



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Fri, 30 Oct 1998 20:09:25 -0500  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: new yarn

Laura wrote:

>Instead of being woven, it is a knitted  
>construction with areas of the core, and areas of  
>chenille.

Or you could just buy a cheap mill-end chenille where some of the fuzzy areas are worn off or just plain come off when you beat. <ggg> Seems to me I just worked with something like that recently. I kept splicing in fresh ends to cover the naked areas. I should have thought to call it devore and let it go. heheheheheh

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #43  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #42  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Friday, October 30 1998

Volume 01 : Number 042

Re: weavetech-digest V1 #41 ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
Re: weavetech-digest V1 #41 ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
Re: weavetech-digest V1 #40 ["Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>]  
Re: Louet Megado [Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>]  
Re: weavetech-digest V1 #41 [Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>]

-----  
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 06:53:13 -0700  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #41

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

>One of our members  
>took a measure of Bach's Partita #6 and translated this directly into a  
>12-shaft twill using black on white. It is quite amazing how beautiful it  
>turned out.

so just how is this done. Is the score used as a pattern with shafts  
assigned and corrections made where needed?

Curious  
Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 07:05:25 -0700  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #41

One of the many points she focuses upon is the tendency  
>of weavers to "see their work not only as art, but also as part of a  
>tradition in the fiber form. They look back and celebrate the work of a  
>anonymous generations of makers as seriously as any of the towering  
>figures in the indexes of big volumes of art history. There is a  
>radicalism in the choice of label (because fiberart forms have never  
>been recognized officially as Art), but there is also willful  
>isolationism." She goes on to suggest if fiberartists were more  
>accepting of other forms of expression, they might be more valid as  
>artists, and an example of this is her suggestion of the disgruntled  
>reactions of fiberartists when an artist from outside the fiber circle  
>is successful with a fiber related piece.  
> A curious viewpoint from my angle...what do you all think?  
>Su :-)

I think the problem is most weavers do not think they can produce art and  
that most people do not think of fibre in the terms of art. I believe with  
weavers we revel in both producing beautifully crafted useful items as well  
as those that wish to express themselves in this media. Why is one mutually  
exclusive of the other? Why does a painter who adds fibre to their work in  
the form of mixed media work have no problem being accepted as a fine artist  
but when one works with fibre as their media they are labeled "just a  
craftsman" ( a label I am proud of by the way). Few fibre artists are  
taken seriously in the art world.

Also that is a pretty big (and wrong) generalization for someone to make  
"She goes on to suggest if fiberartists were more accepting of other forms  
of expression, they might be more valid as artists, " as to the rest of the  
sentence see my statement above. I do not make the rules, stupid as they  
are. Frankly I think the art world is held hostage by pretentious art  
critics who have convinced this world that 1. That you need a degree to  
be a REAL ARTIST, 2. that all pieces must make a worthy  
statement to be valid 3. That fibre work is not valid as an art form  
unless it is an add on or is tapestries from a gazillion years ago.

Pamela  
getting out the latte and waiting for rebuttals, comments and general  
stuff. I love these discussions.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 98 09:54:31 PST  
From: "Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #40

A web site that may be of interest:

<http://www.emergingtextiles.com>

It is geared towards the textile "industry" but has interesting info such as the freeze Australia has just announced on wool sales because the price is too low.....

Laura Fry

-----  
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 16:06:04 -0700  
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>  
Subject: Re: Louet Megado

>Since I didn't have the good sense to get bitten by the CAW bug \*before\*  
>Convergence (only since Conv), I wasn't cruising the booths trying out  
>various computerized looms. Did anyone give the Louet Megado a workout?  
>If so, what did you think of it? I had thought it came only as a 32-shaft  
>loom, but it seems they make a 16-shaft version as well, and the price  
>makes it \*much\* more attractive than an AVL.

>  
>Next question: are you software developers (Ingrid, Sally) writing drivers  
>for this loom? If yes, when do you expect them to be ready?

>  
>Ruth

>-----  
>rsblau@cpcug.org  
>Arlington, Virginia USA  
>-----

Ruth

I did try out the Megado and was quite impressed! We even pegged it for double weave and the lifting was almost feather weight due to the clever way they have designed it to pivot. (I can't explain it well but my physics prof hubby looked at the picture and the specs and told me to order one.) I talked to David at Louet and he told me they were probably only going to have it be computer driven as there are some "technical difficulties" with the pegging method. So, we'll see. I am still torn by which to go with (AVL or this loom) but I am tempted by the 32 shafts! But since I have a Mac I have to hope that ProWeave will be writing a driver for this loom. Or, Ingrid, is Bob going to get the PCW for Mac by Xmas this year???

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-----  
Date: Thu, 29 Oct 1998 16:17:31 -0700  
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #41

>>One of our members  
>>took a measure of Bach's Partita #6 and translated this directly into a  
>>12-shaft twill using black on white. It is quite amazing how beautiful it  
>>turned out.  
>  
>so just how is this done. Is the score used as a pattern with shafts  
>assigned and corrections made where needed?  
>Curious  
>Pamela

Hi Pamela  
She had the original hand-scribbled manuscript and noticed the striking  
similarity to early weaving notation. She found a section which had a very  
twill looking run of notes up 5 or 6, then down 3 or 4, then back up. It is  
almost an advancing point twill. Hope this helps.

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #42  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #41  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest      Thursday, October 29 1998      Volume 01 : Number 041

Warp Face/ Weft Face      [Alice Schlein <aschlein@concentric.net>]  
Re: Weaving on the edge      [Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]  
Re: weaving, music, and math      [Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>]  
Louet Megado      [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 08:41:30 -0500  
From: Alice Schlein <aschlein@concentric.net>  
Subject: Warp Face/ Weft Face

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Bonnie wrote:

>Alice Schlein had an article a while ago in Weaver's about making  
>warp-faced fabric and weft-faced also, same piece of fabric, not one side  
>warp emphasis etc but a warp rep fabric and then some boundweave next to  
>it. She did it by grouping the warp ends when she wanted weft-faced, and I  
>believe she used a fine weft yarn too.

The Weaver's Issue referred to is #13, p.30.

Yarns used in the samples for that article are all 5/2 pearl cotton, sett at 40 epi and 40 ppi. The technique is most effective when warp & weft yarns are exactly the same grist, and the same sett. There is complete coverage in both warp-faced areas and weft-faced areas. This is a rather stiff fabric.

Other yarns & setts may of course be used. Betty Carlson has had good results with a finer rayon yarn & more open sett and beat. In this casem the coverage is only partial (warp emphasis areas contrasting with weft emphasis areas), and the fabric is quite drapable. Her repeat units are smaller, too: groups of 3 instead of groups of 6.

Whatever the yarn & sett, the opportunities for color & weave effect are enormous.

Alice

-----

Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 08:15:16 -0800  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

Ruth Blau wrote:

>

> There's a letter to the editor in the Fall SS&D

Hi all...trying hard not to beat a dead horse...have you seen the latest issue of Surface Design Journal? It is all about "Textile Matters", with a particularly intriguing essay written by Lois Martin called "When is Thread Art?" One of the many points she focuses upon is the tendency of weavers to "see their work not only as art, but also as part of a tradition in the fiber form. They look back and celebrate the work of anonymous generations of makers as seriously as any of the towering figures in the indexes of big volumes of art history. There is a radicalism in the choice of label (because firberart forms have never been recognized officially as Art), but there is also willful isolationism." She goes on to suggest if fiberartists were more accepting of other forms of expression, they might be more valid as artists, and an example of this is her suggestion of the disgruntled reactions of fiberartists when an artist from outside the fiber circle is successful with a fiber related piece.

A curious viewpoint from my angle...what do you all think?  
Su :-)

-----

Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 09:41:09 -0700  
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>  
Subject: Re: weaving, music, and math

Interesting that this subject should come up as our group just finished a

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

1999 calendar containing over 30 handwoven swatches. One of the month's topics was; "Find your inspiration in a piece of music". One of our members took a measure of Bach's Partita #6 and translated this directly into a 12-shaft twill using black on white. It is quite amazing how beautiful it turned out. Another month's example is; "Mathematical", and a member wove a pair of rectangular spirals in an 18-block Atwater/Bronson lace. If anyone is interested in knowing more about this stimulating study feel free to contact me.

Sincerely, Terri Tinkham  
arachne@humboldt1.com

-----  
Date: Wed, 28 Oct 1998 17:58:41 -0500  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Louet Megado

Since I didn't have the good sense to get bitten by the CAW bug \*before\* Convergence (only since Conv), I wasn't cruising the booths trying out various computerized looms. Did anyone give the Louet Megado a workout? If so, what did you think of it? I had thought it came only as a 32-shaft loom, but it seems they make a 16-shaft version as well, and the price makes it \*much\* more attractive than an AVL.

Next question: are you software developers (Ingrid, Sally) writing drivers for this loom? If yes, when do you expect them to be ready?

