April Meeting: Tom Hannaher on Budget Collecting

On April 13, NERS members are invited to attend a joint meeting of the Armenian Library and Museum of America and the New England Rug Society at which textile collector and NERS member Tom Hannaher will present a talk on how to collect esthetically-significant textiles and rugs on a limited budget.

A self-employed entrepreneurial veteran of New England’s high-tech audio business, Tom has for years been a collector of ethnographic textiles. Describing how he became interested in the field, he said, “At first I was fascinated with oriental rugs but quickly realized I could not afford the high prices that the best pieces were bringing in the marketplace. So I started looking a bit farther and discovered that there were wide-ranging opportunities to purchase important ethnographic textile art at much lower prices simply because their categories hadn’t been ‘discovered’ yet.”

Tom’s present collecting efforts are concentrated in the category of pre-Columbian textiles of the Andean region in South America and the Kuna Indians of Central America. But his talk will explore a wide variety of worldwide opportunities available to today’s collectors who are excited by the merits of ethnographic textile art but are put off by the high asking prices of such traditional textile art forms as oriental rugs and kilims.

Attendees are encouraged to bring examples of ethnographic textile art that they or their families have collected for a show-and-tell at the conclusion of the talk. In addition, Tom has asked that NERS members submit images of “great” rugs and textiles they have acquired for $190 or less (the price for a yearly subscription to Hali). Please send them to huariman@yahoo.com with your name and a brief description. Tom would like to include some of these in his presentation. At the end of the session attending members will vote for their favorite textile/rug under $190—and the winner of the vote will get a mola from the Kit Kapp collection as a prize.

May Meeting: Picnic, Show & Tell, and Moth Market

New Date and Location!

The picnic will be held on Saturday, May 5 (please note the change in date!) at 103 Herring Pond Road, South Plymouth, MA, the vacation home of NERS founding member Judy Smith. The attractive property borders on a freshwater pond and a beach. It is about a one-hour drive from the Boston area. We will have a large tent for those wishing to get out of the sun or rain. Bring warm clothes just in case of cold weather.

Bring your own picnic. Pack up your own munchies, and we’ll provide the beverages, including soft drinks, coffee, tea, beer, and wine. If you can, bring a blanket or a lawnchair or two to make things comfortable. We’ll provide tables and chairs.

Participate in our moth market. We are inviting our members, dealers or not, to bring a few things for

May Meeting details and directions on page 7
February Meeting: John Collins on Persian Rugs
Reviewed by Jim Adelson

On February 16th, long-time NERS friend and supporter John Collins hosted the group in his Watertown gallery. John’s topic for the evening was urban Persian weaving, which he covered in rapid fashion with many illustrations from major Persian weaving centers.

John commented that “we’re going to start in the South, where the designs started.” He began with an explanation of the geography of Persia—a large central desert ringed almost completely by mountain ranges, with people living at the desert/mountain junctions. Ethnographically, Persian-speaking peoples surrounded the central desert, with Turkic, Turkmen, Kurd, Baluch, and other groups in various places on the periphery of this circle.

John also stated another of the evening’s themes early on: city-originated designs in other media carried over into city weavings, and into tribal rugs as well. His first design examples were from tilework, illustrating the influence of one artistic medium upon another. He showed a tile design from Kerman with a winged angel figure, and then picked a 1535 Kashan rug with a clear example of a similar angel, and a much later South Persian weaving still using the same design element.

For the most significant design origins, John pointed to the southern city of Kerman. He noted that classical, 16th century paradise gardens in Kerman featured a central pavilion, trees, and water channels—all carried over into Kerman garden carpets of the 16th and 17th centuries. Other designs were also influential, e.g., a 16th century swirling leaf design from Kerman “morphing” into the later Herati and other designs. Another staple of Kerman weaving design—the vase carpet—similarly spawned new motifs like the Harshang pattern, and also moved geographically to a lot of other regions. Later in Kerman’s history, as elsewhere, there was considerable evolution, leading to what was labeled the Lavar Kerman (an American carpet term—there is no place called Lavar, but rather Ravar) and also the late, degenerate, so-called American Kerman.

The Afshar people were both nomadic and semi-nomadic. We probably focus more frequently on their tribal weaving, but they also had considerable output with a more urban design vocabulary. There are a number of Afshar carpets using the vase design, and these carpets are typically much finer than Afshar work using tribal designs—around 200 knots per square inch, vs. 100-110 for the tribal weavings.

