Common axes/parameters which provide to us a flexible, fruitful, comparative scope for the study of the Balkan historical cases:

1. **Imperial Past (2 dimensions)** : 1) as a familiar, long-term experience of co-existence under multi-ethnic, multi-religious, multi-culture empires, 2) this past both as a constructive , vital element of the present and as inspiration of the future as well
2. **Europe/West (4 dimensions)**  : 1)as a cultural protype /paradigm of the civilized (imaginary ) world, 2) as a power bloc (Great Powers), 3) as liberal bourgeoisie, 4) as a cultural border between West and East, between Christianity and Islamism
3. **The economic and social (common) base**: if we figured out the social hierarchy in each Balkan case- despite of the differences, especially with the historical paradigm of Romania) - we have a massive agricultural base, in the center a gradual (during the long duration of the nineteenth century) shaping of a middle class and on the top the powerless indigenous bourgeoisie. At the same time, we have in all the cases, not with the same importance, powerful Diaspora strata (the “outside” Greeks, the “outside” Serbs, the “outside” Romanians, the “Outside” Bulgarians) which played a crucial role both on the national mobilizations and on the making of the new autonomous or independent states.
4. **The** **national issues /questions:** 1) each national issue/question has, at the same time, two parallel dimensions: the demand of the expansion and the demand of modernization. 2) Each national issue/question can only be approached and must be understood as a part of the major Eastern Issue/Question. The Easter Issue was, in the long term of the nineteenth century, the most famous and most drastic diplomatic issue.
5. **The political issue/question:** during the first half of the 19th century, in the most cases, the political issue defined according the proper distribution of power between the crown and the representative institutions. (Parliament or Parliament and Senate). The demand for a liberal and progressive Constitution has been the apple of the discord during the years 130/40-1850/60- except the Bulgarian case. 2) On the second half of the 19th century, the political issue has been transformed into questions similar to those: has the political system been operated by the rules? How often, and under which circumstances the King had crosses the “line” and used arbitrary and authoritarian practices? Did we have, in others, words a regime where the borders between legitimacy and delinquency had been understood as loose and porous?