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #41  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #40  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Wednesday, October 28 1998

Volume 01 : Number 040

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

weaving, music, and math [Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>]  
Re: weaving, music, and math [arwells@erols.com]  
Harnesses&Initials [Alice Schlein <aschlein@concentric.net>]  
Old Fiberworks ["Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>]  
advancing twills and looms ["Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>]  
warp faced/weft-faced [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 06:29:26 -0500  
From: Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>  
Subject: weaving, music, and math

Clyde, I've played a lot with drafting music. It's an endlessly fascinating study from both the music and the weaving design standpoints. I find that some styles of music work better than others (best luck has been with some classical, folk, and hymns). Even though I played classical piano for years (with 9 years of lessons), I learned a whole lot about the structure of music and differences between various composers and styles of music. Bach, with his very logical and mathematical approach, often works very well as a weaving draft. The swooping curves bear a lot of similarity to network curves although they are not so regular as what people normally choose to network.

One musical trick that I find interesting and useful in weaving is the way a phrase is given, then repeated with a little elaboration, then perhaps again with more elaboration, and then finally with closure. In weaving that leads to a series of largish motifs that may gradually increase from half to full, a useful design trick. As they increase in completeness they do not stay exactly the same, but "morph" (vary in a semi-logical way) a little each time. The change in completeness combined with the small changes in shape lead to a much more interesting design than the usual symmetric (mirrored) figures repeated like soldiers across the plane of the fabric. By moving the location of the "complete" columns and rows you can change the focal point of the piece. Having it along one side and one end (analogous to the musical climax at the end) doesn't work as well in weaving unless you are doing wall hangings.

I've also played a lot with trying different ways of showing harmonies and using different structures for different kinds of music.

Biggest problem in weaving music? The best patterns tend to take more shafts than I have. So my work is almost all in drafts - boo hoo!

Have you read "Godel, Escher, Bach"?

Laurie Autio

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:33:00 -0800  
From: arwells@erols.com  
Subject: Re: weaving, music, and math

Clyde -

Well, I can't find your original message any more, but have read the responses to it with interest! You know, though, I got a very different set of thoughts from your original post (which I can't reread - - darn!). Based on the composers you mentioned, I got the idea that your point was that these modern age musicians (most of whom I dislike, sorry to say) were perceived as modern, composing on the edge, etc. \*but\* they were composing based on formula music theory. The dodecaphonic stuff came to my mind immediately! (which I also, for the



## WeaveTech Archive 9810

most part don't like ...). So I thought you were trying to draw the analogy that as in music, new weaving, contemporary "on the cutting edge" weaving seemed to you to be very mechanical and based on formulas.

Now, Clyde. I don't have your address, so I have to send this to the List, but please be kind in your response (or respond privately)<g>. Did I miss the boat \*completely\* in what you were trying to say???

Mystified but interested,  
Anne in Annandale  
arwells@erols.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 10:18:09 -0500  
From: Alice Schlein <aschlein@concentric.net>  
Subject: Harnesses&Initials

Just jumped into the list and probably missed the beginning of this discussion. However, the following message from Bonnie caught my eye:

>Judie said, "The number of harnesses is usually a multiple of the initial."  
>  
>The reason for this, I believe, is that it's much easier to make  
>interesting tie-ups when this is the case.

That's quite true for working with tieups. If you're designing in the lift plan, however, there's an additional advantage in keeping the network as an exact multiple of the initial. You can wrap the lift plans (horizontally) and make vast changes in the design this way.

On the other hand, using networks which are NOT a multiple of the initial allows the "shaft impaired" to use networking on structures they might not otherwise be able to use. Like 5-end satin and 3-end twill networks on 8 shafts, etc. But you can't wrap.

Alice Schlein

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 18:37:33 +0200  
From: "Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>  
Subject: Old Fiberworks

Thanks Ingrid, I'm very interested. At the Patternland Study Group, Bob mentioned he could give me a driver (or something like that) but I did not have a chance to pick it up.

I'm running an AVL 16H, and, as I mentioned, I bought the "Compu-Dobby I" so that my old software could run the loom. I'm using Weave Planner 1.2. I do have it installed on my hard disk Windows 95. Ingrid, I really appreciate it but remember, my PC is "the" original, even the Weave Planner Plus was too sophisticated.

But, your the doctor!

Yehudit

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 98 14:36:59 PST  
From: "Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>  
Subject: advancing twills and looms

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

About advancing twills, Judie wrote: "the number of threads in the twill line can be predicted: the sum of the length of the initial and the advance equals the number of threads in the twill line."

Thank you Judie for this formula. I suppose it was the conclusion of all my numbers but I had not seen it yet and now it is very clear.

To continue on the topic of advancing or "descending" sequences, I have recently tried advancing points on a 3-end initial network, different lengths, and it helps to have a formula to check them:  $t3+1$  (13, 16 or 19 threads ascending) or  $t3-1$  (14, 17 or 20 threads descending). (Bonnie wrote: " If you are going down, and consider it a negative number advance, I think my numbers still hold true.")

" I'm in the throes of making a decision about whether to move to CAW, and want to learn everything I can about the various types of looms."  
Ruth, I am interested too. I would like to know if anybody has tried one of the big Leclerc looms with the computer-dobby they have on their web page (Nilus, Nilart...). They are not so expensive, even for Canadians.

Marguerite Gingras

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Oct 1998 18:58:52 -0500  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: warp faced/weft-faced

Alice Schlein had an article a while ago in Weaver's about making warp-faced fabric and weft-faced also, same piece of fabric, not one side warp emphasis etc but a warp rep fabric and then some boundweave next to it. She did it by grouping the warp ends when she wanted weft-faced, and I believe she used a fine weft yarn too. I've just tried some of this, using a treadling on opposites, and very very fine weft, and I can't make it all that weft-faced. Has anybody on this list tried this? I did eventually make some that looks OK, but I had to change the sett first, and make larger groups of warps too. It was part of an exploration of treadling on opposites, an interesting approach with several different structures. I'd be tempted to blame my loom (this AVL is not a rug loom) but ALice has the same kind of loom, I think. I've found this concept interesting but hadn't tried it before, although somebody had nice results using very fine weft and packing firmly in a workshop I taught once.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #40  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #39  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Tuesday, October 27 1998

Volume 01 : Number 039

Re: weavetech-digest V1 #38 [Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>]  
the edge ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
music & weaving [cbrezine@standard.com]  
advancing [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]  
AVL looms [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]

-----  
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 08:08:50 -0600  
From: Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #38

Catherine wrote: I don't have a warp on yet, but am practicing...the coordination, flying, compudobby, software, etc. I smashed my finger/fingernail int >the shift handle while pulling on the fly shuttle pull. I have

Hi Catherine, I have about 7" above my beater. I think I tried higher but it was too high for comfort for my arms. I think a lot of that may be individual size and preference. My pull handle is an older one I believe, a rectangular piece of wood crosswise at the end of the cord.

Anyway, with the beater pushed back, I pull the cord straight down, perhaps a little forward, and to the side (otherwise I would hit myself in the nose!!!). I go to which ever side I am using, in other words to the right if I'm using my right hand to pull and to the left etc.

On the subject, if you don't keep the beater back for the whole ride of the shuttle, or if the pirn is tightly in the case causing a jerk in the movement, the shuttle will fly right off the race and hit whatever is at the side of the loom. Be it a wall or a window!! I have some lovely dents in my wood floor and the first time it happened my DH had a dent in his leg! because he was standing by the loom. Just a cautionary mention to be careful. Don't put the computer where the shuttle might fly. I've often thought it could really do a number on that. It comes flying off at a pretty good force. I always make sure my dogs are not lying in it's path too.

Cynthia

Blue Sycamore Handwovens  
116 Sycamore Street  
Bay St. Louis, MS 39520-4221

cyncrull@datasync.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 09:28:08 -0700

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: the edge

>A year ago, at the Intermountain Weavers Conference, the winning piece in  
>the fiber exhibit (not fashion show), was a square of cloth, hand-stitched  
>all over in (I think) embroidery floss. Not elaborate stitches--just  
>half-inch or so straight stitches. It was suspended from all four corners  
>by fishing line. Period. That was it. Most people who saw it were  
>bewildered that it got into the show at all, much less won. Was this art  
>on the edge, and I'm a philistine? Or were the judges duped?

Boy is this a can of worms. When in art college I had a prof who would only consider art fibre that which had "meaning"! You could not produce a piece for its intrinsic value, beauty, technical expertise, etc. I crocheted a bridal veil out of wire, built copper wire baskets to hold something precious ( I choose truffles!), did an architectural piece inside the college using survey tapes, did big handmade paper collages focusing on the environment. These all got fairly good marks because I would write a big artistic statement accompanying them. The other pieces would not do as well in her eyes because of the lack of a statement, political or otherwise. Can not pushing the edge be learning a technique and doing it well? Is producing a beautiful piece of fabric not the edge? I watched the videos of the last two convergence fashion shows and several pieces reminded me of couture fashion shows. Cool to look at, totally impractical, workmanship suspicious as the need to make a statement outweighing the good production.

Pamela

not finished on this topic but need to get back to the loom. By the way although rayon chenille is definitely a trend fibre why should not weavers do what pays in order to push the envelope in other pieces.. Even visual artists often take other jobs to pay the way so they can produce their work. The key is to do it well, have pride in the piece.