The same observation applies to other South Persian tribes as well. For the Qashqa’i, only about 25% of their output used tribal designs, while the majority sported urban designs. Another of John’s examples was a Niriz village weaving, where motifs and concepts of the garden carpet were used in saddle bags (see picture on page 4).

John next moved to some of the major cities of central Iran. He picked a couple of examples from Isfahan, the first one a so-called “Polonaise” carpet, and then a tree carpet with a strapwork border. From the city of Joshegan John selected an early example (circa 1800) with a single plain lattice design. From Kashan, he illustrated the Mohtesham group known for its very fine spun wool, as well as a silk mat and a carpet with a vase design. As elsewhere, the 20th century brought new types and designs with a heavy export emphasis—these included Manchester Kashans, such as a 1920s example with detached floral sprays, and the “European” Kashan, named for its export destination.

John turned to Bakhtiari weaving and their designs. For the more urban weavings of the Chahar Mahal valley, a box garden design was very popular, and many rugs had cartouches, some of them dated. There were a number of other garden influences, with ogival garden designs, and other depictions of gardens and trees. Some carpets utilized a split-leaf arabesque design, and the Bakhtiari weavers revived the strapwork border design.

John spent significant time with the weavings of the Arak province and its urban center Ferahan, which are typically labeled Sarouks. In this region, the vase design was one of the first to be adopted. John applied the term Ferahan Sarouk to weavings from 1875 – 1920 to distinguish them from the later “American” Sarouk. This earlier period is subdivided into three periods: 1) early, with wide open designs, and sometimes really noticeable irregularities, from 1875 – 1890; 2) middle, still retaining the open designs but reflecting a much higher
Continued from page 2

degree of technical weaving skill, from 1890 – 1910; and 3) final period, with designs becoming much more crowded, particularly as you approach 1920.

Sarouk weavings come in many different formats. In addition to the more common floor pieces of varying sizes, John showed Sarouk saddlebags from circa 1900.

The Mohadjeran Sarouk, starting in the 1910s, employed a different structure: a heavily depressed warp and longer pile, being much heavier as a result. Going into the 1920s, Sarouk weaving became increasingly commercial, with detached floral sprays as a common design. From 1925 to 1935 the practice of rug painting for the American market commenced, with the rugs bleached with lye after completion, and the red repainted to reflect a different color preference in the west. This process of chemical alteration and repainting continued, with a resulting decline in the rugs’ quality and reputation.

Weaving in the Jozan area shared some characteristics of Sarouk weaving, but fortunately not all. Earlier weaving in this area was single-wefted, but they acquired Sarouk structure and designs in the first half of the 20th century. However, they avoided some of the chemical and paint abuses, producing reasonable quality rugs between 1920 and 1950.

Malayer weaving evolved similarly to that of Jozan, going from a single-wefted structure to more closely emulating Sarouk weaving. Malayers tended to be a little coarser and more angular than Jozans, although, for example, the Michan Malayer was woven very finely, with knot densities up to 300 per square inch.

John moved on to Senneh weaving, from the area of Senandaj, the capital of Kurdistan. Senneh weavers used extremely fine wool for some of their work. John showed an example with 11 colors of silk in the foundation; he thought that this piece probably wasn’t meant for the floor. A second example was also extremely fine, with approximately 650 knots per square inch. Senneh weavers often used the prayer rug format, and kilims were very common, with both prayer and medallion designs employed. John showed a Kurdistan garden carpet, circa 1800, which was a descendant of earlier Kerman garden designs. Another example combined split arabesque with the garden carpet design motifs. So-called Garrus weavings from the area were distinguished by a particular quality of weave, red woolen wefts, and several specific borders, including cloudband and open palmette designs.

The rugs of nearby Bidjar were influenced by the presence of mineral springs that affected the dye palette—the mineral waters “turned up the intensity of the color.” Bidjar medallion/anchor carpets are perhaps the best known in the west. John felt that they show a Turkish design influence, perhaps drawn from Ushak medallion carpets. Lion rugs represent another well-known design family, utilizing acanthus leaves, vases, and other elements from Ottoman tapestries 200 years older. There are a number of weavings that are attributed to specific villages around Bidjar. For example, Helvai Bidjar weavings are known for their particularly good construction, and the earlier ones have wool foundations. Another prominent village was Gogargene, where quality weaving continued up until WWII, showing some distinctive design elements—fish, birds, and dragon heads-in the spandrels.

