XIII
Richard Dawes (1708–1766), Classical Scholar and Tynesider, Part Two

P. J. FitzPatrick

IV

I resume the account I offer of Richard Dawes (FitzPatrick 1999) by setting beside the *Tittle-Tattle-Mongers* his work of classical scholarship, the *Miscellanea Critica*. This was published at Cambridge in 1745, being seen through the press by two members of the University who were acquaintances of Dawes. It is not easy reading. Dawes writes in what I must call a congested Latin, and seems incapable of letting his readers have a wider view of any topic he discusses; they are given trees to look at rather than a wood. I add that Kidd's edition is even harder reading; Kidd does not distinguish adequately between Dawes's text and his own, and clogs the pages up with foot-notes about any and every subject. The edition of 1781 by Burgess (later Bishop of Salisbury) is far easier to read – it was reprinted in Germany by Gottlieb Harless in 1800. But Kidd (1827) does give Dawes's pagination in the margin, and all my references to the *Miscellanea* are by this.

Dawes's book is divided into five parts. The first examines Terentianus Maurus, a Latin writer on metre. The second offers a critique of the Oxford edition of Pindar (1697) made by West and Welstead. The third has a more miscellaneous content: the pronunciation of Greek and the rôle here of the accents; forms and moods of the verb (here occurs the *Canon Dawesianus*); and a critique of the metrical views in a recent edition of Callimachus. The fourth section gives the views of Dawes about the *Digamma*, a letter allegedly needing to be restored in editions of Homer. The final section, after discussing the relations between the 'ictus' or 'pulse' in Greek, and various meters used by poets, offers emendations of Aristophanes and of the Greek tragedians. In all five parts, Dawes is engaged in the difficult and delicate work demanded when we seek to elicit the linguistic and metrical rules followed by authors from the texts that have come down to us – texts that are often themselves only imperfectly preserved. Housman's words in 1922 express succinctly the difficulty:

> this state of affairs is apparently, nay evidently, paradoxical. The MSS are the material upon which we base our rule, and then, when we have got our rule, we turn round upon the MSS and say that the rule, based upon them, convicts them of error. We are thus working in a circle, that is a fact which there is no denying; but as Lachmann says, the task of the critic is just this, to tread that circle deftly and warily . . . (Housman 1972, 1966).

These five parts are preceded by a Preface, which begins by printing and criticising adversely the Greek that Dawes himself had used in 1736, when offering the specimen of a Greek version of Book 1 of *Paradise Lost* (FitzPatrick 1999, 145). The method is both amusing and informative – would that the rest of the book had been as cheerful. What has to be said is that the *Miscellanea Critica* exhibits a persistent and embarrassing animus against Bentley. Dawes seems unable to leave him alone: he suggests that Bentley's claim to have rediscovered a certain metrical rule for Latin verse is surprising, because the rule was given by Terentianus Maurus in a passage Bentley must have seen (Kidd 1827, 29-30). He allows Bentley the honour of detecting the need for the *Digamma* in Homer – but then quibbles as to just what the discovery was and suggests that

Bentley has misunderstood the matter (Kidd 1827, 110f.). He concedes that Bentley's accentual notation for Terence is virtually faultless – but goes on to claim that it is too laborious (Kidd 1827, 193). In disagreeing with an emendation of Callimachus by Bentley, he suggests that Homeric and other examples offered by him were simply obtained from indices and lexica, which are Bentley's 'oracles' in things to do with Greek (Kidd 1827, 107). And in the course of his observations on the use of the *Digamma*, he has to bring in a citation from a foot-note to Bentley's edition of *Paradise Lost* (Kidd 1827, 186).

