



*Creation rug, designed by Joice NanKivell Loch, Ouranoupolis*

Maria Mavroudi

Berkeley University

## Joice Nankivell Loch: an Australian Contribution to Byzantium's Modern Greek Reception

As the first Australian Byzantinists, it would be fair to count Joice Nankivell Loch (1887-1982) and her husband, Sydney Loch (1888-1954). Although neither had academic training in any aspect of Byzantine studies, Sydney Loch wrote a book on Mount Athos (edited and published posthumously by his wife in 1957) which is now counted among the most insightful travelogues written on the Holy Mountain in the twentieth century. In addition, the Lochs put into circulation an interpretation of Byzantine aesthetics that helped enfold Byzantium into a bourgeois version of modernity in Greece: they initiated the production of handmade rugs using Byzantine-inspired designs and set into motion a dynamic that, in terms of aesthetic approach, mode of production, and financial organization, remained in place for about eighty five years and had a perceptible impact on the development of an important modern Greek craft. This second contribution belongs to a broader phenomenon of reusing Byzantium in the applied and fine arts of the twentieth century in various parts of the world, which scholarship in English has mostly discussed in connection with European and American cultural and artistic life.

As would be expected, scholarship in Greek has discussed aspects of Byzantium's modern Greek reception, and especially the Byzantine inspiration in the literary and other artistic production of the "Generation of the 1930s." However, as far as I am aware, it has not addressed the involvement of the Lochs, perhaps because of their focus on the applied and not the fine arts. In

addition, treatments of the modern reception of Byzantium in other languages mostly ignore its Greek manifestation. Joice NanKivell Loch received some attention (and a 2000 biography) on account of her humanitarian work. She is the most decorated Australian woman, although still far from being a household name in her native country. As for her contribution to broadening the appeal of Byzantine art, it is overshadowed by her other achievements and has not been discussed as it deserves. The pages that follow aim to highlight her importance as translator of Byzantine culture into a modern vocabulary of decorative art and provide a point of departure for a more in-depth investigation in the future.

Joice narrated her eventful life in her 1968 autobiography, *A Fringe of Blue*, and no retelling could possibly do justice to the spectacular changes of fortune she described: born into one of the wealthiest families in Australia but raised in rural poverty, she became an author and married a Gallipoli veteran whose book on its battlefield was banned by Australian military censorship. Together, they sailed to Britain and wrote a book on Ireland, which aroused the animosity of the Irish Republican Army. To avoid reprisal, they became aid workers for the Quacker Relief Movement in Poland. They moved to Greece in 1923, soon after the Greek defeat in the Graeco-Turkish war of 1919-1922, which led to the Lausanne “Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations” in January of 1923. The Convention determined ethnicity on the basis of religious affiliation (Orthodox Christians were “Greek,” Muslims were “Turkish”). As a result, between 1.3 and 1.5 million orthodox Christians native to Turkey were deported to Greece (over 20% of the total Greek population, estimated at approximately 5.5 million in 1920). Approximately 350,000 Muslims native to Greece became residents of Turkey in return. The result was a humanitarian crisis of enormous proportions, which the sheer pressure of numbers made more acutely felt in Greece than in Turkey.

At the beginning, the Lochs participated in relief operations out of the American Farm School in Thessaloniki. The location provided Sydney with an opportunity to visit Mt Athos, which thoroughly fascinated him. The couple decided to spend a summer on the nearby island of Amouliani and for the first time visited Ouranoupolis, the last civilian outpost before the monastic republic. This was a village of ninety cottages newly built on land that the Greek state had appropriated from the monastery of Vatopedi in order to settle refugees. Beyond the cottages and directly by the sea-side rose the “Pyrgos,” a fourteenth-century Byzantine tower recently evacuated by the monks with a

little chapel at the top, which served as village church. Within a week of their visit, the Lochs were invited to move in to the tower. It remained their home for the rest of their lives.

In Sydney's words, "The villagers came from the Princes' Isles, near Istanbul, and from distant inland Caesarea, and they looked on themselves as two distinct tribes. Each despised the other. Farmers received a cottage, olive trees, and a few acres to cultivate. Fishermen were given a cottage, olive trees, fewer acres, and a promise of fishing gear. The islanders arrived speaking Greek and Turkish; but not all Caesareans knew Greek. They were moved under a ruling that all members of the Eastern Orthodox Church in Turkey were to be considered Greeks, an instance of the Greek Church's ability to keep the nationality of a group in being. [...]. The outstanding thing about all the villagers was their poverty and the poverty of their acres."

The land the refugees were given to cultivate was waterless and stony, and they had no experience farming in such conditions. Disease was rampant and mortality high. The Lochs tried to help with medical care. One day they went to see an elderly man dying from dysentery and starvation. He had been a rug designer in Caesarea and, to relieve the enormous financial pressure of that moment, his family offered to weave for the Lochs a rug with silk thread they had brought from Turkey—evidently a valuable portable they had hoped would help them restart their trade in their new homeland that had proven useless that far. The Cappadocians were expert weavers. They were using their own signature knot and were famous in the world of rug making, but found it impossible to exercise this trade in Greece because they had no access to a market that would absorb their products. The Lochs commissioned the dying man's family with a silk rug, which they did not want. He passed away before it was finished but as Joice later wrote, "his family worked on it, and the first rug of what was eventually known as the Pyrgos Industry came into being. A silk rug of no great consequence and of Turkish design." The Lochs now resolved to help the village set up a cottage industry of weaving, but producing rugs in Ouranoupolis and successfully siphoning them to the Greek market meant finding a niche outside the industry of hand-knotted rugs, which was quickly developing in Greece at the time.

Joice Loch's memoir does not outline the economic landscape in which the Ouranoupolis rugs had to compete, but it can be described as follows: in the early 1920s, refugees from Turkey played a capital role in developing the Greek

production of pile rugs and weaving more broadly. They overwhelmingly came from Eastern Turkey: Kayseri (Caesarea), Sivas (Sebasteia), Kütahya (Kotyaion), Isparta (Sparte), Konya (Ikonion), Uşak (Ousakeion), and elsewhere. There, increasingly since the 1860s and into the beginning of the twentieth century, Christian populations had been involved in large-scale production of handmade oriental rugs and their international export. During these decades, the looms themselves evolved little except to become larger in order to accommodate bigger rugs, but other new technologies such as machine-made threads and synthetic dyes were embraced. Members of these rug-making communities who reached Greece as refugees around 1923 had the know-how, in terms of both production and marketing, to set up factories, or work in them. They did so mostly in the environs of Athens, but also in Thessaloniki, Veroia, Evros, and elsewhere. These Greek factories produced “oriental” designs and their competition was Turkish and Iranian rugs. They boomed between 1923 and 1929, primarily through exports, which absorbed 90% of their production, especially in the US. They received a heavy hit with the American financial crisis, which soon became international, in 1929. Some closed, others switched into other types of production (especially weaving cotton), and a few survived as rug making enterprises.