In describing weavings from the Heriz area, John started with an 1807 “Proto-Heriz,” with a wool foundation and a single plain lattice design. The first significant period of large-volume Heriz weaving ran from approximately 1860 until 1880, using large scale designs drawn with a lot of freedom and inventiveness. Middle period Heriz weavings were made from 1880 until 1910. During this period, weavings still had good scale and color, and a lot of open space, but the design renditions were starting to get more repetitive. Weavings from the later period—1910 to 1930—were characterized by lower knot density and less color variation. Like other major weaving centers, there were also distinctive weaving traditions in satellite villages, including single-wefted pieces from the Heriz-area village of Karaja, and open designs from the village of Bakshaish. Within Heriz itself, there was also much use of silk, and many pictorial carpets were made.

Completing his movement from South to North, John finished with comments about Tabriz weaving. He mentioned the Hadji Jalili Tabriz weavings, known for
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designs with open ground and floating central medallions, appearing from approximately 1890 (see picture on page 7). This design remained popular until about 1920. Tabriz weavers studied and drew from classical Persian carpets, producing, for example, vase carpets. There were also some just plain wacky Tabriz weavings from 1920 onward, with camels, dragons, monkeys, and chained bears among the design elements. There was also great variation in quality among Tabriz weavings—“from the sublime to the ridiculous.”

Having spent much of his talk assigning pieces to specific weavers and areas, John concluded by talking about his approach to attribution. For urban Persian weaving, he counseled to start with design and color first, and then to consider structure and wool quality. He observed that attribution is a fun challenge—“it’s just like making a diagnosis, but nobody dies.”

Our considerable thanks to John for sharing his many years of experience with Persian weaving with the NERS group, and for generously hosting the group for the meeting. As always, it was an extra benefit to take John’s comments and keep them in mind while examining the many pieces in his gallery!
Member Profile: Beau Ryan
By Ann Nicholas

At first it reminded me of my grandparent’s attic, walking up a flight of creaky stairs to find a room filled with wicker chairs, garden ornaments, and hooked rugs. Except it was Beau Ryan’s store, Rare Elements. On the floor of his office were boxes filled with seashells, books, and dishes, and stacked against the walls stood piles of paintings and carpets. On the walls schoolwork from his two young daughters hung next to his collection of old carpet fragments.

Walking into the next room, the similarity ended. It was a huge naturally lighted room with high ceilings. Rugs were hanging on the walls and islands of carefully arranged furniture and rugs filled the room—Beau describes it as showing rugs in their context. After working a number of years in the home furnishings industry in New York City, he and his wife moved to Massachusetts in 1999. His wife grew up in the house next door to where Mark Hopkins now lives, and they felt the area would be a good place to raise their two daughters. He opened Rare Elements in West Concord in an old warehouse—“Where in New York City could I have such a great space to display rugs and furniture?”

The store is full of one-of-a-kind items—rugs, furniture, garden and architectural pieces, fine art, and unique accessories. He splits his time between searching for inventory and working with customers—describing his mission as ferreting out fine and rare objects, especially antique rugs and furniture. He finds most of his inventory in antique shops, estate sales, auctions, and at other dealers, but still has to sift through hundreds of items to find each piece. Using Antiques Roadshow as an example, he explained that five to seven thousand people come for each show and maybe three or four have real treasures, less than one in a thousand. To better those odds, he has to understand the marketplace, be able to quickly recognize an object’s value, and have a little luck.

Once he had the opportunity to bid on a basement piled with hundreds of rugs, the remaining inventory of a rug shop owned by the seller’s mother in the 1950s. After looking through the piles for a while, he saw a rolled up rug over in one corner. When he unrolled it, he found a huge Haji Jalili Tabriz in perfect condition, with not even one little moth trail. Outside in the sunlight its earthy tones glowed. He carefully considered his bid for several days and, when all the bids were in, he became the owner of hundreds of rugs of varying quality and one dynamite Tabriz. It is sold now, but he proudly keeps pictures of it in his laptop. He puts most things he buys in his inventory immediately, but occasionally he finds something he truly enjoys. Those things he puts aside for a while to help him understand them and their value. He admits he is often sad when a special item is sold.

