it was so as it had a decisive effect on the political balance within the region in the second half of the nineteenth century.

The political and cultural consequences of the succession between the two systems constituted to be preoccupied by the Western powers that intervened at San Stefano and Berlin, as the continuity
between the two would guarantee political stability in the nineteenth century. Even so, at the beginning there was a huge shock over the loss of the southern Bessarabia, the Romanian intelligentsia rejected Dobruja as territory that would be given in exchange. This was mainly due to the fact that there was a very limited knowledge regarding the characteristics of this region, but gradually they changed their opinion. The leaders accepted all the conditions that were part of the peace treaties and the opportunities that Dobruja would bring became more visible to most of the leaders, the new territory accelerating the pace in which Romania would develop in the late nineteenth century and during most of the twentieth century.

This was mainly correlated with the generous seaside that Dobruja would give Romania, which was more convenient for the construction of a maritime infrastructure than the coast of southern Bessarabia. Through colonization we should not understand only the expansion of imperial powers outside the territories that they already control, but also placing people groups in territories that are sparsely populated, which also have a big agricultural potential (as was Dobruja), or that has a substantial amount of unexploited natural resources. In such a scenario, the demographic characteristics slowly change until the indigenous peoples become a minority, in a well-structured displacement of new groups of people in the territory that is subjected to colonization (Colțescu 2005). The data that we have available from the surveys that took place in Dobruja clearly show us that the colonisations that took place in were well organized and had a very well defined purpose, that of assimilation by the Romanian colonists of all of the ethnic groups that were inhabiting the territory, thus giving it a more homogenous structure. The pace in which the colonization took place determined a series of government-drafted policies that were implemented after 1880.

At the end of the nineteenth century, and the beginning of the twentieth century, Romania was marked by significant social changes and by a substantial demographic growth. The demographic growth significantly changed the social structure and the need for land became more obvious, the land was still, in a large proportion, owned by the elite which was in part represented by big landowners. This, along with some of the other aspects that we previously mentioned, determined the government to encourage the displacement of groups of people to certain provinces, in order to counterbalance the land ownership inequalities, Dobruja was a good option as it had a lot of land that was not exploited and numerous settlements that were left deserted after the war. Taking this into consideration, we can surely affirm that there was a certain strong economic interest for Romanianizing Dobruja after 1878.
After 1878, we are witnessing a rapid development of the province’s cultural landscape, mainly through contribution given by non-Muslims. Independence was a direct result of the diplomatic negotiations that took place. They were marked by a few stipulations that had to be respected, one on which was the territorial exchange between the Russian Empire and the Kingdom of Romania (Ionescu 2002). The Romanian elites made it their agenda to make the Dobruja issues known to the European diplomats. How much did Dobruja contribute to the development of Romania as a modern state and which the costs of „integration”? How was Dobruja’s integration within the territory of Romania and which were the particularities that the province had at the moment of becoming a Romanian territory?

The particularities that were mostly associated with Dobruja were mainly a consequence of the Ottoman heritage and the Islamic culture that was dominant in the region for about half a millennium. The region’s integration into Romania came with some massive change within the demographic structure of the Dobrujan villages (Cushing 1998). Dobruja’s assimilation came hand in hand with a massive shift in the dominant pre-existing mindset. The main focus of our study stands on three highly distinctive characteristics of Dobruja from the end of the twentieth century:

a) The first has to do with the fact that it was an Ottomanized province that hosted a big number of ethnic groups.

b) When it was incorporated within the territory of Romania (1878) Dobruja was the region where one could find the most inconsistencies when it came to aspects linked to the territory’s demographic structure, culture, economy and administrative structure. These differences came to highlight even more the already existing gaps that were present between the country’s region, that were caused by some aspects linked to the local culture of each territory.

c) These differences were also in part linked to the fear of the local communities to integrate in a new social system. These tendencies continued even after 1900 and it can also be easily spotted with Greater Romania after 1918. Secondly, Dobruja was part of the Balkan Peninsula which had in fact numerous consequences on its culture and political system, which came to coexist with the Romanian national culture. Thirdly, Dobruja was still dependent on a highly primitive system of agricultural production which was not capable of exploiting the province’s true potential. The region almost had no infrastructure, and the one that existed was in a terrible shape. The region scored one of the slowest pace when it came to development at the end of the nineteenth century and at the beginning of the twentieth century due to the social and economic system that was inherited from the Ottoman Empire, which was mostly rooted in the teachings of the Quran. After 1878, the
Romanian authorities implemented a modern model with more liberal social norms and a drastic reform in the economic sector. In Dobruja, at 1900, there were numerous groups that spoke different languages and belonged to various religions which inhabited the territory before its incorporation in Romania. Each of these groups remained faithful to their cultural heritage, maintaining their own sense of national identity. Taking this into consideration, we can state that Dobruja is a melting pot of cultures, which overlapped each other as a result of them inhabiting the same territory for centuries. There are some regions in the proximity of the Black Sea that also are characterized by a multicultural profile, such as the Northern Caucasus, but unlike Dobruja the interethnic relations from these regions are mainly marked by conflict (Golopenţia 2002).