The Ouranoupolis weavers would have to survive a market dominated by considerably larger scale production. Around 1925, the Lochs understood that, if the villagers continued to weave in the Turkish tradition with which they were familiar, they would only be repeating what the factories were doing and would have no hope of competing with them. Instead, Sydney proposed to create rugs in “Greek” designs, inspired from Byzantine art he had seen on Athos. As Joice put it, “we knew that if they would only try some of the amazingly lovely Byzantine designs from Athos they could develop a unique industry, and it could be something which no factory could touch or take from them.” The departure from what the Ouranoupolis weavers knew and, more importantly, what they had been commercially successful with in the past, was so radical that they found the proposed products ugly and were reluctant to cooperate. In spite of such opposition, the Lochs worked together, day and night, “over squared paper we knew nothing about.” They came up with three designs for rugs that, as Joice reported, were still favorites more than forty years later: “The Tree of Life from the monastery of Esphigmenou; the Vatopedi Fresco; and the Lavra Phiali”. How the operation took off from then on is best described in Joice’s own words:

“Our next battle was dyeing. We were determined to dye from the weeds of the locality. The villagers were determined to use synthetic dyes. They said anything else was absurd. Our first rugs were a compromise of undyed sheep’s wool. Mrs Melas, President of the Committee of the Laiki Techni in Athens, was a friend, and I wrote our troubles to her. She offered, without seeing the rugs, to exhibit them for us at the first International Fair in Salonika. The village rose in uproar and said we were mad, and they sent a spy to the exhibition. They were astounded at the news that he brought back. Only our rugs attracted any attention, and they got the Grand Prix! Those awful black and white abominations! Orders poured in, and from then on until World War Two they could never keep up with their orders.”

The mention of the Thessaloniki International Fair dates these events to 1926. In spite of the success there, the villagers resisted adopting natural dyes. But the Lochs insisted, and at this point “the village midwife, Paraskevoula, came forward, and until her death was our only helper.” She and Joice developed a set of fast dyes from locally available plants that was still used for rugs woven in Ouranoupolis into the 1980s.

The spirit in which Joice Loch designed and produced rugs in the 1920s may have been generated by the concrete circumstances in Ouranoupolis, but has obvious roots in the Arts and Crafts movement that flourished in Britain, and later Europe and the United States, between the 1880s and the 1910s. Both valued traditional craftsmanship, drew inspiration from forms found in medieval and folk art, and promoted social and economic reform. The ideas and products of the British and American protagonists to the Arts and Crafts movement like William Morris, whose rugs, printed textiles, and wallpapers extensively and creatively reused motifs drawn from medieval art, were known in Australia already in the closing decades of the nineteenth century. A distinctively Australian manifestation of the movement took off in the early 1900s. It was marked by the foundation, in 1906, of the Society of Arts and Crafts of New South Wales, which promoted not only craft as opposed to industrialized production but especially the use of designs, motifs, and materials distinct to Australia, drawn from its native flora, fauna, and art.

The initiative of the Lochs also fits well within a broader Greek social and intellectual context, of which they were clearly aware, as their connection with the Committee of Laiki Techni in Athens indicates: in 1911, fifteen years before the Ouranoupolis rugs received their first official accolades, the feminist

journalist Kalirrhoe Siganou-Parren founded the *Lykeio ton Hellenidon* (Lyceum Club of Greek Women), with the purpose of highlighting the aesthetic, social, and national value of older and more recent Greek tradition. A like-minded institution founded in 1918 was the “Museum of Greek Crafts” (*Mouseio Hellenikon Cheirotechnematon*), later renamed “National Museum of Decorative Arts” (*Ethnikon Mouseion Kosmetikou Technon*, as of 1923) and finally “Museum of Greek Folk Art” (*Mouseio Hellenikes Laikes Technes*, from 1931 until today).

Although both the Lyceum Club and the Museum were primarily concerned with Greek folk art post-1453, the Greek intellectual and social leadership that brought these institutions into being was influenced by nineteenth- and early twentieth-century European intellectual trends that located the roots of contemporary folk art in the Middle Ages. In the Greek case, the study of folk art could help emphasize cultural continuities between Byzantium and the modern Greek state and offer support for the thesis articulated by the historian Constantine Paparrhegopoulos toward the end of the nineteenth century regarding the continuity of the Greek nation from antiquity into the modern era. At the beginning of the twentieth century, leading Greek academics invested much of their research and publications in promoting this idea. The most voluminous documentation of continuities between Byzantine material culture and modern Greek folklore is undoubtedly Phaidon Koukoules’ monumental *Byzantinon Bios kai Politismos* (Athens, 1948–55), the mature product of life-long endeavors on this topic that began decades earlier.

Much of Joice Loch’s activity chronologically coincides with that by Angeliki Chatzimichali (1895-1965), the mother of modern Greek ethnography, and arguably the most important single contributor to the study and preservation of modern Greek folklore. Like for Joice Loch, Byzantium had a prominent place in Chatzimichali’s concept of creatively re-using earlier Greek patrimony, as exemplified by her residence in Plaka: designed by the architect Aristoteles Zachos in 1924, it incorporated elements from neo-Byzantine, Greek traditional, and modernist architecture. The wooden carvings of its interiors, inspired from folk art, were designed by Chatzimichali and executed by traditionally trained craftsmen.

These trends further came together in the ways expatriates other than the Lochs were implementing their cultural politics at around the same time: an aesthetic appreciation of Byzantine art in association with its folk and modern counterpart is evident in the activities of the American School of Classical

Studies at Athens and contributed to establishing Byzantine archeology as an independent discipline in Greece.

The Lochs therefore belonged to a group of Western-educated Greeks and foreign expatriates that sought to creatively engage Byzantine and folk traditions for the purposes of a modern Greek aesthetic and social revival. They were pioneers in targeting the applied arts and achieving production and distribution at a scale greater than anything else I am aware of in Greece at the time—always, of course, within the realm of a craft and never reaching industrial proportions.

The esthetic of the rugs designed by the Lochs was created by and for urban tastes, which the weavers themselves did not necessarily share. On the other hand, the financial model adopted to help Pyrgos Industries take off aimed to ensure the independence of the weavers in the near future—an ethically laudable and economically sensible goal, especially in the context of a regional and national economy that desperately needed development, but one that did not help the esthetic coherence of the weavers' collective production without some form of supervision. Lack of esthetic coherence risked undermining the value and desirability of the rugs in the market. Joice concisely described this challenge as follows: "After two or three years we gave the industry over to the village as a going concern. The Agricultural Bank was prepared to lend money for looms and equipment to any girl with a pair of rug-making hands, while the Laiki Techni took all they could produce, paying in advance when necessary. We did the designs, guided them in color schemes, and saw they kept the different periods of design together, and in their rightful monasteries. We handed them on many extra private orders from our friends who were all interested in the good cause, and until we went to World War Two everyone was satisfied. But immediately after we left the rot set in. Vegetable dyes were mixed with synthetic; designs were mixed until rugs were produced with Athos centres and Turkish borders, and vice-versa."

Inconsistencies in the designs and use of dyes were introduced during an absence of the Lochs that lasted six years: in 1939, they were called to administer the Polish Relief Fund. They ended up in Rumania helping out Polish refugees, and relief work made them move on to Turkey, Cyprus, and the Holy Land. They returned to Greece in 1945, and faced the disastrous civil war that blazed there until 1949. Rug production had been interrupted, and it was very difficult to pick it up again. Joice wrote: "When finally we got back to the village, things

were still in shocking condition. The rug-making industry, which we had left in a good state before the war, had completely stopped, and I felt it would be very difficult to start it again, as there was little money for buying rugs. But in the end we did get a few foreigners—chiefly Quakers—to give orders. We had lost all our original rugs except for five which the monks had kept safely for us in one of the monasteries. We sold these and ordered some wool with the money we got. At last when the industry was on its feet again I turned it over to the Queen's Fund in Greece, an organization concerned with village industries; and I hope it will always be a means of livelihood to the village."

