goes on, and a language ages, it becomes more difficult to find out what words mean, and whether they are meaning the same thing to different people',[22] as if the very fullness of the *OED*'s lexicographical record could put the communicative utility of a word into doubt.

Perhaps Eliot's idea of the relations among the *OED*, *SOED*, and *COD* was muddy, and he understood these simply as three formats—full, shorter, shortest—of the same Oxford Dictionary. This would allow him to avoid the (apparently confounding) exhaustiveness of the *OED*, while still laying claim to its authority. And it would not be an uncommon misapprehension. Today the situation is much worse, with 'Oxford Dictionary' and even *Oxford English Dictionary* used commonly to refer to any of the dozen or more English dictionaries published by Oxford University Press in the last century, in print and online.[23] This phenomenon in itself speaks to a peculiar kind of authority within the public imagination of a title which—more like the Bible than other reference works—has come to stand for authority itself, so much that it transcends the specificity of its own authoritative statements.

Eliot did not write an essay called 'Johnson as Lexicographer', but in 'Johnson as Critic and Poet' (1944) he set out the 'responsibility of our poets and critics, for the preservation of the language', in terms rooted in the philological:

> amongst the varieties of chaos in which we find ourselves immersed to-day, one is a chaos of language . . . and an increasing indifference to etymology and the history of the use of words.[24]

Though this might suggest a kind of fusty linguistic conservatism (would not some other 'varieties of chaos' prevalent in that year perhaps be more pressing?), really it is a pedagogical conservatism, combined with a perfectly modern view of linguistic development. To return to 'Can ''Education'' be Defined?', the essay in which he pays most attention to dictionaries, words, and definitions, Eliot there approves of the 'wobbliness of words', saying that 'it is their changes in meaning that . . . indicate that a language *is* alive'.[25] It is a view clearly informed by the same philological principles that guided the *OED* project. Discussing the attractive Americanisms *grifter* and *shill*, Eliot writes that, should they succeed in American writing, 'They will find their way into the English vocabulary as well, and eventually into a supplement to the great Oxford dictionary . . . and so their dictionary status in Britain will be assured.'[26]

David-Antoine Williams
St Jerome's University in the University of Waterloo

doi:10.1093/notesj/gjw022

Advance Access publication 11 April, 2016

[22] Eliot, *To Criticize the Critic*, 68.
[23] These include, in addition to the titles already discussed, *The Oxford Dictionary of English*, *The Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, *The New Shorter Oxford English Dictionary*, *The Oxford Paperback Dictionary*, *The Oxford American Dictionary*, *The New Oxford American Dictionary*, *Oxford Dictionaries Online*, and *The Oxford English Dictionary Online*.
[24] Eliot, *On Poetry and Poets*, 192.
[25] Eliot, *To Criticize the Critic*, 65. Original emphasis.
[26] *Ibid.*, 47. The two words would appear in volumes of R. W. Burchfield's Second Supplement to the *OED*, in 1972 and 1986, respectively.

## T. S. ELIOT IN THE *OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY*

THE second Supplement to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, edited by Robert Burchfield between 1957 and 1986, more than doubled the number of literary eponyms in the dictionary, to 167.[1] The first edition of 1933 (*OED1*), including the first Supplement, had *Aristophanic* (first attested 1827) and *Sophoclean* (1649) but not *Æschylean* (1844) or *Euripidean* (1821); *Ossianesque* (1874) but not *Omaresque* (1892); *Coleridgean* (1834) but not *Southeyan* (1817); and so on. In addition

[1] Quantitative evidence is based on analysis of the pseudo-SGML text of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd edn (1989), encoded in the late 1980s at the University of Waterloo as part of the digitization process, and the TriStar CD-ROM edition (1987) of the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1st edn (1928). Information from the first Supplement (1933) has been gleaned manually. Compiled results are available from the author. All *OED* data is published by Oxford University Press.

to these missing nineteenth-century terms, the second Supplement—and subsequently the integrated second edition of 1989 (*OED2*)—also added a number of newer ones, such as *Joycean* (1927), *Poundian* (1939), *Woolfian* (1936), and *Yeatsian* (1928).[2] However, although there are headwords in *OED2* as recent as *Durellian*, *Gravesian*, and *Greeneian* (all 1961), and as expendable, arguably, as *Lylian*, *Runyonesque*, and *Pinerotic*, there is no *Eliotian*, *Eliotesque*, or *Eliotic* to be found in any edition—including, as of early 2016, the current *OED Online* (*OED3*), which is in the midst of a complete revision. This despite the appearance in print of these terms (with reference to the style of T. S. Eliot—earlier occurrences refer to earlier Eliots) as early as 1926 and 1928.[3]

