Who has been tampering with these pianos?: The surrealist writings of Montagu O’Reilly (Wayne Andrews).

Andrew Hugill

This article makes a case for Wayne Andrews as a neglected and original voice in American surrealism. The article begins by examining his periodical La revue de l’élite (1930-33) (later La revue intime and Demain) as evidence of his early interest in European avant-gardism. Next, it offers close readings of the short stories he wrote under the nom de plume “Montagu O’Reilly.” Within overtly surrealist narratives, these stories conceal a series of encounters between a sickly European high culture, characterised by consumptive girls, imperilled aristocrats, failing pianos and a vigorous American materialism, represented by thrusting bankers, ostentatious socialites, gleaming technologies. They provide a novel twist on some of the familiar tropes of surrealism, but also reveal something of how its revolutionary vision was subtly undermined during its transatlantic passage. In particular, the article discusses Andrews/O’Reilly’s fascination with the outmoded and the uncanny and how they are modified through their staged encounters with American wealth. It concludes with a discussion of Andrews’ later works, including his unfinished history of surrealism, The Surrealist Parade (1988).

Wayne Andrews seems an unlikely conduit for surrealism to America – a conservative, academic, religious, careerist figure – yet his periodical La revue de l’élite, and fiction written under the nom de plume Montagu O’Reilly played an important though marginalised role in introducing surrealism to America. Andrews presented to Americans a version of surrealism that differed from others circulating at the time, such as the interpretations of the movement put forward by Eugene Jolas’ transition magazine (1927-38) or Charles Henri Ford’s slightly later publication, View (1940-48). As such, his responses to the movement invite us to rethink conventional understandings of how surrealism was received by Americans in the first half of the twentieth century. As is well known, the most the celebrated inheritors of the surrealist legacy were not writers such as O’Reilly but rather Abstract Expressionist painters, whose success during the 1940s and 50s eclipsed the waning surrealist avant-garde. Andrews/O’Reilly was not particularly optimistic about a future for surrealism in America, its marginalisation was partly foreseen in the stories themselves, in which the hard realities of commerce and enterprise repeatedly trounce surrealist imaginings. Andrews switched fairly quickly from being a champion of surrealism to become a cultural commentator and globetrotting photographer, though his interest in the movement did not disappear completely.

Andrews, who was born in Kenilworth, Illinois in 1913 and died while travelling in 1987, is probably best known today as the author of a series of exemplary books on American architecture. These were published during the 1950s, 60s and 70s, and are still used as standard texts in some universities. The books comprise hundreds of photographs, mostly taken by Andrews himself during his travels around Europe and the United States, accompanied by his idiosyncratic accounts of the evolution of various architectural styles. Andrews was no Wallace Stevens, who never visited Europe, preferring to live in ‘a Paris that has never existed and that is composed of the things that other people, primarily Parisians themselves, have said about Paris.’ For Andrews, Europe was a concrete reality whose architecture was testament to its cultural richness. His pleasure was to document photographically this evidence and to involve himself with its most enlightened inheritors (as he saw
them): the French surrealists. He first went to Paris in 1934, initially meeting André Breton, who then introduced him to Alberto Giacometti, Paul Éluard, Salvador Dalí and other surrealists. Andrews recorded that Dalí, in particular, ‘[paid] the most flattering attention to the pianos and the heads of hair that figured in the fiction I was writing under the pseudonym of Montagu O'Reilly.’

In the postwar years, he visited Paris many more times in his role as a globetrotting cultural historian and photographer and it was during one of these trips that he died.

Andrews emphasised continuity between surrealism and European cultural precursors, rather than seeing surrealism as predicated upon the latter’s renunciation, a common interpretation of avant-gardism that views it exclusively in terms of novelty or rupture. His history of surrealism, entitled *The Surrealist Parade*, which was ‘nine-tenths completed’ at his death tellingly makes little mention of the movement in America, preferring to concentrate on its European existence.

Andrews first became involved with surrealism in 1930, at the age of 17, when he founded *La revue de l’élite*, a journal he co-edited with his fellow student James Douglas Peck at Lawrenceville, a New Jersey prep school. It contained a mixture of literary and critical writings by Andrews and Peck, along with contributions from their better-known collaborators, including: Marcel Arland, Georges Braque, Jean Cassou, Paul Claudel, Jean Cocteau, Henri du Régnier, Roger Martin du Gard, André Gide, Arthur Honegger, Valery Larbaud, Jean Lurçat, André Maurois, Jean Paulhan, Ezra Pound, Romain Rolland, Georges Rouault, Bertrand Russell, Paul Valéry, and William Carlos Williams.

Andrews and Peck’s generally enthusiastic and unfailingly courteous correspondence with many of the leading French avant-garde writers was crucial to the journal’s success. Romain Rolland wisely persuaded them to rename it *Demain*, although only after it had first passed through another name, *La revue intime*. Raymond Roussel even sent them money, which arrived just as the final edition was going to press in 1933 (the year of Roussel’s death).

There were some similarities between Andrews and Charles Henri Ford who, at the age of 20, had begun his periodical *Blues* (1929-30) in the previous year. *Blues* shared some of the contributors to *La revue de l’élite* and also originated in a provincial American town (Columbus, Mississippi, in this case). The pair became acquainted and years later, when Ford was editor of *View* he introduced Andrews to Joseph Cornell, who had become an admirer of the Montagu O’Reilly stories. Like Ford, Andrews travelled to Paris during the 1930s to explore the avant-garde and fashionable society.

However, there were also some important differences between the two men. Andrews lacked Ford’s social, financial and artistic ambitions, and was never to express the level of admiration for Cocteau that complicated his (Ford’s) relationship with Breton. Nor was he willing to quit high school and devote his life to the avant-garde: his future academic career was too important to him. Whilst Ford would later be seen as a populariser of avant-gardism, making it available, palatable even, to Americans, this was in marked contrast to the overt elitism of Andrews and Peck’s title.