Various explanations have been offered of the animosity. One, which apparently goes back to Dr. Parr, is that Emmanuel College was excessively Tory, and even a nest of Jacobites (Hodgson 1832, 152): the claim sounds odd and the reason seems inadequate. For Monk, Bentley's biographer, Dawes may have been spurred to emulation (and jealousy?) by remarks of Bentley when he published the specimen of his Greek version of the first book of *Paradise Lost* (Monk 1744, 368–69). But the version itself (it is printed by Kidd in his edition of the *Miscellanea*, Kidd 1827, 623–27) already has – as Monk points out – a note against Bentley: this attacks his hypothesis that the blind Milton had a stupid 'editor' who saw his work on the press, and claims that for Bentley to make the hypothesis is tantamount to a claim that he himself always knows what is best (Kidd 1827, 624). A third explanation, in Kidd's preface to his edition, states that Dawes's hatred of Bentley arose 'partly from taking sides in quarrels (*studio partium*) and partly from other causes' (Kidd 1827, ii*). The quarrels were real enough. If Bentley was the greatest critic Europe has produced, he was also the means by which time, money, lives and temper were wasted at Cambridge, in the interminable and futile litigation and controversy which seem to have been an obsession with him. All Cambridge would have been divided; Dawes must have been on the other side. It is significant (Giles records it) that one of the two scholars who saw Dawes's book through the press was Dr. Mason of Trinity, 'one of the Fellows most strongly opposed to Bentley'.

The 'other causes' of which Kidd writes are now as buried in the past as the causes of the quarrels of Dawes at Newcastle. That his carping at Bentley was seen as foolishness can, I think, be gathered from a statement by Jonathan Toup, whom we have already seen (FitzPatrick 1999, 146) referring to Dawes's youthful blunder in metre. Toup had written in 1777 to Bishop Warburton a letter in which he criticized Bentley, but he adds near the conclusion:

> If, in native out-spokeness and the heat of argument, I have said anything rash or ill-advised against our own Bentley, I herewith unsay it. He is the lasting glory of the country . . . . let only blockheads carp at him and only ill-will personified fail to praise him (Toup 1777, 182-83).

I use the translation given by Brink (Brink 1985, 94), to whom I owe knowledge of this passage. But I add that Toup's Latin (Brink prints it at his page 211) surely indicates that he has Dawes in mind, and that he had read the *Tittle-Tattle-Mongers*. 'Blockheads' here is *Fungus*; 'ill-will personified' is *Momus*; one thinks of Dr. Askew and of 'facetious Momion'. Toup spent much of his life in the south-west of England; Dawes's pamphlet must have reached him as far away as that. And if Toup saw the pamphlet, he would have noticed the carping even there. Thus, when denouncing the indifference of the Logopoiians to the sciences and the arts, Dawes offers an example of achievement in each (Dawes 1747, 9). For those engaged in the sciences ('philosophers') the choice is obvious – he offers Newton. For those engaged in the arts ('scholars'), Bentley was at hand as a fitting associate for Newton – both were supreme in their respective fields, both were Englishmen, both were deceased (Newton 1727; Bentley 1742), and both were linked with Dawes's own university. But he will not offer him – he chooses instead Scaliger (†1609).

I cannot offer any suggestion as to the first cause of all this. But, just as I suggested ways in which the enmities in Newcastle might have grown, so I now suggest a way in which Dawes's

dislike might have been fostered and protracted.

What strikes one most in Bentley's work is the breadth and apparent ease of it. He is asked by his friend for some corrections to a chronicle he was publishing – and he offers a series of dazzling emendations and reconstructions in his reply, the *Epistola ad Millium*. He controverts the genuiness of the letters of Phalaris – and invokes grammar, history, numismatics and inscriptions to exhibit his case. He undertakes the Boyle Lectures – and uses the methods of Newton in his claim that the order in the world calls for a Creator. He considers the project of a critical edition of the New Testament – and conducts a correspondence with monks in France about manuscripts. And along with all this there is the rectification of the metre in Terence, the editions of Horace and of Manilius, and so much else (as well as the litigation and controversy!). Not only was the man a giant in his discipline, he took essentially broad views of what it could achieve and displayed his immense learning and critical sagacity in generous and wide measure (see on all this Chapters 2 to 4 of Brink 1985).

Dawes's own cast of mind was different. He possessed, in Housman's words, 'a preternatural alertness and insight in the two fields of metre and grammar' (Housman 1972, 1005) – which we may complement with Brink's remark to the effect that, when Dawes wrote the *Miscellanea Critica*, those two fields were in good measure still to be formed (Brink 1985, 91). The work directs our attention to language, to the forms it takes, and to the discernment of what rules govern the various metres used by poets. All these call for minute examination of linguistic evidence, and here Dawes exhibited best the powers that were his. It is, for example, worth noting the emendations to Aristophanes in Part V of the *Miscellanea Critica*. Dawes made them independently and by conjecture, working on an edition of 1710 by Kuster. One of the plays is *The Frogs*, and for this a new edition by Sir Kenneth Dover appeared in 1993. Editing Aristophanes has changed a good deal since Dawes wrote; but of the thirteen emendations to the play he printed in *Miscellanea Critica*, seven match the text to be found in Dover.

