
I.2. LA GUERRE ET LE TERRITOIRE : DISLOCATION DE VIE, DISLOCATION DE POÉTIQUE

Body, Love, Object: Frontiers for Romanian Surrealism*

BALÁZS IMRE JÓZSEF

French as a minor language?

THE FACT that the Bucharest surrealist group chose French as their main artistic and theoretical idiom should not be overlooked. Most of their individual publications as well as their collective texts were published in French—although this choice led to disagreements among the group members. Gellu Naum seems to have been partly against the publications of French texts in Bucharest, but this “minority report” inside the group did not prevent him to sign the collective tracts and texts of the group written in French.

When exploring the possible reasons of the group for the choice of French in the given historical context, Monique Yaari considers the following arguments: 1. using French, which was a traditional language of the local elites anyway, the exponents of this more marginal culture could aim to reach a wider audience and be part in a more direct way in international debates; 2. French was the original language of surrealism that linked the Bucharest group to individuals like Breton, but also to ideas—being this way “the language of cultural and political affinities” for them. As Yaari points out, this also meant that the Romanian Surrealists could express themselves in a language that remained for them, in their personal experience, untainted by ideologies of fascism or Stalinism. In the given political context, French was “available for them as a vehicle of affirmation and of resistance to impositions and censorship;” 3. French was a vehicle also to shift to a broader and more abstract cultural space that seemed easier to be made into their own.¹

*. The research was undertaken with the support of the project Humanistic social sciences in the context of globalized evolution—development and implementation of the postdoctoral study and research programme code POSDRU/89/1.5/S/61104, project that is co-financed by the European Social Fund.

Indeed, the Bucharest group is rather singular in this sense among the other East-Central European surrealists: for Czech or Hungarian authors for example the shift to French usually coincided with their actual physical presence in France or their publication in Paris. The choice of French can be seen as a strong statement mostly in comparison with this context. French is a major language of culture, of course, but considered in the 'national' literary field can be seen as a potentially subversive idiom (to escape, indeed, the two ideologically dominant discourses of the time). When introducing the term 'minor literature,' Deleuze and Guattari focused very much on the functionality of a certain language usage: "To make use of the polylingualism of one's own language, to make a minor or intensive use of it, to oppose the oppressed quality of this language to its oppressive quality, to find points of nonculture or underdevelopment, linguistic Third World zones by which a language can escape, an animal enters into things, an assemblage comes into play. How many styles or genres or literary movements, even very small ones, have only one single dream: to assume a major function in language, to offer themselves as a sort of state language, an official language (for example, psychoanalysis today, which would like to be a master of the signifier, of metaphor, of wordplay). Create the opposite dream: know how to create a becoming-minor."² In this sense, the choice of Luca and his comrades can be seen as an attempt to transcend the local, the national,³ but also as an option for a "minor" usage, as compared to a closer context. We should not neglect the avant-garde, the intensive, "untamed" character of this type of French language.

The choice of French, as I have already mentioned above, was not unanimously approved of by the group members. Although Gellu Naum was trying hard to get back to Paris after the war (but his request for a passport was refused by the authorities), he did not want to write or publish his own texts in French at the time. While the other members of the group published individual texts in the collection *Infra-Noir*, Naum refused to do so (but signed the majority of the collective texts written in French). According to Rémy Laville, he saw the collection as a "passport for abroad," and did not want to be part of it.⁴ When published in 1946 in a surrealist thematic issue in the *Cahiers du Sud* from Marseille, the poems of Gellu Naum were translated by Jacques Hérold and a certain Mme Bret, while the other member of the Bucharest group, Virgil Teodorescu, was also translated by a certain Mlle J. R.⁵ Naum and Teodorescu therefore act as foreign authors within the French literary field, and won't insist on the long run to become "French" authors, remaining intimately connected to their native tongue.

To be able to see the singularity of the choice of the Bucharest group to publish several volumes in French, we could compare their strategy to those of surrealist authors in the neighbouring countries—with whom they actually exchanged several messages and letters in the postwar period.