After 1878, the Romanian political class was deeply influenced by elitisms, coming from the strong ties that Romania had with France during this era. The studies that were conducted by Sabin Manuila were mainly focused on the study of the common social traits that were shared by most of the ethnic groups that inhabit Dobruja, and not so much on the particularities which give each groups its unique identity.

During 1878 Dobruja’s population was estimated between 125,000 and 222,000 people as it is shown by the date that was made available at that time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Cities, towns, villages</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Non-Muslims</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tulcea</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.838</td>
<td>15.426</td>
<td>18.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaccea</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.298</td>
<td>5.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilia (Danube Delta)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.412</td>
<td>30.022</td>
<td>61.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulina (Danube Delta)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31.900</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>32.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmudia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.248</td>
<td>17.868</td>
<td>30.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babadag</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>24.625</td>
<td>7.344</td>
<td>31.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Măcin</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.044</td>
<td>1.818</td>
<td>25.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiustengea</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.790</td>
<td>5.196</td>
<td>7.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hârşova</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>2.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgidia</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.384</td>
<td>2.626</td>
<td>7.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>271</strong></td>
<td><strong>134.662</strong></td>
<td><strong>87.900</strong></td>
<td><strong>222.562</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This survey was made by Jean-Henry-Abdolonyme Ubicini, a French ethnologist, which received this duty from the Sublime Porte in 1876, two years before Dobruja became part of Romania.
The data that was made available by Robert Kolb was heavily reliant on approximations, this is why we can see that some districts almost have the same number of inhabitants, which does not actually reflect reality very well. Another survey that was made by the Romanian authorities in 1880 shows that Dobruja had around 157,114 inhabitants which were split among various ethnic groups as shown here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin or nationality</th>
<th>Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romanians</td>
<td>50,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks and Tatars</td>
<td>45,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>30,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians and Lipovans (Old Believers)</td>
<td>17,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>4,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>2,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1882 the statistics that are shown differ about among each other due to the various methods that were used to calculate the total population, some being more exact, while other relied more on approximations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inhabitants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Nazarettean</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>166,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Jackson</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>134,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. E. Lux</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>185,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.I. Nancian</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>between 115,000-160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E.Pittard 1897 260.409

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic group</th>
<th>Constanța County</th>
<th>Tulcea County</th>
<th>Dobruja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Romanians</td>
<td>93.806</td>
<td>51.422</td>
<td>145.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turks</td>
<td>7.245</td>
<td>3.351</td>
<td>10.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatars</td>
<td>23.208</td>
<td>2.160</td>
<td>25.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarians</td>
<td>12.245</td>
<td>29.633</td>
<td>41.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russians</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>15.282</td>
<td>15.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipovans (Old Belivers)</td>
<td>1.601</td>
<td>13.734</td>
<td>15.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>5.198</td>
<td>4.721</td>
<td>9.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagauzians</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.758</td>
<td>3.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germans</td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>8.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma (Gypsies)</td>
<td>3.352</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>5.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>1.557</td>
<td>2.827</td>
<td>4.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenians</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>2.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>1.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nationalities</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>1.536</td>
<td>2.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>150.906</strong></td>
<td><strong>136.213</strong></td>
<td><strong>293.119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dobruja’s ethno-demographic landscape (1900 -1914)

Some changes occured due to the fact that the Bulgarians, Serbians, Albanians and Turks migrated during this period from Dobruja due to the state of war in which the region was
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Introduction into Jewish Philosophy

