

## IDENTITY DISCOURSE AND EUROPEANISM IN THE ROMANIAN CULTURE OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

Gabriel NEDELEA<sup>1</sup>

---

### **Abstract**

*This work proposes an analysis of how Romania constructed its national identity discourse, upon its participation in the 1867 Paris Exposition. It shows the relationship between the configuration of the national cultural image and the European culture in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. This first presence in a universal exposition, with its own pavilion, was the outcome of a complex diplomatic strategy, supported by cultural means. It also was a major proof of European behaviour, as forms of monographic knowledge and representation of a state were imported. We shall focus on how these forms were assimilated.*

**Keywords:** the century of nations; the 19<sup>th</sup> century; universal expositions; Al. Odobescu; Titu Maiorescu; Paris 1867 Europeanism.

DOI: 10.24818/SYN/2025/21/1.10

---



---

### ***1. European voyages and cultural transfers in the 19<sup>th</sup> century***

---

The 19<sup>th</sup> century in Europe has been researched and narrated mostly from the perspective of configuring the national political and cultural identities that had emerged all over the *old continent*. Against this background, it was referred to as *the century of nationalities/nations*, a phrase synthesizing not only the wish and the idea of merging and reinforcing states, but also the main methodological option of historians. Prevalence was given to actions and ideologies resulting in a crystallization and concretization of nationalisms, with a focus on the differences, on the specific aspects or *psychologies* of certain regions and communities that, in principle, *shared* approximately the same language and a common recovered and/or rewritten mythological background. Romanticism played a decisive part in the development and imposition of this perspective, and philosophy, literature and arts were widely used as means to reach this purpose.

Given the evolution of technologies and the continuous development of trade, many international events and phenomena took place at this time – for instance, the public became increasingly aware of the concept of Europeanism, which would also give way to *orientalism* and colonialism, in general, but without decisively changing the power relations involved by the tradition of the European-centred thinking; however,

---

<sup>1</sup> Gabriel Nedelea, University of Craiova, Faculty of Letters, gabriel.nedelea.macedon@gmail.com.

in some circles and networks, this would be affected by several nuances. These realities, which are *secondary* compared to the topics of nationalisms only from certain viewpoints and angles of the research, reveal the profiles of the 19<sup>th</sup> century modernism in all their complexity when given proper attention. A generous bibliography is available to this end, much more limited than the one focused on the development and *behaviours* of nations, but, from our point of view, much more attractive and, for instance, mostly useful to reestablish the contexts required by postmodern cross- and transdisciplinary methodologies.

Orlando Figes conceived his work *The Europeans* (2019) making a choice for connections between arts (literature included) and capitalism, following the consequences of the international circulation of creators, artists and symbolic goods by means of the railways that were built, as of the half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, over the borders within the continent. After establishing the assumptions deriving from this relation, he asserts: “My aim is to approach Europe as a space of cultural transfers, translations and exchanges crossing national boundaries, out of which a ‘European culture’ – an international synthesis of artistic forms, ideas and styles – would come into existence and distinguish Europe from the broader world” (Figes, 2019: 28). Due to the culture of voyage, which continuously developed and extended across the middle classes as well, and also due to international trade in books, scores and paintings, “the European canon”, as Figes points out, emerged, “which forms the basis of today’s high culture not just in Europe but all around the globe where Europeans settled – was established in the railway age. An élite international culture had existed in Europe since at least the Renaissance” (Figes, 2019: 28). The British historian proves, based on relevant documentation, by means of proper interpretations and exemplary contextualizations, that cultural tourism begins in the decades of 1850-1860, in forms that are very close to the ones we are familiar with nowadays. Museums, memorial houses, show halls, mass reproduction workshops are opened and institutionalized, reaching a state-of-the-art level.

The mobility of cultural actors and new distribution networks significantly develop the market of symbolic goods and cultural transfers. National cultures compete against each other, and major capital cities fight for the first place. However, the free market ensures the coexistence of several epicentres, and consumers have a cross-national behaviour.

