

CHAPTER 7

Achievement at Carchemish

June – December 1913

LAWRENCE left Jerablus at the end of June and arrived in England a fortnight later. The visit was to be a very short one, and he took with him Hamoudi and Dahoum, the villagers who had looked after him during his illness two years before. They lived in his garden bungalow at Polstead Road and created a good deal of amusement by cycling round Oxford in their Arab clothes. Hamoudi spent part of the time with Woolley, and Dahoum made himself useful unpacking materials at the Ashmolean. Bell arranged for Dahoum to be sketched by Francis Dodd, and Lawrence was present during the session. This was probably the first time Lawrence had seen anyone sit to a professional artist, and it left him with a lifelong fascination for portraiture. He wrote to Bell with immense gratitude: 'Dodd turned up smiling in the morning and got to work like a steam engine:— black and white, with little faint lines of colour running up and down in it. Number 1 was finished by midday, and was splendid: Dahoum sitting down, with his most-interested-possible expression... he thought it great sport – said he never knew he was so good-looking – and I think he was about right. He had dropped his sulkiness for a patch.

'No 2 was almost a failure. Dodd gave it up half-finished.

'No 3. standing, was glorious. My brother came to the door with some people, and Dahoum, just at the critical moment looked round a little bit annoyed, to see what the dickens the matter was. Dodd got him on the instant, and promptly stopped work in the funk of hurting it. It is an absolute inspiration: no colour, 'cause it was perfect as it was, unfinished.'¹

By August 25th Lawrence was back in Aleppo, having travelled overland with Hamoudi and Dahoum to Italy and then by boat to Alexandria. A few days later he reported to his family from Carchemish: 'The Hoja and Dahoum entertain large houses nightly with tales of snakes as long as houses, underground railways, elephants, flying-machines, and cold in July. I have not yet had the chance of hearing anything ludicrous.'²

Before the fifth season began Lawrence had time to visit several villages where local people had reported finding antiquities. The trip was disappointing. At Hammam, the presence of a government tax official made it impossible to excavate some Hittite graves, and then: 'I saw one rather melancholy thing on my trip down the river. The Arabs of Kala'at en Nejm, a very large and splendid Arab mediaeval castle on the Euphrates, had dug out a pit in the old fourteenth century town'.³ They had found 'great masses of glazed pottery, with Arab inscriptions in green-gold on white, and about forty jugs and cups, and lamps in glass, with applied ornaments in red, blue and green... fishes, snakes, birds, and conventional flowers: some they said, inscribed. Unfortunately, they had hopes that there was gold at the bottom of the pit, and had smashed to atoms all the glass and pottery. One could pick up all over their dumps

little scraps of mosaic glass with fish and birds, but no hope remained of patching anything together. The stuff was too hopelessly scattered.

'The work was done about a month ago. I think it was jolly hard luck that I didn't happen to be there at the moment. I was in Kala'at en Nejm two months ago, and two days ago... and this happened in between. A little of that mosaic glass would have gone down very well, with my penury!'⁴ He wrote home: 'Each of these glass vessels would have been worth from £500 to £1,000 if brought complete to Europe. If I had gone to Kala'at en Nejm two weeks earlier we would have all been very well off for a little time! I don't suppose such another store house of Arab glass has ever been discovered in history.'⁵

In mid-September, before Woolley arrived for the beginning of this fifth season, Lawrence went down to Aleppo to meet his younger brother Will who had now graduated from Oxford and was on his way to a teaching post in India. Will spent several days at Jerablus and was feasted by the Kurdish chief Busrawi. He much enjoyed his visit to Carchemish and referred to Lawrence as his 'Bedawi brother',⁶ and 'a great lord in this place.'⁷ After leaving he wrote reassuringly to his parents: 'You must not think of Ned as leading an uncivilised existence. When I saw him last as the train left the station he was wearing white flannels, socks and red slippers, with a white Magdalen blazer, and was talking to the Governor of Biredjik in a lordly fashion.'⁸