*La revue de l’élite* seems to have aligned itself more with Eugene Jolas’s *transition*: indeed the first complete Montagu O’Reilly story, ‘The Evocative Treason of 449 Golden Doorknobs,’ was published in *transition* 23 in 1935. Andrews would have sympathised with the celebrated twelfth proclamation in the “Revolution of the Word” manifesto, published in *transition* June 1929, which
declared ‘the plain reader be damned.’\textsuperscript{5} The fact that \textit{La revue de l’élite} was ‘a mimeographed chronicle of French civilization written in the French language’ seemed deliberately calculated to exclude (especially American) ‘plain readers.’\textsuperscript{6} This divided the opinions of some of the editors’ better-known correspondents. Ezra Pound was supportive: ‘I dare say you are right to print in French. Will confine circulation to those who can understand the contents.’\textsuperscript{7} This was no doubt exactly what Andrews and Peck wished to hear (although they might have been somewhat less sympathetic to Pound’s later opinion, expressed in a letter of July 21, 1934: ‘nothing much against the Surrealists, save that a lot of ‘em are French, and therefore bone ignorant, like the English’).\textsuperscript{8} Somerset Maugham, on the other hand, was damning:

\begin{quote}
I wish I knew why you wrote to me in French, which you write very well, rather than in English which you probably write better. Are you by any chance under the impression that the French language is richer than the English, or that the literature of France of today has a merit greater than that of England and the United States? If so, I venture to point out that you are quite wrong.\textsuperscript{9}
\end{quote}

This Francophile tendency was to become a defining characteristic of O’Reilly’s style. In what appears to be the only extant piece of critical writing about his stories, Céline Mansanti positions Andrews (she omits to mention his pseudonym), along with Paul Bowles and certain other American writers interested in surrealism, as a fantasist who wrote what Nathanael West called ‘Frenchified Symbolist stuff.’\textsuperscript{10} She compares this with William Carlos Williams’ \textit{A Novelette}, published in \textit{transition} 19-20 (June 1930), an example of ‘Superrealism’ which she calls ‘a concrete, dynamic American form of Surrealism, relying on the physiological body to express its specificity, unlike the more abstract and psychological conceptions at work in French Surrealism.’\textsuperscript{11} This evaluation certainly holds good for the small amount of Andrews’ writing that appeared in \textit{transition}, but does not do justice to the complete O’Reilly stories which, as we shall see, played out something of the contrast between that same American ‘concrete dynamism’ and the ‘Frenchified Symbolism,’ admittedly within a generally fantastical narrative.

Andrews’ views on the political aspects of surrealism at this time are difficult to discern. A natural conservative, he nevertheless seems to have found communism fascinating from a safe distance, if we are to judge from the account given in \textit{The Surrealist Parade}. \textit{La revue de l’élite} implicitly echoed \textit{transition}’s guarded yet thorough rejection of communism by studiously avoiding the subject.\textsuperscript{12} When the ‘Revolution of the Word’ was rejected by Breton in his preface to the catalogue for Dalí’s 1929 exhibition at Galerie Goemans, Paris, Andrews seems to have avoided taking sides. He thus maintained a somewhat ambiguous relationship with Breton, whose blessing he enjoyed but whose political direction he could not follow. Writing retrospectively in \textit{The Surrealist Parade}, Andrews placed Breton centre-stage, but also described him as a ‘perpetual adolescent’ who rather wilfully drifted from Freud to Trotsky to Fourier.\textsuperscript{13}

Andrews’ literary ‘revolution’ involved a brush with censorship which he recounted with glee in the foreword to \textit{The Surrealist Parade}:

\begin{quote}
on January 27, 1932, \textit{Demain} reprinted Guillaume Apollinaire’s proto-Surrealist poem “Zone,” in which Christ wins the world’s record for altitude. This was too much for a sad example of a Roman Catholic on the faculty, who complained to our headmaster (incidentally a direct
descendant of Cotton Mather). *Demain* was suppressed for a few weeks - which vastly increased our readership once it reappeared. News of the censorship enchanted Georges Braque, who wrote us that this proved that Apollinaire was still very much alive.\(^{14}\)

His youthful radicalism thus assuaged, he was never again to risk controversy. Indeed, he eventually became a pillar of the Episcopal Church, a family man of impeccable character, and a distinguished academic. He graduated from Harvard in 1936 and then worked as a banker and subsequently as curator of manuscripts for the New York Historical Society. He gained his PhD in Art History from Columbia University in 1956 and became the Archives of American Art Professor at Wayne State University in Detroit in 1964, a position that had been created especially for him.

Andrews' own contributions to his review included discussions of subjects as diverse as Georgia O'Keeffe, Manuel de Falla, the photographic collection of Alvin Langdon Coburn and modern architecture at the Museum of Modern Art, as well as some short pieces of creative writing. In the latter, the first signs of the surrealist style of Montagu O'Reilly begin to appear. A short piece entitled ‘… Si le balcon tombait’ (a quotation from Raymond Roussel’s *La Doublure* [1897]) features a narrator with a mad love for Eliane, whose ‘blue eyes reflected the orange of I don’t know which Grecian painting by Picasso.’\(^{15}\) He terrifies her by reading from Lautréamont, then pursues her through a window, while making sinister references to Louis Aragon and Gérard de Nerval. She ends up mysteriously frozen in the glass, stone dead, in his arms.

The first complete Montagu O'Reilly story, ‘The Evocative Treason of 499 Golden Doorknobs, Dedicated to the perilous memory of Don Luis de Gongora’ was published in 1935 in *transition*. In the foreword to *The Surrealist Parade*, Andrews recounts how this fiction was endorsed by Breton.\(^{16}\) The tale includes descriptions of billowing hair without heads and walls that palpitate like melting soap, images that were to recur in later stories. James Laughlin described it as ‘painfully clumsy,’ and mocked Jolas’s rather over-enthusiastic trumpeting of it in issue 23 of *transition* as an example of ‘paramyth.’\(^{17}\) It was never included in any subsequent Montagu O'Reilly collection, which was perhaps a reflection of the fact that Laughlin secured all O'Reilly's future output for his own press, *New Directions*.