The "Queen's Fund" referred to by Joice is the *Idryma Basilikes Pronoias* (Royal Welfare Foundation), created in 1947 to care for children, an enormously pressing social need in the midst of civil war devastation. In 1953, it expanded its activities to promote rug making in rural areas. Under modified names after the end of the Greek monarchy, but for several years retaining the component *Pronoia* (Welfare) and therefore frequently referred to by this name alone, it continued to support rug making until the suspension of its crafts program in 2011. I am not aware of any systematic research on the rugs produced under the auspices of *Pronoia*. Its own website acknowledges its 1953 beginnings out of the Royal Welfare Foundation without mentioning any connection with Ouranoupolis. By 1969, seventy weaving centers throughout Greece were running under its auspices.

Important information on *Pronoia*'s mode of production can be gathered from electronic blogs by individuals wishing to record and disseminate chapters of local history in the places where they grew up. They all convey a sense of urgency to document a world of crafts that has vanished before it is entirely obliterated from living memory. The combined information of *Pronoia*'s website and the recordings of local history indicate that key aspects of rug making under the auspices of *Pronoia* were closely modeled after the Ouranoupolis pre-war operation: the creation of yarns, dyes, and weaving followed traditional procedures. The designs were new, but inspired from ancient, Byzantine, and folk Greek art. *Pronoia* employed professional designers to coordinate designs and colors. This esthetic approach continued uninterrupted into 2011.

An indication that the pre-war success of the Ouranoupolis rug operation was important at a panhellenic scale and provided a model for further similar operations in post-war Greece, is the fact that it was visited by a figure key in promoting traditional arts and crafts, and appears to have inspired her own

further initiatives. The woman in question is Phroso Liapi-Ioannidi (1896-1986), whom her fellow citizens affectionately called “the Mother of Zagori” (*i mana tou Zagoriou*) for her contributions to social life in Epiros. She is credited with the revival of the *samaroskouti* (a kind of woven cloth full in a watermill), and the promotion of *flokati* production, a floor covering that became fashionable around the industrialized world in the late 1960s and 1970s. From 1967 onwards, she promoted the use of elements from traditional Epirote women’s costumes in female fashion, especially wedding dresses. This, of course, followed a trend in Western fashion that promoted traditional dress and crafts as they were largely disappearing from most European societies. As Greece treaded on the heels of demographic, social, and economic trends evident in other parts of the Western world (albeit frequently at a considerably different pace), a similar urgency was felt to maintain traditional crafts; encouraging their continuation, especially in rural areas, was one of the expressed goals of *Pronoia*.

The esthetic, social, and economic pursuits of Greek rug making in the post-war period are inscribed within a substantially evolved social and economic landscape. WWII and the civil war that followed it until 1949 completely destroyed Greece’s infrastructure and led it to abject poverty, which was especially felt in the countryside. Reconstruction and economic recovery started in the 1950s. In the three decades that followed, the material conditions of life steadily improved. Like elsewhere in Southern Europe, this resulted in the urbanization of rural populations through internal migration, upward social mobility through education, and a significant expansion of the middle class. For handmade rug production, this meant a considerable expansion of its domestic clientele. The social prestige of owning an expensive handmade rug referencing Greek patrimony meant that *Pronoia* not only mirrored, but also influenced, the tastes of an urban middle and upper class, increasingly joined by successful and upwardly mobile educated professionals.

From its inception, *Pronoia* intervened in rug-making through a decentralized model of production. Weavers were trained at schools from which they graduated after completing a certain number of knots. Upon graduation, they received their loom as a gift and were free to work from home, usually on projects commissioned through *Pronoia*. They were paid by square meter woven. Schools of weaving obviously played a role in influencing design, since weavers who became free-lancers were likely to continue producing rugs in designs they had already executed during their training. In pre- and post-war

Ouranoupolis, it is clear that the immense respect commanded by Joice Loch, especially within the limited context of a single village's production, was a force that could guide tastes and esthetic approaches most of the time. Within the context of *Pronoia*, artistic supervision was carried out by hired staff. An artistic consultant was available when a client ordered through an urban outlet of this organization. However, both factories and individual buyers could and did seek *Pronoia*-trained weavers for commissions in designs of their own choice. Growing up in Thessaloniki in the 1970s and 1980s, I had an opportunity to witness that its residents (more frequently women rather than men, sometimes but not always accompanied by their husbands) would travel to rural areas in order to commission rugs to individual weavers, or to schools of weaving that operated for different lengths of time in various parts of Greece. In these cases, the design was selected based on suggestions made by the weaver, or the school, usually by showing executed samples, but sometimes only photographs or outlines of the knots on squared cardboard and samples of colored wool threads. Among the different options, the individual weavers and the school of Ouranoupolis enjoyed a more exalted reputation and were considered finer. The Ouranoupolis rugs may have been more renowned in Thessaloniki than in Athens, as is reasonable: the greater geographic proximity inevitably generated closer social and economic interactions between the two places, renewed and intensified every summer from the late 1960s onwards, when urban residents began to systematically seek the respite of beaches.

Joice's surviving rug production indicates that Byzantine designs which came into being in the 1920s and 30s continued to be executed in the post-war period, with adjustments and modifications. The looting at the Ouranoupolis home of the Lochs during the civil war resulted in the destruction of almost everything that had to do with rug production, including the looms themselves. Joice likely had to redraw her old designs from memory. She also created new ones that referenced further sources of inspiration, such as Minoan art. Although Joice's memoir does not discuss her activity as rug designer beyond the Byzantine inspiration at the inception of Pyrgos rugs in the 1920s, some information can be gleaned from a booklet she published in 1964. It comprises a total of 42 pages, plus 8 plates of black-and-white photographs, and is dedicated to the rugs and dyes produced in Ouranoupolis. It appears to have been intended as a guide for those wishing to pursue a cottage industry of handmade rugs. It includes a list with brief descriptions of twenty Byzantine-

style designs executed by Pyrgos rugs, explaining their sources of inspiration and the manner in which Byzantine decorative elements were distributed on the rug's surface.

Six of the eight accompanying photographs are dedicated to the Byzantine rugs. Under the rubric "Further Designs and Their Meanings", Joice listed an additional thirteen sources of inspiration. Six reference the myths of Australia's aboriginals (illustrated with one photograph). The rest involve drawings found in pre-historic caves in Africa, France, and Spain, ancient Egyptian monumental art, and archeological finds from "Ur of the Chaldees" and the frozen tombs of Pazyryk (a site south of the modern city of Novosibirsk), which receive the lion's share of Joice's attention (one full page, compared to a few lines for all other items). The reasons are clear: in 1949, excavations at Pazyryk yielded a famous rug, probably made at around 400 BC and therefore the oldest surviving pile carpet in the world. It was subsequently displayed at Saint Petersburg's Hermitage. One can sense some hidden but understandable pride in Joice's statement that she copied it: the rug's density of 360,000 knots per square meter makes the design exceptionally intricate and therefore difficult to copy.

Further, copies of a recently discovered rug displayed in a far-away museum required wrestling a design on squared paper out of photographs published in foreign-language books, which were almost luxury items: they could be bought either in the course of rare international travel, or at bookstores that, throughout Greece, could be counted on the fingers of one hand alone. Compared with books in Greek, they were considerably more costly and, if not already in stock, one had to order them and await their arrival for several weeks. Reviving the Pazyryk design in twentieth-century rug production was, indeed, an act of love for, and dedication to, the craft.