There were other visitors at this time, including Hubert Young, a lieutenant in the Indian Army who stayed on a few days after Will had left. Since the dig was still closed, Lawrence had to devise ways of passing the time. Young recalled going out on the Euphrates in the canoe, competing with Lawrence at target shooting, and carving gargoyles.⁹ Lawrence wrote to C. F. Bell on October 1st: 'Carchemish has been dreadful of late. I got intermittent fever, and to console me a huge number of visitors turned up. In the East one has quite a lot of work to keep them fed and amused... I couldn't burke the feeding, but I gave each a lump of soft limestone and set them in competition to carve gargoyles for the roof... it really is a tip worth trying, since it kept them hard at work for three days.'¹⁰ The carvings were made between September 25th and 28th, and were also referred to in a letter from Lawrence to Will: 'I persuaded Young . . . to spend his spare time carving gargoyles for the better adornment of the house. He managed in limestone an ideal head of a woman; I did a squatting demon of the Notre-Dame style, also in limestone, and we have now built them into the walls and roof, and the house is become remarkable in north Syria. The local people come up in crowds to look at them.'¹¹

p. 127

The model for Lawrence's own carving was Dahoum and when Woolley arrived a few days later he was shocked by it. Writing to Hogarth about the house (which had just been enlarged) he said: 'Lawrence spent his holidays carving improper gargoyles for it, faintly reminiscent of Dahoum, so it is in every sense of the word monstrous.'¹²

Woolley seems to have jumped to the conclusion that Lawrence had carved the figure while living alone with Dahoum. Many years later, when writing an essay for *T. E. Lawrence by his Friends*, Woolley gave an account of the carvings which is incorrect, and salacious in its insinuation: 'Dahoum . . . was then a boy of about fifteen, not particularly intelligent (though Lawrence taught him to take photographs quite well) but

beautifully built and remarkably handsome. Lawrence was devoted to him. The Arabs were tolerantly scandalised by the friendship, especially when in 1913 Lawrence, stopping in the house after the dig was over, had Dahoum to live with him and got him to pose as model for a queer crouching figure which he carved in the soft local limestone and set up on the edge of the house roof; to make an image was bad enough in its way, but to portray a naked figure was proof to them of evil of another sort. The scandal about Lawrence was widely spread and firmly believed.¹¹³

This account is factually misleading: it is clear from the contemporary documents that Lawrence spent almost no time on his own at the Carchemish house, either in June or September 1913, since there was a stream of visitors. Even without visitors, he would not have been alone there since Haj Wahid and his family lived in the house permanently. Moreover, we know that the figure was carved when Young and other visitors were present in September, not in June as Woolley states. Finally, the 'queer crouching figure' was intended to look like a gargoyle.

From photographs published in 1997 we know that it was a kneeling figure about 70 cm high, showing the upper half of the body emerging from a block of stone.^{113A} Below the waist, the sides of the figure were carved in relief on the sides of the block. The front was not carved. It would not have been necessary for Dahoum to pose in the nude. Given that other people were present that seems very unlikely, although this is what Woolley implies. Woolley evidently did not know the truth about the carvings.

This passage in Woolley's essay is followed, somewhat incongruously, by a statement that in his opinion Lawrence was not homosexual: 'The charge was quite unfounded. Lawrence had in his make-up a very strong vein of sentiment, but he was in no sense a pervert; in fact, he had a remarkably clean mind. He was tolerant, thanks to his classical reading, and Greek homosexuality interested him, but in a detached way, and the interest was not morbid but perfectly serious; I never heard him make a smutty remark and am sure that he would have objected to one if it had been made for his benefit; but he would describe Arab abnormalities baldly and with a certain sardonic humour. He knew quite well what the Arabs said about himself and Dahoum, and so far from resenting it was amused, and I think that he courted misunderstanding rather than tried to avoid it; it appealed to his sense of humour, which was broad and school-boyish. He liked to shock.'¹⁴ Lawrence's letters from this period bear out this opinion entirely, and it is legitimate to ask why Woolley should have included the allegations in his essay. Gossip of this kind is common enough but would not normally appear in a serious memoir, especially when it was known to be unjustified. Woolley must have realised that this disingenuous combination of allegation and 'loyal disclaimer' would cause many readers to believe the worst.

