In his correspondence, Rosetti often amuses himself with classical allusions to his experience of exile: he becomes Ulysses to Marie’s Calypso and to Ion Brătianu’s Telemachus in letters to Marie. Rosetti’s and his peers’ letters also abound in moments of despair, mourning for premature deaths caused by exile and indignation over the inevitable political divisions and squabbles of the diaspora. However, their texts remain short and pragmatic, the emotional effusions curbed and the verbal interchanges channelled towards organizational and strategic matters rather than towards theorizing or lamenting exile.

The memoirs, life narratives and fiction of the revolution of 1848 in Romania have not yet formed the object of a dedicated study similar to Sylvie Aprile’s study of the literature of exile in Second Empire France. Aprile found out that, in the life narratives of the French proscrits, exile was often presented, not surprisingly, as a form of social death, a space of absence, stillness, suspension of action and confusion of identities. Her findings suggest that the exiled French republicans, whether in the Channel Islands, Switzerland, Belgium or Britain, tended to congregate with groups of co-nationals and that an ‘internationalism of exile’ did not exist. Without going into a detailed comparison of the two considerably different types of exile (the Walachian exile of 1848 vs. the French proscrits of 1852), it would appear that, in spite of similar economic pressures and social isolation, the Wallachians placed a greater emphasis on the transnational solidarities afforded by cosmopolitan Paris, and, to a lesser extent for their group, by London. Creating and maintaining transnational networks appear as some of the central concerns of these texts, from which exile often emerges as a cohesive force: while it separated individuals from their countries, it also created new forms of internationalist...
solidarity which brought together people as diverse as the Greek-born Sami Pasha of Vidin, Michelet, Quinet, the Romanians Brătianu and Rosetti, the Guernsey-born Marie Rosetti, Mazzini, Arnold Ruge and lesser known republicans such as Ange Pechméja. The support they offered each other was often of a very practical nature and may have involved no more than humble tasks such as circulating money and letters, providing accommodation and food, or dropping names, but such support was crucial.

Exilic solidarities and the growth of print culture often came together. There are many examples in the preceding chapters which show how the printed word linked centres of exile such as Jersey, London, Brussels, Veytaux, Geneva, Bursa and Kütahya, turning them into a “common home for the European left.” Exilic solidarities and the growth of print culture often came together. There are many examples in the preceding chapters which show how the printed word linked centres of exile such as Jersey, London, Brussels, Veytaux, Geneva, Bursa and Kütahya, turning them into a “common home for the European left.”

This somewhat contradicts some of the conclusions of Sylvie Aprile who, in the afore-mentioned study, argued that there was significant distrust between the East-Central European and French diasporas in mid-nineteenth-century Europe and that strictly national agendas collided with the ideal of left-wing, republican and revolutionary internationalism. Even though macro-historical projects such as a pan-European insurrection, a “république universelle” and the Saint-Simonian “United States of Europe” remained theoretical, there were pockets of transnational resistance to authoritarian states which could be quite effective on a smaller scale, as the Romanian case study outlined in this narrative has suggested.

The shared experience of exile made the more reflective of this cosmopolitan group realize that individual and national identities are fluctuating entities which can be given or constructed, assumed or relinquished, inverted or reinforced. When he left France for a voluntary exile which lasted eighteen years, Quinet travelled with a false passport bearing an assumed Romanian name, “Groubesko”, and in the company of an old Romanian friend of his wife’s. “We are all Romanians”, he seemed to say, all united in this common experience of being thrown beyond one’s national borders and having to invent a new self. The correspondence between Jules Michelet and Dumitru Brătianu and the shared life in Nantes of the Rosettis and the Michelets also led to a realization on both sides that the helpers could turn overnight into social pariahs and that, instead of a ‘French-
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