One of Luca's pen-friends⁶ was at the time Hungarian philosopher and art historian an Árpád Mezei (1902–1998), co-author with surrealist painter Marcel Jean of several volumes on surrealism and its contexts: *Maldoror* (Paris, 1947), *Genèse de la pensée moderne* (Paris, 1950), *Histoire de la peinture surréaliste* (Paris, 1959). Árpád Mezei enters the international scene of art criticism in 1947, publishing two texts in the catalogue of the surrealist exhibition⁷—a theoretical text about language theory and the non-aris-

totelian logic, *Liberté du langage*, the other being an essay about the sixth canto of *Maldoror* by Lautréamont, this latter text being written in cooperation with Marcel Jean. This was to become a chapter of a whole book on *Maldoror*, published in the same year in Paris, in a collection directed by Maurice Nadeau.⁸

However, Mezei's theoretical activity can be traced back by then more than two decades: with his brother Imre Pán, he became involved with the avant-garde as early as 1924, being one of the authors and editors of the Hungarian avant-garde journal from Budapest called *IS*. Later, in the 1940s he was co-founder of the Európai Iskola (European School), the most important assembly of progressive Hungarian artists and art theoreticians of the postwar period. His friendship with Marcel Jean (who lived in Budapest in the 1938–1945 period, and later on introduced Mezei to his surrealist friends) had a strong impact on Mezei and he became one of the most constant „correspondents” of the international surrealist network on the topics of Hungarian art and art theory in general.⁹ Later on, beginning from the seventies he lived in the United States and published several texts about surrealist artists and art theory mostly in the journals called *Onion* (Toronto) in English, and *Arkánium* (Silver Spring), in Hungarian.

As we can notice, the position of Mezei is somewhere in between those of Luca or Naum. He is ready to write and publish in French while living in Budapest, but these texts are published in France or Belgium. When publishing in Hungary, in the small collections *Index* and *Európai Iskola Könyvtára* (Library of the European School), resembling very much the collection *Infra-Noir*, his texts appear in his native language. Writing in two (or later on, even more) languages is though partly frustrating, partly amusing for him. He can feel that his presence as an author is quite different within the French literary scene and the Hungarian one. In a letter addressed to Claude Serbanne in 1947, he speaks about the multitude of his personalities experienced when writing in different languages: “D’ailleurs, ce mois de juin était très favorable pour moi, car le catalogue de l’exposition est paru également avec mon étude logique et j’entends de Marcel qu’un recueil belge: *Les Deux Seurs*, apporte mon petit étude sur Tanguy. Comme je ne possède pas encore ni le catalogue, ni le recueil, j’ai un peu l’impression comme s’il existerait quelque part un écrivain français Mezei qui publie à l’étranger. . . . Mais je commence à penser qu’au lieu d’avoir un Moi chassé par toutes les aventures comme dans un tourbillon, il est mieux d’avoir plusieurs MOI-s tranquilles qui poursuivent chacun une tâche avec perseverance.”¹⁰

We should add to this self-analysis that the European School has a marginal position in Hungarian culture of the time just like the Bucharest group in Romania—in the postwar situation a platform of abstract and surrealist art could not attract the sympathy of official culture in spite of the value of the group’s artistic and theoretical achievements.

After getting back to Paris, Marcel Jean wrote to his friend Mezei regularly, letting him know about the activity of the central surrealist group. He was generally very positive about the Bucharest group, although a bit ironic when speaking about their plans to get to Paris: “Quant à un groupe surréaliste de Budapest sans doute cela dépend-il plus de vous-mêmes que de quiconque ici. Crois bien que le groupe roumain s’est constitué ainsi, et sans que les avis ou jugement de Brauner y soient pour grand chose. Il est curieux

d'ailleurs que le seul désir de beaucoup de ces Roumains soit de venir à Paris y poursuivre leur activité. De même, deux surréalistes tchèques ont récemment arrivés, complètement soulagés d'avoir échappé à la Tchéquie en d'être enfin à Paris."¹¹ This desire that Marcel Jean speaks about is connected most probably to the hope of the Romanians and Czechs to have access to freedom of expression—something that was already more and more difficult to achieve in the East-Central European countries in 1947.