The confident manner in which Woolley published his libellously inaccurate account of the carving episode must raise doubts about his other testimony regarding Lawrence. This is a matter of some importance since Woolley is the only qualified person to have written about Lawrence's work as an archaeologist at Carchemish on the basis of personal knowledge. Woolley's essay in *Friends*, though interesting, has a slightly hostile ring throughout; it gives the strong impression that Lawrence was dilettante in his attitude towards archaeology.

A great many documents concerning the Carchemish excavations have survived and from these it is possible to form an independent view of Lawrence's contribution to the dig. When Woolley's essay in *Friends* is compared with these contemporary sources it becomes clear that he was biased. For whatever reason, the essay deliberately slights Lawrence: it passes lightly over the very large amount of work he did at Carchemish, where he shared the daily tasks almost equally with Woolley; it states that Woolley rather than Lawrence took field notes, without mentioning that it was Lawrence who maintained the detailed catalogues of pottery and sculpture finds; it gives no credit to Lawrence for his extensive buying of *antikas* on behalf of the Ashmolean and the British Museums, though this was an important activity in which Lawrence was evidently much more able than Woolley. While Lawrence is credited with an ability to recognise different fragments of a sculpture or inscription, the essay does not indicate the special value of this ability at Carchemish, where very many of the monuments and inscriptions had been smashed and dispersed when the city was destroyed.¹⁵

Distorted testimony is a problem faced by all historians, and it is particularly common in statements about Lawrence. When a witness is found to display bias one does not usually have to look very far to find a motive. Woolley may have been influenced by several factors. First, he was an inveterate raconteur who thought nothing of improving his yarns. In Lawrence's words, he was 'a curious person . . . he tells the wildest stories as a habit'.¹⁶ A memoir by E. T. Leeds points to other difficulties as well: 'Woolley . . . was a source of mirth and lent himself to some delightful descriptions [in Lawrence's letters to Leeds and Hogarth]. These caused great enjoyment to the Ashmolean. We all knew our Woolley. Kindly, earnest, extremely hard-working, but one of the ablest drawers of the long bow it has ever been my fortune to meet. Imbued with a passionate belief in his own connoisseurship, resulting in more than one disastrous break in his purchases, he could with difficulty see that tactful disagreement with his diagnoses and downright condemnation were synonymous among friends. If Woolley had only avoided encroachment into the deeper recesses of historical and archaeological research, his fame in the future would be greater even than that he has deservedly won as the best of contemporary excavators abroad. A desire to transform geese into swans has always been his serious failing.'¹⁷ Lawrence later made a similar criticism when discouraging a publisher from asking Woolley to edit Herodotus: 'A good fellow, witty, sociable, experienced; an admirable digger, who from two broken bricks will deduce a palace. Only your Herodotus would be too complete under Woolley's hands: the next generation would find it out. That would be a pity. Notes should be accurate, if possible.'¹⁸ Woolley's monthly reports from Carchemish were studded with superlatives: finds were often described as 'the most important', 'the finest', 'the largest'. It is clear from Kenyon's Carchemish papers that these judgments were not always shared by Hogarth, and that Hogarth discussed the finds independently with Lawrence. Woolley read through these files in the 1920s when he was writing the second volume of the Carchemish report. He must have discovered and bitterly resented the implied criticisms.