The omission of adjectives derived from the name of such a consequential literary figure becomes more curious when one takes note of the 'reverence' (Burchfield's own term)[4] otherwise shown by Burchfield towards Eliot's writings. When Valerie Eliot enquired by letter in February of 1977 as to why the second volume of the second Supplement had overlooked her husband's earliest use of *mug's game* in *The Use of Poetry and the Use of Criticism* (1933), though it had quoted him for the same phrase in *The Elder Statesman* (1959), Burchfield wrote back to say that 'In practice we would almost certainly have given both examples if we had had them to hand, simply because they were from his works.'[5]

Perhaps this was a diplomatic bit of flattery, but Burchfield's Supplement does show a degree of piety to Eliot. In terms of lexicographical evidence drawn from his work, Eliot is represented by more evidence quotations (556) than any of the influential contemporaries mentioned above, except Joyce (1,825—*Ulysses* alone supplies 1,323). These illustrate 394 main senses or sub-senses, and 145 attributive and combined formations. Fifteen times *OED2* does what Burchfield told Mrs Eliot would be an expected practice given the availability of evidence, quoting Eliot more than once for the same sense. Three quotations are reprinted for *culture* (n.), definition 5a. ('The training, development, and refinement of mind, tastes, and manners . . . the intellectual side of civilization'), all from *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (1948). Another multiple citation affects the dictionary's definition even more directly: the second sense of *groaner* not only quotes Eliot's 'The heaving groaner | Rounded homewards', from *The Dry Salvages* (1941),[6] but also his parenthetical gloss in the prefatory note to that poem—'Groaner: a whistling buoy'—which appears both as quotation evidence, and again verbatim within the *OED* definition: 'b. A whistling buoy. *local U.S.*'

Like most frequently-quoted literary sources, Eliot supplies evidence for a mix of unusual lexis (*acridian*, *azyme*, *autarky*, etc.), common words used in ordinary ways (*alibi*, *amateur*, *bike*), and words both ordinary and extraordinary which he used in such ways as to have made a mark on the reading culture. In *OED2*, words for which Eliot is cited and which might recall particular passages of his verse to the familiar reader include: *agonistes*, *anfractuous*, *Baedeker*, *barbituric*, *behovely*, *burnt-out*, *chthonic*, *coffee spoon*, *demob*, *demotic*, *door-yard*, *gramophone*, *groaner*, *grimpen*, *gutter* (v.), *hyacinth*, *inoperancy*, *juvescence*, *Komsomol*, *laquearia*, *maculate*, *miasmal*, *mug's game*, *muttering* (ppl. a.), *née*, *piaculative*, *pneumatic*, *polyphiloprogenitive*, *prayable*, *sawdust*, *semblable*, *shanti*, *smokefall*, *tereu*, *towelled*, *twit*, and *unprayable*.

When Charles Monteith, Eliot's latter-day colleague at Faber and Faber, wrote to the

[2] As with many first citations in *OED2*, these all can be antedated. The earliest I have found are, respectively: 'Joycean ellipsis' in *The Dial*, lxix, (1925), 173; 'Poundian canons' in *This Quarter*, i (1925), 315; 'Woolfian novel' in *The Bookman*, lx, (1924), 193; and several instances of 'Yeatsian' from 1913, including 'a more Yeatsian reason' in *The Living Age*, cclxxvi (Jan–Mar, 1913), 488.

[3] Viz., 'T. S. Eliotian metaphysics', in *Voices: an Open Forum for the Poets*, vi (1926), 35; 'Eliotesque leanings', in *The Oxford Outlook*, viii.41 (1926), 308; and 'Eliotic complacence' in *The London Aphrodite*, i–vi (1928), 316.

[4] In his preface to *Unlocking the English Language* (London, 1989), which prints his T. S. Eliot Memorial Lectures, Burchfield mentions his frequent references to Eliot and his works (the index gives sixteen topics under 'Eliot, T. S.', covering fourteen pages), saying 'It hardly needs to be said that in this case reference means reverence' (n.p.).

[5] OUP Archives: OED/ML/26.

[6] Eliot, *The Dry Salvages*, I, 8. In a 1941 letter, Eliot replies to John Hayward's puzzlement over this term: 'I noted absence from O.E.D. This is a pretty problem too'. *The Poems of T. S. Eliot*, ed. Christopher Ricks and Jim McCue (London, 2015), I, 969.