Beau has been collecting fine antique rugs since the early 1990’s. His interest in them began in the late 1970s when he met rug dealers like Stolp Fraser, Bertram Frauenknecht, and Jack Cassin. At first he was both intrigued with rugs and puzzled at how ones full of holes could actually be worth any money. One experience that strongly influenced a growing interest in rug collecting was meeting NERS members Mitch and Rosalie Rudnik and seeing their fine Caucasian rug collection. For Beau, a weaving’s appeal is in its graphics and color composition, whether it is a fine piece in perfect condition or a tattered fragment. In December when I emailed Beau asking to interview him, he was in New York City at the Sotheby’s auction of the Vojtech Blau collection (Picture 1 on next page). When interviewing him several weeks later, he was still talking about the preview, “The carpets were so extraordinary, just seeing and feeling them at the preview was like going to a great museum exhibit.”

While we talked about Beau’s business and his love of antique rugs, we wandered around the room. Now and then he would point out an item and discuss it. Over in one corner was a pair of tall garden planters—in the 19th century they served as chimneys on a large English house. In one furniture group was a large coffee table made by welding together links of a very large chain—once the chain hung on the Staten Island ferry. And under a large window sat a tiny chair with richly mellowed red paint—at the turn of the century it was a doll’s high chair.

Near the end of the interview Beau sat down on a
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In one hand he held a small flat bag. Made by the Nez Perce Native Americans of the Northwest Plateau, the bag was woven from thin cornhusk strips with a colorful geometric pattern created by false embroidery with wool yarn, a technique similar to extra weft wrapping (Picture 2). In the other hand was a flatwoven Shahsavan fragment, probably the end panel from a mafrash (Picture 3). Although they were woven in cultures thousands of miles apart, he marveled at their commonalities. The red, blue, and green color palette and many geometric designs were quite similar. He wondered, “Did they resemble each other because of the design constraints of weaving or something more innate in human nature?”

Most of his customers are designers, decorators, and other dealers, although he does sell to some rug collectors. Each type of customer has its challenges. For the decorator and designer market he has to keep aware of the fads and fashions which can change very quickly; for the rug collectors he needs to understand each collector’s focus and wants. In the seven years he has had Rare Elements the internet has changed his business dealings. It has expanded his customer base, introducing him to unexpected people, both buyers and sellers, and enlarging his market far outside New England. Less than ten years ago he left New York City to open a business in Massachusetts and now, thanks to the internet, he virtually never has to travel.

Note: There is a website with more information on his store and pictures of rugs and other items at www.rareelements.com.
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sale, and we’ll hold our own small informal flea market (moth market in ruggie terms). In case of inclement weather, we’ll move things under the tent.

**Share one or two of your treasures.** Please limit yourself to one or two pieces for the Show & Tell session. That way we’ll keep the event from becoming an overly-long marathon.

**We Raised a Bundle, Thanks to You!**

Thanks to member generosity, in February we were able to raise $847 for a very worthy rug-related cause. Members who purchased *Hali* magazines and rug books donated by Susan McCraw brought us a total of $347. In addition, a group of *Hali* magazines donated by Jo Kris was auctioned off to an NERS member for a total return of $500.

We are awaiting word from NERS member Bethany Mendenhall on the status of the scholarship fund that is being established in Istanbul in memory of noted researcher/photographer Josephine Powell, a past NERS speaker, who passed away earlier this winter. Once the details have been firmed up, we will donate the proceeds of these sales to this very worthy cause.

Meanwhile, thanks to all our members who participated in the sale. The rug world will be richer for your generosity.

Mark Hopkins

**Beware the Scam, All Ye Buyers!**

*Editor’s note: the following item was contributed by a respected dealer and NERS member who chooses to remain anonymous.*

Something has come to my attention which I think might be of interest to many rug society members, particularly in advance of the Istanbul ICOC.

The scam works as follows: disreputable rug dealers in Istanbul get the names and addresses of U.S. rug buyers. This private information is procured by bribing dealers who send merchandise back to the buyers at their home address in the states, and/or by paying the UPS drivers to turn over the information. In one typical case, you get a call from “Ali” or whoever, saying that he is in the States and has some more rugs to show. He comes to the house where you proudly show him your good pieces, because, after all, you are friends now and you want to be hospitable. You might buy from him, say, a $4000 “antique,” only to find out that it was a Pakistani fake, worth about $400. At some future point, your house is robbed, with all the old rugs taken, as well as the new purchases—this is the tip-off. The new purchases are recycled for sale to another customer.

The best thing is to know your dealer. When you buy, take your purchases with you. If that is not possible, have them shipped to an office location and preferably to a business name. And pay cash if at all possible.