There was also some coolness, after the war, on Lawrence's side. In 1920 Woolley published an entertaining account of events at Carchemish

in his book *Dead Towns and Living Men*. Lawrence made no secret of his dislike of the book, saying it was 'very untruthful, which is not a deadly sin: but a very vulgar book too. Carchemish was a miracle, and he turns it into a play.'¹⁹ Woolley almost certainly heard about Lawrence's reaction and cannot have been pleased to have his work condemned by a colleague who had since become so famous.

The tone of Lawrence's post-war remarks and of Woolley's essay in *Friends* has led many people to conclude that they had never got on together; but contemporary records show that they worked alongside one another very happily at Carchemish, and that Lawrence enjoyed Woolley's company. There is no note of personal hostility in the surviving documents prior to 1920, and the occasional disagreements caused by Lawrence's excessive loyalty to the Ashmolean were successfully smoothed over by Hogarth.

The brief season of autumn 1913 was extraordinarily fruitful; there were important finds even before the digging began. Lawrence wrote: 'We . . . had to cut away a little earth to bank up our railway line, and found out a new line of sculptures in basalt, running in two directions. We have come upon the point of the right angle of the corner, about six inches away from the end of our work last spring! It will make our season a burning success if we find nothing else'.²⁰ As before, Woolley divided his labour force into two. One group worked in the King's Gate area; the other on the top of the mound, where he hoped to explore levels on the south end beneath the foundations of a later Roman Temple.

At the end of October he wrote to the British Museum: 'I have much pleasure in laying before you my report on the most successful month's work that has yet been done upon this site.'²¹ So far, work on top of the mound had proved disappointing, but he enthused over the discoveries at its foot: 'altogether we have found during the past month, on this lower site, seventeen reliefs, one of our best inscriptions, the double lion base and broken statue that stood over it, besides many fragments of sculpture.'²²

By now Woolley was convinced that there was much more to be discovered. Hogarth had written on October 9th urging him to excavate some complete buildings so that their plans could be published. This was especially important because there would only be money for one further season. Woolley replied on November 3rd pointing out the difficulties: 'Our new building lying behind the Herald's wall etc. is probably, at least for a good part of its area, better preserved [than the Lower Palace]; but it is going to be a huge place and whether we get it cleared by next autumn is quite doubtful. Of course I'll do my best; I quite realise the importance of getting the plans; but we can't force the pace beyond a certain point. I can without any difficulty get next spring a complete plan of the city walls, and should like to have the South Gate finished and the West Gate dug: but the wall and its towers can be traced all along the North side of the Euphrates bank, with towers and postern gates. The Water Gate plan is practically complete . . . Really we must assure a continuation of the dig beyond next summer; it would be ludicrous and shameful to stop with our present prospects, and the thing couldn't anyhow be wound up decently by the end of next season . . . The top of the *Kala'at* is nearly finished: I feel that we ought to do any amount more work up there, but that must wait

until our future is more assured.¹²³

He wrote to Kenyon in the same vein three days later: 'Things have gone very well indeed, and I think that the promise for the future is excellent . . . It would be heartbreaking to chuck up this work at the present stage. We need at least as much money again before we can begin to think that we have made an impression on the site . . . Moreover I am now convinced that the whole *Kala'at* is not the whole of Carchemish, but the royal city, outside which lay the bulk of the town; for the greater part of our *Kala'at* must have been given over to great public or royal buildings and as such would repay excavation. Of course one must go at it by degrees; but there is an awful lot to be done, and we can't stop short at this initial stage.'¹²⁴ In the hope of attracting further funds, it was decided that Woolley should put a report about the site in *The Times*, and Hogarth would also write an article for the *Illustrated London News*.

Work stopped for the winter on December 4th. When the planned excavation on the acropolis had finished, the men had been put on to a small postern in the north wall but: 'As is usually the case at Carchemish, what seemed to be but a small piece of work proved on trial to be a considerable excavation, and the main part of it has to be left over till next season.'¹²⁵ Yet the season had been extraordinarily successful, with buildings, reliefs, inscriptions, and many other finds of importance.