Timo Schmitz

Jewish philosophy is traditionally largely connected to the Jewish religion. Until the era of enlightenment, the major emphasis in Jewish education laid on the study of the Talmud and Torah. The Hasidic philosophy (尼斯Nonnull) used the Jewish vernacular languages, such as Yiddish, as language of instruction and later as literature language for Ashkenazi Jews. With the growing influence of the Enlightenment in Europe, a counter-philosophy called Haskalah (השכלה), often named “Jewish enlightenment” grew into being, emphasizing the Hebrew language and classical liturgy. Most interestingly, it were not in the places were Jews had liberal rights such as in Great Britain or the Netherlands, but in Germany and Russia where enlightened ideas rised, and where Jews were mostly persecuted (Raisin, 1913; Akadem, without year). The Hasidic branch developed in medieval Western Germany at around the 12th century, but later was reborn in Poland-Lithuania and Russia, and thus called ‘modern Hasidism’. The latter one was founded by Israel ben Elieser right after the Jewish pogroms in Eastern Europe during the Polish-Cossack War from 1648-57. Hasidic traditions emphasize mystical traditions and faith. People shall gather in the communities on Sabbath – known as shabes in Yiddish’ – to pray and chant together and come closer to God through extasis. In addition, the Rabbi – known as Rebbe in Yiddish – tells stories and parables to teach morality, virtue and a righteous life. The community life stands in the foreground and thus Orthodox Jews mainly lived assimilated from the rest of the population, while the Maskilims – followers of Enlightenment – suggested integration and reason as highest priority (cp. Leber, without year).

While the Hasidic and Haskalah tradition came into being in the New Age, there were several Jewish philosophical schools in the Middle Ages. In the Middle Ages, philosophy was not subjected to reasoning, but a helping tool for religion (Rembaum, 2007). Despite influences from Graeco-Roman philosophy, Islamic influences also can be found. The Egyptian philosopher Saadia Ben Joseph founded a Jewish school of the Kalam (an Early Islamic philosophical school) in the 9th century, being the first Jew after Philo to bring Biblical sources and Ancient Greek sources in harmony (ibid.). Saadia assumes that God is created out of nothing and thus created everything. As such he did not have any benefit in creating the world but just did so because he wanted to, and by creating it he could make people obey him and benefit them for good behavior (Rembaum, 2007: 60). It shares the thought
with Islamic Kalam philosophy which states that the universe was created out of noting and therefore it must be created out of something greater: God (Craig, 2000: 149). The rational idea behind it is that everything which begins has a cause and the universe began to exist somewhere, so it must have a cause. If nothing existed before the universe then the cause must be God (cp. Craig, 2000; Craig & Moreland, 2009).

Jewish Neo-Platonism was founded by Solomon ibn Gabirol in the 11th century. The Spanish-Jewish philosopher who wrote in Arabic had the image of God that God is not graspable by physical senses and therefore is hidden to us. Anyways, he has to be there since he is the source of the world (Rembaum, 2007: 61). Everything goes back to a First Author which equals the world of the Ideas, and every final cause must have part of this first author, and therefore share a part of the idea. Like Plato, he writes dialogues, though Solomon uses to set it between master and disciple as can be seen in his Fons vitae. Concerning the nature of the soul, he suggests “The soul is lofty, discriminating, pervading all and perceiving all. It pursues and comprehends all things by its potencies that permeate all. (The Master continues) In view of this, I suggest that you first study the science of matter and form, because this first division of philosophy is prior to the two subsequent ones” (Solomon, 2005:12). In addition, Solomon defines knowledge as the goal of life, including knowledge of oneself and other things. As such, knowledge shall lead to deeds which separate the soul, as life force, from things harming it. Therefore, there is a certain connection between knowledge and soul. In addition, man is reasonable and has to strive for reason as will of the Sublime One, which is God. Solomon speaks through “The Master”: “Since to know is the most excellent of all the functions of man, what he most of all needs to seek is knowledge; and the most necessary knowledge is to know himself so that in the light of this he can understand all that exists apart from himself; for his nature encompasses and permeates all things and all are subject to his supremacy.” (Solomon, 2005: 5). Like Plato, Solomon proposes a tripartite soul, which shall go back to a Higher World, and thus it needs knowledge. Knowledge shall purify the soul to bring it back to a higher stage – therefore, closer to God.

Moses bin Maimon (called Rambam) is a 12th century Aristotelian philosopher in the Jewish tradition. The difficulty between Aristotelianism and Judaism is the creation of the universe which Aristotle explains with an unmoved mover and thus an unawareness and unintentional creation which contradicts Biblical accounts. To solve this problem, Moses bin Maimon simply comes to the conclusion that Aristotle could be wrong with this point (Rembaum, 2007: 63 f.).
These influences of Jewish philosophy kept the main inspiration for Jewish community life, since traditionally people did not pay attention to individuals but the collective will counted, until Moses Mendelssohn – the “Socrates of Berlin” – declared Kant as maxime of all philosophy. Mendelssohn wanted to find the Promised Land in Germany and thus rejected a Jewish State as proposed by the forerunners of Zionism. In annotation to Plato’s Phaedo, Mendelssohn published his own Phaedo in 1767. Unlike previous Jewish philosophers who stayed mainly within Jewish intellectuals, Mendelssohn received attention from a non-Jewish audience.

His core teaching is the idea that there is a difference between imagination and reality and therefore we can be misled. We have to avoid this misleading through reason. Anyways, we can never find the thing-in-itself as only God knows it (a Platonic remark on the Ideas).