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 09:20:52 -0800  
From: cbrezine@standard.com  
Subject: music & weaving

Clyde,

I can't say that I've thought particularly of the composers you've mentioned. But, I have done profiles by "name drafting" the melody of favorite hymns.(started with hymns because, in general, the melodies are simple) Also, I've recently been listening to a lot of Bach, and thinking about ways to incorporate the sense of fugue into weaving. This hasn't come to fruition yet, but it's simmering down there.

After reading Deb Menz's new book on color in spinning, and the major and minor color schemes she describes, I wonder if there is a structural way to use major, minor and other modes in cloth.

I know there are some others out there interested in music...

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Carrie

Carrie Brezine   cbrezine@standard.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 12:27:51 -0500  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: advancing

Judie said, "The number of harnesses is usually a multiple of the initial."

The reason for this, I believe, is that it's much easier to make interesting tie-ups when this is the case. Also you have more tie-up choices. I haven't done much with an initial of 3, and I have 16 shafts and prefer to use them all (I could use 15). Marguerite has 12, which is a multiple of 3 as well as 4, and she has done beautiful work on a 3 end initial. I feel I get more possibilities from the 4 end initial and it works well with my loom. I like big designs, and make big things. Those of you with 16 or 24 shafts can look at the 8 end initial (8-shaft twill base) for advancing twills, as it's also quite interesting-- it contains the 4 end as well. Cynthia Crull had this on her Louet last summer at Agnes Scott.

Although the recent discussion has involved advancing twills, the work that prompted my formula was not with twill runs but with curves using an initial and making an advancing threading from the curve. It also works for expanded advancing twills.

Although we've been talking about threadings, of course all these concepts translate immediately to treadlings and can be used with many popular threadings (such as a straight twill, point twill, and twill blocks using the same initial: 1,2,3,1,2,3, is the first block using a 3-end initial). These are all single shuttle fabrics whether you are turning the draft or not. And they have the hand and drape of a twill.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
[www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347](http://www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347)

-----  
Date: Mon, 26 Oct 1998 18:16:27 -0500  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: AVL looms

I hope those of you who are responding to Catherine Markey's questions about her new AVL will reply on-list and not directly to Catherine. I'm in the throes of making a decision about whether to move to CAW, and want to learn everything I can about the various types of looms. I, therefore, found Bonnie's announcement of a class at Chico using AVL's various looms really interesting. One of the great aspects of this list is that so many of you are already using AVLs, Louet Magics, etc. Those of us who are about to stick our toes in those waters need all the help & advice we can get.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #39

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

```
From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #38
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
```

weavetech-digest

Monday, October 26 1998

Volume 01 : Number 038

```
more numbers [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]
Advancing Twills [Jo Anne Ryeburn <ryeburn@sfu.ca>]
=?ISO-8859-1?Q?Re=A0:_numbers?= ["Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>]
Need help w/new AVL [Catherine Markey <markeyali@earthlink.net>]
Re: Advancing Twills ["Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>]
weaving, music, and math [Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com]
```

-----  
Date: Sun, 25 Oct 1998 10:23:52 -0500  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: more numbers

Margaret said, "...still be capable of weaving all 4-shaft twills." That's exactly what I mean when I say I am working with a threading that's on the 4-shaft twill base. When I said I want to retain a consistant fabric, I guess I mean this again, stay on one base.

Margaret again: "Frequently, when one shifts 2 shafts, one can weave plain weave or basket weave but not 4-shaft twills."

Yessss! This is what happens when you look at whether it's an odd or an even number, instead of the t4+ number of advance. If you advance by 2 shafts, you need to have t4+2 threads in the segment you want to advance. This is indeed an even number but not just any even number. It's 6 or 10 (2 times 4 plus 2 is 10) or 14. If you have the wrong sort of even number, you can still make plain weave but not twills. Same thing happens for odd numbers and odd advance numbers.

I've also worked out the reverse direction thing this list was discussing a little while ago. If you are going down, and consider it a negative number advance, I think my numbers still hold true. I gave Sally a sequence for going down with an advance of negative 1, and there were 7 threads in each segment. t4-1 would work for 7.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
Date: Sun, 25 Oct 1998 09:06:34 -0800  
From: Jo Anne Ryeburn <ryeburn@sfu.ca>  
Subject: Advancing Twills

The numbers discussion has reminded me of a question I have concerning advancing twills: is there an optimum number of threads in the twill line that advances for each number of harnesses involved, (and perhaps for the number of harnesses skipped in the advance?). I don't know whether that was clearly expressed, so I'll give an example: I have been taught, and learned from experience, that five threads advancing by one harness works seems to work best on eight harnesses. How about ten, twelve, sixteen, 24 harnesses, etc? (I recently had success with seven threads advancing on 16 harnesses.)

Jo Anne

Jo Anne Ryeburn ryeburn@sfu.ca

-----  
Date: Sun, 25 Oct 98 14:26:21 PST  
From: "Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>  
Subject: =?ISO-8859-1?Q?Re=A0:\_numbers?=  
-----

Bonnie wrote:

...with a 4-shaft twill network base, and I use this most of the time too.  
> For this, if I want to advance 1 shaft, my piece must be an odd number of  
> threads, and it also needs to be  $t+1$ , where  $t$  is a whole number. If I  
> want to advance by 2, I think my piece of threading that I'm advancing  
> needs to be  $t+2$  threads long, and if I'm going to advance by 3, it should  
> be  $t+3$ , and if I want to advance by 4 then it should be a multiple of 4.

Bonnie, I think your formula is right. We can check it this way: if  $t = 1$ ,  $t \times 4 + 1 = 5$ , you get the 5-end advancing twill that is on the 4-shaft twill network base. And  $t \times 4 + 2 = 6$ , a 6-end advancing twill advancing by 2, still on the 4-shaft base.

If you want to stay on the 3-shaft twill network base, the formula is  $t+1$ , so if  $t = 1$ ,  $t \times 3 + 1 = 4$ , the 4-end advancing twill on the 3-shaft base, etc. I have tried yesterday a sequence advancing by 5 on this base, because with 12 shafts I can advance it 12 times. The sequence had 11 threads, so here  $t = 2$ ,  $t \times 3 + 5 = 11$ .

For overshot, can I say that it is on a 2-shaft base? If  $t = 1$ ,  $t \times 2 + 1 = 3$ , a 3-end advancing "twill", alternating odd/even. And  $t \times 2 + 2 = 4$ , an even number.

And if  $t = 0$ ? We get straight twills for all bases, for example,  $t \times 4 + 1 = 1$  (1 2 3...) or  $t \times 4 + 2 = 2$  (12 34 56...).  
Are there exceptions, maybe strange threadings not following these rules?

Here I have used the advancing twills to check this formula, but conversely this formula is useful to find the advancing twills that fall on the right network. Margaret, the reason why I prefer advancing twills on networks (it does not have to be on the 4-shaft twill base, it can be another base) is that this way we have rules for tie-ups that prevent long floats. It is something coherent that satisfies my mathematical brain!

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Marguerite Gingras

-----  
Date: Sun, 25 Oct 1998 11:34:26 -0800  
From: Catherine Markey <markeyali@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Need help w/new AVL

To all you AVL veterans:

I have now assembled my 24s, double fly box, overhead beater, CD2 and have my first set of questions - I know many more will follow.

I don't have a warp on yet, but am practicing...the coordination, flying, compudobby, software, etc. I smashed my finger/fingernail into the shift handle while pulling on the fly shuttle pull. I have identified at least three methods by which I can lessen the potential for this:

1. shorten the pull handle (currently have 10 inches between the bottom of the pull handle and the top of the shift handle. I thought this height was good for not having to stretch upward too much to grab handle.
2. change the direction in which I pull the fly shuttle handle. I was pulling straight down - toward the top of the reed top when this happened. Should I be pulling toward the cloth/breast beam instead?
3. The overhead beater hangs in what I call the neutral position when it returns from beating. I can tighten the return tension cords so that it returns further back - closer to the shafts.

What do the experts suggest? (while considering a sort of joint sensitively, which means I would want to lessen tension on my shoulder/arm/wrist joints).

Thank you all in advance (saves more time for warping this wonder machine).

Catherine Markey  
Petaluma, CA  
markeyali@earthlink.net

-----  
Date: Sun, 25 Oct 1998 17:35:08 -0700  
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Subject: Re: Advancing Twills

>is there an optimum number of threads in the twill line  
>that advances for each number of harnesses involved,

the number of threads in the twill line can be predicted: the sum of the length of the intial and the advance equals the number of threads in the twill line.

For a 4 thread intial with an advance of 1 the twill line should be 5. For an advance of 2; 6 threads in the twill line. For a 3 thread intial and advance of 1, the twill line is 4 threads long.

The number of harnesses is usually a multiple of the intial.



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

So for your example, a 4 thread intial with an advance of 1 equals a 5 thread twill line. This should work well on 8, 12, 16, 20 and 24 shafts.

If you want a twill run of 7 and 16 shafts, you could pick a 4 thread intial with an advance of 3.

Hope this makes sense.

Judie

-----  
Date: Sun, 25 Oct 1998 23:58:14 EST  
From: Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com  
Subject: weaving, music, and math

While listening to this thread on networked drafted advancing twill, I am struck by the similarity to listening to a performance of Schoenberg's Verklaerte Nacht, which was constructed on strict mathematical principles (more or less.)