But Dawes's work, of its nature, lacked the width and range of what Bentley had achieved, and I suggest that he may have been irritated and vexed by the fact that a critic with such a range was able, time and again, to engage in the kind of work he himself was doing, and to engage in it with so careless and elegant a success (one thinks of Bentley's recurrent claim that this or that work has been completed by him in a brief period of time – or sent to the printers with the ink still almost wet on its pages). It must all have seemed unfair to Dawes, whose labours were spent in circumscribed investigations of language and metre, with no thought of wider horizons. And I offer what looks like an example.

Readers will remember how Dr. Askew ('Fungus') mistook the phrase *festiva capita* in a passage of Dawes's preface to the *Miscellanea Critica* defending classical learning (FitzPatrick 1999, 147). What was on Dawes's mind when he wrote that was textual criticism, and it is worth noticing how the passage in the preface continues:

> Since our own work, such as it is, has to do above all with emendations, and since I find that certain learned men set down the art of the emender, and set it below the principal place it ought to have in criticism, I shall undertake the defence of its honour and of its place there. Those learned men want the chief place in the field of criticism to belong to the art of discerning supposititious from genuine writings' (Dawes 1745, xiv).

And Dawes continues his complaint by claiming that nothing more is required for this discernment than what is wanted for the art of emendation. The 'learned men' must surely be Bentley himself, who had accumulated massive learning to exhibit the non-genuineness of the 'letters of Phalaris'; and who in his edition of Manilius had expelled verses as not being by the poet himself. Besides, what I translate from Dawes as 'the field of criticism' is '*critica palaestra*' – surely an echo of Bentley's '*critices palaestra*' in the preface to his edition of Horace. What interests me is not the justice of Dawes's claim but his refusal to include in the summit

of criticism anything more than the kind of work he himself was doing. As I said, this gap between the two men need not have been the first cause of the grudging and carping attitude shown in other works as well as in the *Miscellanea Critica*; but it might explain why the attitude lasted as it did and why it was so pervasive.

But we can go further. If, after looking at the *Miscellanea Critica*, we return to the *Tittle-Tattle-Mongers*, can we not detect there too an incapacity for taking a larger view of what is at stake – might we not call it a lack of negative capability? I have given what I take to be the outline of that pamphlet, but one's reading of it is continually distracted by learned interjections that have nothing whatever to do with the points Dawes is trying to make. Thus, having introduced the name for Newcastle 'Nesowanassa' (FitzPatrick 1999, 147), he adds that it is sometimes pronounced with less accuracy 'Nesoanassa' – the point of course being that the 'Aeolic Digamma' needs putting in. (Ominously, he was when at Cambridge already sometimes called 'Aeolic Digamma Dawes', Hodgson 1832, 147 – he must have 'gone on' about it). He gives and mocks at a phrase of Akenside 'the blushing diffidence of youth' (*The Pleasures of Imagination*, Part III line 205), and claims to find a resemblance here to a line of a play preserved in a dialogue by Lucian. But having made the claim, he then spends three and a half pages (22–25) rebuking the editor of a recent edition of Lucian for incompetence. I have traced the edition (Murphy 1744); but I can see no link whatever between Murphy and Akenside, and I doubt whether Dawes could. I notice that, in the advertisement for *Tittle-Tattle-Mongers* that appeared in the *Newcastle Courant*, beginning in April 1746, the second extract is described as 'the blushing Diffidence of a certain Poet illustrated. The true Reading of Meaning of an Iambic Verse, preserved by Lucian'. By the middle of May of the same year, the advertisement adds 'some Instances of the late Editor's Inaccuracy'. I suppose Dawes had come across Murphy's book in the interval, and decided to put in his own thoughts about it. If Dawes could not leave Bentley alone, he found it just as difficult to leave anything else alone.