*London Review of Books* to defend a poet's right to esoteric vocabulary, he recalled his first encounter with some of these words (and one or two others): 'when I was a schoolboy, I was very puzzled by ''anfractuous'', ''pistillate'', ''staminate'', ''sutler'', above all by ''polyphiloprogenitive''... I looked them up in a dictionary.'[7] If this is true, the young Monteith would have been only partially unpuzzled by the dictionaries available to him, since Burchfield's Supplement vol. 3 (O–Sd) was the first to record the final and most puzzling of these terms, in 1982. Looking up *anfractuous* would only have puzzled him further, since the definition available in *OED1* ('winding, sinuous') is not what Eliot means by 'Paint me the bold anfractuous rocks', in 'Sweeney Erect' (1920). He means something more like the current French sense of *anfractueux*—'rugged, craggy'—which is how *OED2* defines a new sense of the term, based on Eliot's usage alone.

Of the remaining terms on the list given above, *agonistes*, *inoperancy*, *juvescence*, *Komsomol*, *laquearia*, and *piaculative* are the other words for which Eliot is the first recorded user.[8] As with *anfractuous*, for *pneumatic*, *towelled*, *prayable*, and *unprayable*, his is the first recorded use of a new sense or sub-sense (there are sixteen such semantic extensions recorded in all, not counting combinations). Literary usage, including even nonce usages and hapaxes, has always had a place in *OED* entries—James Murray himself coined the term 'nonce-word', self-reflexively, to describe terms coined for a particular purpose within a set context (i.e. employed only 'for the nonce').[9] Murray had wished to include the usages of 'all the great English writers of all ages',[10] a predilection shared by his successor Burchfield: 'I love poetry and poetical use has been poured into the Supplement'.[11]

As with Joyce's neologisms and nonce usages, however, some of the evidence from Eliot's works substantiates dictionary entries of dubious lexicographical value. The putative word *opherion*, for example, which appears in *The Waste Land*: *A Facsimile and Transcript of the Original Drafts* (1971), is given as a new headword, with the explanation that Eliot likely meant *orpharion*, but no other instances of this (mis)spelling are listed. It is not unheard of for *OED* to record one-time misspellings or transcription errors—Shakespeare's *cyme*, *pannell*, *prenzie*, *solidare*, and *wragged*, for instance—but these are exceedingly rare, especially for literary sources (many are from glossaries and lexicons), and even more so for texts written after the advent of spelling standardization. Eliot's *opherion* is the only twentieth-century example in *OED2* of an erroneous headword with only one citation.[12]

Charlotte Brewer has given one account of how Burchfield manoeuvred on behalf of an Eliotic coinage that had been called into question by his colleagues:

> his inclusion of T. S. Eliot's *loam feet*... was disapproved of both by some of the consulted scholars and by his 'publishing overlords within OUP'.... Nevertheless, Burchfield decided to retain this quotation, together with one he has also included from a poem by Donald Davie... which he thought might have been influenced by Eliot's use.[13]

Davie's usage, after Eliot, in *Brides of Reason* (1955), may be scant corroboration of the term's broader currency, but it does mark down in the lexicographical record the suggestion that the term has made an impression on the tradition of English poetic diction. Similarly, Eliot's *juvescence*, described by Burchfield as a mis-formation of *juvenescence*,[14] is included in the dictionary along with a second quotation, by Stephen Spender (1948). As if to acknowledge

[7] Charles Monteith, 'Reckless' (letter), *The London Review of Books*, xi.22 (23 November 1989).

[8] First recorded uses not on this list are from Eliot's prose or from drafts: *counter-rhythm*, *en principe*, *on-stage*, *rature*, *salonnière*. One might also wish to include *bullshit*, which has an anterior attribution buried within the first quotation: 'c 1915 Wyndham Lewis *Let*. (1963) 66 Eliot has sent me Bullshit and the Ballad for Big Louise. They are excellent bits of scholarly ribaldry.'

[9] See *OED2* s.v. *nonce*. Cf. James A. H. Murray, 'Preface' to *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (Oxford, 1888), I, xx.

[10] *Ibid*., v.

[11] Quoted in Charlotte Brewer, *Treasure House of the Language: The Living OED* (New Haven, 2007), 191.

[12] In a 2004 revision, *OED3* added a second citation from 1991.

[13] Brewer, *Treasure House*, 185.