Rationality before religion paved the way to a Jewish secularization. Through this attempt, not religious laws stood in the foreground but moral ethics which shall lead to a societal integration. The Maskilims therefore stood in a clear opposition with the Hasidic philosophers. Paradoxically, the Maskilims who sought integration used the religious language Hebrew and strived for its revival, while the Orthodox Jews preferred Yiddish as daily language rather than the religious Hebrew. Anyways, since Hebrew was not alive for many centuries and just used for liturgical purposes, Yiddish as well as other Jewish languages, such as Ladino in Spain, Italy and Greece; Judeo-Arabic in North Africa and the Middle East; Jewish-Persian (such as Judeo-Bokhari and Judeo-Tat), as well as Judeo-Georgian, became not only languages for daily communication, but also community languages for instructing religious studies. As such, the Maskilim saw the different Jewish languages a kind of imitation of a source language that degenerated due to isolation, and Hebrew as prestige language of the Jews should be used instead. However, as Hebrew was not a daily spoken language, the messages in Hebrew could not really reach the masses leading to the fact that the Maskilim instrumentalized Yiddish for their purposes.

To put it in a nutshell, modern Jewish philosophy has three epochs, the first starts in the Middle Ages, using influences from surrounding religions such as Islam, Christianity, but also classical philosophy (Platonism and Aristotelianism) and try to bring these schools in harmony with Judaism. The Jewish Kalam emphasize that God is the creator who created the universe ex nihilo and his creation can be observed and studied (through holy texts). God is a perfect undivided Being unreachable for man. Jewish Platonism is a two world concept. As such, all things in the perceptual world share a part of the ideal world, but in the perceptual world everything is made of matter and form which can be
found everywhere and nothing is without matter and form as it is created, and this goes back to the first author. The second era is the era between Hasidic and enlightened philosophy. The Hasidic tradition continues religious interpretations and focusses on internal matters of the Jewish community, based on understanding the faith; while Secular Jews strive for societal integration and secular science. The third phase starts in the end of the 19th century with the rise of Proto-Zionism, which is neither really secular, nor in a religious continuation, but a try to reform Judaism by seeking the promised land and go back to Biblical beginnings. In contrast to these, Jewish philosophers also engaged in Socialism and anti-monarchical activities. The second and third phase mainly existed parallel. Anyways, to put it short, the three phases of Modern Jewish philosophy are ‘Middle Ages wisdom-seeking’ (c. 800-1400), the dispute between Hasidics and Maskilim (1770-1880), and Zionism vs. diaspora dispute (c.1860-1950).
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Alexandru Drăgulun

There are a lot of subjects on the European Union’s public agenda but fundamental rights is a topic discussed both by the researchers in legal sciences and in politics. On the other hand, fundamental rights are a basic part of a democratic regime and it contributes to the establishment of civilised relationships between individuals. Even if these are treated in a liberal vision, in a socialist manner or from a conservative position, fundamental rights define the global society in which we live today.

Sonia Morano-Foadi and Lucky Vickers come with a new perspective regarding this subject and they combine the judicial interpretation with the political analysis by using a sophisticated research apparatus. A clear positivist approach is relevant to prove the role of human rights in construction of a democratic regime in the European Union. As it is mentioned in the preface, “This collection joins the new and expanding scholarship on the protection of fundamental rights in Europe and reflects on the relationship between the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) and the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR). The book questions whether the changes introduced by the Lisbon Treaty align the CJEU to the ECHR’s interpretation and methods, triggering different processes of institutionalisation within a coherent European system”.

The volume is consisting of an introduction and two major parts including a series of articles written by researchers in law and politics from the entire Europe. Sonia Morano-Foadi, Lucky Vickers, Niilo Jaaskinen, Stelios Andreadakis, Oreste Pollicino and Samantha Velluti are some of the contributors who analyze the features of the European democracy through the implications of human rights. Their writings are focused on the political traditions in Western and Eastern Europe, the judicial and political elements of the EU’s democracy, the protection of citizens against the abuses of the state, the problems of the EU’s accession to the European Court of Human Rights, the protection of fundamental rights in the new digital era and its challenges, the human rights in the context of
migration, the risks of erosion of human rights due to the proliferation of populism and the extremist parties in some European countries. Writing on the risks of erosion of human rights standards, Titia Loenen and Lucky Vickers state that these “are generally well protected in Europe. Since World War II human rights protection mechanisms have been set up and improved over time, both nationally and at the European level. In the latter context the European Convention of Human Rights has played the most prominent role, but more recently the European Union has become an ever more important player in the field. (...) Although the enlarged opportunities to invoke human rights would suggest that this aim will be fulfilled, this chapter argues that this may not, in event, be the case. This is because of the risk of adverse effects from the fusing of European competencies, in particular the risk of a lowering of substantive human rights protection notwithstanding increased procedural possibilities to make human rights claims”.