Interesting...to a point; important, perhaps (at least to several generations of music students.)

But are there no weavers here who think in terms of the Prokofiev sonatas or Stravinsky? .....Granados, maybe ....Bloch.....Satie?

I keep listening, listening, listening, for a Guarnieri....and all I hear is a synthesizer.

Clyde

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #38  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #37  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Sunday, October 25 1998

Volume 01 : Number 037

Re: weaving on the edge ["Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@wor>]

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

numbers  
Re: numbers  
Introduction

[Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]  
[Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
[Beryl Moody <berylm@crl.com>]

-----  
Date: Sat, 24 Oct 1998 12:31:00 -0400  
From: "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>  
Subject: Re: weaving on the edge

I have not yet received my fall issue of SS&D, but I can't resist entering the discussion. To me, the issue boils down to

1. What is art? If, as I've heard, art is a creation that evokes an emotional response in the viewer, then how can there be a single definition? It seems to me that a work of art can evoke many emotions and still be inoffensive.
2. Does it have to be on the cutting edge to be art? If so, then what about all of those wonderful old masters? What about those beautiful Bauhaus textiles that today's weavers surpassed long ago in terms of "cutting edge?" Are they of historical interest only and no longer considered art? Should we put them away and never show them? Should we not take inspiration from them?
3. What is cutting edge? I, for one, haven't a clue. I don't mean this to sound naive or chauvinistic, but...  
If a piece of work doesn't speak to me in some visceral way, then to me it isn't art, regardless of how avant garde it is.
4. What determines a juror's choices for a given show? Having been involved in 2 of the 3 sides of juried shows (applying to and organizing juried shows, but, thankfully not jurying,) I've found that the decisions of a juror often are no better than a crap shoot. A juror's response to a given applicant's work can be affected by the mood and receptiveness of the juror, distractions during jurying, the theme and venue of the show, the juror's prejudice (I once worked with a juror who felt that wearable fiber did not belong in a museum show,) the juror's familiarity with the applicant's "signature" in the work and therefore his/her personal opinion of the applicant, slide quality - and sometimes the artistic merit of the slides themselves, ...

I agree with Su:

> Ms Imes remarks seem to have struck a vulnerable chord with some  
> folks, and my first question is why? The published opinion of one  
> person does not speak for all weavers, nor viewers, collectors, judges  
> etc.

And, yes, I do own, wear and adore Bonnie's coat. As a matter of fact, I plan to wear it Monday night (over my own dress from the Convergence '92 fashion show) to the annual membership meeting and dinner at a local museum. I always feel very artsy in it and, judging from the admiring looks and remarks that it elicits, it certainly is cutting edge art for folks in this area. Isn't that what counts?

Martha

-----  
Date: Sat, 24 Oct 1998 12:54:57 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: numbers

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

I've noticed that many of us have an interest in mathematics. Weaving and math concepts are intimately related, but often we get caught up in the designs and try to do everything visually. I needed to check something from one of the older weavetech digests last night, and happened to come across the message from Margaret Coe about her unusual fabric. Now I'm totally frustrated because I just can't find that one again! The first time I read it, something about the numbers she gave didn't add together to me, and I tried to give advice but wasn't on the right track for this particular threading. I think I've got it now, wish I could find the original from Marge, but here's the generalization anyway. Now I want some of you to check it for me (hi, Marguerite).

If you take a piece of a threading and advance it, usually you want to retain a consistent fabric. For example, if your structure is overshot, you have to retain the alternation of odd/even, so if you plan to advance 1 shaft, you need to have an odd number of threads in the piece. If you plan to advance 2, you need an even number. With overshot, sometimes you want to advance by 1 and other times you want full blocks. Margaret was working with a 4-shaft twill network base, and I use this most of the time too. For this, if I want to advance 1 shaft, my piece must be an odd number of threads, and it also needs to be  $t+1$ , where  $t$  is a whole number. If I want to advance by 2, I think my piece of threading that I'm advancing needs to be  $t+2$  threads long, and if I'm going to advance by 3, it should be  $t+3$ , and if I want to advance by 4 then it should be a multiple of 4. If I remember correctly, Margaret had a network drafted curve of 50 threads and wanted to advance it by 4 shafts. If the curve had 48 threads it would come out right. If Margaret uses 24 shafts, she could advance it 6 times by 4 shafts each time, and then the threading would repeat. I've been working with a curve that is 17 threads long, advancing by 1 shaft, using 16 total. These are very long threadings. I thought I'd point that out in light of the recent discussion on tying on and pulling through-- this is why I don't casually rethread my loom!

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
[www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347](http://www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347)

-----  
Date: Sat, 24 Oct 1998 13:57:15 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: numbers

Bonnie Inouye wrote:

> If I remember correctly, Margaret had a network drafted curve of 50 threads  
> and wanted to advance it by 4 shafts. If the curve had 48 threads it would  
> come out right. If Margaret uses 24 shafts, she could advance it 6 times  
> by 4 shafts each time, and then the threading would repeat. I've been  
> working with a curve that is 17 threads long, advancing by 1 shaft, using  
> 16 total. These are very long threadings.

You're right Bonnie, but it wasn't exactly 50 ends it was \*about 50\* (i.e., 48 or 52). (My problem was purely logistical. I have an ancient computer to run the loom, so I do all designing on a much better situated computer with a more sophisticated program. For the nonce, I have to copy the draft into the loom computer and this is where I dropped the thread! I compounded the error by threading my room sans errant thread, and advanced and repeated the error across the warp. I discovered the whole thing when I started weaving and went back to the draft to check!)

To add to this discussion, one must take into consideration the structure and advance accordingly if it's to remain a \*networked\* draft. An advancing twill \*can\* be on a network, but it doesn't have to be. In other words one can advance

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

two shafts, but with a 4-shaft twill the twill may no longer be. If one doesn't corrupt the network the whole thing, no matter how long a draft, should still be capable of weaving all 4-shaft twills. Frequently, when one shifts 2 shafts, one can weave plain weave or basket weave but not 4-shaft twills.

To make sure I'm not fouling up the structure I now keep a section of plain weave tie up and treadling, and a section of twill tie up and treadling (think computer here) handy to check as I go.

> light of the recent discussion on tying on and pulling through-- this is  
> why I don't casually rethread my loom!

Words from the wise.

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sat, 24 Oct 1998 19:13:39 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Beryl Moody <berylm@crl.com>  
Subject: Introduction

I joined this list several weeks ago, have been enjoying the exchange very much and know that it is time for me to come out of hiding and introduce myself.

I am a relatively new weaver -- 5 or 6 years, but have been involved with fiber for most of my life. In fact, my spinning stash was so out of control, that it was the impetus for my learning to weave. (It hasn't helped my stash, I've only added to the inventory with more weaving yarn). My weaving interests have not solidified yet because I haven't had enough time to do a proper amount of experimentation. I am still constantly surprised by the interaction of weft and warp and even more surprised that what may look good to me on the loom, is a real dog off the loom. Of course, the opposite is also true.

The loom I most frequently use is the Louet Magic Dobby -- just the doobby bars and pegs so far. My sights are on a 24 Shaft AVL Production loom, which will be one of my first purchases as soon as my SO and I sell our current home and move to a more rural environment. My SO uses a Baby Wolf and I borrow that on occasion for painted warps or heavier handspun warps.

I have not sold much of what I weave so far, but hope to do some kind of production weaving with that in mind for the future. Also, I am looking for someone with whom I can collaborate in doing clothing or hats. The idea of weaving yardage for home sewers or decorators is appealing.

The thread about weaving on the edge has been informative. My personal uptake is that my edge is probably someone else's tried and true. I am trying to find a signature and style of my own but it is still too early in the weaving game for that to take its form.

Beryl Moody

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #37  
\*\*\*\*\*

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

```
From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #36
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
```

weavetech-digest

Saturday, October 24 1998

Volume 01 : Number 036

Re: Weaving on the edge  
edge fashion  
Re: weavetech-digest V1 #33

[Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]  
[Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]  
[WC3424@aol.com]

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 15:09:21 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

Ruth Blau wrote:

> the writer (Cynthia Rymer Imes) sees juried  
> into shows and published in magazines is technically well executed but  
> safe--"imaginatively inoffensive,"

I have recoiled from responding to this as I have not yet received my fall SS&D and cannot read the letter for myself....but.....

Ms Imes remarks seem to have struck a vulnerable chord with some folks, and my first question is why? The published opinion of one person does not speak for all weavers, nor viewers, collectors, judges etc.

What I am "reading between the lines" is Ms Imes doesn't value a technically well executed piece, and possibly feels technical expertise results in boring weaving. I would question her blanket statement before taking offense. I would also like to hear her opinion on what she considers imaginatively creative pieces....what makes it work, what makes it cutting edge, why is there more value, in her opinion, in work which breaks the rules....and finally I would like to know how often her own work is rejected from a show.....it feels a bit like sour grapes...IMHO.

> Are judges reluctant to accept new ideas & techniques?