[14] Burchfield, *Unlocking*, 68.

the questionable validity of such entries on purely lexicographical criteria, Burchfield comments wryly that documenting such Eliotic echoes in *OED2* would, 'At the very least . . . obviate the need for such a note in some future issue of *Notes & Queries*' (the other Oxford publication of which he was Editor).[15]

*OED* quotation evidence can often tell a story of literary influence in this way. Davie's and Spender's usages are almost certainly influenced by Eliot; they may even represent an allusion or reference to the works in which he coined them. One may also reverse the angle of view, to discern Eliot's own sources: as Burchfield notes, before Eliot uses it allusively in 'Burbank with a Baedeker: Bleistein with a Cigar' (1920), *defunctive* is only attested in Shakespeare; *concitation*, used in 'Gerontion' (1920), is absent from the record after 1656.[16] One could add to Burchfield's examples Eliot's title, 'Sweeney Agonistes' (1932), the first recorded use of the postpositive epithet since Milton's *Samson Agonistes* (1671), and *grimpen*, which does not appear between Arthur Conan Doyle's *Hound of the Baskervilles* (1902) and *East Coker* (1940). Even more complex stories of influence can be read in(to) such entries. Burchfield, for example, speculates that William Faulkner and Thomas Wolfe use *defunctive* under the influence of Eliot, rather than of Shakespeare.[17] However, one must also be on one's guard: of the word *behovely* in *Little Gidding* (1942)—'Sin is Behovely, but | All shall be well'—Burchfield says, 'Eliot almost certainly encountered it in Chaucer's *Parson's Tale*.'[18] The implication (not quite an assertion) of debt is certainly wrong, though one can see how Chaucer's 'it is bihovely thing to telle whiche ben dedly synnes', which *OED1* records, might suggest itself as a source. Neither *OED1* nor Burchfield was acquainted with Eliot's actual source, Julian of Norwich's *Revelations of Divine Love* (1395), which he is quoting directly (albeit without quotation marks).

In some cases the association of the term with its originator is so strong that it must enter into the definition, as with the headword *objective correlative* ('Term applied by T. S. Eliot to . . .' etc.), and the inclusion s.v. *sensibility* of the combination *dissociation of sensibility* ('T. S. Eliot's term for . . .' etc.), coinages that Burchfield described as 'towering over' Eliot's 'poetical experimentation with words'.[19] Two other *OED2* definitions make a judgement of Eliot's literary influence explicitly. In the entry for *wasteland*, the Supplement added three new sub-senses, the last recognizing not only the appearance of a literary work of cultural significance, but also the lexical extension of the headword by the allusion-generating force of that text (which does not in fact contain the headword—arguably not even in the title): '1.d *transf.* and *fig.*, sometimes with allusion to T. S. Eliot's poem *The Waste Land* (1922).' In the same vein, *OED2* supposes that in writing 'not with a bang but a whimper'[20] in 'The Hollow Men' (1925), Eliot had extended *bang* (n.[1]) into a new allusive sub-sense, recording three subsequent variations on that phrase. One cannot overstate how rare such explicitly allusive sub-senses are in *OED2*. The dictionary has 1,874 occurrences of 'allusion to' or the equivalent ('used allusively', 'in allusive use', etc.) in its definitions, of which about 575 are 'to' texts (the rest being non-textual types of allusion, e.g. 'allusion to sense 1', 'allusion to the convict's task of breaking stones', etc.), or 0.07 per cent of all the definitions in the dictionary. Of those, 230 are alluding to passages of the Bible and 177 to Classical mythology or other cultural commonplaces, such as proverbs, sayings, fables, and legends. Of literary texts attributable to a particular author (169), half (87) are based on proper names (e.g. Dickens's *Scrooge*), or other invented names for things (e.g. Wyndham's *triffid*) and neologisms (e.g. Carroll's *slithy*), rather than on extant words used memorably (e.g. Milton's 'drop serene'). In this last and smallest category, only five sources appear more than once, headed by Shakespeare with twenty-five allusive

[15] *Ibid.*, 12.

[16] In 1960 Eliot fretted over what exactly he had meant by this word, pleading that it was 'only in recent years that I have formed the habit of looking up in the dictionary every important word that appears in my verse!' See the note to lines 52–53 in *Poems*, I, 480.

[17] Burchfield, *Unlocking*, 68. I would guess from the context that Wolfe's primary debt is to Faulkner rather than to Eliot, however, whereas the fifth and final quotation, from *The Listener* (1961) unambiguously alludes to Eliot's Shakespearean usage.