The 1964 booklet does not, of course, provide an exhaustive list of Joice's executed designs. Within it, she acknowledges an even wider scope of inspiration and a vision best summarized in the phrase "Rugs-rugs-rugs and I dream they are 'history'." Although it is hard to trace the chronological evolution of this vision, it is clear that it started from a firm grounding on Byzantine art and, by the time the arts-and-crafts program of the *Pronoia* came into existence, it included forms of ancient art which, like art of the medieval period, were important to modernist sensibilities throughout the twentieth century. This included, but was not limited to, ancient Greek art. Similar sensibilities, but more strictly focused on a Greek geography, are detectable in the early rug

production of *Pronoia*: a 1969 newspaper article, published to advertise a trade exhibition of *Pronoia* rugs, names the sources of inspiration for their designs as follows: archaic (sic) and folk art (*archaike kai laike techne*), mosaics, and works by contemporary painters such as Yiannis Moralis (1916-2009) and Yiannis Tsarouchis (1910-1989). The text does not mention Byzantine art, but the only photograph that accompanies it depicts a rug in a design unthinkable without acquaintance with Middle Byzantine silks: interconnected roundels enclosing animal figures.

Considerable research into the archives of *Pronoia* and whatever evidence can be gathered regarding the Ouranoupolis rug production would be necessary in order to obtain a quantifiable and reasonably documented view of the afterlife that each of Joice's designs may have enjoyed in the context of *Pronoia*. For now, only some preliminary observations based on readily accessible source materials are possible: the webpages of *Pronoia* that advertise to potential buyers the production of its final years up to 2011 include thirty-nine photographs of pile rugs. Four among them are clearly of Byzantine inspiration, although their appellation can occasionally be deceiving. One of the four is labeled "Peteinaria" (cocks). It is organized in orderly rows of roundels, which enclose not cocks but griffins, elephants, and lions facing one another. Although this rug is not identical to the one pictured in the aforementioned newspaper article of 1969, both are clearly variations of the same design. Other Byzantine designs in the final wave of *Pronoia*'s production are named "Pagonia" (peacocks) and "Pagonia kai vrysi" (peacocks and fountain).

They are probably related to the one that Joice named "The Garden of Eden." There is an obvious similarity (though not identity) between the *Pronoia* "Peacocks" and a pre-war design by Joice, a photograph of which was published in her autobiography. The fourth among the *Pronoia* Byzantinizing rugs is called "Ravenna" and is modeled after the vaulted ceiling of Galla Placidia's mausoleum, a blue sky studded by golden stars. Dying raw wool with natural dyes in a uniform, intensive, and permanent blue is challenging. When Joice managed this in the 1960s, it inspired her with a design depicting dolphins against a magnificent deep blue background, referencing the well-known Minoan fresco from Knossos. Perhaps the intensive blue sky of "Ravenna" reflects the same exuberance in achieving an exquisite dye; if so, Joice may have come up with a version of this rug during the same period.

Yet a fifth design, not pictured, is possibly implied on the page of the *Pronoia* website that enumerates the various sources of inspiration for the textiles on electronic display. The two expressly mentioned Byzantine sources of ideas are mosaics and vestments. Although none of the aforementioned designs appears to reference the latter, Joice Loch had, indeed, created a design after the “Sakkos tou Tsimiske” (The Sackcloth of Emperor John Tzimiskes), a famous liturgical vestment of a date considerably later than the tenth-century emperor, kept at the Athos monastery of the Iberians. Ouranoupolis weavers in the late 1970s were still reproducing the “Sakkos”. It is possible that it remained in the repertoire of *Pronoia* into 2011.

The overwhelming majority of the advertised *Pronoia* designs reference Greek folk art, especially embroidery and ceramics. It is uncertain how many of these may go back to designs by Joice. A possible such is “Louloudi Epeirou” (Flower of Epirus), because it was definitely woven in Ouranoupolis by 1965. We already mentioned Joice’s Minoan inspiration in the 1960s. At least one rug in the 2011 *Pronoia* collection also references Minoan art, but again it is unclear whether it is in any way connected with specific ideas originally developed by Joice.

Although oriental designs were excluded in the pre-war rug production of Ouranoupolis, they were embraced after the war, obviously responding to a domestic market demand for them. By the 1970s (and perhaps already earlier), the Ouranoupolis weavers would undertake established oriental patterns, like the ubiquitous “Bukhara”, or motifs originating in the West-Iranian city of Senneh. They would also execute more *recherché* designs, like one copied from the Pazyryk carpet.

The *Pronoia* designs appear to have had a further career among the hand-knotted rugs produced under the auspices of the Hellenic Organization of Small & Medium sized Enterprises and Handicraft S.A. (known with its Greek acronym EOMMEX), active between 1977 and 2011. EOMMEX primarily supported projects other than rug making (jewelry, ceramics, wood carving, lace, knitting, etc) but did set up weaving schools. A blog publishes information and photographs from one that operated between 1992 and 2006 at the village Potamoula in Aitoloakarnania. The motifs of the rugs pictured on the looms have an obvious relationship with the *Pronoia* designs drawn from Greek folk art. Byzantine inspiration is not missing, either: rolled up in the background, one can discern a rug in the “Ravenna” design.

The evidence surveyed above suggests that Joice Loch's approach to rug design—an important component of Greek material culture in the post-war period, when urban middle-class households came to consider pile rugs as necessary luxuries—was pioneering and widely influential, even if this fact remains unrecognized. Her work rode on the wave of artistic and intellectual trends already swelling in Greece and beyond (which at least partly accounts for her success), but it gave them coherence and pointed them to particular esthetic directions. To a scholar of modern Greece, the significance of further studying her work and its impact is obvious. To a Byzantinist, studying the creation and dissemination of Joice Loch's now largely dispersed body of work could pay rich dividends. The most obvious one is recognizing how elements from Byzantine culture were translated to suit social and political realities in the twentieth century; this can usefully illuminate the background against which our Byzantine studies are inscribed at the beginning of the twenty-first. Perhaps less obvious but equally important is the help it can offer us in grasping, mostly through analogical thinking, some fundamental questions in the study of Byzantine society and culture.<sup>1</sup>

Although it would be absurd to claim that the Ouranoupolis rug production developed outside of an industrial context, the conditions of desperate poverty in which it had to take off generated certain pre-industrial limitations, and Joice Loch's insistence on natural dyes deliberately reversed some of the advantages of industrialization. Relatively well-recorded because of its chronological proximity to us, it suggests ways to think about big problems in both Byzantine and modern history, such as the following: what provincial approaches share regarding their interpretation of metropolitan artistic trends—in this case how two cultural peripheries, Australia and Greece, dialogued with the British Arts and Crafts movement, conceived and exported out of a cultural center; this can offer avenues of understanding how artistic and intellectual trends originating in Byzantium were adapted in its cultural peripheries throughout its millennial history. Further, the Ouranoupolis experience can offer avenues of contemplating how city and countryside interact in economic, cultural, and esthetic terms; what “tradition” and “innovation” or “foreign” and “indigenous” mean in the context of such an interaction. It can also drive home for us the impossibility of clearly separating the “vernacular” from the “high-style”, and show us how to look for figures that move between these two categories, and are capable of translating one into the other.