Again, in my very own opinion, I do not think so. I wouldn't have much respect for a judge who granted awards to pieces which were "over the line" just for the sake of being different. Rather I think there is a broader basis for judgement of work submitted for either gallery or

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

Convergence type shows. Having been both an entrant and a judge, I know I myself require an item to be well executed, well designed, made of quality materials, and artistically creative. But who is to say, especially me, if my opinion of what is artistically creative is the same as anyone else's?

I guess the bottom line for me is...it is easy to throw paint on something, frizz up fiber, tangle a web, or a myriad of other "different" methods of manipulating fiber to be imaginative....but to do it within the confines of good design principles, retain aesthetic appeal, create a conceptual statement...that is where the art is created.

Su :-)

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 16:35:49 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: edgy fashion

Ruth, both the paperclip wig and Penny's Dress were made by a first-year student in a fiber art program in Kansas City. The wig was a homework assignment. The girl could not afford to go to Atlanta, so her textiles professor went to take photos and buy the video. The professor sat next to me at the fashion show-- Pauline Cowart-Veerbunk but I might have the spelling wrong. She said the dress was heavy but not impossible. Sigrid Piroch published something years ago with red pockets with things in them, in one of our magazines. Remember, the judges for the fashion show saw slides, had no idea what things might weigh, and we can give the young artist credit for having good slides and concepts, anyway. I was sorry she couldn't be there. I believe that by the time the acceptances arrive, it's too late to apply for scholarships.

Ann, the sweater I made for that fashion show is mine now, and very wearable. It was a personal goal, harder because I'm not built like a model (I'm 5'1" tall). And the coat I made for the 94 Conv. fashion show is wearable, too-- Martha Hubbard bought it and she says she wears it! That one was too long for me.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 20:59:34 EDT  
From: WC3424@aol.com  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #33

I'd like to know how others feel about this. Are there weavers out there "working at the edges"?

Well, I finally must share my thoughts regarding this thrashed topic. As a firstborn, I had to be perfect...yet never reached perfection. I was in this closed little box until discovering the art/craft of weaving and spinning and all it encompasses. I've been trying to "learn" to color outside the lines...but I find I'm most comfortable in creating a work...perhaps repeated from the past by those who created beautiful things before me. But...to create to the very best of my ability. So what if I have a 24 shaft loom and find solace in weaving a 4 shaft overshot pattern!

Does any of the jargon really matter? Are we not involved in the art of creating...looking at our cloth with it singing notes of pure joy? To those who want to push the envelop...go for it. But for those of us who desire to merely take our cloth from the loom and have peace in the accomplishment...isn't this enough?





## WeaveTech Archive 9810

pottery that is going to be used on the table. Broad statements such as those in this article do not, I think, take purposes into account though I may be wrong. Just a few of the thoughts going through my mind as this discussion progresses (thank you Ruth). Another thought, creativity in technique, in the use of computer software in drafting for instance, may not produce a product that is quantitatively different from what has gone before yet it may still be weaving at the edge .....so where do we start judging what is happening creatively, determine where the edge really is....just wondering. (May not have expressed all of this exactly but have tried to capture some of what I've been thinking.) S

Sharon C. Hinze, M.S., ASOTP  
Spokane, WA  
sharlin@uswest.net

-----

Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 08:40:54 -0600  
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

This was an interesting letter to juxtapose against my assignment (as an experienced volunteer docent) in demonstrating for new docents, at a museum of art, techniques that help in taking elementary students through a variety of shows. (Right now we have an Art Department faculty show - very diverse media; Any Warhol's Marilyn series; the fifty states print show, and a new show called Art on Wheels, that features cars.) The theme this month was using the question "What Is Art?" to tie the tour of exhibits together and create the conversation. In the museum staff's presentation they used a Peanuts cartoon to set the stage for the question. Lucy had a clear cut definition of "Art". She had a list the picture needed -- trees, a sunset with orange lines in the sky, waterfall, smoke from chimney of cabin, deer, etc. Now That's Art!, she says. For the rest of us, the question is not that simple.

Is my weaving 'art'? Do I want it to be? Those are the harder questions for me. Sometimes, I just want 'good cloth' as Mary Atwater describes in the Shuttle Craft book. There is pleasure in weaving and using a chennile throw or a wonderful baby blanket. Why weave 'ugly' textiles, you can buy lots of those. Sometimes, I want to weave something more. I found the "Virtuoso!" show very inspiring and thought provoking. When the piece works, it looks so effortless.

Sometimes, you have to listen to hear the song, the volume is not amplified.

Judie

- -----Original Message-----

From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
To: weavetech@List-Server.net <weavetech@List-Server.net>  
Date: Friday, October 23, 1998 6:05 AM  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

>Anne wrote:

>> As I looked through the photos from the Convergence fashion show, my  
>>own opinion was that most of it was on the edge. I didn't feel that



## WeaveTech Archive 9810

>>"real people" would, for the most part, be apt to wear much of what I  
>>saw. To me, it was most definitely weaving on the edge because it was  
>>wild and crazy, and "packaged" as clothing.

>

>I also noodled around about this letter to the editor in the context of the  
>fashion show at Convergence. However, if you'd seen the whole show, I  
>don't think you'd come to the conclusion that \*most\* of it was weaving on  
>the edge. I'd say perhaps 75% was truly wearable clothing and 25% was more  
>art than clothing. For example, "Penny's Dress," which is pictured in  
>SS&D, is a double-woven pocket structure, and into each little pocket the  
>artist enclosed a penny before she wove the pocket shut. The model at the  
>fashion show was carried in on the shoulders of a couple of guys, and the  
>rumor later was that the dress was so heavy, she couldn't walk. This is  
>clearly not a very practical dress, but I think I'd call it at least as  
>conceived as clothing (there's nothing very "art on the edge" about weaving  
>pockets into double cloth) pretty innovative.

>

>The outfits that Diana Brenna makes using lots of tabletweaving are also  
>more what I'd call costuming than clothing, but some of the outfits in the  
>fashion show were very practical, even day-to-day clothing. And some, if  
>not day-to-day, was at least appropriate for special occasions.

>

>But--to take another example from the fashion show: what about the wig made  
>of paper clips? Is this fiber art on the edge? Is this art at all? Is  
>this fiber art at all? (The last two questions reveal my innate  
>fuddy-duddiness.) For those of you who didn't have a chance to see this  
>item, it was a wig in which the hair was paper clips, chained together.  
>The "hair" was mounted on some kind of fiber base (I don't know if the base  
>was handwoven).

>

>A year ago, at the Intermountain Weavers Conference, the winning piece in  
>the fiber exhibit (not fashion show), was a square of cloth, hand-stitched  
>all over in (I think) embroidery floss. Not elaborate stitches--just  
>half-inch or so straight stitches. It was suspended from all four corners  
>by fishing line. Period. That was it. Most people who saw it were  
>bewildered that it got into the show at all, much less won. Was this art  
>on the edge, and I'm a philistine? Or were the judges duped?

>

>Ruth

>-----

>rsblau@cpcug.org

>Arlington, Virginia USA

>-----

>

>

>

>-----

Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 11:36:18 -0500  
From: Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #33

Ruth wrote:

>I'd like to know how others feel about this. Is most (all?) of what gets  
>into shows (Convergence, for example) "imaginatively inoffensive"? Are  
>judges reluctant to accept new ideas & techniques? Are there weavers out  
>there "working at the edges"?

Yes, I saw that letter too, and I think it was offensive. Perhaps the work  
being done now is not "weird" for the most part, but I think that the work  
with advancing twills and networking etc. where we definately are not  
following the tried and true formulas is very much breakthrough.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Sometimes when I see a piece that is supposed to be "great art" in weaving, it reminds me of macrame, just a lot of fiber fouled up. I've seen a lot of it in various magazines, and always felt that because I'm not "artistic" or imaginative enough I will never make it in the fiber world. I prefer to make fabric that is useable and lasting, classic even, although with my own personality included.

I think we have a great bunch of fiber artists that are doing breakthrough work that will be much more than a flash in a pan sort of work. I think there are judges out there who feel that way too, but maybe in some shows the requirements are that it be strange to get in. Maybe those are the shows to which Ms. Imes should apply and attend.

Cynthia

Blue Sycamore Handwovens  
116 Sycamore Street  
Bay St. Louis, MS 39520-4221

cyncrull@datasync.com

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 15:26:38 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: edge-cutting

I thought the pieces in "Virtuoso!" were more innovative than those in the Convergence fashion show. The yardage show was heavily juried, well displayed but unfortunately not conveniently located. I wonder if the things that look innovative to one audience aren't the "trendy" things to another. Trends I've noticed in artsy weaving in the past few years: a big one is distortions... burn-out areas, voided with chemicals, fabrics purposely shrunk in places or portions (I've played with this one). I first heard a talk about burn-out at Convergence in 1984, so it isn't exactly a new thing. Verda took a workshop at a Surface Design conference (those people are way more cutting edge than weavers in general, and more connected to art schools too) and told me about somebody shooting fabric with bullets to make interesting holes, now there's a literal cutting edge!

I don't like distortion for the sake of being new or shocking. The other trend is text. Words in textiles. I think we'll see more of this, too. Again it isn't new, but seems a current fad. I don't see any point in doing something just because it's the trend, but then I'm not in school either. Jane Eisentein, are you still on this list? How about the view from the grad student in textiles desk? And thanks for showing me around the Phila College of Textiles.