[18] *Ibid.*, 76.

[19] *Ibid.*, 70.

[20] Eliot, 'The Hollow Men', V, 31.

definitions. Next come Milton with five, Swift and Virgil with three, and Eliot and Kipling with two.

When collocations such as *loam feet* are recorded as lexemes, the usual practice is to include them in a separate section within the main entry. Over 8,000 *OED2* entries have such a section, listing over 145,000 words formed with affixes (e.g. *non-Christian*, *unaffrayed*) and attributive combinations both transparent (e.g. *weather report*, *sandwich papers*) and opaque (e.g. *loam feet*, *water fruit*, *Sunday face*). For the literary historian and critic these are either the most or the least interesting of the lexemes recorded in the dictionary. Though they cite him as the first compounder of fifty-four such forms, for instance, it is unlikely that *OED2* lexicographers thought Eliot was the first to put *pre-Renaissance* together, or to write about a *poker game*.[21] Neither is his employment of these terms (in 'Dante' (1929) and in 'Sweeney Agonistes', respectively) particularly memorable or remarkable. On the other hand, he might reasonably be supposed to have come up with *dream-crossed* or *sandsmoke* on his own, and perhaps a few others.[22]

Although the *OED*'s practice for documenting attributive and affixal forms was not as exhaustive as with main senses and sub-senses, as a corollary this involved more discretion in determining what could be included as a combination, and what evidence would substantiate these. From the first edition onwards, which and which types of formations to record had been a matter of some controversy, as Burchfield described in a paper given to the Philological Society in 1971.[23] Because of this, however, combinations provide a way to judge an author's esteem with the historical dictionary maker which headwords do not, since the policies for including these are comparatively rigid.

Eliot is the only cited source in *OED2* for thirty combinations, including *batflight*, *blue-nailed*, *dreamcrossed*, *dream kingdom*, *proud-necked*, *sandsmoke*, *Sea-girls*, *smokefall*, *time-kept*, and *time-ridden*. Dame Helen Gardner wrote to Burchfield in 1983 to ponder a definition for one of these, which she had been discussing with friends at a party. Burchfield published her suggestion verbatim in the dictionary, with attribution, s.v. *smoke*:

> **smokefall** [after *nightfall*] rare$^{-1}$, 'the moment when the wind drops and smoke that had ascended descends' (Dame Helen Gardner)

Though it would be mean to object *tout court* to the inclusion of this (lovely) compound, one might quibble that Gardner's gloss partakes less of 'scientific definition' than 'philosophic interpretation', as Eliot once complained of Friedrich Max Müller.[24] And, further, that if *smokefall* should be included in the dictionary, on what grounds could it then ignore Gerard Manley Hopkins's *bloomfall* ('The Bugler's First Communion', 1918 [1878]), or Cecil Day-Lewis's *ghostfall* ('The Way In', 1965)?

For all these liberal inclusions of Eliot's poetical usages, two memorable Eliotic words are conspicuous by their absence. Neither the first nor the second Supplement thought *phthisic* (n. and a.) required revision. And (perhaps more surprisingly), as Burchfield notes, 'there is no record in [the Supplement] of Eliot's famous use of the word *etherised*... because this nineteenth century word was also covered by the OED, with illustrative examples beginning in 1800'.[25] Burchfield is, again, not quite correct about this, however. Eliot's immortal line employing *etherized* (with a 'z' in 1915/17) is, in fact, in Burchfield's Supplement, only not where one might expect to find it. It has a prominent place in the entry for *table* (n.), quoted as the first recorded use of sub-sense I.5.d: 'A surgeon's operating table....' In the same vein, 'A

[21] Indeed, *OED3* antedates *pre-Renaissance* by some 57 years (and has removed the Eliot quotation), and *poker game* by 75.

[22] A number of Eliot's seemingly 'opaque' compounds, such as *rain land* and *time-ridden*, have also been antedated in *OED3*'s revised entries.

[23] Reprinted in Burchfield, *Unlocking*, 83–108. It is fascinating that Burchfield could say, 'In practice the great majority [of combinations] that are admitted are in fact from literary sources' (Burchfield, *Unlocking*, 107, n.16), since this is not at all the case. Although it appears that, at least for the twentieth-century sources Burchfield was handling, literary works may be slightly over-represented in combinations as compared with main senses, periodicals and newspapers are by far the most common types of source. *The Times*, *Nature*, and *The Westminster Gazette* contribute the most twentieth-century quotations for combinations (none of the top ten sources are an individual author's corpus). See also Brewer, *Treasure House*, 180–4, for a fuller discussion of editorial policies regarding combinations.