Additionally, Romanian boyars travelled a lot. The first one to write and publish a diary during his lifetime was Dinicu Golescu, *Însemnare a călătoriei mele în anii 1824, 1825, 1826*. In “Cătră cititori”, the foreword he uses to support this editorial endeavour, novel at that time, the author points out the benefits of voyages, indicating, by means of bookish sources, cultural transfers taking place from the beginning of civilization until his contemporaneity. He begins with the transfer of knowledge between antique civilizations (from Egypt, through voyages, to the Greeks and Romans – “our ancestors”), concluding: “And they [the Greeks and

Romans] brought them to the whole enlightened Europe and the latter grew them day after day, making them more fruitful than ever and benefitting the peoples through the communication of the good gathered from the voyages that create nations, and publishing them through books” (Golescu, 1915: 4) [our translation]. These are the thoughts of the first Romanian diarist, who was travelling to take his sons to study.

Romanian 1848 revolutionists travelled a lot, on waterways and by train. They bring Illuminist and Romantic ideas on the nation mostly from France, where they study from the very first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Members of the Junimea literary society also focus on the German-speaking area. Information provided by the works, diaries and correspondences of cultural and political protagonists of the Romanian countries outline attitudes, ideas and behaviours that perfectly match the ones analysed by Orlando Figes in *The Europeans*.

Titu Maiorescu, Mihai Eminescu, Iacob Negruzzi travel to Germany and Austria for studies or on diplomatic missions. They are all highly familiar with German language and culture; they read, write and translate from German, importing philosophical models and systems that are highly relevant for the symbolic substance of the *Junimea* group, such as Kant’s and Schopenhauer’s philosophy. Titu Maiorescu got his PhD at Giessen University. Eminescu attended philosophy studies in Berlin, at the beginning of the 1870s, also preparing a PhD dissertation that he would never complete; this experience was also reflected in his work, through poems such as *Privesc oraşul furnicar*<sup>2</sup>. The “Romania Juna” [Young Romania] Academic and Literary Society was also established in a German-speaking area, i.e., Vienna, operating for about four decades (1871-1911).

The fictive dimension of voyage books is hardly separable from the documentary one; from the very first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Romanian elite anticipated the efficiency of literature on a diplomatic level and widely used it, from all perspectives, for the construction of national identity discourses. The imaginary margin of the perception and conception of everything that happened outside, in the West, had a direct impact on the representation of the communities and the nation from the inside. To this purpose, Florin Faifer emphasized that:

*Many voyages have a double of their own, an imaginary reflection. Due to the intentional or unintentional infidelity of certain descriptions, the associative flow, bordering the excentric and improbable, and the impertinent inventions (on a keyboard covering from the plastic to the playful, from the sublime to the grotesque), a text becomes highly mobile, and the borderline is always moved, sometimes in a*

<sup>2</sup> On this topic, see Ilina Gregori, *Ştim noi cine a fost Eminescu?* (Bucharest, Editura Art, 2009), which, by means of documents, reconstitutes the entire activity of our national poet in the German capital.

*confusing manner. A borderlessness that prepares the feast of the imaginary. The imaginary, as a pure joy of the evasion to the borderless.* [our translation] (Faifer, 1993: 13)

Voyage has represented a complex collective experience of self-knowledge, of capitalization of the past and the traditions, that can “provide those who know how to see with an opening towards a world which is nothing else but a system of mirrors, a self that unveils and confesses itself” [our translation] (Anghelescu, 2015: 206). Romanian intellectuals even set up associations in the European capitals to which they travelled for training, thus searching and asserting a range of common principles, related to those of the host culture, and assimilated them, in order to be able to adopt them in their native culture.