A bit of news: AVL is opening a different kind of school, in Chico. They want me to teach a class in February, so I'm hearing some details now. Room for 10 students at a time, using 5 AVL looms that will be warped ahead by warping fairies, a chance to learn advanced techniques and try out those bells and whistles, and more. Your official notice will come with that newsletter that AVL puts out. I hope they don't mind this little sneak preview. I think this group would want to know ahead, in case anybody is planning a trip in that direction.  
Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
[www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347](http://www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347)

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

End of weavetech-digest V1 #35

\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)

To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net

Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #34

Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net

Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net

Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Friday, October 23 1998

Volume 01 : Number 034

Re: Weaving on the edge

[Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]

Re: Weaving on the edge

[Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com]

Re: trend/leading edge tradition

[Foresthrt@aol.com]

Re: Weaving on the edge

[hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)]

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 08:00:45 -0400

From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>

Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

Anne wrote:

> As I looked through the photos from the Convergence fashion show, my  
>own opinion was that most of it was on the edge. I didn't feel that  
>"real people" would, for the most part, be apt to wear much of what I  
>saw. To me, it was most definitely weaving on the edge because it was  
>wild and crazy, and "packaged" as clothing.

I also noodled around about this letter to the editor in the context of the fashion show at Convergence. However, if you'd seen the whole show, I don't think you'd come to the conclusion that \*most\* of it was weaving on the edge. I'd say perhaps 75% was truly wearable clothing and 25% was more art than clothing. For example, "Penny's Dress," which is pictured in SS&D, is a double-woven pocket structure, and into each little pocket the artist enclosed a penny before she wove the pocket shut. The model at the fashion show was carried in on the shoulders of a couple of guys, and the rumor later was that the dress was so heavy, she couldn't walk. This is clearly not a very practical dress, but I think I'd call it at least as conceived as clothing (there's nothing very "art on the edge" about weaving pockets into double cloth) pretty innovative.

The outfits that Diana Brenna makes using lots of tabletweaving are also more what I'd call costuming than clothing, but some of the outfits in the fashion show were very practical, even day-to-day clothing. And some, if not day-to-day, was at least appropriate for special occasions.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

But--to take another example from the fashion show: what about the wig made of paper clips? Is this fiber art on the edge? Is this art at all? Is this fiber art at all? (The last two questions reveal my innate fuddy-duddiness.) For those of you who didn't have a chance to see this item, it was a wig in which the hair was paper clips, chained together. The "hair" was mounted on some kind of fiber base (I don't know if the base was handwoven).

A year ago, at the Intermountain Weavers Conference, the winning piece in the fiber exhibit (not fashion show), was a square of cloth, hand-stitched all over in (I think) embroidery floss. Not elaborate stitches--just half-inch or so straight stitches. It was suspended from all four corners by fishing line. Period. That was it. Most people who saw it were bewildered that it got into the show at all, much less won. Was this art on the edge, and I'm a philistine? Or were the judges duped?

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 08:14:24 EDT  
From: Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

In a message dated 10/23/98 5:05:08 AM Pacific Daylight Time, rsblau@cpcug.org writes:

> into each little pocket the  
> artist enclosed a penny before she wove the pocket shut.

hmmmm, Mary Atwater did the penny trick over 60 years ago.....

Clyde

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 08:55:48 EDT  
From: Foresthrt@aol.com  
Subject: Re: trend/leading edge tradition

I have difficulty agreeing that if it pushes the boundaries, has not been done before, is imaginatively OFFensive, that it is better.

I think those doing something different just to be different often get a leg up on those doing something more traditional but technically and artistically masterful. Seems that if work is reminiscent of work that has been done before, that it is automatically disadvantaged, despite that more exploratory work may not be as functional, as technically well done, insightful, whatever.

This is not to say that once we've found something that works, let's just do that over and over. But it does irk me that "new" is equated with "better". New is different, that's all. Better remains to be seen.

>art "can't grow without people working at the edges, pushing the limits and trying the unthinkable. This work is bound to be rough and difficult, but without it, everything else eventually becomes decoration."

Lots of breakout work appears to be decoration right from the get go (and not

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

necessarily well made, but applauded anyhow). It's a step, a milestone-and perhaps that is its value, without necessarily being a piece to die for in and of itself. (The first time someone caught their hair on fire- marker of having fire within our reach, but burnt bald is not the victory!)

An exploratory sample is not necessarily a breakthrough. We can generate lots that is new, but what of all that is something we actually WANT? Loosing virginity live on the internet- just because it hadn't been done before doesn't make it wonderful, or even, in my opinion, growth.

There may be excellent reasons that nobody has made a baby blanket out of barbed wire. (Oh, I could write lots of materials to show what a strong statement a barbed wire baby blanket is- it's the stuff grants are made of.)

>technically well executed but safe--"imaginatively inoffensive,"  
Inoffensive probably sells better. There's a practicality/financial feasibility factor.

Rough and difficult? Not your big sellers. Not even the stuff of dreams (except nightmares). Art doesn't have to be (and should not be exclusively) pretty, but enjoyment feels good. For some, challenge is the best feeling. Breakout is valuable for that.

I'm not sure if weaving exhibition judges tend to be more conservative than others, or if weavers as a group present less breakout work, or even if there is consensus that between breakout/traditional work one is favored over the other in any given venue. In general, I feel like breakout gets more than its fair share of attention and applause.

(this may be the first test of the feisty factor of this list?)

Mary Klotz

-----  
Date: Fri, 23 Oct 1998 09:16:26 -0500  
From: hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)  
Subject: Re:Weaving on the edge

-----  
>Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org> Wrtoe:

>Subject: Weaving on the edge

>

>There's a letter to the editor in the Fall SS&D that I found interesting.  
>It's the first letter, called "Where is the Breakout Work?" The thrust of  
>the letter is that the weaving the writer (Cynthia Rymer Imes) sees juried  
>into shows and published in magazines is technically well executed but  
>safe--"imaginatively inoffensive," in Ms Imes' words. She goes on to say  
>that art "can't grow without people working at the edges, pushing the  
>limits and trying the unthinkable. This work is bound to be rough and  
>difficult, but without it, everything else eventually becomes decoration."

>

>I'd like to know how others feel about this. Is most (all?) of what gets  
>into shows (Convergence, for example) "imaginatively inoffensive"? Are  
>judges reluctant to accept new ideas & techniques? Are there weavers out  
>there "working at the edges"?

I have often worked "on the edge" for years. Frequently I try all sorts of things that one might not believe of me. However, 99% of those "edge" things got thrown in the trash. I don't think that my experiments should necessarily be made public - they are \*my\* learning experience and I don't need to have them stuck on the world's refrigerator door so that others may say that it is "interesting" and verbally pat me on the back. One thing I'm concerned about is that someone may like it well enough to try to get me to do it again. No way!! If I think it is bad - IT'S BAD and I sure don't want to do it again. I'm not a masochist who finds pleasure in

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

parading my rejects before the world.

There may be some who think that everything they do is worthy of presentation but I'm not one of them.

One of my criteria is that my weaving must also be structurally sound and, in some way, useful. Perhaps Ms. Imes is just getting bored by the high quality goods that always seem to rise to the top. In my experience, the "creme de la creme" is rarely derived from the unthinkable, the imaginatively offensive, or otherwise so far out that it appeals only to judges who are bored with their work and, so, challenge others to get them to titillate their (the judges) fancy.

I doubt that judges are reluctant to accept new ideas and techniques. I think it far more likely that they have a very discerning eye and will rarely do much to sanction the really strange works that might represent tomorrow afternoons hot item, only to die by the next morning. In other words, most judges, I believe, do know really good stuff. And they know that difference for the sake of difference is a poor criteria for excellence.

I don't agree with Ms Imes that art cannot "grow" without people working at the edges. Art is, to me, more about excellence than it is about about being different.

Dick Lindell, Weaver  
visit me at <<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>>

- - - - -

The first step to Wisdom is in calling things by their right name.

-- Lao Tzu

-----

End of weavetech-digest V1 #34  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #33  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Friday, October 23 1998

Volume 01 : Number 033

Weaving on the edge  
Re: Weaving on the edge  
Re: Weaving on the edge  
Re: Weaving on the edge

[Ruth Blau <[rsblau@cpcug.org](mailto:rsblau@cpcug.org)>  
[[Xu4Gpy9cQ1@aol.com](mailto:Xu4Gpy9cQ1@aol.com)]  
[[Xu4Gpy9cQ1@aol.com](mailto:Xu4Gpy9cQ1@aol.com)]  
[[arwells@erols.com](mailto:arwells@erols.com)]

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-----  
Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 17:42:20 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Weaving on the edge

There's a letter to the editor in the Fall SS&D that I found interesting. It's the first letter, called "Where is the Breakout Work?" The thrust of the letter is that the weaving the writer (Cynthia Rymer Imes) sees juried into shows and published in magazines is technically well executed but safe--"imaginatively inoffensive," in Ms Imes' words. She goes on to say that art "can't grow without people working at the edges, pushing the limits and trying the unthinkable. This work is bound to be rough and difficult, but without it, everything else eventually becomes decoration."