Lawrence and Woolley had suggested to the Museum that they should not go back to England for the three winter months, since the cost of the return voyage was far higher than that of keeping them at Jerablus on half pay. Moreover, there was a great deal of work for them to do at Jerablus. Woolley wrote to Kenyon that: 'We have got all fragments of stone inscriptions into our new museum, for working on; there are I fancy about 2,000; having done that we ought to start on the sculpture fragments. Copying inscriptions will also take some time.'¹²⁶ Kenyon accepted the idea, and agreed to pay them full pay for one month while they worked on the finds, and half pay for two months' holiday. They decided to spend December at Jerablus and then to travel in January and February. Lawrence planned to go down towards Antioch, looking for *antikas*, while Woolley intended to visit Egypt.

A few days later Lawrence wrote to Vyvyan Richards, confessing at last that he could not join in the printing scheme he had persuaded Richards to embark on: 'The fault was in ever coming out to this place, I think, because really ever since knowing it I have felt that (at least for the near future) to talk of settling down to live in a small way anywhere else was beating the air: and so gradually I slipped down, until a few months ago when I found myself an ordinary archaeologist. I fought very hard, at Oxford and after going down, to avoid being labelled: but the insurance people have nailed me down, now.

'All this preface is leading up to the main issue – that I cannot print with you when you want me. I have felt it coming for a long time, and have funked it. You know I was in England for a fortnight this summer, and actually found myself one afternoon in Liverpool Street coming up to you . . . and then went back again. I have got to like this place very much: and the people here – five or six of them – and the whole manner of living pleases me. We have 200 men to play with, anyhow we like so long as the excavations go on, and they are splendid fellows many of them . . . and it is great fun with them. Then there are the digs, with dozens of wonderful

things to find – it is like a great sport with tangible results at the end of things – Do you know I am keen now on an inscription or a new type of pottery? and hosts of beautiful things in the villages and towns to fill one's house with. Not to mention seal-hunting in the country round about, and the Euphrates to rest in when one is over-hot. It is a place where one eats *lotos* nearly every day, and you know that feeling is bad for one's desires to do something worth looking at, oneself.

'Which is the end, I think, of the apologia... do write and tell me if there is any hope of your pulling it off on your own? Carchemish will not be finished for another four or five years: and I'm afraid that after that I'll probably go after another and another nice thing: it is rather a miserable come down'.²⁷

Although Lawrence had abandoned the printing scheme, he does seem to have been working on one of his other personal projects during 1913. This was the proposed travel book about seven cities of the East (the original 'Seven Pillars of Wisdom'). He later wrote that it was 'a queer book, upon whose difficulties I look back with a not ungrateful wryness'.²⁸ It was probably never completed, though he had now visited all of the seven cities it was to describe (he once listed these as Constantinople, Cairo, Smyrna, Aleppo, Jerusalem, Urfa and Damascus:²⁹ on other occasions, however, he included Baghdad,³⁰ which in 1913 he had not visited).

On about December 10th a letter arrived from Kenyon which changed Lawrence's and Woolley's winter travel plans. Kenyon asked them whether they would be prepared to accompany a survey party making maps in the Sinai Desert south of Beersheba. Woolley replied by cable: 'Both ready survey work January 1st'³¹ and sent a letter of confirmation on the same day. Shortly afterwards he wrote: 'We should both greatly like to do the work, but I have some misgivings about this place: really we ought to be working on into January . . . though your letter took so long in reaching us that we may well be too late for the job, I hope they will still want us; it would be a splendid trip'.³²