The next O'Reilly story, ‘The Romantic Museum,’ was published in the first New Directions Anthology in 1936, alongside works by Gertrude Stein, Ezra Pound, Jean Cocteau, e. e. cummings, Henry Miller and others. The story is set in the estate of the reclusive Paul Duval near Maisons-Laffitte, fourteen years after his graduation from the Lycée Condorcet. ‘Pianos of Sympathy’ was also published in 1936, the first single-authored book from New Directions. This story takes place initially in the Palazzo Ducale Museum, once the sixteenth century residence of Isabella d’Este, Marchioness of Mantua, on August 21, 1935. The narrator, an American traveller, is subsequently driven to Florence by Count Giacomo delle Fontane, a wealthy banker. After that publication, a steady stream of O'Reilly stories appeared, which were eventually issued in 1948 as a collection by New Directions, under the title *Who Has Been Tampering with these Pianos?* This was reprinted in London in 1988 by Atlas Press.

The name Montagu O'Reilly was taken from a box of old visiting cards in a London bookshop, whose proprietor ‘identified O'Reilly as an admiral in the King’s Navy.’\(^{18}\) Despite the vivid contrast
between the rather daring O'Reilly and the ultra-respectable Andrews, Laughlin argued for their indissolubility:

I resist the temptation to claim that Professor Andrews and Montagu O'Reilly were two different persons, they were not. I knew them both very well. They were one of the same.¹⁹

Montagu O'Reilly was not Andrews' only alter ego. The stories repeatedly feature an aptronymic character named James (or Paulus) Wander who travels widely across Europe and America. Wandering, whether in dreams, prose, or reality, was extremely important to Andrews. It is also tempting to see the substitution ‘Paulus’ as a reference to an episode from the childhood of Hermann Hesse, described in loving detail in Andrews’ *Siegfried’s Curse* (1972), when he ran away from school and the attentions of his teacher, one Professor Paulus.²⁰ However, the O'Reilly stories were probably written too early in his career for Andrews to have been aware of this coincidence at the time.

James Wander is described as the owner of a ‘Moline emporium’ who had ‘amassed his first fortune at Cannes.’²¹ In ‘Once the Soft Silken Damage Done,’ which takes place during a masked ball in the home of wealthy society hosts Mr. and Mrs. Honorius Anger in New York, we learn that he also owns a transatlantic steam yacht named ‘The Wanderer’ and a private car called ‘Aquila Molinae.’ The latter could be a meaningful play on the names of Molina Aterno, a comune and town in the province of L'Aquila in the Abruzzo region of central Italy, and Moline, one of the ‘Quad’ cities on the banks of the Mississippi, 165 miles west of Chicago, and then (as now) part of the engine of the American industrial machine. Moline was well known to Andrews: after attending Harvard he had worked at the Northern Trust Company in Chicago for a year. Laughlin consequently surmised that Wander was ‘surely a holdover from [Andrews’] days in banking at “Pourtales & Cie” in Paris (“Pourtales & Cie” was a Wanderism).’²² He went on to recall that:

> I never met Wander, but now and again cryptic postcards from him would reach me from abroad as Wayne travelled or there would be news of his operations in letters. The most puzzling of these reports came in a letter of March 1968:
> You will be saddened … to learn of the death of James Wander on July 14, 1921, in his suite at the Hotel Plaza, Buenos Aires. At the time of his death he had decided to eschew all American steels (for which we must forgive him) and to rearrange his portfolio to emphasize his faith in André Citroën S.A. and the Michelin works. He had already booked passage for Bordeaux on the new *Duc de Choiseul*.”²³

André Citroën (1878-1935) was a French industrialist who founded the S. A. André Citroën automobile company in 1919, which by 1921 was the fourth largest car manufacturer in the world. Wander’s rejection of American steels in favour of European car manufacture suggests a certain Europhile longing which ultimately goes unfulfilled.

The originality of the O'Reilly stories turns on the surreal encounters between brokers, bankers and wealthy American industrialists and a Proustian (or rather, given Andrews' interests, Whartonian) world of the fading French-speaking élite. They respond to surrealism’s antipathy to the ruling classes yet do not endorse their embrace of communism. Communism is a constant but subtle presence, most dramatically articulated by the sudden appearance of Lenin, working in disguise as a butler, in ‘The Depraved Piano of the Nevski Prospect.’ He stands up for an oppressed and
consumptive young female pianist by magnetizing the steel keys of the piano with his teeth. However, this liberating, yet threatening, gesture may well owe more to Dalí’s 1931 painting *Partial Hallucination: six apparitions of Lenin on a Grand Piano* than to any incipient communist sympathies. It is certainly eroticised, as Mlle. S. has her lap ‘confused’ by the teeth-like keys that slip from the ‘depraved’ piano (‘Had Neva moisture? Some wondered …’). This appearance of Lenin reflects Andrews’ evolving attitude to the political aspects of surrealism. By this time, his youthful fascination with the movement had matured into the distanced curiosity of a cultural historian. Andrews was certainly no communist, but neither was he unsympathetic to their anger and frustration at the bourgeoisie. Rather than make political identifications in an explicit or transparent way, the politics of the O’Reilly stories inhere in their exploitation of the outmoded.