V

We have no scholarly publication of Dawes from the years spent at Heworth, only (if it be his) a squib from late in his life at the throaty 'r' associated with the pronunciation of English in Newcastle. No first edition of this pamphlet seems to have survived; the second was published in London a year after Dawes's death. Richardson, whose reprint of this edition appeared in 1844, says that it was taken from a copy in which a note by a Mr. Buddle, a contemporary of Dawes, identifies him as the author. This Buddle might be the village schoolmaster from County Durham who was the father of John Buddle (1773–1843), the Tyneside colliery engineer. The poem itself is of little merit. Two couplets may throw light on Dawes's opinions:

> 'Priests' logic then was, burn and kill;
> They must convince, if nothing will'

and

> 'Priests' only logic to convince
> Is fasting, prayer, and abstinence'.[1]

But we have a letter from Dawes of 1744 (printed by Kidd in his edition: Kidd 1827, 629f.) which suggests that his plans for writing went beyond what appeared in 1745 in the *Miscellanea Critica*. Dawes wrote on a classical topic to John Taylor (1704–1766; known as 'Demosthenes Taylor' from an edition of parts of the orator he produced from 1741). The volume he intends to publish, Dawes writes, will be called *Emendationes in poetas graecos* ('Greek poets emended') and will cover Aristophanes, the tragedians, and others; it will deal with accents, metre, and the letter to be inserted into Homer. So far, what Dawes mentions can be found in the *Miscellanea Critica*. But he adds another topic that is not there to the same extent – comments on the emendations made by Bentley to Philemon and Menander. He adds that he has a large stock of emendations – 'upon Aristophanes in particular about 1500

[*sic*]' (Kidd 1827, 636). What happened to all this? Moreover, when Dawes made his will in 1761, leaving everything to his sister and nephew, he mentioned 'a large collection of books' (J. C. Hodgson 1918, 97). What happened to them?

Burgess, whose edition of the *Miscellanea Critica* I praised earlier, writes in his Preface that Dawes's MSS were bought by Anthony Askew – who is, of course, the 'promiser of Aeschylus' we met when examining the *Tittle-Tattle-Mongers* (FitzPatrick 1999, 149). Askew by then had become a well known and respected bibliophile (in 1775, Toup dedicated another of his works on 'Suidas' to him). But Dawes's doubts about his critical abilities were confirmed by what followed. His 'specimen' of the edition of Aechylus has appeared in 1746, one year before Dawes's pamphlet. It gave twenty-nine lines of the *Eumenides* with a Latin translation *en regard*, followed by three pages of readings and commentary by Askew himself, with a final page on which subscriptions are invited, no money to be paid as yet, for the three-volume edition – which, of course, never appeared. Kidd (1827, 156) cites the doubts expressed by scholars other than Dawes as to Askew's competence, but then makes the much graver charge that Askew passed off the conjectures of other scholars as his own in his own MS marginal notes to classical texts (Kidd 1827, 287, 606). The same verdict is reached by C. J. Blomfield (†1857; a Cambridge critic who became Bishop of Chester in 1824 and eventually Bishop of London). In the preface to his edition of the *Prometheus Vinctus* of Aeschylus, Blomfield (1810) says that a collation of MSS apparently made by Askew was in fact no more than a transcription of work done by the scholar Peter Needham (†1731). The dubious reputation of Askew is confirmed by a note in his defence from J. Johnstone, the editor of Dr. Parr's works. Parr, we saw, records the story of Askew's first encounter with Dawes (FitzPatrick 1999, 146). Johnstone adds a note

> with concern I have lately observed a disposition of the critics and editors of this country to depreciate the merits of Dr. Askew . . . . ' (Parr 1828, 593–94).

But the note does not controvert any of the charges.