The task in hand was in truth very demanding. Lawrence wrote: 'We are working over our many thousand fragments of carving, trying to make out which is which, and to group them again into sculptures fit to photograph. It is a most awful job. It took four men just three hours to carry the fragments of a lion about fifty yards – from one store room to another – and there over a thirty-five foot room the pieces were lying three and four deep over the floor and the three shelves that run round the room. You will appreciate the difficulty of picking out of this pile (which takes half a day to turn over) the particular claw or ear or scrap of jaw required to complete a broken lion in the excavations. And it would require a genius to tell which is lion hair, and which human hair, in the tangle of tiny fragments, many of them no bigger than a penny: some of them weighing three or four tons. We have got together the figure of a charioteer in magnificent style:– as good as fine Greek work – about two feet high, and we only need the chest and beard to complete a colossal statue of a standing god in the round about seven feet high'.³³ At the end of December they were working late into the night, trying to achieve as much as possible before leaving for Sinai. The weather had turned so cold that outdoor photography was very unpleasant; but they carried on, knowing that Hogarth wanted to include a good many photographs in the first volume

of the British Museum's official report on the Carchemish excavations, which was to be published in 1914. Chap. 7
Age 25

Woolley and Lawrence were looking forward to the journey south: 'It will be warm down there, and sunny: which will be pleasant after our snow and frost up here.'³⁴ But they had little idea what was required of them. Lawrence wrote home: 'we got a wire from the British Museum [a confirmation that they were to go to Sinai] asking us to do the archaeological part of a survey of Arabia Petraea (Gaza-Petra) undertaken by the Palestine Exploration Fund. So we go off in two days . . . not knowing in any respect more than I have told you . . . we are taking down the necessaries and Dahoum with us to make arrangements locally.'³⁵

Before leaving they spent a solitary Christmas together at the expedition house: 'Woolley went out into the outer quad (outer at my request) and sang two short carols, and "Auld Lang Syne". The effect was really beautiful, from a little distance'.³⁶ There would not be another peacetime Christmas for five years.

Notes for Chapter 7. Achievement at Carchemish

June – December 1913

1. T. E. Lawrence to C. F. Bell 12.8.1913 *MB* pp. 50-1. BL Add. MS 63550. Of these portraits only the first survives. Lawrence also spent a day during this brief visit to England reading about Oriental carpets. Records preserved in the Bodleian Library show that he consulted five works on the subject on August 6th. His letters from Carchemish display an increasing interest in carpets, which could be bought fairly cheaply in Arab towns and villages. During these years he seems to have acquired a number for his family and friends.
2. T. E. Lawrence to his family 29.8.1913 *HL* p. 262. Bodleian MS Res C13.
3. T. E. Lawrence to his family 9.9.1913 *HL* p. 262. Bodleian MS Res C13.
4. T. E. Lawrence to E. T. Leeds 9.9.1913 *L-L* p. 81. Leeds papers.
5. T. E. Lawrence to his family 9.9.13 *HL* pp. 262-3. Bodleian MS Res C13.
6. W. G. Lawrence to a friend 14.10.1913 *DG* p. 158.
7. W. G. Lawrence to his family 16.9.1913 *HL* p. 442.
8. W. G. Lawrence to his family 27.9.1913 *HL* p. 447.
9. See H. W. Young, *The Independent Arab* (London, John Murray, 1933) p. 18.
10. T. E. Lawrence to C. F. Bell 1.10.1913. BL Add. MS 63550.
11. T. E. Lawrence to W. G. Lawrence 21.10.1913 *HL* pp. 270-1. Bodleian MS Res C13.
12. C. L. Woolley to D. G. Hogarth 12.10.1913. BM/WAA.
13. C. L. Woolley in *Friends* p. 89. Another reference to the carving occurs in Eric Kennington's contribution to *Friends*: 'I . . . asked if he had ever done some creation with his hands, and how he knew he had no creative power. He said, "I carved eight life-sized figures in soft stone in Syria, using knives, and forks, and a hatchet. My servant was my model. They had no merit."' (p. 276). The conversation referred to had probably taken place fifteen years before Kennington

wrote this account, so the exaggerated number of figures is not surprising.