## References

- (Anonymous), "Australian Dreams—Designs by the Aegean," *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 May 1973.
- DeVries, Susanna. *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread: The Life of Joice Nankivell Loch, Australia's Most Decorated Woman* (Hale & Iremonger, Pty. Ltd: Alexandria, NSW, 2000).
- Irvine, Rachel. "Rugs that Saved a Village," *Melbourne Herald*, 11 December 1964.
- Kitromilides, Paschalis. "On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigououlos, Byzantium, and the Great Idea," *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, ed. David Ricks and Paul Magdalino (Ashgate Publishing: Aldershot, 1998), 25–35.
- Kontominas, Bellinda. "The Great Heroine Australia Forgot," *Sydney Morning Herald*, July 8, 2006, viewable at <<http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/the-great-heroine-australia-forgot/2006/07/07/1152240493799.html>> accessed October 2016
- Kourelis, Kostis. "Byzantium and the Avant-Garde: Excavations at Corinth, 1920s-1930s" *Hesperia* 76:2 (2007), 391–442.
- Llwellyn Smith, Michael. "Athos, Mount" in Jennifer Speake, ed., *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia* (New York: Fitzroy and Dearborn, 2003), 42–43.
- Loch, Sydney. *Athos: The Holy Mountain* (Lutterworth Press: London, 1957).
- Marder, Brenda. *Stewards of the Land: The American Farm School and Greece in the Twentieth Century* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2004).
- Montana, Andrew. *The Art Movement in Australia: Design, Taste and Society 1875-1900*. Second Miegunyah Press Series (Book 31). (Melbourne University Publishing: Melbourne, 2000).
- Muthesius, Anna. "Essential Processes, Looms, and Technical Aspects of the Production of Silk Textiles," in A. Laiou, ed., *The Economic History of Byzantium: From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*. *Dumbarton Oaks Studies* 39 (Washington, DC, 2002), 147–168.
- Nankivell Loch, Joice. *Prosporion-Uranopolous [sic]: Rugs and Dyes* (Istanbul: American Board Publication Department, 1964).
- Nankivell Loch, Joice. *A Fringe of Blue: An Autobiography* (John Murray: London and Southampton, 1968).
- Nelson, Robert. "Modernism's Byzantium Byzantium's Modernism" in Roland Betancourt and Maria Taroutina, eds. *Byzantium/Modernism. The Byzantine as Method in Modernity* (E. J. Brill: Leiden and Boston, 2015), 15–36.

(Ανώνυμο), “Ωραία χαλιά και κιλίμια στην έκθεση Βασιλικής Προνοίας» *Βήμα*, 27 November 1969, 107; viewable at <[http://www.nationalgallery.gr/library/el/cifiopoiimena\\_ar8ra\\_efimeridon/el\\_19693107\\_00003\\_0001.html](http://www.nationalgallery.gr/library/el/cifiopoiimena_ar8ra_efimeridon/el_19693107_00003_0001.html)> accessed October 2016.

Βογιατζόγλου, Όλγα. «Η βιομηχανική εγκατάσταση των προσφύγων στη Νέα Ιωνία: παράμετρος της αστικής εγκατάστασης» στο *Ο ξεριζωμός και η άλλη πατρίδα*.

*Οι προσφυγοπόλεις στην Ελλάδα* (Σχολή Μωραΐτη. Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας: Αθήνα, 1999).

Ιστικοπούλου, Λήδα. *Η ελληνική ταπητουργία και η ταπητουργός στη Μικρά Ασία, 1860-1922*

(Βιβλιοπωλείον της Εστίας: Αθήνα, 2000).

Σαπουντζάκης, Χάρης και Λουκάς Χριστοδούλου, *Η Νέα Ιωνία στο Μεσοπόλεμο, 1922-1941*

(Εκδ. Ένωση Σπάρτης Μικράς Ασίας: Αθήνα, 2015).

Χατζηαντωνίου, Φαίδων. «Μια Αυστραλή συγγραφέας στην Ελλάδα» *Kathimerini*, October 8, 2006. <<http://www.kathimerini.gr/264994/article/politismos/arxeio-politismoy/mia-aystralh-syggrafeas-sthn-ellada>> accessed October 2016.

Χατζημυχάλη, Έρση. *Περίπατος με την Αγγελική* (Κάκτος: Αθήνα, 1999).

Χουμεριανός, Μανώλης. “Αργαλειοί της Καππαδοκίας”, 2002, *Encyclopaedia of the Hellenic World, Asia Minor* URL: <<http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=3718>>, accessed October 2016

## Notes

- 1 The research and writing of the present paper were conducted during a stay at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin. I am particularly grateful to its library staff for their effort to locate copies of articles published in the Australian press in the 1960s and 1970s, for which my references were imprecise or wrong.
- 2 Sydney Loch, *Athos: The Holy Mountain* (Lutterworth Press: London, 1957); Michael Llwelllyn Smith, "Athos, Mount" in Jennifer Speake, ed., *Literature of Travel and Exploration: An Encyclopedia* (New York: Fitzroy and Dearborn, 2003), 42–43.
- 3 Two recent examples: Robert Nelson, "Modernism's Byzantium Byzantium's Modernism" in Roland Betancourt and Maria Taroutina, eds. *Byzantium/Modernism. The Byzantine as Method in Modernity* (E. J. Brill: Leiden and Boston, 2015), 15–36 (with useful earlier bibliography); Kostis Kourelis, "Byzantium and the Avant-Garde: Excavations at Corinth, 1920s–1930s" *Hesperia* 76:2 (2007), 391–442.
- 4 Susanna de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread: The Life of Joice NanKivell Loch, Australia's Most Decorated Woman* (Hale & Iremonger, Pty. Ltd: Alexandria, NSW, 2000).
- 5 Joice NanKivell Loch, *A Fringe of Blue: An Autobiography* (John Murray: London and Southampton, 1968).
- 6 The call to Greece is described in Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 96–98.
- 7 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 101–12; on the activity of the Lochs in Thessaloniki, see also Brenda Marder, *Stewards of the Land: The American Farm School and Greece in the Twentieth Century* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 2004), 379–80.
- 8 When the Lochs first visited Ouranoupolis it was not yet called by that name. Locals would refer to it as "Pyrgos" because of the dominance of its Byzantine tower over the landscape; maps would mark it as "Prosporon", a name reflecting its status as imperial offering to the monks of Vatopedi. The Greek government renamed the village "Ouranoupolis" in 1946. "Ouranoupolis" is used throughout the present contribution for reasons of clarity.
- 9 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 116–17. More details on the circumstances of this invitation in de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 192–93. It is hard to pinpoint the year in which the Lochs arrived

at Ouranoupolis. No exact date is mentioned in *Fringe of Blue*. Joice NanKivell Loch, *Prospori- on-Uranopolous* [sic]: *Rugs and Dyes* (Istanbul: American Board Publication Department, 1964), 7,

dates this arrival to 1928—a date contradicted by the participation of the Ouranoupolis rugs to the First International Fair in Thessaloniki (mentioned in NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 122), which took place in 1926. For the purposes of the present contribution, I chose to consider the memory of the First International Fair as more reliable because it is based on a fiscal event that proved very important for Joice Loch's life-long endeavors.

10 Loch, *Athos*, 13–14.

11 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 121–22.

12 Μανώλης Χουμεριανός, «Αργαλειοί της Καπαδοκίας», 2002, *Encyclopaedia of the Hellenic World, Asia Minor* URL: <<http://www.ehw.gr/l.aspx?id=3718>>, accessed October 2016;

Λήδα Ιστικοπούλου, *Η ελληνική ταπητουργία και η ταπητουργός στη Μικρά Ασία, 1860-1922*

(Βιβλιοπωλείον της Εστίας: Αθήνα, 2000). Some information can also be found in Ioakeimidis,

<<http://www.ioakeimidis.gr/i-istoria-tis-oikogeneias>>, accessed October 2016.

13 Όλγα Βογιατζόγλου, «Η βιομηχανική εγκατάσταση των προσφύγων στη Νέα Ιωνία: παράμετρος της αστικής εγκατάστασης» στο *Ο ξεριζωμός και η άλλη πατρίδα. Οι προσφυγομπόλεις στην Ελλάδα* (Σχολή Μωραΐτη. Εταιρεία Σπουδών Νεοελληνικού Πολιτισμού και Γενικής Παιδείας: Αθήνα, 1999), 148–63; Χάρης Σαπουντζάκης, Λουκάς Χριστοδούλου, *Η Νέα Ιωνία στο Μεσοπόλεμο, 1922-1941* (Εκδ. Ένωση Σπάρτης Μικράς Ασίας: Αθήνα, 2015).