There are many honest dealers in Istanbul and it is our hope that they are the only ones to make sales.

Hadji Jalili Tabriz carpet, ca. 1900
March Meeting: Fred Ingham Leading a Great Rug/Good Rug Session
Reviewed by Jim Adelson

On March 23rd, Seattle collector Fred Ingham led another instance of Good Rug/Great Rug for about fifty attendees. While the format resembled previous sessions, the selected weavings, the moderator’s remarks and leadership, and particularly the panelists’ comments provided new insight and entertainment.

Before moving to comparisons of pieces, Fred opened the session with observations on what gives different weavings their levels of artistic value. He stated that the purpose of this segment, and of the night as a whole, was to turn “huh?” into “aha!,” i.e., to increase one’s understanding of what makes a weaving great art.

In Fred’s view (and in the tradition of Good Rug/Great Rug), the most important positive attributes of weaving art are Color, Composition, and Character. Regarding color, he said that a piece doesn’t have to have a large number of colors, and the colors don’t even have to be bright, but they have to have a certain glowing, inner light. Excellence in composition requires good, coherent, vigorous shapes, and perhaps most importantly an appropriate sense of scale, with things going on at all levels, large and small, in all parts of the weaving, and in some cases in both the positive and negative readings of the design. Character is possibly a little vaguer and more subjective, but character in a great piece is “a living thing that grabs and holds your attention.”

By contrast, Fred observed that there are some Cs we do not care about from an artistic standpoint. Condition affects the cost of a piece, but not its artistic worthiness. Construction can be very helpful for attribution, but is not in and of itself an artistic virtue for most rugs, although for some pieces the construction is integral to what the rug accomplishes artistically. Chronology does not have inherent artistic merit; age often correlates with beauty, but it is not itself beauty: there certainly are very old but not beautiful rugs. Finally, Cost doesn’t matter in determining an item’s artistic appeal. On this last point, Fred concluded his introduction by encouraging the audience to pursue pieces of high artistry, and gave the following practical advice if cost is an issue: “if you can’t get a rug, get a fragment … if you can’t get a fragment, get a textile … if you can’t get a textile, get a textile fragment … if you can’t get a textile fragment, get a book … and if you can’t get a book, go to exhibits or sessions” where you can see great pieces.

The session then moved into its core—the comparisons of pairs of weavings, rated and commented upon by the panelists. The three panelists were Lawrence Kearney, Rosalie Rudnick, and John Collins (we particularly appreciate John’s willingness to step in for Jo Kris at the last minute). These three demonstrated again that while they may be known for their expertise in particular areas of weaving, their knowledge covers a very broad range. There were thirteen pairs of rugs for the panelists to evaluate and rate on a scale of 1 (no artistic value) to 10 (fantastic). This summary only covers a subset of the pairs.

On a pair of Turkish village rugs (pictured on left), all three panelists preferred the fragment over the complete
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rug, but with tremendous differences in their ratings. Rosalie gave the complete rug a 2 and the fragment a 10, while Lawrence and John were closer on the two, with Lawrence at 7/9 and John at 5/7 respectively. Rosalie commented first, labeling the complete rug stiff and characterizing it as a decorator rug. Lawrence spoke next, saying “that’s the difference between a dealer and a collector … I’m paid to be more generous.” He went on to explain that while the fragment was a better piece, the other one was still a good rug with a number of positive elements. John observed that the fragment had the archetypal human form as its major design motif, while in the complete rug this form has been stylized to the point of becoming unrecognizable. However, echoing Lawrence, John concluded “we should not make the good the enemy of the great.”

While on the whole the panelists agreed on which piece was better, one example that brought out different preferences was a pair of ikats (pictures below). Rosalie gave the one on the right an 8 and the one on the left a 4, while both Lawrence and John rated them the other way around, with Lawrence’s voting 6/8 and John 7/9. In the discussion that followed, it became clear that this was really more a matter of personal taste, with Rosalie noting what she described as the “playful” character of her preferred ikat, while Lawrence and John both reacted to what they saw as the three-dimensionality of the vertical color stripes against a black and white background in their preferred ikat.