In a book exposing the history of transportation across the Danube between 1830 and 1860, Constantin Ardeleanu provides a highly relevant panorama of the situation. For instance, he quotes Mihail Kogălniceanu, who, as he travelled by train through the Habsburg Empire in 1844, “showed that, ‘with no intention’, Austria was ‘a provider of civilization and freedoms, since new ideas can spread through railways’” (Ardeleanu, 2021: 19) [our translation]. The work *O croazieră de la Viena la Constantinopol. Călători, spații, imagini* (1830-1860) shows the impact of the transformation of the Danube, by Austrian waterway transportation companies, into a genuine civilising motorway, in general, also for touristic purposes, in the second third of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Austrian ships – provided by the Danube Steamboat Shipping Company (DDSG) – “favoured the connection of the Romanian area to ‘modernity’” (Ardeleanu, 2021: 156) [our translation], being, on the one hand, “the vehicle that some locals boarded towards destinations from the ‘civilized’ West or the ‘exotic’ East” and, on the other hand, representing “the first engine of the industrial revolution that Romanians became acquainted with directly, in their country” (Ardeleanu, 2021: 157) [our translation].

Against this background of mobility and willingness to travel of more and more members of the aristocracy and bourgeoisie in all European states, as well as due to the growth of international markets in material and cultural/symbolic goods, the most outstanding European capitals, initially London and Paris, began to organize *universal expositions*. From the first editions, they were more than mere fairs, having deep identity-oriented and diplomatic meanings and implications. They generated an unprecedented, multilayered intercultural dialogue. According to Laurentiu Vlad, the author of the most encompassing Romanian study on this topic, universal expositions became genuine stages that “disseminated various lifestyles, ideologies or political constructs, i.e., coherent systems of representations, underpinning a globalizing reason, hence, a stage reuniting a range of images circulated by the foreign propaganda of the participating states” (Vlad, 2007: 28) [our translation]. Expectations and motivations proved to be valid, as these manifestations developed impressively. Besides the obvious commercial aspects and business relations they

were based on, they involved several types of transfers, as the exposition also reflected, for instance, “the expression of a belief, sometimes bordering mysticism, in the scientific and technological progress of the world” (Vlad, 2007: 28) [our translation]. In the wide areas arranged in the two capitals, one could find products, inventions, artistic objects and events, of course, along with scientists, engineers, politicians, artists and writers.

---

## ***2. Romanian identity images in the 1867 Paris Exposition***

---

Romania’s participation in the *1867 Paris Exposition* had great political stakes, as our country conditioned its presence by requiring its own exhibition area, like independent states. This proved to be a brilliant diplomatic strategy, most likely designed with the collaboration of influential top French politicians. After a period of uncertainty, according to Al. Odobescu, who was appointed Romanian commissioner for this event during Cuza’s reign and was also maintained during Carol I’s reign, “the Imperial Commission, convinced that peoples should not be affected by political hindrances in the civilizing realm of industry and trade, agreed to receive Romania among the exhibiting countries, on fully equal terms” (Odobescu, 1908: 318) [our translation]. The assigned area was deeply significant in the symbolic architecture of the event, which also indicates a subtle diplomatic manoeuvre: “the place in the Exposition Palace that is assigned for the principalities bordering the Danube, Romania and Serbia, is near the one of Turkey, but distinct from it, and is facing the place assigned to Rome or the Pontifical States” (Odobescu, 1908: 318) [our translation]. Thus, the neighbourhoods were as suggestive as possible; they were imposed, however, by the political situation, but were also symbolic, given the proximity of Rome.

The 1867 exposition practically launched the Paris that Napoleon III had transformed along with Baron Haussmann, becoming an example for the urbanism of the great modern metropolises. Actually, it positioned itself as a capital of cosmopolitanism, thus establishing a new pattern of economic interaction, through the most advanced means of culture. The status it built had a double effect: it confirmed France’s power as a nation, and it claimed to be a forum of Europeanity and universality. The exposition was a fair, a museum and a modern agora at the same time. Orlando Figes outlines these features through Haussmann’s vision, quoting from his extended memories:

*[...] the city he was building did not belong to Parisians, alone: it was to be an international capital, belonging equally to the people of the French Empire and to foreign visitors, who could get to it by rail from every corner of the Continent. ‘Paris is a capital of consumption, a huge workshop, an arena for ambitions, a rendezvous for pleasure,’ Haussmann told a banquet of financier. (Figes, 2019: 123)*

In 1867, Paris induced the rhythms of modernity across all its artistic, literary, economic and technological dimensions: “This was the Paris of the flâneur – the idle stroller and anonymous spectator on the crowded boulevard, for whom, in the words of Baudelaire, it was ‘an immense joy to set up house in the heart of the multitude, amid the ebb and flow of movement ... the fugitive and the infinite’” (Figes, 2019: 124). It gained a major advantage against London, which had organized and would also organize such *Expositions*.