I'd like to know how others feel about this. Is most (all?) of what gets into shows (Convergence, for example) "imaginatively inoffensive"? Are judges reluctant to accept new ideas & techniques? Are there weavers out there "working at the edges"?

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 20:25:25 EDT  
From: Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

Yes, Ruth, I agree.  
Trends rule.

In each decade, there is the trend, and there is the new. I believe there are weavers venturing beyond the trend, but they keep their smart mouths shut. There are trends that are so powerful, no one dares to dissent.

For example: I am amazed at the present fascination with rayon chenille. My view: rayon is an inferior fiber, not worth spending valuable weaving time exploring. Towels should be absorbent, but is rayon absorbent? No..it just looks glitzy and trendy...  
My opinion, of course...but that is the trend.

Weaving that is more artistic than practical....it follows the same trend. I was also amazed in the 60s that weavers like Lenore Tawney got gallery space. This was what I called the mummy's tomb school of weaving. It was ugly,without the artistic motivation that ugly art always has, if it is not to be just not trendy. But those, at that time, who wove artistic objects for beauty were rejected. Compare, now, to the beautiful, even astounding explorations in Fiber Arts.

Just my first impulse response to your good question...I will be interested in seeing other responses. And, of course...this list not being, after all, so much different from the big list....responses to my response! :-)

Clyde



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 20:30:59 EDT  
From: Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

more:

It is not, I think, that there are not innovative weavers on the edge. It is that day-to-day weavers are intimidated into weaving what is the trend. Innovators will always find their way. Day-to-day weavers may not have that artistic drive and courage.

Clyde

-----

Date: Thu, 22 Oct 1998 20:55:14 -0700  
From: arwells@erols.com  
Subject: Re: Weaving on the edge

My reaction to this is that is a generalization -- which nonetheless serves as a reminder to us to keep trying to push the boundaries. Let me "word on a bit" about pushing boundaries both \*personally\* as well as pushing them as a \*group.\*

As I looked through the photos from the Convergence fashion show, my own opinion was that most of it was on the edge. I didn't feel that "real people" would, for the most part, be apt to wear much of what I saw. To me, it was most definitely weaving on the edge because it was wild and crazy, and "packaged" as clothing. But I am also a very conservative person! And I recognize that what is weaving on the edge to me is (maybe) standard fare for someone else.

I think that, depending where an individual is in her/his own development (both from a weaving and from an artistic sense), being on the edge means something different. You can justifiably argue that as one proceeds along the path of learning to weave (and I don't mean the Debbie Redding learning to weave bit -- I mean learning the full spectrum of weaves and weave possibilities), one is always pushing the edge. When you compare two weavers, one weaving 10 years and one weaving 2 years, what is "weaving on the edge" to one may be old hat to the other. Of course, as in any technical field, it is possible that both weavers are at exactly the same place: the old saying that the weaver with 10 years experience may just have 2 years experience, repeated 5 times! Still, each of us is \*personally\* weaving on the edge if we are continuing to grow as weavers. If we don't push ourselves, we end up weaving the same stuff, and the same threads, over and over and .... In other words, having 2 years of experience, 5 times.

I also think that only the most experienced of us tend to weave "on the edge." For the entire field to advance, I think that this is the way it happens and yes, I am probably too new to judge if it is happening or not. But when I see things in Convergence that to me are so avant garde ... well, that to me is pushing the edge in the format available. And, it is inspiration from which may come some \*personal\* growth/change in the same direction as what I see that is so different. I'm sure there are a few, rare individuals who learn the weaving basics quickly and then weave something so innovative that it can also be counted as pushing the edge.

Therefore, to bring all these words to some sort of conclusion, I would agree that someone(s) has to be pushing in order for the whole body of weaving to advance, and yes, I believe those pushes \*are\* happening. Maybe the edge is advancing so slowly as to not be easily visible, but I disagree that only the safe, known weaving is making it into shows and into Convergence and into the magazine articles.

Anne in Annandale



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

arwells@erols.com

Ruth Blau wrote:

>  
> There's a letter to the editor in the Fall SS&D that I found interesting.  
> It's the first letter, called "Where is the Breakout Work?" The thrust of  
> the letter is that the weaving the writer (Cynthia Rymer Imes) sees juried  
> into shows and published in magazines is technically well executed but  
> safe--"imaginatively inoffensive," in Ms Imes' words. She goes on to say  
> that art "can't grow without people working at the edges, pushing the  
> limits and trying the unthinkable. This work is bound to be rough and  
> difficult, but without it, everything else eventually becomes decoration."  
>  
> I'd like to know how others feel about this.

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #33

\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)

To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net

Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #32

Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net

Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net

Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net

Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Thursday, October 22 1998

Volume 01 : Number 032

Sheila O'Hara Technique ["Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>  
Re: Tying on to a dummy warp [Num1weaver@aol.com]  
sitting at the Louet [Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Re: revolution counters [Grimi@aol.com]

-----  
Date: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 20:12:54 +0200

From: "Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>

Subject: Sheila O'Hara Technique

Reply to Sue Butler...

Hi Sue, I have made my own variation on the warping. First of all, since I needed only three colors, as per Sheila's suggestion, I'm only using 12 harness. I'm using the same twill structure but the warping technique is the ordinary one. That is, I warp with a mill my three colors at a time (I change colors at will depending on the placement of color for my design) but the principle is the same, three possible four-harness twill

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

structures. I am using sectional warping. The interesting thing is that I have three counts. One is the cross at the beginning which is every thread; second is the cross at the end which is eight threads alternating with seven threads because the warp beam section is 2 1/2 cm, my set is 12/cm and the comb spacer is 4 dents per 2 1/2 cm; third is a 12 thread divider (with a string) at the end near the 7 & 8 cross for the one white thread per centimeter (Sheila using one white thread per 1/2 inch). This white thread will help in accuracy in weaving the design. But once I got into the rhythm, it moves quickly.

This is as far as I've gotten Sue. I begin threading in a couple of days. I mistakenly threaded for two tapestries because as I said in my introduction, I'm a production weaver at heart. I say mistakenly because I keep running out of my yarn and have to wait for delivery. So far I've spent over \$500. I'm using ribbon, chanelle, gold, silver and copper gold thread. I'm a bit hesitant about starting the computer work. I'm designing with Fiberworks and then transferring to my old Weave Planner on my old PC which runs the loom. My studio is a 15 minute walk and my family would be put out if I took away our new computer. Also, I can't justify such an expensive computer just to run a loom when anything can do. By the way, I almost bought a Compu-Dobby II last year when I realized that my old software would not be able to run it and that my old PC's (and an old Mac with Design and Weave) would not be able to run it. I quickly changed my order. It's something to consider.

Yehudit

-----

Date: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 14:33:01 EDT  
From: Num1weaver@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

Last year I was weaving for a designer. She was a weaver, but couldn't keep up with the demand for the scarves. We were weaving chenille scarfs, 12" wide and 2 yards long. About 6 or 7 different stripe designs. I would put on a dummy warp of carpet warp or something similar and then thread it through the heddles and reed. I measured a warp 15 yards long and tied it on the dummy. I tied a weaver's knot with the chenille and the cotton. I held a small clipper in my hand and cut the ends of the knot as I tightened it. The fuzziness of the chenille kept the knot from loosening. I got pretty fast at the knots, but I think it was from practice and reading several sources to find the fastest way for me to tie the knots. I was tying 240 knots on each warp and usually putting a warp on every week and a half. (I'd go several weeks without doing scarfs if it was a slow time, or do a warp a week if things were busy.)

I think that the speed and efficiency of the method came from doing it many times and getting better at it. The first time was much slower than the last time!

Deanna

-----

Date: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 20:58:38 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: sitting at the Louet

Hi Loueters:

I use a 21" height bright red stool at the loom. I don't think that the red has anything to do with it, but it is just the right height. I have used a sheepskin on it and that helps. The edges are slightly rounded, so it does not cut into the thighs

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

About the treadles and handle.

I have a 16" Louet and that may be the difference, but I find the my treadle give as good a shed as the lever. I HAVE made a modification.

I constructed a brace which fits between the two treadles and allows me to use one foot and brace the other on the floor.

Th cross brace is out of a multi-ply 3/8 inch plywood to keep the weight down, about 10" wide and 13" long. There are two pieces of quarter round nailed to the long dimension of the plywood with the flat sides facing out. They are spaced to fit just inside the treadles.

Then a bit of door insulation (thin) is glued to the straight sides of the quarter round and the brace is then placed on the treadles and pushed into place. The insulation makes sure that it does not slide around. This gives me a WIDE treadle. I was getting torquing of the two stick treadle if I used only one foot, and two feet are impossible to use, esp if one has no back to speak of.