In his celebrated 1929 essay ‘Surrealism: The Last Snapshot of the European Intelligentsia,’ Walter Benjamin included grand pianos in his list of those outmoded items whose revolutionary energies were, he argued, first perceived by Breton. Twenty-first century means of reproducing music, such as the phonograph, had quickly consigned pianos to that category. They consequently exerted a certain fascination on the surrealist mind, both as evidence of a superseded culture and as fetish objects. The imposing casing, the shiny surfaces, the black and white teeth of the keys, the mechanical interior and the tremendous heaviness could combine to create a vaguely sinister eroticism. Several surrealist works play with the eroticism of the piano and its, usually, female performer. For instance, Salvador Dalí’s sculpture *Surrealist Piano* (1954), in which a naked female dancer in bronze stretches atop a piano whose three legs are in fact those of a girl wearing high heels and bloomers, seems to embody this spirit of imaginative, libidinal revolt against the prudery of the Victorian drawing room.

Following Benjamin, Hal Foster argues that one way of viewing the revolutionary potential of outmoded forms is their ability to ‘relativize … bourgeois culture.’ The challenge to capitalism represented by O’Reilly’s grand pianos can be located within this reading of the surrealist outmoded which sees it, following Benjamin, as identifying “the situation of the middle class at the moment it shows the first signs of decline,” when its cherished forms begin to crumble as “wish symbols.” Far from appearing as ‘wish symbols,’ the pianos in O’Reilly’s stories are subjected to ‘tamperings,’ to alterations which go far beyond the ‘temperings’ of piano tuners. In ‘Pianos of Sympathy,’ we have water-filled Pleyels. In ‘The Prairie Avenue Piano Recital,’ which is set in the gothic pile of the wealthy businessman Ogden Dearborn, on Prairie Avenue, near Lake Michigan, we find English Broadwoods filled with snow. ‘Slippers, the Imperial Police and Paris’ is a kind of detective story in which a German piano manufacturer and a French minister pursue a mysterious quest around the private dwellings of various Princesses and Countesses in Paris, with a dénouement that hinges on a ‘golden mane’ cushioning the keyboard of a Gaveau. The title alone of ‘The Depraved Piano of the Nevski Prospect,’ which takes place in 1921 during a hotel luncheon hosted by Count Raimund von Waldtraum, onetime secretary to the German ambassador in St. Petersburg, with guests including an hotelier (Floor dei Vasani), the narrator, and various Russian diplomats is enough to convey the point, but the story features an Erard piano filled with dough, while Steinways churn champagne. O’Reilly is detailed in his descriptions of all these tamperings, specifying the manufacturer of each grand piano.
Indeed, there are several diverting discussions of the relative merits of different makes of grand piano that focus on their construction and commercial advantages rather than their tonal characteristics. So O'Reilly's grand pianos are ridiculed, commodified and instrumentalised. Their appeal as an aspirational feature of bourgeois life is ironised and undermined.

Liszt and Chopin both appear, either through their music or in person. The fountains of the Palazzo of Isabella d'Este (who was known as ‘La Prima Donna’ of the Renaissance), which provide the setting for ‘Pianos of Sympathy,’ evoke ‘Les Jeux d'Eaux à la Villa d'Este’ (The Fountains of the Villa d’Este), from Liszt’s *Années de Pélerinage* (although the work itself is never directly mentioned). Liszt makes an appearance in person in ‘Slippers, the Imperial Police and Paris,’ initially disguised as a ‘silent and hooded figure in Magyar boots.’\(^{29}\) Chopin’s *Barcarolle* is performed by two Italian dwarfs, who lick the strings of the Broadwood before executing ‘tortuous cadenzas’ and ‘degenerate notes’ in ‘The Prairie Avenue Piano Recital.’\(^{30}\) In ‘The Depraved Piano of the Nevski Prospect’ a tubercular young girl is unable to summon up the physical strength necessary to play Chopin’s *Etude* No. VII on the Erard filled with dough. Liszt and Chopin were the archetypal Romantic pianist-composers, and the piano manufacturing industry depended to a great extent on the popularity of their music. Just like the pianos themselves, these composers are invoked as evidence of outmoded bourgeois high culture whose superiority and longevity can no longer be taken for granted.

The recurring appearance of frail and consumptive girls throughout the stories reinforces the impression of a fatally sick high culture. As they reappear within the twentieth century context of the stories they become manifestly uncanny, often transformed into mannequins or, in the case of the late Miss Elenor Hammersley, recreated entirely from human hair. Paulus Wander falls temporarily and sickeningly in love with her in ‘Once The Soft Silken Damage Done.’ The moment he realises that she is a ventriloquist’s dummy and automaton provokes that ‘sudden fear in the forest of symbols’ that Breton described in *L'Amour fou.*\(^{31}\) The ill-prepared Wander turns away from the horror in a state of delirium and stumbles ‘through shabby avenues until dawn’ before, significantly, cabling for his car, the ‘Aquila Molinae.’\(^{32}\) The solution is evidently to get away in his modern machine, back to the rational world of business.

Ideas of liberty and love predominate in the O'Reilly stories. He seems to have responded to what Foster identified as a connection between the surrealist uncanny and the Freudian death-drive.\(^ {33}\) The stories figure this connection in the form of sadomasochistic deconstructions of the female form, which are accomplished through recurring fetishistic motifs of hair and keyholes. In common with many of the European surrealists, O'Reilly displays a certain misogyny. Women are frequently objectified and dehumanised, reduced to a collection of body parts. The extent to which this reveals a more deep-rooted misogyny in Andrews himself is debatable. These dislocated body parts are rather typical, even clichéd, surrealist tropes, but their frequent occurrence in O'Reilly’s fiction indicate one way in which the problematic gender politics of European surrealism gained currency in America.