Another theme with a great impact on the public agenda – and discussed here – is the role of fundamental rights in the process of migration; in recent years Europe was colonized by a numerous population coming from Syria because of the civil war. The integration of these groups created a dilemma regarding their equality in rights with the autochtonous citizens. Most problems were created by the illegal migrants, for which the European Union was forced to apply restrictive laws and regulations. The chapter written on this subject by Sonia Morano-Foadi aims “at an understanding of the relationship between control of migration and respect of fundamental values. Combining empirical findings and case law on migration and human rights, this chapter reflects on the extent to which the European Court of Human Rights and the Court of Justice of the EU, in addressing issues of migration when a human rights element is under scrutiny, take a coherent approach”.

This volume is very usual for students because it offers a large collection of information and interpretations on the ways in which the European Union and its institutions implement the fundamental rights. Many politicians say the democracy is conceived for the people and the protection of their rights is necessary to prevent any turnout to a form of authoritarianism or populism. From this point of view, the populists affirm that it is their merit to deserve the citizens but, if we look carefully, we observe that they do not have the proper legal instruments to do this. In conclusion, the book must be read in the light of distinction between a legal and consolidated democracy – where the human rights are respected – and a political regime featured by personal authority of politicians, arbitrary decisions and systematic violations of the citizen’s rights.
Nuntași (Duingi) vernacular village church - Digital reconstruction

Iulian Mitran

Nuntași, formerly known as Duingi, is a village located in the north-eastern corner of Constanța County, nearby the great lagoon area. Some of the settlement’s notable architectural heritage sites are comprised of a few slightly well preserved vernacular homes, and the old village church.

The old village church, still in use until this day, is situated within the village’s central axis, which also encompasses a few other important buildings, such as the school, the kindergarten, the pharmacy, and the local cultural center.

The building is representative for the old vernacular Christian architecture of Ottoman Dobruja, having a rectangular layout, no towers, and having low height. The church, as it is today, was subjected to a few interventions that sought to do some well-needed improvements.

In neighboring Istria, the church of Saint Elijah is a very well conserved Ottoman-era church, sharing a few similarities with the church from Nuntași. During the era of Ottoman rule, churches could not exceed in height the local mosques, and were banned from displaying visible Christian symbols and imagery. As solution to the height restriction, many churches were built quite low above the ground level, but were dug under the ground level, usually having an additional one meter in height due to this.
The main building of the parish has a rectangular shape, being quite divergent from the usual stylistic and architectural norms that are reserved for Eastern Orthodox churches. The overall look of the buildings is not very different from that of a regular home, even so, some key-details indicate its function as a place of worship. Some of the details that highlight the function of the building are not exclusively represented by the display of Christian symbols, but rather by the way in which certain elements are placed in contrast to the surrounding residential buildings from the village. Even though the vernacular homes from Nuntași share the same rectangular layout, the façade is always placed on the wider edge, while it is facing the interior of the yard and not the roadside. Though modest, the church building preserves a key-feature of religious buildings – symmetry, but only in the case of the main façade. An apparent perfect symmetry is given by the absence of any additions added to the main
The bell tower is not an integral part of the church building, in fact being a free-standing structure located near the roadside, in front of the main building. Free-standing bell towers are commonly found among old EO churches from Dobruja, as they, in fact, were added on later, after 1878. During the time of Ottoman rule, churches were prohibited from having a bell. After the region became part of Romania, as a consequence of the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878, the churches that were built from that point on had the bell tower incorporated in the main building, sitting above the narthex usually, these were usually churches that had three tower, two sitting on the narthex, and another one at the point where the nave intersects the apses.
The church, like the majority of buildings from the villages, is built of abode. Over the course of the last decades, a few interventions were made; one of them consisted in adding a few extra layers of abode bricks to raise the height of the building. The church also did not have any interior paintings, those were added later on. For most of the time, icons were displayed throughout the building in order to fill the lack of religious imagery.
Nowadays, the church was “upgraded” with a new, and more colorful, paintjob. New windows and doors were added, both having a dark wood color. The original color scheme of that the church was made up of variations of grey contrasted with the white exterior walls. The original colors scheme can still be seen on the bell tower. The roofing material was also replaced, the original one being made up of thing metal sheets interconnected by thin ribs.
Vernacular house from Southern Dobruja, Romania