Another interesting contrast came with a pair of East-Turkestan rugs—Yarkand or Khotan (pictured on next page)—where all panelists rated both pieces very highly. Again, Rosalie spoke first, indicating that she had given the example with three blue roundels a 10 and a 9 for the single-roundel example, but that she actually liked the single-roundel example better. Lawrence rated the single-roundel a 9, and the triple-roundel an 8, particularly citing the field background with its linkages to earlier artistic forms from China. John rated both pieces equally at 8, but lauded the border execution of the single-roundel example for its better proportions. These were very close ratings of two excellent rugs.

Following the panelist evaluations, the session finished with the “speed round”—ten pairs of rugs where the audience as well as the panel was asked to give their own scores in 30 seconds or so. After going rapidly

Continued on page 10
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through the ten pairs, the group circled back to see which had been given higher ratings in each pair. In most cases, the audience had a significant leaning for one piece over the other, but only one comparison was close to unanimous. In only one or two of the ten pairs was the vote close to even.

Our thanks to our leader and moderator, Fred Ingham, for organizing and conducting the session. His choice of weavings was particularly strong and varied, with the desirable consequence of helping the panelists focus specifically on what does differentiate the merits of weavings. Considerable thanks, too, to Rosalie, Lawrence, and John for their ability and willingness to explain their thinking and give all of us some of the benefits of the many thousands of pieces they had observed over their long involvement with our beloved Oriental art.

Left: Yarkand Carpet, East Turkestan, circa 1800
Right: Yarkand Carpet, East Turkestan, circa 1800

Below, a pair of Turkmen asmalyks (camel flank decorations); the one on the left was preferred by the majority of attendees.

Left: Ersari Asmalyk, West Turkestan 19th century

Below, right: Yomud Asmalyk, West Turkestan 18th century
**Upcoming Rug Events**

**Auctions:**
- Christie’s, London, 4/16
- Sotheby’s, London, 4/17
- Bonhams, London, 4/17
- Nagel, Stuttgart, 5/8
- Skinner, Boston, 5/12
- Rippon Boswell, Wiesbaden, 5/19, 11/17
- Grogan, Dedham, 5/27 (including rugs)
- Sotheby’s, New York, 6/7
- Christie’s, New York, 6/26.

**Conferences:**

**Exhibitions and Fairs:**
- Tsutsugaki textiles from the David Paly Collection, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, until 7/6. These are Japanese folk textiles from the 19th century. The indigo ground cotton and silk fabrics are patterned with strong graphics and subtle colors of salmon, blues, greens, off whites etc. They include resist-dyed futon covers, gift wrapping cloth, and padded kimono-like sleeping robes.
- Red, Textile Museum, Washington, DC, until 7/8. This exhibition explores the uses and meanings of red in textiles across time and place.

**Tours:**
- Istanbul and Greater Anatolia Textile and Rug Adventure, 10/16-28/07 and 11/1-13/2007. Tours to be led by Vedat Karadag and will include visits to Istanbul, Iznik, Cappadocia, Konya, and Antalya. Contact info@walkturkey.com or telephone 011-90-212-458-5750, or visit www.walkturkey.com for more information.

**Congratulations to Anne Nicholas and Richard Blumenthal on the publication of their outstanding article South Persian Tribal Weavings in HALI. The first installment appeared in the January-February issue (150); the second will appear in the following issue.**

**We welcome new NERS members Paul Feinberg & Lauren Shaw, Pebble Gifford, and Jill Harrison**

Newsletter contributors and helpers: Yon Bard (editor), Jim Adelson, Dora Bard, Mark Hopkins, Ann Nicholas, Janet Smith. *Brief impressions and pictures from the Istanbul ICOC are especially welcome!*

Comments/contributions/for sale ads to: Yonathan Bard, doryon@rcn.com

---

**The New England Rug Society** is an informal, non-profit organization of people interested in enriching their knowledge and appreciation of antique oriental rugs and textiles. Its meetings are held six to eight times a year. Annual membership dues are: Single $45, Couple $65, Supporting $90, Patron $120, Student $25. Membership information or renewal forms can be obtained on our website www.ne-rugsociety.org, or by writing to New England Rug Society, P.O. Box 582, Lincoln, MA 01773, calling Mark Hopkins at 781-259-9444, or emailing him at mopkins@comcast.net.

**NERS 2006/7 Steering Committee:**
- Mark Hopkins (President)
- Jim Adelson
- Robert Alimi
- Julia Bailey
- Yonathan Bard
- Tom Hannaher
- Lloyd Kannenberg
- Ann Nicholas
- Gillian Richardson
- Janet Smith
- Jeff Spurr
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