Hair, in particular, features in every one of the stories as the supreme example of a fetish object. This is rooted in Freud's understanding of the fetish as a substitute for the maternal phallus, often 'some part of the body (such as the foot or hair) which is in general very inappropriate for sexual purposes.'\(^ {34}\) In ‘Pianos of Sympathy’ changes in piano temperature alternately deaden and revivify the
hair of Giulia Davanzati, in an echo of the musical phenomenon of sympathetic vibration. In ‘The Prairie Avenue Piano Recital,’ a keyhole is hidden in the side of an F sharp key, which when opened reveals another key, which in turn opens a drawer containing a young girl’s dehydrated chevelure which soaks up the snow filling the piano. In ‘The Romantic Museum,’ Eliane de Hautecoeur (possibly the same “Elaine” that appeared in ...Si le balcon tombait) connects her hair via a control cord to a mechanical brooch she wears. Travelling as a passenger in a motor car at a speed of 89 kilometres per hour, she is able to adjust the cascade of her hair at a precise rate of 88.3 kilometres per hour.

Eliane's mechanical hair provides a particularly arresting moment of convulsive beauty that seems to encapsulate O'Reilly's surrealism in a single image. It takes place at a dinner at the Maisons-Laffitte home of Paul Duval, which he significantly describes as a ‘veritable romantic museum,’ a phrase that causes some ‘misgivings’ in the minds of his guests. After a promising start as a student, Duval has withdrawn completely from society ‘to devote himself to a thorough study of scientific problems.’ On their way to the dinner with his friend, Duval, who is ‘well versed in Italian history,’ Eliane's husband pleads with his wife to behave well. Eliane memorably replies ‘I believe hair can confuse history,’ and proceeds to demonstrate this as she sits in a stationary car, its engine racing, in Duval's garage:

Sublime in the spurious sun of the garage lanterns, the tresses of Eliane de Hautecoeur had descended, liquid in speed. And as the onlookers gazed with pleasure at the conquering imitation of light, it was acknowledged by all that hair had indeed vanquished history.

The word ‘sublime’ is not used lightly in this passage. The history that has been ‘vanquished’ is at once personal and political. The onlookers are provided with an alternative to reality, achieved at a certain speed, which is nevertheless arrested. At the same time, Paul Duval’s abandonment of a political reality, in favour of the sequestered pursuit of (surrealist) science, finds fulfilment in the scene. This ecstatic and mechanomorphic moment of surrealist precision seems also to validate the ‘fantastic’ approach to writing of O'Reilly himself, even if it is only by transforming women into machines that such transcendence may be achieved.

Mannequins they may have become, but these uncanny females nevertheless resist Bataille’s ideas of an ‘inorganic’ sex appeal. O'Reilly apparently shared Breton’s disapproval, expressed in the Second Manifesto, of Bataille’s fascination with ‘that which is vilest, most discouraging, and most corrupted’ in the world. These are tales of a sublimated fetishism. Thus, Wander is entranced by Elenor Hammersley’s hair, which is so sensitive that it seems to weep in the heat and can only be comforted by an ice bath, which causes her ‘two alabaster treasures’ to ‘palpitate with relief.’

Despite the warnings of the dandy Ward McAllister and his companion, the Duc de Morny, who reveal that Elenor is in fact operated by her demented widower husband Count Capolavoro (the name means ‘masterpiece’), Wander cannot resist her allure.

Similarly, in ‘The Influence of Harps and Laundry on Railway Commitments,’ which is set in the orphelinage Eugène-Napoleon in the Rue de Martignac (next door to the Bavarian Embassy) in the early years of the Second Empire, a dozen young girls perform an aria of Offenbach on partially de-stringed harps that are laid flat (effectively, eviscerated pianos) and have soiled napkins covering their remaining strings. The foundlings, whose ‘foaming hair [falls] gaily over their shoulders’ play
shyly to the Empress Eugénie, the banker Giovanni delle Fontane and the mine owner ‘Marchese Ragnatelo, born Treptu in Bucharest, [who] had once clerked for Carlos Anger in New York.’ The latter ‘admires for a moment the confusion of the girls’ supple busts.’ The young girls wear ‘abused’ warm white slippers, donated by the Empress. All the Freudian symbols come together in this story, which seems to parody psychoanalysis and even gently mocks surrealism itself.

O’Reilly nevertheless generally followed the surrealists’ attitudes towards Freud, favouring the irrationality of the dream to its analysis. Freud’s disapproval of Breton’s fascination with un-interpreted dreams and their ‘artistic’ consequences is described by Andrews in The Surrealist Parade. He recounts the letter from Freud to Breton dated 26 December 1932, which stated: ‘I really am not in a position to understand what surrealism is and what it means. Perhaps I am not intended to understand it, since I am far away from art.’ O’Reilly’s stories also encode differences from therapeutic psychoanalysis. The Romantic Museum, for example, recounts a story of 87 young girls (the same number, minus one, as there are keys on a grand piano) who, having been hypnotised by a whirling triangle on a black circle dangling from the wrist of a mysterious gentleman, wander the streets of Asnières with hands that are bewitched into ‘making the most unseasonal advances, the most gratifying caresses that that city had yet seen’ to passing strangers. This example of fetishism parts company with Freudianism, not least in its use of hypnosis to achieve a sexual outcome. Having explored hypnosis in his early work, particularly with Josef Breuer, Freud rejected it as a technique in favour of free association, and ultimately his celebrated sessions of analysis on the couch. O’Reilly, on the other hand, places it at the centre of the most overtly sexual episode in the stories.

‘Slippers, the Imperial Police, and Paris’ contains another example of O’Reilly’s reinterpretation of the Freudian death-drive:

> Although the yards of chevelure which lay on the flooring of the young woman’s bedroom had been long shorn, the manes were still murmuring when the two old men entered. Doubtless the swollen Venetian slipper which pierced the mound of hair had agitated some sensitive strands. However, the warm bread which inflated the girl’s shoe had not been permitted to mar in any way the admirable shellac of the footwear: meticulous baking had allowed no dough whatsoever to overflow the tight lacing.