The fact that Gherasim Luca was not content with the mediation between cultures and languages around 1946 may be considered as a key aspect of his decision to write in French. In a letter addressed to Gellu Naum, he expresses his discontent about the activity of René Renne and Claude Serbanne who tried to follow and comment the international surrealist activity in a series called *Courrier d'ailleurs* at Cahiers du Sud. This led him to be suspicious about other messages, too, like the one sent to him by Georges Henein,¹² future “secretary” of the surrealist group. But in another ironic account we can sense also the anxiety concerning the access of East-Central European cultures to the global scene—when describing some Czech journals to Naum he also mirrors indirectly the position of texts written in Romanian: “unfortunately by great international agglomerations I mean constantly a single short letter accompanied by two publications received in an envelope from the surréaliste group of Brno-Praha (Brrrr-Hahaha) / as far as the letter is concerned it begins with Cher Monsieur it continues with the much expected fusion of commerce and surreality and ends politely irreproachably higienically occidentally / as far as the publications are concerned I think you'll agree that they are very good extremely good unbelievably good because they are written in the czech language and all that is written in czech and in leopardese can't be anything else but the best.”¹³ In spite of his suspicions, Luca remained in contact with several members of the international surrealist network.¹⁴ We can notice however his frustration that the texts he considered to be very important and that were not yet translated into French at the time did not have the impact he had hoped for. The Romanian edition of *Inventatorul iubirii* (The Inventor of Love, 1945) was sent to surrealists from several countries (one of its copies was preserved by Árpád Mezei), and from a 1947 letter to Sarane Alexandrian we know that Luca considered this work as being essential for the debates of the time concerning the possible directions of surrealism, and hoped that part of it might be translated by Jacques Hérold or Victor Brauner in Paris.¹⁵ After all, *L'inventeur de l'amour* was published in French only posthumously, in the author's own translation, in 1994.

From the comparative analyses made by Petre Răileanu we also know that in most cases Luca's French versions were not mere translations of the Romanian texts: we can speak rather of rewriting the originals, of omitting some parts, of “taming” some wilder elements of the Romanian versions.¹⁶ Like many other authors who shifted from Romanian to French as their literary language, Gherasim Luca tried also to reinvent himself as a French author (mostly after his definitive move to Paris). This also meant to forget elements of his former life—Răileanu points out that forgetting is essential in Luca's thinking since his youth: the name he chooses (Gherasim Luca instead of Salman Locker) implies in itself a shift, and then, in the postwar period, names of publishing houses like Éditions de l'Oubli are very relevant: the whole non-oedipian theory of Luca and Trost are based on the power and possibility of forgetting.

The example of E. M. Cioran shows some important similarities—Pascale Casanova speaks about Cioran’s “rebirth” as a French author and about his need to forget when abandoning Romania and Romanian culture. Part of this rebirth is adopting a style (in case of Cioran, Racine’s style),¹⁷ and we can conclude that for Luca and the other members of the Bucharest group this element was essential. They shifted to French, but they shifted to a certain variant of it—to the language of Breton and of the other surrealists of the time.

Were the Bucharest surrealists writing for (and within) the Romanian literary field? Not necessarily and certainly not exclusively. Their group activity was performed within a rather hostile context, with only a few supporters, among them, interestingly enough, people like the young Paul Celan, marginal presence within the Bucharest literary circles of the time. Celan attended at least one of their surrealist exhibitions and several of their private parties according to their contemporaries.¹⁸ Celan’s experiments with the shifts between German and Romanian problematized in a similar manner the existence of a favourable climate for a radical poetic discourse. All these texts seem to be a “minor” variant of the dominant language, and it is no paradox to say that in relation to the Romanian “official” idiom, French itself might be considered as such.

Reinventing the cultural field by reinventing objects, language, love

THE BEST known concept promoted by the surrealist group of Bucharest is called the ‘objectively offered object’ (O.O.O.), theorized by Gherasim Luca in his 1945 book *Le vampire passif*. Several of these objects designed by Luca are interpreted and reproduced in the book—they can be described as found objects modified and assembled while thinking of a person, and thus vehicles for sentimental or intellectual exchanges. Here the objects become what they are mainly through their interaction with people, while retaining also the element of ‘chance meetings’ inherent in surrealist recontextualizations of found objects. As an analysis (by Dominique Carlat) of Luca’s books points out, while found objects usually function as mirrors for the one who finds them, Luca introduces a third element into the relationship with the object through the offering gesture, which makes possible an analysis concerning the circulation of signs.¹⁹ Luca insists on the delimitation between an ‘objectively offered object’ and a gift, denouncing the standardized character of gifts that support ‘bourgeois love’, in Luca’s terms.²⁰ In fact, these objects have a “critical” function as far as the social codes of human interactions are concerned, and they try to show how desire could act and interact among people through them. When reading the analyses of his own objects we can see that Luca does not attempt to create “pleasant” moods in those who would receive the objects, but the affects and emotions triggered have several times a disturbing or violent nature. The creation of the objects and their interpretation have a strong psychoanalytical key that documents the circulation of desire well beyond the limits of ‘bourgeois love,’ into the field of sadistic or homosexual erotic exchange. Gherasim Luca gets closer in his very specific way to a less symbolic and more subversive language of the body that was often described in the works of women surrealists.²¹