Did Askew buy Dawes's MSS? Burgess's claim uses, for what I translate as 'MSS', the Latin '*librariam supellectilem*' and J. C. Hodgson records a statement to the same effect made to John Hodgson: that the books were valuable because of the MS notes in them (J. C. Hodgson 1918, 97). But those claims about Askew are rendered somewhat doubtful by the catalogues for the sale of his vast accumulations in 1775 and 1785. The 'precious books' were sold first (Askew 1775); no book by or belonging to Dawes is mentioned. Ten years later, the MS collection was sold (the catalogue, Askew 1785, apologizes for the delay but gives no explanation; states only that nothing has been added or removed). The 'MSS' are largely printed editions of classical authors with the marginal annotations of scholars. Once more, there is no mention of Dawes – except for the copy of the *Miscellanea Critica* he had given to 'Demosthenes' Taylor (above, p. 208). When Kidd made his edition of the *Miscellanea Critica* in 1827, he recorded his ignorance of where Dawes's MSS were (Kidd 1827, v*). And when Hodgson was writing his memoir of Dawes in the 1820s, he wrote to Askew's son Adam asking if any material had survived. The reply was that none did – not even a copy of the *Tittle-Tattle-Mongers* (J. C. Hodgson 1918, 98). Giles expresses the belief that Dawes's emendations to Menander (above, p. 208) were acquired by Askew, but adds that their whereabouts is now unknown (Giles 1894, 69).

It is, I suppose, possible that Askew destroyed what he had bought; but there is evidence that not all that Dawes had written passed into his hands. Burgess acknowledges in his preface a debt to Dr. Farmer, then Master of Emmanuel College, thanking him for the loan of a MS of Dawes. Burgess's edition of the *Miscellaneous Critica* appeared in 1781; so something was in Emmanuel College then. The other piece of evidence comes from Hodgson himself, and I offer it for what it is worth, recalling how we saw that 'MSS' could here mean 'printed books with annotations'. He writes in his memoir that about fifty years ago

(that would be in the 1770s) there was a sale of books at the house of a Mrs. Jackson, who lived in Matterdale above Measand Beck (this lies to the west of Haweswater in the Lake District) and that two or three sacks of Greek and Latin books were bought by the Rev. John Bowstead, Master of Bampton School (and Hodgson's old headmaster). 'I think he used to say that they had belonged to a great scholar by the name of Dawes, who had resided near Newcastle upon Tyne, and was in some way related to Mr. Jackson. I well remember some of the books being much benoted with critical remarks' (Hodgson 1832, 139). Hodgson offers there a genealogical table that would link this woman with Dawes; I do not pretend to adjust all this with the terms of Dawes's will, but the story is sufficiently circumstantial to bear recording. I wonder whether any of them has survived.[2]

VI

So Dawes was buried, his books and manuscripts were apparently scattered, and we learn from J. C. Hodgson that the *Newcastle Courant*, recording his death in its issue of 29 March 1766, described him as a former Fellow of Peterhouse. He was to be given in 1825 another monument, through the good offices of the Vicar of Heworth, John Hodgson, to whose memoir of Dawes I have made frequent reference. Hodgson (1779–1845, the memoir in Raine 1857 gives details) was a remarkable man. Largely self-taught, he was eventually ordained and became Vicar of Heworth and Jarrow in 1808. He organised relief for the bereaved after the mine-disaster of 1812; gave information to Davy about 'fire-damp', which Davy acknowledged in his memoir in 1815 on the safety-lamp; became a respected antiquary; and designed the new church at Heworth. Dawes's tomb was preserved by him, and he placed by it a slab of 'bazalt', still to be seen, with a brass plate bearing the words

THE BVRIAL PLACE OF RICHARD DAWES,
M.A.
AVTHOR OF THE CELEBRATED WORK
INTITVLED
MISCELLANEA CRITICA
LET NO MAN MOVE HIS BONES

He also secured subscriptions, not only for the slab, but for a monument in the church itself – where it may still be seen, to the north side of the chancel arch. The inscription was the work of the Rev. J. V. Tate, Headmaster of Richmond Grammar School, and was erected in 1825: I give it, with a translation, in a footnote.[3]

Perhaps some readers will recall the ominous character of that year, as described by Housman in 1903 in the Preface to his edition of Manilius:

> 1825, when our own great age of scholarship, begun in 1691 by Bentley's Epistola ad Millium, was ended by the successive strokes of doom which consigned Dobree and Elmsley to the grave and Blomfield to the bishopric of Chester' (Housman 1903, xii).