Iulian Mitran
Dobruja has a very rich and diverse architectural heritage. We can point out significant difference between the architecture that we find in the region’s big urban centers, and what we often find in small towns and villages. The striking variety that we encounter here is the product of several factors, from the different terrain type and construction materials that were subsequently available. In villages, we can find mainly two types of homes – tri-cellular and bi-cellular. Both terms refer to the characteristics of the home’s layout, a tri-cellular having three living spaces (rooms), while a bi-cellular has two spaces – one may serve as a living space for the family while the other one will be used as a storage space. In the areas that are near Dobruja’s lagoon region, homes tend to be made from mud brick, the roofing is made from reed. The homes of the lagoon region tend to have a very linear layout, usually taking the form of a narrow and elongated rectangle. The living quarters are positioned near the roadside, while the storages spaces are extended within the yard. In southern Dobruja, mainly the area that stretches south of the imaginary line that would connect the cities of Cernavoda, Medgidia and Techirghiol, the vernacular architecture suffers a few changes, the style starting to the rural homes of north-eastern Bulgaria. In the south, we will find a substantial number of homes built from stone masonry, due to the numerous quarries that are scattered throughout the region. As we go more to the southern part of Constanta County, the terrain becomes hilly, being crossed by numerous dry valleys which the locals call canarale. In the south-western part of
Constanta County the vernacular homes are elevated from the ground-level through a base made of stone masonry. The homes have as a defining trait the wooden porch that extends across the whole length of the main façade. The middle part of the porch is often extended outward forming a foyer-type construction.

The models displayed here are a fine representation of the vernacular style of southern Dobruja. The house is built of stone masonry, sits on an elevated base that ensures more stability, as usually the ground is rather angled and it makes it somewhat difficult to build directly on it without an elevated base. The main façade is dominated by a wooden porch with a foyer situated in the middle. The exterior is finished off with mud plastering and painted in white, while the woodwork is painted in a greenish color. The house is divided into three spaces, all of them filling the function of living quarters, the room where we have the entrance is something similar to a hall, but wider, being called sală. This room does not fill the function of a bedroom but rather that of an intermediate space between the two bedrooms, which locals often call camerele bune (the good rooms) which are situated on right and left of the sală. In many cases, the house will have an extension in the rear with an angled roof called aplecătoare, this space usually tends to act as the living quarter while the two bedrooms from the main house are rather used as housing for guests. In some cases, we will find some annexes scattered across the yard that will fill the function of living quarter and kitchen. The roof has a low slope and is covered with ceramic tiles, usually in two layers, top and bottom. The roof framing, in the old days, would be made of wood from the pygmy oaks of the Babadag forest. Oak wood was highly sought due to the fact that the roof coverings were quite heavy and they necessitated a very solid frame to sit on. Some of the building materials that were used were good indicators of a family’s social standing within the community – homes that had metal roof coverings were usually owned by wealthier families, sometimes by the chiaburi (somewhat similar to the Russian kulaks). In the old days, in Dobruja, even in the interior region, most homes were covered with reed or cobs, later some were covered with reed on which a layer of ceramic tiles were added. After that, cobs were taken out of use as roof covering, and ceramic tiles were used exclusively. Even so, the Mediterranean-style tiles, which were used at first, were quite heavy and pretentious. There was a period in which this type of tile was banned. Flat rectangular-shaped tiles became popular especially after World War II, the period that followed was marked by considerable changes in the architectural landscape of many rural communities. The “modern house” started to appear in many communities, especially in semi-urbanized villages and small towns where small industries and craftsman shops were present. Unlike their previous counterparts, the “modern house” was made of
brick, had quarters made to suit every type of daily activities, and even had some intermediate space between rooms – halls. Nowadays, homes such the one presented in this model can still be found in some of the villages from the south-western part of Constanța County, such as Lipnița, Viile, Floriile, Ostrov etc. Some are well conserved, some are in an advanced state of decay, or their original architecture was subjected to various interventions that greatly distorted their original charm.
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The Astral World: The Prelude

Dejan Vasiljević

Before somebody begins to „shout“ about how, by their very nature, (all) demons are evil, we should first go through the following categorization and see what each contains:

According to Christian teachings, all demons are indeed evil. They are simply “just” fallen angels who stood on Lucifer’s side in his rebellion against God, that is, angels whom Lucifer managed to convince that God is “bad”, and that he is “good”. All demons follow Lucifer’s orders and commands, and all of them (including Lucifer) are working on just one goal — the destruction of mankind.

If we analyse the very word »Demon«, we can see that it comes from the Greek word »Daimon« (δαιμων) which denotes the spirit of any type which possesses any sort of supernatural capabilities/powers and having any type of intelligence. The word itself does not imply a good nor a bad spirit, but neutrally just a spirit. So, spirits, like humans, are good and/or bad (evil).