The concept of the O.O.O. was described and analysed most often in its relationship with André Breton's *Équation de l'objet trouvé* and the larger context of *Mad Love*, and also Salvador Dalí's theories about the surrealist object. While keeping in mind these theoretical links, we should attempt also to briefly contextualize Luca's ideas within the Bucharest group activity, highlighting some theoretical texts that could be considered in detail as counterparts of Luca's book: *Medium* by Gellu Naum and *Vision dans le cristal* by Trost, both published in Bucharest in the same year as *Le vampire passif*, in 1945.

During Gellu Naum's stay in Paris, in 1938–1939, there remained traces of a discussion between Naum and Breton about a commissioned text for Minotaure concerning the 'demonology of the object.' Naum never wrote the text in French because of his forced return to Romania in 1939, but the concept appears in *Medium*, written in Romanian language.²² Naum's approach, just like the one conceived by Luca, sees the relationship between humans and objects in its dynamics, in both directions. He speaks about the 'vampirism' of the objects—of either malefic or benefic states induced in people's lives, but also about the 'crystallization of desire,' more or less in Breton's terms from *Mad love*.²³ Objects are considered here also from the perspective of their influence, of their "behaviour."²⁴ One of the group's well-known "surrealist games," the game of the "nocturnal sand" involved for example a specific interaction with random objects, where only the touch and the feelings triggered by it were involved: participants had to enter a darkened room and after feeling an object had to provide its "surautomatic" description. Such descriptions that try to re-create the intensity of a decisive meeting by focusing on just one of the senses were published by the group in the catalogue of the 1947 international surrealist exhibition.²⁵

Objects in the "nocturnal sand" are objects of desire, just like the images that appear in the manifest content of dreams. As Trost puts it in his *Vision dans le cristal*, to neglect the manifest content means to reduce all interpretations of dreams to a directly utilitarian aspect which also means that a sophisticated imagery would be reduced to support a very few general laws.²⁶ From the surrealist perspective, this way of interpretation means that the therapy, when trying to show to the dreamers that social reality is opposed to the fulfillment of their desires, suggests in fact that they should reduce the intensity of their desires or they should abandon them.²⁷ But this logic also means that the other possible option (promoted by Luca, Trost and their comrades), to change "social reality" itself, is excluded by Freudian therapy. This is the aspect where a very close analysis of the manifest content of dreams and the very close analysis of emotions provoked by strange offered objects meet.

In *The Passive Vampire*, one of the O.O.O.-s created by Luca, *The Ideal Phantom*, is finally offered to G.—that is, to Gellu Naum, who is a witness and companion of Luca's presence in pre-war Paris, and also of their later years in Bucharest. The object itself, "a metallic head with two eye-breasts, resembling a drawing by Magritte" is prepared by Luca on the day of an earthquake. The image of the earthquake gives the opportunity for Luca to describe the city of Bucharest and to analyse his feelings towards this space that was rather hostile and dangerous for Luca during those years:

G. came over from the other side of town to see if I had survived, and told me the city was in ruins. I gave him *The Ideal Phantom*, and we went outside. The streets were full of destruction and rubble, and this town I'd never liked, with its stupid people, stupid streets, stupid houses, was now unrecognizable, now it had a truly unique beauty, and scantily-clad women traversed it like ghosts. . . . I listened to people recounting their reactions to each other and returned home to take the following notes: During, or else immediately after, the earthquake, either the sole or the first human erotic desire is to masturbate. Such an experience, awakening the instinct of self-preservation in such an extreme and contracted form within each individual, means that in response those sexual impulses which normally accompany the instinct in all their complexity now became simplified. The supreme defense of one's own being in the most terrifying moment of panic can only be followed by an erotic release in the form of auto-eroticism. . . . Two years earlier, during a conversation with my friends in Paris, I had claimed that I would find great satisfaction in a major catastrophe—the destruction of the Earth by a comet, for example, as foretold by astronomers. In a time of violent revolutionary pessimism, like that during which this conversation took place, several weeks after France's entry into the war, it seemed justifiable to exchange one desperate but vital solution for another that was so natural yet so alien to us. At the level of desire, such a catastrophe being predicted in advance would have offered me, hastily and for a limited time, the satisfactions a revolutionary transformation of the world would have given me over a whole lifetime.²⁸