14 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 122.

15 It bears clarifying that hand-knotted pile rugs were a refugee specialty; obviously, other forms of weaving had strong local traditions elsewhere in Greece. On the Chalkidiki area, see <<http://www.dimosaristoteli.gr/gr/culture/textiles-Ouranoupoli-Arnaia>> accessed October 2016.

16 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 122.

17 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 122. An account of how Joice was inspired with Byzantine designs is provided in de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 212, but a Byzantinist would find it impossible to trust, given that it includes phrases like the following: “Her favorite design was taken from a carving at Vatopedi of the *Espighmenou* or Tree of Life [sic], showing amongst the blossoms a bird which had eaten the flower of good and evil.” The photograph of a rug in this design is published *ibid.*, plate 3 after p.

18 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 122.

The first encounter with Paraskevoula, nick-named “the Witch”, is narrated in NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 116; her death in 1939 is mentioned *ibid.*, 160. Some details on developing the dyes *ibid.*, 122–23; on training the Swiss Martha Handschin in vegetable dyes after the war, *ibid.*, 238; see also NanKivell Loch, *Prosporion-Uranopolous*, 25–42; Joice painted of Paraskevoula the following portrait: “The Witch was my favorite. There was a worldly elegance about her, and I wondered in what Constantinople slums she acquired her gestures. She was thin from the barest necessities, but long, lean years had not disillusioned her sufficiently to blunt her excellent wit, and she walked briskly as if life had a meaning, her ancient Turkish trousers swinging from her hips with her movements.” (NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 125). More information on Paraskevoula in de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 199–201; more details on developing the dyes in de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 214 ff. An explanation about this book and how it was used in the present paper is in order here: In many cases, it fills in silences in Joice Loch’s 1968 autobiography, *Fringe of Blue*. According to the author’s preface (p. 6), it is based on four years of research. In discussing the rug industry set up by Joice Loch in Ouranoupolis, the author occasionally footnotes oral interviews with two of Joice Loch’s assistants in the enterprise: Fani Mitropoulou (d. 2008), a manager of Pirgos rugs and Joice Loch’s housekeeper during the last decades of her life; and Martha Handschin (d. 2006), an associate of Joice Loch in creating dyes for the rugs. The footnotes to the text suggest that Susanna de Vries also consulted, at least to a certain degree (she remarks on the difficulty of accessing them), the private papers of the Lochs, now in Ouranoupolis, and newspaper clippings apparently collected by Martha Handschin (de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, Chapter 29, note 3, p. 354). The book is therefore valuable for consulting unpublished primary sources and key informants who are now deceased. However, it contains inconsistencies and some obvious misinformation, which compromise its overall reliability and suggest that anyone wishing to mine it for hard facts should do so only after checking independent sources. Some examples that could easily be multiplied: the emperor who provided the funds for the building of the Great Lavra is said to be Nicholas II of Byzantium (*ibid.*, 180); the great painter, sculptor, engraver and author Nikos Hadjikyriakos-Ghikas (1906-1994) is mentioned as “Panos Ghika” (*ibid.*, 315, 322); the well-known British poet, essayist and translator Philip Sherrard is said to be an archaeologist (*ibid.*, 329); a monk from the monastery of Panteleimon with whom the Lochs had a friendly relationship is repeatedly referred to as “Brother Anaphronos”—a non-existent Greek-sounding name, perhaps a mistake for “Sophronios”; the minute island of Amouliani is said to be uninhabited

in the year 2000 (*ibid.*, 180), although it was ceded to refugee families in the 1920s and has been steadily inhabited by a few hundred permanent residents since; acorns, repeatedly mentioned as milled to produce flour and coffee for the poor diet of the villagers, are impossible to find at a sea-side location such as Ouranoupolis; the description of a mass wedding celebration in the

late 1930s (*ibid.*, 230–31) includes so many outright impossibilities that it can only be a figment of the author's imagination: the traditional costumes cannot have been worn as described because, by the late 1930s, both men and women in the broader area of Chalkidiki around the mines

of Stratoniki had entirely adopted European fashions and no longer wore traditional dress, not even on special occasions. The *rebetika*, a variety of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century songs expressing the sentiments of the urban poor at the margins of Greek society in frequently risqué terms, cannot have been performed at a village wedding in the 1930s: they came together as a collective category under this name only in the 1960s, and would have been scandalously inappropriate for such a celebration, even if they were known to a rural population. Likewise, the “threshing dance” commemorating “Greeks slaughtered by the Turks” is the *kangeleftos*, danced only at the site where the execution took place in 1821, i.e. the threshing floor outside Ierissos (a large village in the vicinity of Ouranoupolis), strictly on the Tuesday after Easter and on no other occasion. I would like to thank my father, NAME WITHHELD (b. Stratoniki, 1929), for confirming details of everyday life in Chalkidiki in the 1930s. For this reason, I decided to base my own narrative exclusively on Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, and footnote de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread* only when the information it offered appeared to be verifiable through independent testimony, or when it footnoted a concrete primary source that could be independently pursued.

19 On William Morris in Australia, see Andrew Montana, *The Art Movement in Australia: Design, Taste and Society 1875-1900*. Second Miegunyah Press Series (Book 31). (Melbourne University Publishing: Melbourne, 2000), 223–24; although Morris' products were a hard-to-afford luxury for most Australians, there were other channels of disseminating a taste for medieval art, such as the “Medieval Court” at the 1866–67 Intercolonial Exhibition (*ibid.*, 140).

20 <<http://www.australia.gov.au/about-australia/australian-story/arts-and-crafts-movement>> accessed October 2016.

21 Paschalis Kitromilides, “On the Intellectual Content of Greek Nationalism: Paparrigooulos, Byzantium, and the Great Idea,” *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity*, ed. David Ricks and Paul Magdalino (Ashgate Publishing: Aldershot, 1998), 25–35.

22 For details on the life and work of Angeliki Chatzimichali, see the memoir of her daughter: Έρση Χατζημιχάλη, *Περίπατος με την Αγγελική* (Κάκτος: Αθή

23 να, 1999).

24 Kourelis, “Byzantium and the Avant-Garde.”

25 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 123. NanKivell Loch, *Prosporon-Uranopolous*, 10-11 tells the same story in slightly greater detail.

- 1 NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, 238–39; more details can be found in NanKivell Loch, *Prosporon-Uranopolous*, 11-12, including the following information on royal interest: “His Majesty, King George of Greece, was always very interested in the rug making, and in the winter of 1946 he asked me if there seemed any possibility of getting the industry back on its old footing. I quoted prices to him and he agreed sadly that most likely any idea of restarting it would have to be abandoned. It was 1952 before I decided to try to start it by slowly replacing my own collection.” De Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 314, describes the re-start of the operation in similar terms (with small discrepancies). As for the royal interest in rug making prior to WWII, De Vries, *ibid.*, 228, reports that in 1938 the Lochs were decorated by the Greek government on account of their humanitarian work and the founding of Pyrgos rugs; if this is so, a royal request to re-establish the operation in the post-war period makes sense. The problem is that, according to de Vries’ narrative, the King and Queen who decorated the Lochs in 1938 were Paul and Freideriki. This is impossible, as Paul sat on the Greek throne only in 1947.

2 <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaShow.action>> accessed October 2016.