The found slipper reiterates Breton’s ‘lost object,’ the slipper of ‘folklore’ (in other words, Cinderella). In Breton’s example, the slipper spoon is ‘not only a fetish that combines a perception of castrative “lack” with an image of phallic “unity”; it is also a “Cinderella ashtray” that conflates a figure of desire (Cinderella) with an image of extinction “ashes.”’ In O’Reilly’s story, the slipper filled with warm dough is a more maternal and life-affirming substance, which is nonetheless constrained and sadomasochistically eroticised by the tight bondage of the lacing. The male ‘entry’ into this trembling female interior eventually leads the two phallic policemen all the way to the central mystery.

This story is constructed from a chain of reasoning that articulates a bizarre industrial imperative while offering a surreal solution. Napoléon III had told one of the policemen, named Piétri, that the trade position of the Empire ‘depended entirely upon the recovery of two thousand chevelures stolen that night from a warehouse in Passy.’ This was because European piano manufacturers had been using a cheap but poor quality substitute for ivory (the price of which had risen prohibitively high).
in their keyboards. Count Rainer von Waldtraum (the surname translates as ‘forest dream’) knows the commercial secret that the only way to cushion these new keys successfully is to use chevelures, a solution first proposed by Franz Liszt himself. However, the chevelures had been stolen from an Anonymous Society who had purchased the necessary stock. Waldtraum notices a key that resembles one sent to the businessman Ogden Dearlove in Chicago for his piano. The key opens the bedroom (veiled behind ‘voluptuous red curtains’) of the guilty Princesse Mahaut de Chaulnes, and the chevelures are found, along with the slipper. This narrative structure interweaves the tropes of O'Reilly’s fetishism with commercial and industrial themes. American big business is introduced at a crucial moment, relocating the solution away from Europe. Yet without the insights provided by the European ‘forest dream,’ the final penetrative action could not be achieved.

Most of the stories are constructed around similar encounters between the surreal dream and hard commerce. The performance of the foundlings in ‘The Influence of Harps and Laundry on Railway Commitments,’ for example, leads directly to a confession from the banker Fontane to Waldtraum that he has made an investment in twenty thousand shares in Lombardo-Venetian Rails. It is the evocation of Italy through soiled laundry and harps, a discovery of both sexuality and the unconscious that has persuaded him to make that decision.

Likewise, in ‘The Prairie Avenue Piano Recital,’ Ogden Dearborn and Paulus Wander meet to discuss business. Wander’s association with European culture leaves him compromised in the eyes of the ‘realtor and dry goods dealer’ Dearborn, who observes that his tie-pin is ‘hopelessly passé de mode,’ and remembers rumours of an abandoned love and a bastard son ‘living in the remote world of the aristocracy of the Neva….’ The tale goes on to describe the surreal chain of events that lead to the dehydrated chevelure of a very young girl being used to soak up the snow that has filled the Broadwood so that the dwarfs may give their performance. The successful conclusion of this operation leads to some hard bargaining around some tapestries in which Dearborn, deeply affected by the recent experience, comes off worse:

‘And now,’ [Ogden Dearborn] began, ‘those New Jersey Aubussons. While manufactured in Trenton, they will nevertheless have a wide sales appeal.’
‘So wide,’ agreed Paulus Wander, ‘that I take Illinois.’

Wander goes on to claim several more large tracts of land, while Dearborn is disturbed by a more intimate memory. Gazing at the chevelure he sobs: ‘Mary, Mary!’

Thus the tables are turned. Dearborn’s attachment to the Freudian symbol of the hair, with its personal associations and memories, has made him susceptible to precisely that weakness that he first decried in Wander. Meanwhile, the latter has gained in commercial strength. The objects of trade are the very antithesis of surrealist objects: stylised seventeenth and eighteenth century tapestries depicting conventional figures against a background of verdure, foliage and vignettes of plants and animals. These are bourgeois decorations which, to complete the commodification (and vulgarisation) in this case are reproductions, manufactured in Trenton, New Jersey. Wander knows that Americans will consume these objects in large quantities but the price of the trade is that aspect of oneself that is susceptible of surrealist fantasy. It is as though French surrealism itself is incompatible with the banalities and realism of American materialism.
Throughout the stories there is evidence of the influence of visual as well as literary surrealism on O’Reilly/Andrews. The descriptions of nineteenth century interiors recall the collage novels of Max Ernst, with their collisions of catalogue pictures and illustrations from melodramatic novels. As Foster comments, ‘Ernst relates the historically outmoded to the psychically repressed at the very level of representation, specifically of representations residual in surrealist childhoods - that is to say, in the era of the Freudian “discovery” of sexuality and the unconscious.’ In O’Reilly’s version, this encounter is intruded upon by the adult parade of American bankers, traders and businessmen. Andrews lived in a very different time and place to the European surrealists, one in which there were no ready equivalents to Ernst’s Victorian interiors. Andrews felt this discrepancy keenly and the translocation of Ernst’s imagery suffered something of the same marginalisation as Ernst himself in America. In O’Reilly’s stories, European surrealism has not grown up and the encounter with the adult world of American materialism is consequently traumatic. Andrews’ own position as a writer reflects this tension and he consequently seceded into literary silence.

Salvador Dalí is also a strong presence in the O’Reilly stories. Dalí was of course much more influential in the United States than other European surrealists and Breton’s mocking anagram of his name, ‘Avida Dollars,’ neatly summed up the reason for this. Dali’s embrace of capitalist enterprise presented opportunities for surrealism in America yet also, from Breton’s perspective, spelled its corruption. Breton’s dismay at Dalí’s involvement in theatre, dance and, more broadly, spectacle is subtly echoed in the O’Reilly stories. Andrews hedges his bets here, probably rather fascinated with the figure of Dalí while at the same time wary of his self-promotion and narcissism.

Thus the description of the ‘Eye-Lash Quadrille,’ for example, in ‘Once the Soft Silken Damage Done,’ seems to be modelled on the Bal Onirique, which took place in New York in 1935. This was instigated by Dalí and organised by Caresse Crosby and Julien Levy’s wife, Joella. Gala commented ‘it was an experiment to see how far New Yorkers would respond to a chance to express their own dreams.’ High society indulged itself with gusto in the process setting down a blueprint for many such events in the future. Novel costumes were the order of the day, including ‘a woman giving birth to a doll from the top of her head’ and ‘women in shimmering white gowns with green snakes emerging from their heads.’