Housman had in mind here the shift in preoccupations concerning the study of Latin and Greek. The kind of work associated with scholars like Bentley and Dawes gave way, in great measure, to a concern for the training of schoolboys and undergraduates in the languages and above all in the art of 'composition' – the making of Greek and Latin prose and verse. Brink (1985) gives an interesting account of the shift in the seventh chapter, linking it with the changes in University life that were then taking place. I would supplement what he writes with two examples. The first is Arthur Stanley (reputedly the model of 'Arthur' in *Tom Brown's Schooldays*). He secured in 1837 the Ireland award for composition and translation: his biographer (who notes Stanley's relief at never having to work at either again) describes it as 'the highest distinction offered by the University for proficience in Greek and Latin scholarship' (Prothero 1893, 170). The second is the Tractarian movement, associated with Newman and others. For all the frenetic activity exhibited by these men in the cause of what they took to be religion, not one of them to my knowledge thought himself even for one

moment obliged – whether by his office or simply by the salary he drew – to pursue scholarship in any way that could be compared with what men like Bentley and Dawes practised.

It is then pleasing to see that Dawes's monument can in its own way stand as a sign of the change that was taking place. It can so stand if we examine the list of subscribers (printed in Hodgson 1832, 165). The list is headed by the Bishop of Salisbury, with a generous donation of ten guineas. This is Burgess, whose edition of the *Miscellanea Critica* has been mentioned more than once. Emmanuel College gave five guineas and Kidd, whose edition of Dawes's work I have cited a good deal, gave two. I have already complained of his edition of the *Miscellanea Critica*; the disorderliness of his mind appears as well in what he writes there (iv-v) of the tomb and the monument. He describes the figure of an angel blowing a trumpet as if this were a solid figure, placed on the grave – it is, as I said, in *basso rilievo* on the tombstone itself (FitzPatrick 1999, 152). He writes that the inscription on the brass plate has 'with an air of antiquity' "*Let no man moove his bones*"– it has, of course, 'move'. He says that the inscription in the church is also on brass – it is on marble. He prints the inscription with one of the lines conspicuously smaller than the rest – they are in fact all of the same size. He obviously never set eyes on either memorial. After Kidd comes a series of names of donors of one guinea each. A few can be counted as belonging to the older order; the rest are part of what was to be the newer. Peter Paul Dobree and Samuel Parr both died in this year. Dobree (1782–1825), a pupil of Porson and editor of his remains, occupied the Regius Chair of Greek at Cambridge for only two years before his early death. His loss is lamented by Kidd (1827, xxxvii*); Brink (1985, 112–13) gives an account of him. Parr (1747–1825) was noted as an epigraphist among many other things, and composed the inscription for Johnson's monument in St. Paul's. Edward Maltby (1770–1859) was a pupil of Parr and eventually Bishop of Durham – I have been glad to use his library while writing this essay. At Porson's request, he undertook an extensive revision of a 'prosodic lexicon' – a lexicon giving the values of syllables in Greek verse – and wrote a lengthy preface to it on Greek metre. Dobree, Burgess and Kidd must be, Maltby can be, and at a pinch Parr might be counted as belonging to the older order; the others undoubtedly belong to the new. 'Professor Musgrave' on the list is Thomas Musgrave (1788–1868) who at Oxford was Laudian Professor of Arabic (a language with which he was said to be imperfectly acquainted). He became eventually Archbishop of York, but published nothing. Samuel Butler (1774–1839) was Headmaster of Shrewsbury, which was famous under his guidance for the excellence of its pupils' 'composition'. He was entrusted by Cambridge, but with little success, with an edition of Aeschylus. Three other Headmasters can follow in our list – George Butler of Harrow, James Tate of Richmond, and Edward Moises, who had succeeded his uncle Hugh in Dawes's position. Then comes Henry Drury, who was a master at Harrow for years, and a bibliophile; and the last two subscribers to be mentioned are James Raine, the biographer of Hodgson, and Jonathan Raine, presumably a kinsman of James.

If the list of subscribers can be taken as a symbol of change, so can – not unfairly, I hope – an incidental remark made by Hodgson himself in his memoir of Dawes. In his complaint at the style of the *Miscellanea*, he writes:

> The true intent of critical books is to give facility to students in obtaining a knowledge of the subjects they treat upon (Hodgson 1832, 150).

The contrast between older and newer orders could scarcely have been more succinctly put.