For Romania, the mere participation was deeply meaningful, as the authorities and commissioner Al. Odobescu were fully aware; they deemed the exposition was “a unique opportunity of showing Europe our genuine character, especially if our various products will be intelligently and tastefully presented to the eyes of the civilized Europe”. Odobescu distinguished between two important categories of exhibits, “of nature” and “of human genius” and expressed his belief that we could be competitive at both levels.

First of all, the participation followed the general policy of synchronizing oneself with the “illuminated Europe”, as Dinicu Golescu put it, or the “cult Europe”, as Titu Maiorescu would name it. Importance was assigned to a range of *fecund forms*, that could help structure the *Romanian substance* or could actually generate *substance*. Titu Maiorescu, the first modern critic in our culture, failed to see this and, a year later, in 1868, he published *Împotriva direcției de azi în cultura română*, a polemic article where he denounced precisely the *formal synchronization*. He meant the rhythm of establishing the state’s institutions. However, the cultural transfer was much more complex, which can also be seen in the preparation and presence in the 1867 Paris Exposition.

Secondly, the issue of mobilization for such an endeavour should be analysed; the collection of objects proved to be highly difficult, since such practices were absolutely sporadic and had a private nature in the Romanian society of those times. A spirit of solidarity was lacking, and the collaboration had to be outstanding, in order to support what is nowadays coined as the *national image*. Al. Odobescu launched several nationwide calls to this purpose, sending circulars to local authorities. The text of the call shows that he tried to adapt a system which would meet the formal rigors of Paris organisers. Thus, the action can also be seen as a civic exercise, only partially successful.

One of the *forms* that Odobescu had to import was the precise “obsessive classifying reason”, analytically observed and described by Vlad Laurentiu:

*[...]its starting points were the taxonomies of naturalists, i.e. the encyclopaedism of illuminists, but also the positivism or the Darwinism of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; thus, theoretical reflections (dictionaries and universal encyclopaedias) or practical constructs, such as those in the area of library science or in the field of professional,*

*industrial and agricultural nomenclature, proliferated and were put to work with the opportunity of the universal expositions.* (Vlad, 2007: 28) [our translation].

Thus, the work was performed in a coordinated manner, with a system implying a range of knowledge, descriptors and, last but not least, attitudes towards manufactured, industrial, technological and artistic products. Al. Odobescu understood the importance of this structuring and also wrote a request to draw up a presentation album, following the structure of the 1867 Paris Exposition classification. The commissioner, one of the most refined Romanian writers in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, also refers to the “artistic viewpoint” and does it in a European style: “It is impossible for Romania not to take part, as far as it can, in decorating that space of human genius, where all the nations will bring all the products of their imagination and taste, besides their material wealth” (Odobescu, 1908: 321) [our translation]. He raises the issue both in terms of integration with the museum discourse in Paris, as he thought of it at that time, and in terms of differentiation, thus referring to the Byzantine architecture of the Romanian churches. He referred to Curtea de Arges, which, Odobescu anticipated, could “cause some sensation in the artistic world, especially in our century, when, exhausted by the styles used in the civilized Europe, architecture fervently looks for decorative motifs in Byzantine monuments” (Odobescu, 1908: 321) [our translation]. These judgments fall within a subjective assessment, which, however, lacks nationalist exaltation and romantic hyperbolization. The arguments are brought for the symbols used to create Romania’s identity in such an Exposition.