3 A connection with royal initiative is only implicitly acknowledged on this website: «**Η Οικονομία είναι ένα από τα πολλά προνοιακά προγράμματα του Ι.Κ.Π.Α. [Ινστιτούτο Κοινωνικής Προστασίας και Αλληλεγγύης], το οποίο ιδρύθηκε το 1947 με αρχικό στόχο την επίλυση κοινωνικών προβλημάτων υποβαθμισμένων περιοχών. Το 1953, με το στήσιμο του πρώτου αργαλειού στο χωριό Λέχοβο της Καστοριάς, ξεκίνησε το Οικονομικό Πρόγραμμα και με την πάροδο των ετών εξαπλώθηκε σχεδόν σε όλη τη χώρα.**» [The Arts and Crafts program is one of several launched by the Institute for Social Protection and Solidarity, founded in 1947 and initially aiming to address the social problems of poverty-stricken regions. The Arts and Crafts program started with a single loom, set up in 1953 at the village of Lehovo in the region of Kastoria. Over the years, it expanded almost throughout the country]. Soberly evaluating the role of the Queen’s Fund in the post-war development of the Greek arts and crafts stumbles upon a number of political and ideological problems that still tantalize modern Greek society: already at the time of its inception, the Queen’s Fund, which was not a government organization but depended on public funds and resources in order to function, was criticized for using public assets to boost the personal image of the Queen and the royal family. The meddlesome and destabilizing political role of the Queen and the royal entourage during the decades that followed contributed to the unpopularity of

the Greek monarchy and its eventual fall from power—an event folded into Greece’s political adventures during the junta of 1967–74 and its aftermath. This negative political baggage can help explain the reticence surrounding how the *Pronoia*’s successful and influential arts and crafts program took off.

4 “Ωραία χαλιά και κιλίμια στην έκθεση Βασιλικής Προνοίας» *Βήμα (Vema)*, 27 November 1969, 107; viewable at <[http://www.nationalgallery.gr/library/el/cifiopoiimena\\_ar8ra\\_efimeridon/el\\_19693107\\_00003\\_0001.html](http://www.nationalgallery.gr/library/el/cifiopoiimena_ar8ra_efimeridon/el_19693107_00003_0001.html)> accessed October 2016.

5 On rug production supported by *Pronoia* in the 1950s in Phourka, Chalkidiki, see <<http://arhiol.com/laoграфия/oikotexnia>> accessed October 2016. The website of the factory Ioakeimidis offers information on the weavers it employed over the years; some were trained by *Pronoia*. The website includes no dates: <<http://www.ioakeimidis.gr/i-istoria-tis-oikogeneias>> accessed October 2016; on rug production on Spetses from the 1920s onwards, generated by the arrival of refugees and specializing in oriental designs, see <<http://www.spetses.gr/el/traditionaloccupations>> accessed October 2016. The website of the *Lykeion Ellinidon Volou* on weaving: <[http://www.lev.com.gr/%CF%84%CE%AC%CF%83%CE%B7-%CE%B1%CE%BD%CE%B1%CE%B6%CF%89%CF%80%CF%8D%CF%81%CF%89%CF%83%CE%B7%CF%82-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-](http://www.lev.com.gr/%CF%84%CE%AC%CF%83%CE%B7-%CE%B1%CE%BD%CE%B1%CE%B6%CF%89%CF%80%CF%8D%CF%81%CF%89%CF%83%CE%B7%CF%82-%CF%84%CE%B7%CF%82-%)

%CE%B1%CF%81%CF%87%CE%B1%CE%B9%CE%BF%CF%84%CE%AD%CF%81%CE%B1%CF%82-%CF%84%CF%89/> accessed October 2016.

6 Website of *Pronoia*, last modified in 2011.

7 Brief biographic note on Phroso Ioannidi at <<http://izagori.gr/biogra->







phies/350-%CF%86%CF%81%CE%BF%CF%83%CF%89-%CE%B9%CF%89%CE%B1%CE%B-D%CE%BD%CE%B9%CE%B4%CE%B7-1896-%E2%80%93-1986.html> accessed October 2016;

information on her husband, Ioannis Ioannidis (1880-1960) at <[http://cultureportalweb.uoi.gr/cultureportalweb/article.php?article\\_id=1067&topic\\_id=184&level=3&belongs=183&area\\_id=18&lang=gr](http://cultureportalweb.uoi.gr/cultureportalweb/article.php?article_id=1067&topic_id=184&level=3&belongs=183&area_id=18&lang=gr)> accessed October 2016.

8 A chronicle of the supply and demand for oriental-style handmade and machine made rugs, as well as the popularity of the flokati, can be found at the website of the now closed factory owned by the Oulkeroglou family in Veroia, <<http://www.oulkeroglou.gr/history.htm>> accessed October 2016.

9 This model is mentioned in Phourka in the 1950s, as clarified in <<http://arhiol.com/laografia/oikotexnia>> accessed October 2016; something similar is explained in in *Vema*, 27 November 1969 (see n. 29 above) and in the detailed but unreliable de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 214, 216, 227-228 for pre-war Ouranoupolis.

10 The *Pronoia* website describes them as “ένα καλλιτεχνικό επιτελείο» («artistic staff»); see <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaGuideShowPage.action>> accessed October 2016. 36 Personal recollection, Thessaloniki in mid- to late 1970s.

37 Factories as commissioners of weavers trained by *Pronoia* are mentioned at the website of the factory owned by the Ioakeimidis family; see note 30 above.

38 In *Vema*, 27 November 1969 (see n. 29 above) rugs ordered through *Pronoia* could have a maximum number of 250,000 knots per square meter. This was the highest quality of weaving, named “Kassandra” and priced at a hefty 3,000 drachmas per square meter in 1969. The same number of knots per square meter and under the same name is advertised as the highest quality in 2011; see <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaBargains.action?categoryID=1>> accessed October 2016. To the best of my knowledge, this was also the highest number of knots per square meter that the Ouranoupolis weavers would normally undertake in the 1970s and 1980s. It is possible that the reputation of Ouranoupolis in the post-war years was based on the fact that it had a longer tradi-

tion of weaving than most other rural area supported by *Pronoia* and therefore possessed a greater number of experienced weavers who could carry out more complicated projects. This reputation may also be connected with the quality of the wool and the dying process pursued in Ouranoupolis.

39 De Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 314, based on Loch, *Prosporion-Uranopolous*, 12, which describes the difficulties of restarting Pyrgos rugs but does not explicitly say anything about how the pre-war rug designs were recovered.

40 Loch, *Prosporion-Uranopolous*.

41 Loch, *Prosporion-Uranopolous*, 12–22; the book also includes black-and-white photographs of rugs executed at Ouranoupolis, six in Byzantine and one in Australian aboriginal style.

42 Loch, *Prosporion-Uranopolous*, 12. Those who knew Joice repeatedly commented on her life-long devotion to her native country. Under this light, the statement about dreaming of rugs as history seems to evoke the important role that dreams and dreaming have in the culture of Australia’s aboriginals.

43 Australian newspapers published at least two articles on Joice, based on interviews that she gave. They both include comments on her designs that need to be verified independently. The earlier article, Rachel Irvine, “Rugs that Saved a Village,” *Melbourne Herald*, 11 December 1964,

quotes Joice as follows: “As we built up the industry, we used many designs of pre-Christian times, preserving ancient forms of Art. Now the villagers use ancient Chinese, Egyptian, Persian, Arab, and even Australian art in the fine, handwoven rugs.” The second article, (anonymous) “Austrian Dreams—Designs by the Aegean,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, 24 May 1973, mostly discusses the events of Joice’s life known through her autobiography. Its illustrations (a sketch of the Ouranopolis tower and a portrait of Joice) are accompanied by the rubric “Beauty from Byzantium.”