O’Reilly’s story, which takes place during a masked ball organised by the House of Anger, features similarly outlandish garments. For example, Mrs Honorius Anger is ‘costumed as a Burgundian Princess of the XV Century [with] numerous doves nesting about her waist.’ The Eye-Lash Quadrille is accompanied by the band of the conductor and choreographer Wunder (wondering and wandering meet in this story). Wander, trying unsuccessfullly to please Miss Hammersely by offering to fetch a plate of terrapin, settles for joining her in watching the ballroom floor where Mrs Carlos Anger and her set were completing the Eye-lash routine. None other than the outstanding conductor Wunder had invented the fantastic dance steps which those women, mounted on stilts, danced. In the center, the hat of a very young girl represented the pupil of the human eye, while each spouse stepping round her was clad in an enormous lash.
The eye itself is, of course, a recurring motif in surrealism, much exploited by Dalí and here, once again, transported by O’Reilly into the home of wealthy American industrialists. Evidently he could see how surrealism was sufficiently compatible with American high society to be suitable for such occasions. Nevertheless, in his stories, it takes a specifically European presence (Wunder) to guarantee authenticity, something which Andrews presumably concluded from watching Dalí.

The spirit of Dalí also seems to be present at the dinner given by the reclusive Paul Duval in ‘The Romantic Museum.’ The guests are shown into the great Dining Hall,

but as the company leaned back in their Louis XV chairs, they noticed that the very touch of their backs on the chairs produced an intense operatic whistle. When the whistle had run its course, all recognized the tune as the famous Haunting Theme from Schubert’s well-known Unfinished Symphony. Bewildered, the ladies and gentlemen arose and stared at the chair backs. To their surprise, they discovered that on the back of each chair was a projected a pair of full-size lips.  

Duval remarks that the lips are a ‘scientific replica’ of those of Clarice Orsini, the Roman Bride of Lorenzo de’ Medici. Clarice died aged 35 of tuberculosis and was the subject of portraits by Lorenzo and others, as well as being the mother of Pope Leo X. Her lips, to judge by the portraits, were rather thin and consumptive. The initial evocation of voluptuous objects such as Dalí’s Mae West sofa give way to an apparently more repressed image.

There may be an implicit critique of Dalí’s showmanship in this turn. Just as the Louis XV style began the move away from the rococo towards moderation and restraint, so Clarice Orsini’s strict religious beliefs contrasted unhappily with the humanist ideals of Florentine society. Likewise, Paul Duval himself, who was immensely popular as a student and seemed poised to live a high life in polite society, disappeared from view for more than a decade to devote himself to ‘a thorough study of scientific problems.’ This move towards restraint is consistent with Andrews’ own journey into conservatism. The flamboyance of Dalí’s version of surrealism lacked the refinement, discretion and elitism that Andrews admired. While not siding with Breton in denouncing Dalí, Andrews nevertheless managed to convey his unease quite effectively in the O’Reilly stories.

In the public mind, O’Reilly might have most closely been associated with the work of Joseph Cornell, the ‘Enchanted Wanderer’ of Manhattan and another important conduit through which a surrealism of sorts was made available to Americans. Cornell himself used that nickname in an article subtitled ‘Excerpt from a Journey Album for Hedy Lamarr’ in View magazine, in 1941. Myers notes that ‘[a] footnote explains that the title is borrowed from the biography of Carl Maria von Weber who wrote in the horn quartet of the overture to “Der Freischutz” a musical signature, “The Enchanted Wanderer.”’ Cornell acknowledged that his Taglioni’s Jewel Casket (1940), ‘although not inspired by, would remind anyone familiar with it of Pianos of Sympathy.’ This erotically charged box has a velvet lining and contains three rows of four glass cubes resting on blue glass and various fragments of jewellery including a necklace. It is an homage to the ballerina Marie Taglioni, who reputedly danced on an animal skin in the snow to entertain a Russian highwayman.

The subject-matter of the O’Reilly stories and Cornell’s boxes is ostensibly the same: faded fragments from another time, evocations of the Russian ballet or high society balls, mysterious references to journeys undertaken and holidays at continental hotels and collaged objects such as
slippers, ribbons, or birds. They share a love of detailed intricacy and a sense of intense focus that give their work a certain timeless quality. They have a similar sense of history being vanquished by the frozen moment at which these elements come together. However, the hallucinatory conjurings of O’Reilly lead to the rather concrete world of big business, whereas the entranced Cornell remains gazing upon the marvellous. Cornell’s world was essentially small and localised, obsessive in its detailed observation, whereas O’Reilly’s wanderings cover the globe and, despite the intimacy of the events described, have a sense of a grander scale. Cornell’s work is often, though not uniformly read, as ‘a coded personal record,’ suggesting another difference between his practice and O’Reilly’s writing.\(^{57}\) O’Reilly’s stories are impersonal, betraying relatively little of the subjectivity of the author. Given the common currency of the assumption that surrealism was primarily concerned with the psychic life of the author, the use of the pseudonym and the impersonalism of the O’Reilly stories indicate a possible reason why they passed under the radar in America and have been forgotten as bearers of surrealist influence.

O’Reilly seems to have found himself rendered increasingly irrelevant by a combination of Andrews’ natural conservatism, by the intangibility of a geographically and historically distant European culture and by the strength of an American culture that demanded a stronger sense of its own identity. The fact that literary surrealism was itself already marginal in comparison to its visual counterpart only compounded Andrews’s dissatisfaction with his creations.