The word is very similar to the Latin word »Genius« (Genie ⇨Jin or Jinn), which is popular in the presentation of jinns: „Arabic“ spirits created of the smokeless fire. Someone would immediately say that jinns and demons (the Christian version) are the same, since the (hellish) fire are their mutual attribute. But, in the Arab countries, there is a belief that jinns, again, are also very much like humans — they are good and they are bad, they live parallelly with us, but in their own (astral) world. They are not aware of us, just as most of us are not aware of them. Simply, they live their lives; we live ours, each on our own plane of existence. In their belief, in the Beginning, angels were made of light, man from the earthly dust (clay), and jinn of the smokeless fire. God commanded the angels and jinns to be servants to man, but only angels obeyed the commandment, while the jinns decided — because of the jealousy of God’s attention that mankind was enjoying — that they have no contact with man nor to be subordinated to him, but to establish their own „community“.

In English, for example, there are two words for labeling ethereal entity: »Spirit« and »Ghost«. »Spirit« refers to an entity which does not originate from the Earth and never walked the Earth’s surface physically, and »Ghost« is the word that, normally, signifies an ethereal human form of a
deceased person, that is — an entity which originates from the Earth. The two words are often used as synonyms, although they are not directly.

Let me return to Christianity again just for a moment. For the famous biblical king Solomon was claimed that he has been very and strongly attached to God, and God has returned him the same affection. It is claimed that Solomon was the richest man on Earth at the time. He had every honor — even the greatest one which he was given to him by God „personally“: to build Him a Temple. He did not leave any detail to a mere chance. And it is claimed that he was helped by — spirits. It is said that he built the Temple very quickly, which is otherwise a very time-consuming job which can last months, even years. In the end, he wrote the scriptures with the detailed instructions on how to invoke these spirits to help when the need for their help appears in man. These scriptures are now called »Goetia« (again, from the Greek word »Goēteia«: Sorcery), »Gechia« or »Getya« (the names vary from person to person, but these are the three most common ones) and contain a list of 72 spirits with which Solomon worked, as well as their „properties“, or what kind of influence these spirits have on the material world. Every (or at least almost every) spirit of these has its own „sigil“, which is a type of a contact phone number for spirits in the form of a seal. These „seals“ can be unique as the fingerprint in people. Most spirits have only one sigil/seal with which they can be contacted. The system of Goetia is also in line with the talismans of the planets, planetary days and hours. I will give examples of some of these spirits and in what areas they have their both good and evil influence (there is no special order, the order of these spirits is entirely random):

Sitri (also spelled Bitru, Sytry) - reigns over sixty legions of demons. He causes men to love women and vice versa, and can make people bare themselves naked if desired. He is depicted with the face of a leopard and the wings of a griffin, but under the conjurer’s request he changes into a very beautiful man.

Bathin (or Bathym, Mathim, Marthim) — he knows the virtues of precious stones and herbs, and can bring men suddenly from one country to another. He helps one attain astral projection, and takes you wherever you want to go. He is depicted as a strong man with the tail of a serpent, riding a pale horse.

Naberius (also Naberus, Nebiros and Cerberus, Cerbere) — he makes men cunning in all arts, but especially in rhetoric, speaking with a hoarse voice. He also restores lost dignities and honors,
although to Johann Weyer he procures the loss of them. Naberius appears as a three-headed dog or a raven. He has a raucous voice but presents himself as eloquent and amiable. He teaches the art of gracious living. He is depicted as a crow or a black crane. Concerning his name, it is unclear if there is an association with the Greek Cerberus. It is said that, in 1583, Johann Weyer considers both of them to be the same demon. He claimed:

Naberius (or Naberus), alias Cerberus, is a valiant marquesse, shewing himselfe in the forme of a crowe, when he speaketh with a hoarse voice: he maketh a man amiable and cunning in all arts, and speciallie in rhetorike, he procureth the losse of prelacies and dignities: nineteene legions heare (and obeie) him.

Morax (also Foraii, Marax and Farax) — he teaches Astronomy and all other liberal sciences, and gives good and wise familiars that know the virtues of all herbs and precious stones. He is depicted as a big bull with the face of a man. It has been proposed that Morax is related to the Minotaur which Dante places in Hell (Inferno, Canto XII). See Fred Gettings’s »Dictionary of Demons« (1988.). His name seems to come from Latin »Morax« (that delays, that stops).

Purson (also Curson, Pursan) — he knows of hidden things, can find treasures, and tells past, present and future. Taking a human or aerial body, he answers truly of all secret and divine things of Earth and the creation of the world. He also brings good familiars. Purson is depicted as a man with the face of a lion, carrying a ferocious viper in his hand, and riding a bear. Before him there can be heard many trumpets sounding.