It concludes as follows: “Besides the Athos designs Mrs Loch says she has copied prehistoric designs from cave walls and from stones to use in the rugs. And some are copied from Aboriginal cave paintings. “The presentation of these ancient designs in the form of rugs is my way of showing a little history through art.”

44 *Vema*, 27 November 1969 (see n. 29 above).

45 Listed under “handknotted carpets” in the categories “Product description” <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaShowCategory.action?categoryID=1>> and “Offers” <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaBargains.action?categoryID=1>> accessed October 2016.

46 <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaBargains.action?categoryID=1>> accessed October 2016.

47 All designs are labeled with a name in the Greek display of the webpages; the English display of the same webpages includes names for some but not all of the designs.

48 Described in de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 213.

49 The photograph is labeled “Rug made in Ouranopolis” (NanKivell Loch, *Fringe of Blue*, plate between pp. 198 and 199), though this is clearly not exactly the same rug.

50 Photograph and description of the rug in de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 216 ff. and plate 5 after p. 224. Interestingly, the famous dolphin fresco cannot be reckoned as a genuine Minoan work. It is an extensive reconstruction, based on very few fragments, by Piet de Jong, produced between 1922 and 1930, and therefore conforming with, and greatly appealing to, twentieth-century sensibilities.

51 <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaGuideShowPage.action>> accessed October 2016. The sources of inspiration are described as follows: “The beauty of ancient Cretan frescos, the Vergina treasure, the wealth of Byzantine vestments and intricate mosaics, as well as the dress, homes, furniture, and handicrafts of more recent folklore. Greek nature is also an interminable source of inspiration: birds, flowers, shells, fish, even rocks...” (my translation; the English version of the same text on the *Pronoia* website is more terse and on occasion incomprehensible).

52 Personal recollection.

53 Personal recollection of a rug woven earlier than my birth date. A weaver reminisces about having executed his design at <[http://www.rodopiblog.blogspot.de/2010\\_03\\_23\\_archive.html](http://www.rodopiblog.blogspot.de/2010_03_23_archive.html)> accessed October 2016 ; she remembers getting paid 1,5 drachmas per 1000 knots, but in which year (or even decade) is not specified.

54 Design titled “Minoan Flowers” (μινωικά άνθη). The overall lay-out of this rug is closely structured after the rug titled «Vergina diadem» (διάδημα Βεργίνας), an object excavated in the late 1970s, by which point Joice was probably no longer designing (she had a serious accident in the late 1960s that permanently affected her memory and power of concentration; de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 330–31). Among the embroidered rugs advertised on the *Pronoia* website one can see designs inspired from a source chronologically and esthetically close to Minoan

art, namely the frescoes of Thira (excavated from 1967 onwards), in which Joice cannot have had a hand. The closest to Byzantine inspiration among the embroidered rugs is the design called “Coptic.” See <<http://www.ekka.org.gr/OikotexniaShowCategory.action?categoryID=3>> accessed October 2016.

This seems to be the case, based on the article in *Melbourne Herald*, 11 December 1964, quoted above, note 43.

55

Currently called Sanandaj, an overwhelmingly Kurdish city with important Armenian, Assyrian, and Jewish minorities into the middle of the twentieth century. There is a wide array of Senneh patterns. It is unclear whether serendipity or other circumstances drove their selection for introduction to the

Ouranoupolis repertoire.

56 As a child of ten or twelve in the late 1970s, I recall accompanying my parents to Ouranoupolis, where they discussed placing an order with Fani Mitropoulou. We stayed there several hours considering designs, qualities of weaving, and colors. We were shown samples of executed rugs which included “The Tree of Life” and “the Sakkos of Tsimiskes”. I also remember seeing the book out of which the Pazyryk design was transferred on squared paper for the looms of the village, and two different versions of its motifs drawn on squared cardboard, one in higher

resolution than the other. I believe we also saw a small Pazyryk rug woven in the lower resolution, attributed by our interlocutor to “Kyria Lok”. At least two additional Pazyryk rugs in the higher resolution design, transferred on squared paper by Fani’s daughter Elli, were woven in Ouranoupolis in the late 1970s. Further, I recall choosing colors from a voluminous dossier of samples: wool threads dyed in various hues, occasionally accompanied by brief notes on dye preparation. A newspaper article published in *Kathimerini* on October 8, 2006 (Φαίδωv Χατζηαντωνίου,

“Μια Αυστραλή συγγραφέας στην Ελλάδα”) mentions a color sampler at the hands of Fani Mitropoulou. It would be interesting to know how many such color samplers existed in the small community of weavers in Ouranoupolis because of the light it would shed on patterns in the transmission of technical knowledge. Obviously, the type of information recorded in a color sampler is elliptical; full information depends on a weaver’s personal memory and the communication of knowledge through oral explanation and practical demonstration. These are all extremely important questions for the transmission of technology. The article in *Kathimerini* can be read

at <<http://www.kathimerini.gr/264994/article/politismos/arxeio-politismoy/mia-aystralh-syggra-feas-sthn-ellada>> accessed October 2016.

57 <[http://potamoulane.blogspot.de/2015/03/blog-post\\_16.html](http://potamoulane.blogspot.de/2015/03/blog-post_16.html)> accessed October 2016.

58 Although Joice never published a book on her designs, it is likely still possible to reconstitute how the designs evolved over the decades: after her death, her personal belongings passed to the custodianship of the Tenth Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, which turned the tower where she and her husband had lived into a museum of Byzantine culture. As of 2006, it includes a section recreating the personal space of the Lochs with their furniture, rugs, and other items. On the exhibit’s inauguration, the Australian ambassador to Greece donated one of Joice’s rugs that was inspired from the art of Australia’s aborigines. The donation is reported in *Kathimerini*, October 8, 2006; a photograph of the rug (Bild 9) is viewable at <<http://www.agion-oros.de/Ouranoupolis.htm>> accessed October 2016. It is unclear whether this rug is one of the nine that Joice donated to “the people of Australia” during a visit there in 1964. The donation represented all periods of the Ouranoupolis production and was intended for the projected Australian National Gallery in Canberra and other museums. Subsequently, this collection was either dispersed (de Vries, *Blue Ribbons Bitter Bread*, 329–30) or misplaced until all but one of the rugs surfaced again at the basement of the Australia Council for the Arts in 2000 (Bellinda Kontominas, “The Great

Heroine Australia Forgot,” *Sydney Morning Herald*, July 8, 2006, viewable at <<http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/the-great-heroine-australia-forgot/2006/07/07/1152240493799.html>> accessed October 2016). One of these rugs, titled “Creation”, is exhibited in Sydney’s Powerhouse museum (<<http://www.powerhousemuseum.com/collection/database/?irn=361572>> accessed October

2016). The museum's labeling betrays a poor understanding of the conditions in which the rug was produced. Important information can still be recovered from the living memory of the people of Ouranoupolis, but the passing of time will make the task increasingly less feasible. In order to

aid with accurately reconstructing the reception of Joice's work, especially from an urban point of view, I recorded here whatever relevant information I had to the best of my ability to recall it.

59 An analogous approach, using the modern Greek production of silk at Soufli in order to understand aspects of Byzantine silk production, was productively adopted in Anna Muthesius, "Essential Processes, Looms, and Technical Aspects of the Production of Silk Textiles," in A. Laiou, ed., *The Economic History of Byzantium: From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 39 (Washington, DC, 2002), 147–168