But if Hodgson's estimate of Dawes as a scholar is defective, his verdict on him as a human being in the memoir he wrote is both shrewd and kindly, and his procuring the monument was the act of a generous man. We know in fact that Dawes, apart from the moods of silence and depression we have already noticed, suffered much physical pain towards the end of his life (the Latin of Kidd (1827, vi*) is flowery rather than precise; from Brand (1789, I, 97), it seems he had bladder trouble). He must have felt isolated in Newcastle, not

only by the quarrels in which he engaged, but by the lack of anyone with whom he could share his scholarly concerns. Kidd prints a letter of 1744 from Dawes to 'Demosthenes' Taylor (see above p. 208). The letter, in English is conspicuous for the ease and vigour with which is written and for its lack of grudges towards Bentley (Kidd 1827, 629–37). Taylor was a friend of Dawes, and Dawes must have welcomed the chance to write to someone who could share his interests; his solitude in the north-east surely contributed to his oddity. After reading the *Tittle-Tattle-Mongers*, we are struck by the gentle tone in which Dawes writes of the citizens of Newcastle; 'I am afraid, that the only subscription for your Demosthenes, which I shall be able to send you, will be my own. The good people in this part are not very fond of Greek'. But he had made some friends at Heworth Shore and it was by his own desire that he was buried in the church-yard there (Kidd 1827, iv*). In his days at Cambridge, his penetration and shrewdness had gone with a preference for a way of life that did not accord with what was then expected of a Fellow, and he found Newcastle society just as uncongenial. We have words for such things, the eighteenth century had not, and Dawes was born for exile. Let words Hodgson wrote of him, cited in J. C. Hodgson (1918, 96), sum the matter up:

> . . . I have thought it probable that he loved to live in a lower and easier walk of life than that of a graduate from Cambridge, from some natural prejudice against polished society, and a dislike to encounter the labour of dress and neatness which characterize the deportment of well-bred men.

Earth, lie lightly upon him.

NOTES

[1] I can now say that there does exist in Newcastle a copy of the second edition of this pamphlet in its original 1767 printing; it is in the Robinson Library of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne (Clarke Special Collection). I owe this discovery to the kindness and perspicacity of Roger Fern, whom I gratefully thank.

[2] I thought that Dawes might have left *marginalia* in books belonging the library of the Grammar School at Newcastle. I examined what books survive from his days at the Royal Grammar School, but there was nothing to be seen. I thank the Headmaster and the Librarian for their courtesy in the matter.

[3] In coemeterio huius ecclesiae sepultus iacet/ Ricardus Dawes A.M./Coll. Emman. apud Cantabrigienses olim socius/ludoque literario et gerontocomio apud Novocastrenses/annos x praefectus/ acerrimo vir ingenio/et sermonis attici vindex peritissimus/cui miscellanea critica uno libro edita/aeternum honorem apud grammaticos pepererunt/Natus est AC MDCCVIII decessit MDCCLXVI.

(In the cemetery of this church lies buried Richard Dawes M.A., sometime fellow of Emmanuel College Cambridge, and for ten years Master of the Grammar School and Hospital at Newcastle. A man of a most keen mind and a most skilful champion of the Attic tongue. His *Miscellanea Critica*, published in one volume, have won for him everlasting honour among critics. He was born in the year of Christ 1708 and died in 1766).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: The Bibliography includes the sources for both parts of this article.

AKENSIDE, M. (1744) *Dissertatio medica inauguralis de ortu et incremento foetus humani quam submittit Marcus Akinside* [sic] *Anglus.* Lugduni Batavorum: Potvliet.

AKENSIDE, M. (1772) *The Poems of Mark Akenside M.D.* London: W. Bowyer.

ASKEW, A. (1746) *Novae editionis tragoediarum Aeschyli specimen curante Antonio Askew, M.B. Coll. Emman. apud Cantabrigienses haut ita pridem socio commensali.* Lugduni Batavorum.

ASKEW, A. (1775) *Bibliotheca Askeviana, sive catalogus librorum rarissimorum.* London: Baker and Leigh.

ASKEW, A. (1785) *Bibliotheca Askeviana manuscripta . . . his adduntur. . . auctores classici* [with annotations thereon by scholars]. London: Leigh and Sotheby.

BLOMFIELD, C. J. (1810) *Prometheus Vinctus. . . emendavit Carolus Jacobus Blomfield.* Cantabrigiae: J. Smith.

BRAND, J. (1789) *The History and Antiquities of Newcastle upon Tyne.* 2 vols., London: B. White. Vol. 1.