Focalor (also Forcalor, Furcalor) — is mentioned in »The Lesser Key of Solomon« as the forty-first of the 72 Goetic spirits. According to the grimoire: Focalor appears in the form of a man with a griffin’s wings, kills men, drowns them, and overthrows warships; but, if commanded by the conjurer, he will not harm any man or thing. Focalor has power over wind and sea, and had hoped to return to Heaven after 1,000 years, but he was deceived in his hope. One of the three archdemons, LucifugeRofocale, has his second name as an anagram of Focalor, implying an intellectual relationship.

Glasya-Labolas (also Caacrinolaas, Caassimolar, Classyalabolas, Glassia-labolis, GlasyaLabolas, Gaylos-Lobos) — he is the author and captain of manslaughter and bloodshed, tells all things past and to come, gains the minds and love of friends and foes causing love among them if desired, incites homicides and can make a man invisible. He is depicted as a dog with the wings of a griffin.
Aim (also known as Aym or Haborym) — he sets cities, castles and great places on fire, makes men witty in all ways, and gives true answers concerning private matters. He is depicted as a man (handsome to some sources), but with three heads, one of a serpent, the second of a man, and the third of a cat to most authors, although some say of a calf, riding a viper, and carrying in his hand a lit firebrand with which he sets the requested things on fire.

Ipos (also Aiperos, Ayperos, Ayporos, Ipes) — he knows and can reveal all things, past, present and future. He can make men witty and valiant. He is commonly depicted with the body of an angel with the head of a lion, the tail of a hare, and the feet of a goose, less frequently in the same shape but with the body of a lion, and rarely as a vulture.

Camio (also Caim, Caym) — appears in ArsGoetia, the first part of Lesser Key of Solomon. Much detail is offered: he is a good disputer, gives men the understanding of the voices of birds, bullocks, dogs, and other creatures, and of the noise of the waters too, and gives true answers concerning things to come. He is depicted in 19th and 20th century occultist illustrations as appearing in the form of the black bird called a thrush, but soon he changes his shape into a man that has a sharp sword in his hand. When answering questions he seems to stand on burning ashes or coals. Camio’s name seems to be taken from the biblical first murderer – Cain.

Gremory (also known as Gamory, Gemory, or Gomory) — he tells all things past, present and future, about hidden treasures, and procures the love of women, young and old, but especially maidens. He is depicted as appearing in the form of a beautiful woman with the crown of a duchess tied around her waist, and riding a camel.

Seir — he can go to any place on Earth in a matter of seconds to accomplish the will of the conjurer, bring abundance, help in finding hidden treasures or in robbery, and is not a demon of evil but good nature, being mostly indifferent to evilness. He is depicted as a man riding a winged horse, and is said to be beautiful.

According to some more modern (“new age”) beliefs, spirits are nothing more and nothing less than “simple” aliens who have visited the Earth through history and have had any contact with humans. Some even go further and say that these entities are the same ones as those mentioned in fairy tales: the same “aliens” whose „invisibility equipment” technically “failed”, thus being made visible to
people just for a moment. The alleged and unexplained painted “flying saucers” poorly speak in the support of this and are physically visible to the naked eye on frescoes in some churches.
Diana Shamaa

Around Al Dir`aiyah, the forgotten capital of the first Saudi kingdom

The photos were taken in a historical area which is situated on the banks of the Wadi Hanifa, on the outskirts of Riyadh. The landscape is stunningly beautiful, Al Dir`aiyah is also known under its traditional name of Al Awja. It is regarded as an important landmark due to the fact that it was the first capital city of the first Saudi state in 1745.

One of the most interesting parts is represented by the Turaif neighborhood which was preserved in a remarkable state. It was the headquarters of the Saudi royal family. The defensive wall that intersects a few forts which were built under the rule of Abdul Aziz Ibn Muhammad Ibn Saud in order to defend the ensemble from potential threats. The total length of the wall is about 7 km.

The picture represents a simple building with a flat roof where we find a terrace, this place was usually used for spending time with friends and guests where the weather made this possible.
This building is filled with Najdi tribal patterns, they are quite easy to spot due to their complex geometry and light color scheme which is highly representative for the indigenous art of the Najdi people.
The Sawani is a contraption that was used in the past for extracting water which was used for drinking and for irrigations. The wooden wheels that were positioned above the well, four camels would usually make the wheels spin, as they spin water would be extracted from the underground. This is one of the few examples of ingenious vernacular technology.
This tower is an old minaret from the Dir`iyah area which was used by the muezzins would announce the beginning of the prayers and would call on the believers to pray.
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