It is very important that Bucharest appears here not only as a physical space but also as a cultural space, with its negative aspects. It seems as if this earthquake would indeed be a model for the necessary revolutionary action envisaged by Luca. Choosing the French language within this space is itself part of a possibly revolutionary action. The earthquake also triggers the element of the *merveilleux* in the text—as Krzysztof Fijalkowski puts it, “the formerly ugly city has been convulsed.”²⁹ But connecting the image of war to the one of the earthquake would seem quite conventional in itself. What makes Luca's text really subversive, is the reflection on masturbation, and on the exchange of objects with G. *The Passive Vampire* is here and in some of its other paragraphs (like those about the object offered to Breton, *The Letter L*) a good example of how a certain type of discourse concerning the body, the question of love, or the discussions about the object can subvert dominant discourses in a quite unexpected way.

Gherasim Luca and Gellu Naum may have different choices of language, but they walk together across the city in ruins looking for a splendid spectacle. They both feel the ambivalence of the situation: the fascination but maybe also a sort of guilt, having “predicted” the situation. They hope for an earthquake provoked by language and yet they have their uneasy feelings about it.



Notes

1. Monique Yaari, "The Surrealist Group of Bucharest: *Collective Works, 1945–1947*," in *Paris–Bucharest, Bucharest–Paris: Francophone writers from Romania*, ed. Anne Quinney (Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi, 2012), 101–104.
2. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. Dana Polan (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), 27.
3. See also the remark about this choice in Iulian Toma, *Gherasim Luca ou l'intransigeante passion d'être* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2012), 51: "La création de la Collection *Infra-Noir* destinée à accueillir des textes rédigés directement en français confirme d'ailleurs l'aspiration des membres du groupe à assurer une diffusion de leurs idées sur le plan international."
4. Rémy Laville, *Gellu Naum: Poète roumain prisonnier au château des aveugles* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1994), 78.
5. *Cahiers du Sud* 280 (1946): 378–382.
6. "Although the Czechs had already been in correspondence with the Romanian Surrealists grouped around Trost, Luca, Naum and Paun since 1946, the Bucharest artists also contacted the Hungarians through Serbanne. As the extant letters reveal, the two groups planned to introduce one another's work, but the radical change in the historical circumstances foiled their plans." Gábor Pataki, "Two chapters in Franco-Hungarian art connections: the European School (1945–1948) and the Zugló circle (1958–1968)," *French Cultural Studies* 33 (2000): 404.
7. *Le Surréalisme en 1947*, eds. André Breton and Marcel Duchamp (Paris: Maeght Éditeur, 1947).
8. Marcel Jean et Árpád Mezei, *Maldoror: Essai sur Lautréamont et son oeuvre* (Paris: Éd. du Pavois, 1947).
9. Sarane Alexandrian mentions him in one of his books noting his perseverance: "en Hongrie le psychologue Árpád Mezei a été un correspondant assidu du groupe parisien, aux travaux duquel il participa," cf. S. Alexandrian, *Le surréalisme et le rêve* (Paris: Gallimard, 1974), 236.
10. Árpád Mezei à Claude Serbanne, Budapest, 10 juillet 1947, fonds Árpád Mezei, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest.
11. Marcel Jean à Árpád Mezei, Paris, 12 mai [1947], fonds Árpád Mezei, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár, Budapest.
12. "Trei scrisori de la Gherasim Luca [to Gellu Naum]." *Athanos, Caietele Fundației Gellu Naum*, 2 (2008): 27.
13. "Trei scrisori," 31.
14. In 1947, when planning mutual exhibitions of surrealist authors in Bucharest and Budapest, he wrote to Árpád Mezei: "L'idée d'un contact perpétuel et agissent entre Budapest et Bucarest comme entre New York et Tokio va tout à fait avec notre manière d'envisager l'activité internationale du mouvement surréaliste. En ce qui concerne l'essence même de cette activité, il me semble que jusqu'aujourd'hui on a mis un accent trop grand sur le côté artistique ou politique de notre langage révolutionnaire et qu'on a presque totalement négligé les ressources proprement surréalistes (imprévisibles, indéfinis, follement surprenantes) de notre pouvoir sur le monde." In György Péter and Pataki Gábor, *Az Európai Iskola és az Elvont Művészek csoportja* (Budapest: Corvina, 1990), 57. The central element seems to be here the surrealist action—and language itself seen as action.
15. Cf. Petre Răileanu, *Gherasim Luca* (Iași: Junimea, 2005), 120.
16. Răileanu, *Gherasim Luca*, 141–142.
17. Pascale Casanova, *Republica mondială a literelor* (Bucharest: Curtea Veche, 2007), 271.
18. Petre Solomon, *Paul Celan: Dimensiunea românească* (Bucharest: Kriterion, 1987), 91, 95.
19. Dominique Carlat, *Gherasim Luca l'intempestif* (Paris: José Corti, 1998), 143.