For evidence that Lawrence was seriously interested in sculpture, see the letters to his family of 16.6.1915 (*HL* p. 305) and 16.3.1916 (*HL* p. 315).

- 13A See *JTELS* Vol. VII, No. 1, Autumn 1997, pp. 38,39,42.
14. C. L. Woolley in *Friends* p. 89.
15. In a printed notice addressed to people who knew Lawrence, requesting contributions to *Friends*, A. W. Lawrence described the book as 'a collection of . . . portraits of one man's mind'. Since the articles were to be mainly about Lawrence's personality, rather than factual accounts, it could be argued that Woolley was not asked to describe what Lawrence actually did at Carchemish. However, he was surely wrong to leave the reader with such a false impression.
16. T. E. Lawrence to F. el Akle 3.1.1921 omitted from *MB* p. 183. Bodleian R (photocopy of original).
17. E. T. Leeds, 'Recollections of T. E. Lawrence' pp. 92-3 of the manuscript (edited text in *L-L* p. 49). Leeds papers.
18. T. E. Lawrence to D. Garnett 14.2.1930 partially omitted from *DG* p. 681. Bodleian R (transcript).
19. T. E. Lawrence to R. R. Graves 28.6.1927 partially omitted from *B:RG* p. 51. Houghton fMS Eng 1252 (347). After D. G. Hogarth's death in 1927, some archaeologists thought that Woolley should be appointed Keeper of the Ashmolean. Lawrence wrote to one of them pointedly: 'Your idea that Woolley may get the Ashmolean surprised me: Evans was a great archaeologist, Hogarth a great man: and that has set a standard for the Museum.' (T. E. Lawrence to E. Mackay, 2.12.1927. Bodleian R, transcript).
20. T. E. Lawrence to his family 3.10.1913 *HL* p. 267. Bodleian MS Res C13.
21. C. L. Woolley, report to the Trustees of the British Museum for October 1913. BM/A.
22. *Ibid.*
23. C. L. Woolley to D. G. Hogarth 3.11.1913. BM/WAA.
24. C. L. Woolley to F. G. Kenyon 6.11.1913. BM/A.
25. C. L. Woolley, report to the Trustees of the British Museum for November 1913. BM/A.
26. C. L. Woolley to F. G. Kenyon 6.12.1913. BM/A.
27. T. E. Lawrence to V. W. Richards 10.12.1913 *DG* pp. 160-1.
28. T. E. Lawrence to R. V. Buxton 22.9.1923 *DG* p. 431; *MB* p. 245. Jesus College, Oxford.
29. T. E. Lawrence, 'History of *Seven Pillars*' reproduced in *Texas Quarterly* (Austin, Texas) Vol. V, No. 3, Autumn 1962, pp. 48-9.
30. T. E. Lawrence to R. V. Buxton 22.9.1923 *DG* p. 431. Jesus College, Oxford.
31. C. L. Woolley to F. G. Kenyon, telegram c. 10.12.1913, quoted in F. G. Kenyon to Sir Charles Watson, 11.12.1913. PEF.
32. C. L. Woolley to F. G. Kenyon 17.12.1913. BM/A.
33. T. E. Lawrence to his family 17.12.1913 *HL* p. 277. Bodleian MS Res C13.
34. T. E. Lawrence to F. Messham 20.12.1913 *DG* p. 162.
35. T. E. Lawrence to his family 26.12.1913 *HL* p. 278 (where 'Arabia')

Jeremy Wilson,
Lawrence of Arabia,
The Authorised
Biography. Copyright
© 1989, 2000. For
copyright permissions,
see Acknowledgements

is misprinted 'Arabic'). Bodleian MS Res C13.
36. T. E. Lawrence to C. F. Bell 26.12.1913; *MB* p. 55. BL Add. MS
63550.