With this occasion, the bases were laid for a monographic perspective on Romania, in a wide, encyclopaedic meaning, considering all its fields of activity, thought in relation with the European markets. This implied the assimilation of a methodology that Odobescu rigorously followed. His previous activity recommended him to this purpose, as he was formed in the spirit of the 1848 revolutionists and evolved towards Junimea-based principles. The desideratum for critical synchronization helped him find balance in the configuration of the identity images he had been hired to officially coordinate, in his position as a commissioner, upon Romania’s first participation with its own pavilion in a universal exposition, the one in 1867.

Al. Odobescu’s works from this time combine the methods of historical discourses oriented towards a predefined political purpose, the creation of a national profile underpinning independence as a European state, with more modern methods, which take into account everyday business activities, assigning them importance at the level of the main narration, segmented by exceptional events. To this end, he draws up, most likely along with Petre S. Aurelian, *Notice sur la Roumanie, principalement au point de vue de son économie rurale, industrielle et commerciale suivie du catalogue spécial des produits exposés dans la section roumaine à l’Exposition universelle de Paris, en 1867 et d’une notice sur l’histoire du travail en ce pays* (Librairie A. Franck, Paris, 1868). Seen beyond the conjuncture in which it was designed, the

paper appears as a first intended global cultural history of the evolution of the Romanian people. Odobescu's historical discourse, involved in creating an official identity macro-narration, suggests not only a representation of history as teleological and/or fatalist, but also the Romanian elites' wish for Europeanity. In the same year, 1868, Odobescu also published *Notice sur les antiquités de la Roumanie* (Librairie A. Franck, Paris). The image of an *island of Latinity*, which had become a national brand, is counterbalanced by the Byzantine-Orthodox substance in the Exposition and in its catalogue. Vlad Laurentiu provides an accurate analysis of this aspect, also outlining the appearance of clichés that circulated for a long while in domestic identity discourses: "a *Romanian specificity* made up of a Romantic mixture of Latinity and ruralism" (Vlad, 2007: 64) [our translation]. However, the plea did not follow the terms of the enthusiastic discourses that were characteristic of Romantic nationalism; it was rather temperate, descriptive, based on a critical spirit triggered by the introduction into the Exposition's universal discourse and by the inherent comparisons that had arisen on this occasion. In the motivations he had written to prepare the participation, he even identified a range of complexes that participants had or could have felt in such a situation. He had been compelled to explain the amplitude of the concept of *culture* that was thought to underpin the organization of the large gallery of the Paris participants' showcases.

From a diplomatic point of view, with an attitude that was as European as it could get, the Romanian delegation made the most of it. For instance, as Vlad Laurentiu emphasizes, Alexandru Odobescu explicitly instructed Iancu Alecsandri to "systematically use the name of Romania instead of the official one, i.e. the United Principalities" [our translation].

As for the construction of the identity discourse itself, it should not be interpreted in the terms of extreme Romantic exceptionalism, as Laurentiu Vlad also does at many times. "*The direct connection to the Roman ancients*" was undoubtedly "a central topic of the foreign propaganda of the Bucharest governments in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century" and, maybe mostly subsequently, in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, under various forms. However, "the identity of Romanians also stemmed from the Byzantine shining of the Middle Ages" (Vlad, 2007: 77) [our translation]. However, the Commission chose to work with a French architect, Ambroise Baudry, in building the visual identity of its stand, choosing the Arges Church as its identity symbol. Odobescu would draw up a highly detailed report for the restoration of the Arges Church in 1874, when Titu Maiorescu was the Minister of Cults. (The relationship with this building is described by Al. Odobescu in *Biserica episcopală de la Curtea de Argeș*, published in *Epoca*, in 1887). It should be underlined here that "Mr. Ambroise Baudry, a talented architect", "had visited the United Principalities the past year [1865], with an archaeological mission assigned by his Majesty Emperor Napoleon" (Odobescu, 1908) [our translation]. This latter information reveals that the Principalities had received much more complex political assistance than apparent

at first sight from French authorities, most likely also in terms of the diplomatic strategies it would adopt.