20. Ghérasim Luca, *The Passive Vampire*, trans. Krzysztof Fijalkowski (Prague: Twisted Spoon Press, 2008), 27–28.
21. In connection with Leonora Carrington, see: “the narratives are not only to convey Carrington’s authenticity or genuineness as a Surrealist, but to evoke a confrontation between the Surrealist aesthetic that Breton sets up through symbols of the feminine and Carrington’s insertion of the body into aesthetic experience as a gesture against mere symbol. By emphasizing bodily experience, women Surrealists like Carrington staked a claim in the role of the female subject in a dynamic of Surrealist experience that had previously searched for and defined itself through abstract forms of the feminine.” Erich Hertz, “Disruptive Testimonies: The Stakes of Surrealist Experience in Breton and Carrington,” *Symposium: A Quarterly Journal in Modern Literatures*, 2 (2010): 92.
22. “*Médium*, qui peut être considéré comme le prologue d’un autre récit autobiographique, *Zénobie*, publié en 1985, contient encore des fragments de ce qui aurait dû être ‘La démonologie de l’objet,’ conçu pour la revue *Minotaure*.” Laville, *Gellu Naum*, 72.
23. Cf. Gellu Naum, “Medium,” in Gellu Naum, *Opere*, II, *Proză* (Iași: Polirom, 2012), 89–131.
24. Even Breton’s found objects should be interpreted in this way. “The object found as if by chance is situated at the point of connection between external nature, perception, and the unconscious, and thus has a peculiar, elusive relation to vision. The space occupied by the found object is carved out by traumatic experience, defined precisely as an experience that has failed to achieve a representation, but on which, nonetheless, one’s whole existence depends.” Margaret Iversen, “Readymade, Found Object, Photograph,” *Art Journal* 2 (Summer 2004): 49. The act of offering at Luca gives additional dynamism to the relationship between the subjects and the object.
25. Gherasim Luca, Gellu Naum, Paul Păun, Virgil Teodorescu, Trost, *Le Sable nocturne*, in *Le Surréalisme en 1947*, 56–58.
26. Trost, *Vision dans le cristal: Oniromancie obsessionnelle* (Bucharest: Les Éditions de l’Oubli, 1945), 9–10.
27. Trost, *Vision*, 11.
28. Luca, *The Passive Vampire*, 59–61.
29. Krzysztof Fijalkowski, “From Sorcery to Silence: The Objects of Gherasim Luca,” *Modern Language Review* 88 (1993): 632.

Abstract

Body, Love, Object: Frontiers for Romanian Surrealism

The group activity of the Romanian surrealists meant a re-invention of certain surrealist practices that the artists around André Breton promoted by the end of the 1930s. When the II World War destroyed the network of communication between surrealist artists from different countries, the Romanian group continued the surrealist experiments on its own. Their results were very well received by the Paris surrealist group when the links were reestablished around the 1947 international surrealist exhibition at Galerie Maeght. The paper analyses the surrealist discourse of the Bucharest group as a minor language usage, where some key concepts like *body*, *love*, *object* are reinterpreted in a way that they cannot be inserted into the value system of the emerging Romanian society in the late 1940s. Works by Gherasim Luca and his fellow group members explore territories that the dominant language does not integrate into the discourse of ‘normality’.

Keywords

body, cultural mediation, love, minor, object, surrealism