BRINK, C. O. (1985) *English Classical Scholarship.* Cambridge: James Clarke.

BURGESS, T. (1800) *Ricardi Dawes Miscellanea Critica. . . curavit. . . Thomas Burgess.* Tertium edidit Gottlieb Christopher Harless. Lipsiae. Sumptibus Crusii.

DAVY, H. (1815) "On the fire-damp of coal mines. . .". Read November 9th 1815. In *Abstracts of the papers. . . Royal Society of London.* London: Richard Taylor. Vol. 2.

DAWES, R. (1745) *Miscellanea Critica. . .* Cantabrigiae: Typis academicis excudit J. Bentham.

DAWES, R. (1747) *Extracts from a MS pamphlet entitled Tittle-Tattle-Mongers.* Number 1. Newcastle upon Tyne.

DAWES, R. (1827) *Proposals for Printing by Subscription Paradisi amissi a cl. Miltono conscripti liber primus, graeca versione donatus. . .* In Kidd 1827, 623–28.

DAWES, R. (1844) *The Origin of the Newcastle Burr.* 2nd. ed.. W. Nicoll: London. 1767. Reprinted by M.A. Richardson. Newcastle upon Tyne.

DAWES, R. *see also* Burgess 1800; Kidd 1827.

DOVER, K. J. (1993) *Aristophanes' Frogs.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

FITZPATRICK, P. J. (1999) "Richard Dawes (1708–1776), classical scholar and Tynesider, part 1", *AA*[5], 27, 145–54.

GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE (1966), *The Gentleman's Magazine: 1731–51. The Lists of Books Considered with Annual Indexes.* Gregg Press.

GILES, P. (1894) Richard Dawes. *Extracts from the Emmanuel College Magazine.* Vol. V, No 2., 49–69.

HODGSON, J. (1832) *"An account of the life and writings of Richard Dawes"* (Newcastle upon Tyne: T. and J. Hodgson 1828). Reprinted in *AA*[1], 2, 137–66.

HODGSON, J. C. (1918) "Some unpublished letters of Richard Dawes", *AA*[3], 15, 80–99.

HOUSMAN, A. E. (1903) *M. Manilii Astronomicon.* Liber Primus. London: Grant Richards.

HOUSMAN, A. E. (1972) *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman.* Cambridge: University Press. Vol. 3.

KIDD, T. (1827) *Ricardi Dawesii Miscellanea Critica. . . ex recensione Thomae Kidd . . .* London: J and J.J. Deighton.

KIPPIS, A. (1793) *Biographia Britannica. . .* 2nd ed., vol 5. John Nichols.

MALTBY, E. (1815) *Lexicon graeco-prosodicum. . .* Cantabrigiae. Typis academicis excussit Joannes Smith.

MONK, J. H. (1744) *The Life of Richard Bentley, D.D.* 2nd. ed. London: Rivington.

MURPHY, E. (1744) *The Select Dialogues of Lucian.* London: Robert Brown (for the author).

OXBERRY, J. (1927) "A memoir of John George Hodgson", *AA*[4], 4, 83–89.

PARR, E. (1828) *The Works of Samuel Parr, LL.D., with a Selection of his Correspondence.* 8 vols. Ed. by J. Johnstone M.D. London. Vol. 7.

PROTHERO, R. E. (1893) *The Life and Correspondence of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D.* 2 vols. London: John Murray. 1893. Vol. 1.

RAINE, J. (1857) *A Memoir of the Rev. John Hodgson.* London: Longmans.

SURTEES, R. (1820) *History of the Antiquities of the County Palatine of Durham.* London: J. Nichols and Son. Vol. 2.

TOUP, J. (1775) *Curae novissimae in Suidam.* London: J. Nourse.

TOUP, J. (1777) *Epistola critica ad . . Gulielmum episcopum Gloucestriensium.* London: J. Nourse.

TOUP, J. (1790) *Emendationes in Suidam et Hesychium.* 4 vols. Oxonii: typographia Clarendoniana.

WARBURTON, W. (1766) *The Divine Legation of Moses Demonstrated.* 5th ed., 5 vols. London: A. Millar.

WELFORD, R. (1895) *Men of Mark twixt Tyne and Tweed.* 3 vols. London and Newcastle: Walter Scott Ltd. Vol. 1.