Broadly speaking, the identity discourse assembled by the Romanian commission indeed met the following scenario:

*By taking stock of antiquities, Alexandru Odobescu built an ideal continuity from the Roman ages (whose vestiges were found on the territory of ancient Dacia, a territory that had already been nationalized by the Romanian modern state) to the Middle Ages of Orthodoxy, with its Byzantine direction. This procedure by which a state took hold of an ancient or medieval cultural heritage that had developed within the confines of its modern borders, was frequent in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. (Vlad, 2007: 68-69) [our translation]*

However, this narrative should also be interpreted from the perspective of Europeanism, that introduced a range of transnational values, criteria and practices. This is seen in Odobescu's works, both on a conceptual and on a stylistic level. When participation was questioned by the weak mobilization in the country, Odobescu asserted:

*It would be humiliating for our country, which aims to become a European state and participate in the progresses of civilization, not to take advantage of the first occasion it has to present itself to the world with its personal character, among all the peoples, and acquire, on this peaceful and honourable battlefield, new rights to the interest of the great European Powers and new means of developing its natural wealth. (Odobescu, 1908: 323) [our translation]*

Odobescu frequently resorts to capitalist arguments in the modern meaning of the word. He permanently envisages all the pragmatic purposes of this mission, from the diplomatic to the immediately economic ones. As it can be seen, the major identity discourse is not autarchic and closed, but deeply European.

---

### ***3. The quest for synchronicity***

---

The fact that the identity-oriented narration conceived by Odobescu is balanced and was covered by the critical spirit triggered, on the one hand, by the context in which it had been proposed – the participation in the 1867 Paris Exposition – and, on the other hand, by his modern conception on history is also proven by how the historian and writer operated culturally and designed his subsequent works. He is close to the Junimea spirit from several points of view. We could even say that he somehow anticipates Maiorescu's critical position. He does not explain it at such, but he had operated in his position as a commissioner and historian, based on the latter's principles. Although he was a member of the Iași Committee for the preparation of

the 1867 Exhibition, Titu Maiorescu did not consider Odobescu's cultural-diplomatic effort to be relevant in a theoretical critical sense; he did not mention it as such in his articles from the seventies and eighties of the 19th century. For example, we do not find any reference to this undertaking in the polemical *În contra direcției de azi în cultura română* (1868), despite the fact that he was in correspondence with the project's commissioner. Nevertheless, we have seen that the historian had imported a modern encyclopaedic system of classification and textualization of the Romanian fund. This is shown by how he relates to popular culture and to the life of Romanian peasants in 1868 works. Odobescu takes full advantage of the context not only from a diplomatic, but also from a methodological point of view. The inherent taxonomic synchronization and, given the meaningfulness of the participation in the major Universal Exposition, the involved epistemic transfer are seen as a necessity and as an important stake. He publishes the propaganda album in French, thus ensuring the European circulation of the identity narration created to this end. He sees participation to Europeanity as a desire to be fulfilled through the legitimization of a community-based identity that precedes independence.

Not even in 1872, when he published *Direcția nouă în poezia și proza română*, did Maiorescu discuss these endeavours of Odobescu. He invokes him in the chapter on prose, with *Cercetări arheologice*, “dissertations published in *Revista română*, 1861”. The author of *Critice* clearly stated the desire for synchronicity with the cult Western Europeanity, which was seen as a “duty of conscience”:

*Because for us, who are neighbours of a superior culture, any question of science is first of all a question of conscience, and here the conscience imposes two duties: first, to study the relevant matter so that none of the fundamental principles reached by the cult Europe should remain hidden from us, thus, to reach the relevant cultural level from that point of view, or, following a French expression, to be in its trend. [...] The second duty of conscience is: to have enough love for the truth to sincerely state what we have found out, for the better or for the worse.* (Maiorescu, 2005: 202-203) [our translation]

To this purpose, he concluded as follows:

*[...] joining cultural principles is the imperious destiny of each European nation. The question is whether it can do it as a spouse or as a submissive slave; whether it can do it by emphasizing and reinforcing its national independence or by bowing in front of the foreign powers. This question can only be answered with the energy of the people's intellectual and economic life, with their willingness and speed in understanding and assimilating their culture for the suitable activity.* (Maiorescu, 2005: 202-203) [our translation]

Maiorescu wondered whether, once having reached this circuit, Romania could avoid the more subtle and more modern forms of colonialism that the great powers

peacefully instrumented by means of culture. The great stake was acquiring and keeping independence at all levels. The Romanian elites became aware of this dimension and reacted as such. A first answer was provided by Al. Odobescu, as he organized the participation in the 1867 Paris Exposition, an event which, with all the drawbacks and controversies inherent to any beginning, was a major proof of European behaviour.

---

#### **4. Conclusions**

---

Although it may seem general and obvious or, on the contrary, counterintuitive and/or paradoxical, if not even absurd – depending on the chosen ideological angle –, the conclusion that Romanian identity is mostly defined, in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, by its Europeanity actually reveals a range of mechanisms and processes that have helped us reinforce our modern founding narratives. Cultural transfers were indeed providential in the process of self-knowledge, national self-legitimation and European legitimation. We have outlined two discourses that avoided the Romantic paradigm to a significant extent, assigning modern forms to the *domestic substance*, that does not exclude transnational values, but, on the contrary, has been shaped and is still shaped depending on them. The participation in the 1867 Paris Exposition, the first one under its own pavilion and national image, was a diplomatic opportunity and an exercise of Europeanity at the same time, admirably oriented and coordinated by Al. Odobescu, given all the ideational, ideological and political implications of such an event.

---

#### **References and bibliography**

---

- Anghelescu, M.** 2015, *Lâna de aur. Călătorii și călătoriile în literatura română*, Bucharest: Cartea Românească.
- Antoși, S.** 1998. *Exercițiul distanței. Discursuri, societăți, metode*, Bucharest: Nemira.
- Ardeleanu, C.** 2021. *O croazieră de la Viena la Constantinopol: călători, spații, imagini (1830-1830)*, Bucharest: Humanitas.
- Faifer, F.** 1993. *Semnele lui Hermes. Memorialistica de călătorie (până la 1900) între real și imaginar*, Bucharest: Minerva.
- Figs, O.** 2019. *The Europeans: Three Lives and the Making of a Cosmopolitan*, New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Golescu, D.** 1915. *Însemnare a călătoriei mele din 1824, 1825 și 1826*, Bucharest: Minerva.
- Gregori, I.** 2009. *Știm noi cine a fost Eminescu?*, București: Editura Art.
- Maiorescu, T.** 2005. *Opere. I. Critice*, Bucharest: Editura Fundației Naționale pentru Știință și Artă și Editura Univers Enciclopedic.
- Odobescu, A.** 1908. *Opere complete. Vol. II*, Bucharest: Minerva.

**Panea, N.** 2013. *Oraşul subtil*, Bucharest: Editura Etnologică.

**Vlad, L.** 2007. *Imagini ale identităţii naţionale. România la Expoziţiile universale şi internaţionale de la Paris (1867-1937)*, Iaşi: Editura Institutul European.

### ***The author***

**Gabriel Nedelea:** Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Letters, University of Craiova, as of 2015, where he teaches literary history and creative writing. Starting 2015, he has been publishing the book chronicle column “Gambitul lecturii” in the journal *Ramuri*. In 2017, he published *Iluziile modernităţii. Studii despre avangardă şi postmodernism* (Craiova: Aius Publishing House) and, in 2021, *O cercetare asupra poeziei româneşti neomoderniste* (Universitaria Publishing House of Craiova & Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană). He worked as a 1<sup>st</sup> level scientific researcher with the Museum of Romanian Books and Exile of Craiova (2019-2023). He has published more than 150 articles, book chapters, literary chronicles and interviews in cultural magazines, edited volumes and academic journals in Romania and abroad.