The Montagu O’Reilly stories dried up in the late 1930s, roughly coinciding with Jolas’ turn away from surrealism and the publication of the first issue of View in 1940. It is instructive to examine Andrews’ relationship with surrealism once he ceased creative writing. Unlike Jolas, he made no attempt to carve out a new position for himself in the avant-garde. No longer did he present himself as Montagu O’Reilly: instead he was to become Wayne Andrews, a cultural chronicler and critic with a wide-ranging portfolio of interests and the photographic eye of a super-informed tourist. As O’Reilly had, Andrews tended to portray surrealism along Benjaminian lines, as ‘the only intellectual movement of his contemporary era to dream the future out of the ruins of outmoded nineteenth-century cultural modernity.’\(^{58}\) Yet unlike O’Reilly, Andrews did this by showing the relative failures of other movements to do the same, an account that culminates in The Surrealist Parade.

The list of Andrews’ cultural monographs covers an impressively wide range of topics: The Vanderbilt Legend, 1941; Battle for Chicago, 1946; Edith Wharton's Best Short Stories, 1958; Germaine: A Portrait of Madame de Staël, 1963; Siegfried’s Curse: The German Journey from Nietzsche to Hesse, 1972; Voltaire, 1981; The Surrealist Parade, 1988; and numerous shorter essays. Andrews’ trademark writing style consisted of a series of elegant historical or biographical miniatures that are woven together in a highly readable way. This readability drew censure from academic reviewers who frequently found the books too anecdotal to make a useful contribution to scholarship.\(^{59}\) Andrews’ approach was not to discover new facts - he was quite content to draw entirely on existing sources - but to observe relationships and coincidences between people and events that add up to a novel ‘take’ on a familiar story. These are infused with his own infectious curiosity and eye for detail, so the reader gradually builds an impression not just of the subject but also of the author who is telling the tale.
One chapter of *Siegfried's Curse* is entitled *The Expressionist Parade*, a title that prefigures Andrews’ final book *The Surrealist Parade*. In a revealing paragraph, he compares Expressionism with surrealism:

> It is not exactly profitable to read each and every word of all of these [Expressionist] writers. Unlike the Surrealists in France, they did not intend to leave row after row of volumes to be devoured by the generations to come. Unlike the Surrealists, who codified and expanded the marvellous tradition of Rimbaud, Lautréamont, Baudelaire, Hugo, and Chateaubriand – to mention only a few of the men summoned from their graves to applaud the performances of their successors – the expressionists had nothing but contempt for anything that resembled a tradition. To say something absolutely new was the excuse for their existence. Once that was accomplished, or attempted, they were usually exhausted. They could be amazing in the evening and boring the morning after.

This emphasis on the importance of literary tradition strikes at the heart of Andrews’ view of surrealism. Breton and his group famously set themselves against anything that might have resembled a literary career, yet from the First Manifesto onwards, surrealism invoked influential precursors from European literature. Their revival of romanticism and the gothic was clearly of central importance to Andrews, more so than other more recognisable or characteristic features of the movement, such as its investments in psychoanalysis or the marvelous. To him, surrealism’s continuities with radical cultural traditions, rather than a shallow pursuit of novelty, proved the superiority of their revolution over the Expressionists.

Andrews’ interest in surrealism can only be dimly perceived amidst the hundreds of beautiful photographs of buildings in his architectural books. Although the images of buildings bereft of people and photographed in a documentary style might reference, for instance, the photographs from Breton’s *Nadja* (1928) or the city scenes of Brassai, they invite very different interpretations. Anthony Vidler has identified architecture as a home for the surrealist uncanny insofar as it ‘construes a topology of symbolic forms, from the stair to cellar, that, from Freud on, have become topoi of dream analysis.’ Andrews’ celebratory images do little or nothing to further this interpretation of the built environment, concentrating instead on conveying an impression of American construction transcending its European origins. A typical example is his photograph of the Syracuse Savings Bank, New York, designed by James Lyman Silsbee in 1876. Andrews remarks that Silsbee ‘surprised Syracuse ... with a Venetian Gothic savings bank, still standing and still honoured.’

Nevertheless, some of the photographs do seem to betray very subtly the one-time surrealist gaze of the photographer, something that is occasionally reinforced in the accompanying texts. His picture of Horace Walpole’s ‘toy castle’ at Strawberry Hill, London [Figure 2], for example, is accompanied by the following:

> [André] Breton was also happy to find that Otranto could be considered an example of automatic writing. There is a letter of Walpole’s that proves Breton’s thesis. “I sat down and began to write, without knowing in the least what I intended to say or relate,” the author told a friend. “One evening I wrote from the time I had drunk my tea, about six o’clock, till half an hour after one in the morning, when my hand and fingers were so weary, but I could not hold the pen to finish a sentence, but left Mathilda and Isabella talking in the middle of a paragraph.”

---
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However, Andrews' historical narrative ultimately concludes not in the triumph of a surrealist 'intra-uterine' architecture that sets itself against modernist functionalism but rather in a parade of both domestic and public buildings that amount to a catalogue of European influences and original American architecture that takes in modern and traditional styles with a dispassionate eye for quality. His major response to surrealism, therefore, must remain the O'Reilly stories.

The title of the collection - *Who Has Been Tampering with these Pianos?* - perfectly sums up O'Reilly's surrealism. It seems to be a querulous question, delivered to thin air, suggesting an action whose evidence is plain but whose cause is unknown. ‘Tampering’ is a fine but disabling adjustment. In the stories, history itself seems to have been tampered/tempered; the outmoded (pianos) are replaced by capital (American big business), the surrealists' revolutionary aspirations thwarted. And yet, O'Reilly wields a playful but sinister kind of tuning peg; he skews the conventional forms of the short story into something that serves a particular interpretation of surrealism that privileges its capacity to unsettle and disturb. The short creative life of Montagu O'Reilly constitutes a minor, idiosyncratic legacy for surrealism in America, one that has been overshadowed by others, but nevertheless increased its visibility and currency outside of France.
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