[24] Eliot, *Prose*, I, 106.

[25] Burchfield, *Unlocking*, 75.

meagre, blue-nailed, phthisic hand', as it turns out, also appears in *OED2*, not s.v. *phthisic*, but s.v. *blue* (a.). One might conjecture that, having recorded these lines on slips intended for the extraordinary (but deemed unneeded) usage, they were still found useful by lexicographers working on other entries. At least in the case of *etherize*, however, the famous quotation would pass into the dictionary unnoticed by its Eliot-revering editor.

*A postscript*: in a March 2014 revision, *OED3* did update *etherize* with Eliot's line, just as an earlier (2006) revision had done for *phthisic*.

David-Antoine Williams
St Jerome's University in the University of Waterloo

doi:10.1093/notesj/gjw021

Advance Access publication 31 March, 2016

## A PORTRAIT OF JAMES JOYCE IN SAMUEL BECKETT'S *MURPHY*

In a recent article on *Echo's Bones* in the *New York Review of Books*, Fintan O'Toole offered a convincing account of Samuel Beckett's freeing himself from the influence of James Joyce.[1] I would like to suggest that two years after writing *Echo's Bones*, Beckett may, in *Murphy*, have deliberately finalized his independence from Joyce—even to having created in this novel a grotesque portrait of Joyce by concealing his identity behind one of his personages.[2]

*Murphy* of course is a very personal book for Beckett and he will refer to the Murphy character several times in his future novels. Passive, intellectual Murphy has Beckett's own character. Peggy Guggenheim called him 'Oblomov', referring to the eponymous hero of Goncharov's Russian classic. She writes: 'I made him [Beckett] read the book and of course he immediately saw the resemblance between himself and the strange inactive hero who finally did not even have the will power to get out of bed.'[3] Beckett even once signed a wire to her 'Oblomov'.[4] But in addition to the autobiographical likeness, the novel has another depiction of a living man, Beckett's literary idol with whom he had a close personal but not always amiable relationship.

Beckett gives not one description of the appearance of any of his characters: not Murphy's, not Celia's (only that she has 'yellow hair'), nor of any of the others, with the exception of one very detailed portrait, extending to the inner nature of the man, that of Dr Angus Killiecrankie. He is described as a '... large, bony, stooping, ruddy man, bluff but morose, with antiquary's cowl whiskers, mottled market-gardener's hands thickly overlaid with pink lanugo, and eyes red with straining from degenerative changes'.[5] Surely this is a portrait of Joyce. One need only compare this description with others. In Richard Ellmann's *James Joyce*, he is said to be a '... tall, thin, myopic, languid man', who wears '... large powerful spectacles, and a small gingerbread beard ...' and in '... his long face red as an Indian's in the reflexion [sic] of the fire, there is a look of cruelty.... Not that he is not gentle at times, for he can be kind ...,' and Joyce himself said: 'Paul Léon tells me that when I stand bent over at a street corner, I look like a question mark.'[6]

Apart from the name, Killiecrankie—to kill crank—and the 'antiquary's whiskers'—whiskers of a devotee of antiquity—there is a trace of some of Beckett's former irritation with the authoritarian character of Joyce. 'Dr. Killiecrankie ... had some experience of the schizoid voice.'[7] This is probably a little tactless, since Joyce's daughter, Lucia, was schizophrenic. But when he failed to reciprocate her feelings for him, Beckett drew Joyce's ire on himself, and Joyce 'informed him that he was no longer welcome. The interdict was to last for a year.'[8] In another reference, we find 'Dr. Angus Killiecrankie, the Outer Hebridean R.M.S., an eminescent [sic] home county authority and devout Mottist.'[9] 'Outer Hebridean' in all likelihood hints at Ireland's situation out beyond

[1] Fintan O'Toole, 'Samuel Beckett: The Private Voice' (2015, vol. 62, 34–6).
[2] References are keyed to Samuel Beckett, *Murphy* (New York, 1957).
[3] Peggy Guggenheim, *Out of this Century: Confessions of an Art Addict* (London, 1979), 167.
[4] *Ibid.*, 166.
[5] *Murphy*, 257–8.
[6] Richard Ellmann, *James Joyce* (Oxford, 1983), 137–8, 489, 492,; 645.
[7] *Murphy*, 185.
[8] Ellmann, *James Joyce*, 649.
[9] *Murphy*, 257.