Ingrid

~~~~~

When You Are Warped, What's Weft

<italic>

</italic>Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW

Visit us at: <http://www3.sympatico.ca/fiberworks.pcw>

-----

Date: Wed, 21 Oct 1998 23:10:06 EDT  
From: Grimi@aol.com  
Subject: Re: revolution counters

Yardage counters are great for getting similar amounts on all of your spools when sectional warping and can work quite well when winding on the beam. You need to make sure that you wrap an end once around the pulley on the counter, and you need to make sure that you have enough tension on the warp that it turns the wheel of the counter without slipping. Critical.

The revolution counter makes sure that you have the same number of turns on each section of the beam. It doesn't give you an accurate count on yards because of build up on the beam as I'm sure you all realize.

AVL does have a digital revolution counter that uses a magnetic pick-up for counting turns of the beam so it's a bit more flexible when mounting to the loom than a mechanical counter that has to be positioned just so to count correctly.

Tom @ AVL  
info@avlusa.com  
grimi@aol.com

-----

End of weavetech-digest V1 #32  
\*\*\*\*\*

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

```
From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #31
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
```

weavetech-digest            Wednesday, October 21 1998            Volume 01 : Number 031

```
Re: New Magic doobby loom                            [Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>]
Re: Louet Magic Loom                                [Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>]
Sheila O'Hara technique                            [Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]
```

-----  
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 12:09:15 -0700  
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>  
Subject: Re: New Magic doobby loom

Hi Sally

I have had my Magic doobby for 2+ years now and have not yet had a problem with the close spacing. However, I weave with fine threads (20/2 or thinner) and I use paper instead of sticks (old habits die hard I guess). My average warps are 6-7 yards long. If you warp f2b like I do then be sure to hold your warp chains tight as you beam. I know people have mounted the beams on the stand and I'm hoping Cynthia Crull will respond to your question as she has done this with good results. If she doesn't give her a holler.

I use my loom bench which came with my Mighty Wolf. The height is just right. I found that I ended up using the handle rather than the foot treadle as I couldn't get as good a shed. Don't weave standing up, it will kill your lower back!! Once you are up and running please consider joining the 24-shaft study group/sample exchange. We discuss some of the problems and solutions in our twice a year. Let me know if you'd like a copy of the back issues of the newsletter. (This goes for any others of you with 24 shafts)

Good luck with the loom. Terri

-----  
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 15:42:47 -0500  
From: Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>  
Subject: Re: Louet Magic Loom

Sally asked:

>I just got my Magic Dobby loom and started assembling it last night. I have  
>a couple of questions.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

>  
>1) There seems to be very little space to wind a warp on to the back and  
>front beams. The directions suggest mounting the beams on the stand. I  
>would be interested to hear what everyone does. I will only do short warps  
>on this loom, but even so since the beam is only a few inches, I think the  
>warp will increase rapidly.

I have all the beams on the stand. The cloth beam is in the top set of  
holes; my second warp beam, which I don't use much, is in the second set of  
holes. the main warp beam is in the bottom. I got metal rods for the  
beam, attached with long texolve cords and I use short looped nylon lash  
cords to attach my groups of warp.

>2) The loom seems high with the stand. Too high for a chair... Seems like  
>with a stool you couldn't reach the treadle.. So are you expected to  
>stand! How do you all sit at this loom.

I had a Schacht adjustable bench that works perfectly. I am considering  
getting the pieces that put the seat at an angle, I think that would be  
less stressful on the legs.

Cynthia

Blue Sycamore Handwovens  
116 Sycamore Street  
Bay St. Louis, MS 39520-4221

cyncrull@datasync.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 17:02:30 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Sheila O'Hara technique

Yehudit Abrahams wrote:  
> Right now I am working on using Sheila O'Hara's technique for  
> Synagogue tapestries.

Welcome Yehudit! I would love to hear more about this....does this  
mean you are using the quadruple warps and twill structure? Can you  
explain what you are doing and how you are using Sheila's technique?? I  
have long been fascinated with her work, but unable to completely figure  
how she achieves her colorways....  
Su :-)

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #31  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #30  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Tuesday, October 20 1998

Volume 01 : Number 030

Re: Yardage counters [Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>]  
Re: yardage counters [hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)]  
Yardage vs. revolution counter ["Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard@weaveit.com>]  
Re: Tying On ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>]  
New Magic doobby loom ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>]  
[none] ["Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>]

---

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 07:16:37 -0500  
From: Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>  
Subject: Re: Yardage counters

>Subject: Re: yardage counters  
>  
>Pamela Marriott wrote:  
>  
>> Can not one be used for both?  
and Marge answered:  
>I suppose it depends on your equipment. The main part of the AVL yardage  
>counter is a sort of little black box (1 1/2 " long by 1" deep by 1" high)  
and  
>ordering everything so I do have the revolution counter which I haven't  
gotten  
>around to installing. Before I ask if anyone wants one, can someone tell  
me how  
>and under what situations I'll use it?  
And >From: Beryl Moody <berylm@crl.com>  
>nemesis. I have a Louet Magic Dobby that I converted to sectional

I will add my experience to this discussion. I use a yardage counter to wind the spools for my AVL but I do use the rotation counter for winding onto the beam. My beam is 1 yard so that each click is 1 yard and it goes on quite easily. It seems that the one click per yard is less taxing to me I guess, than doing the tenths of yards and keeping track like that. I have the counter on the loom mounted on the upper back cross beam of the loom and just move it down into position when ready to wind, then put it up when done. I do not keep it down to count how much I have woven, you would have to turn it around on my counter and I don't feel the need to do that.

As for the Louet, I got a sectional for that loom, but sent it back and stayed with a plain beam for that one. I tried to use my yardage counter and it was a disaster. The beam circumference is so small, that to me it is much easier to go f2b when warping. I also have found that a long warp doesn't do well, I think maybe about 6-7 yards of say, 8/2 size, is about all I will put on in the future. Remember that if you get a rotation counter, they are easy when your beam is one yard, and not too bad when it

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

is 1/2 yard, just twice the # of rotations. But when you get down to only 4 1/2 " !!! you would have several revolutions per yard and you also get a quick build up of layers, which adds to the circumgerence quite significantly, more so that with short warps on a 1 yard beam.

The upshot is that I would recommend the use of the yardange and revolution counters on the large looms, (1 or 1/2 yard beams) and wouldn't even recommend the sectional beam on the little beams. MHO

Cynthia

Blue Sycamore Handwovens  
116 Sycamore Street  
Bay St. Louis, MS 39520-4221

cyncrull@datasync.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 07:30:46 -0500  
From: hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)  
Subject: Re: yardage counters

>"Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net> wrote:

>>I find that I need both the yardage  
>>counter when winding spools and the revolution counter when beaming  
>  
>Can not one be used for both?

It depends. A yardage counter counts yardage and a rev counter counts \*only\* reveloutions. I don't know how one can serve both functions. However, there are ways to rig a yardage counter so that it counts the yardage wound on the warp beam section. In that manner it serves both purposes.

If you want a rev counter you can find out how to make one in Peggy Oesterkamp's book. Also, a pretty good substitute is to get a lap counter and click it for each crank turn.

Dick Lindell, Weaver  
visit me at <<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>>

-----  
The first step to Wisdom is in calling things by their right name.  
-- Lao Tzu

-----  
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 08:42:29 -0400  
From: "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>  
Subject: Yardage vs. revolution counter

> Pamela Marriott wrote:  
>  
> > Can not one be used for both?

Pamela, my yardage counter is built into my bobbin/spool winder and therefore cannot be mounted on the loom or conveniently placed between spool rack and loom (given my studio space problem.) Also, I've had the same problem that Beryl had. When the thread going through the yardage counter is under high tension, as it is when winding on a warp, the count

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

is highly inaccurate and imprecise as well. Not only do I not get the yardage that I wanted on the beam, but I also find that the length in every section is a little different. As Beryl said, there are tension problems as well as unnecessary yarn waste. I experience the same inaccuracy when winding spools directly from skeins because of tension variation in the turning swift or skein winder. As a result, I wind the skein onto a large holding spool without measuring and then rewind onto smaller spools while measuring yardage. On a long, fine warp, this takes a lot of time. But I haven't come up with a better method. Any thoughts?

> Beryl Moody wrote:

> Then I tried mounting a revolution counter, but have not been able to find a place to mount one that won't interfere with the winding on process, but will still trip once every revolution

The AVL revolution counter is a mechanical clicker activated by a metal pin that sticks up from the rim of the sectional warp beam. I don't know if it's adaptable to other looms, but the clicker mount height is adjustable. It works very well for me. Before I got my AVL loom, my husband made a magnetic revolution counter for my Norwood with bits and pieces from Radio Shack. It worked well as long as a spool didn't snag or a thread break as the magnet was passing the detector. Excess jiggling of the beam at this point caused multiple counts for one revolution. But, knowing to keep an eye out for this, it served me well for a number of years.

Martha

-----

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 10:19:56 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Re: Tying On

I just got back from a week conference in Denver where we spent the weekend driving through the mountains.... pretty awesome. Anyway I have been catching up on all the posts and have found it really interesting and helpful.

Thanks to everyone for their thoughts about tying on. I now realize that one of the reasons that I didn't like it was that threading the loom is my favorite part of the process. I must really be weird. I enjoy setting up the loom and get bored weaving fairly quickly, especially long warps. So I am fairly fast at setting up.

Sally

-----

Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 10:28:06 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: New Magic doobby loom

I just got my Magic Dobby loom and started assembling it last night. I have a couple of questions.

1) There seems to be very little space to wind a warp on to the back and front beams. The directions suggest mounting the beams on the stand. I would be interested to hear what everyone does. I will only do short warps on this loom, but even so since the beam is only a few inches, I think the warp will increase rapidly.

2) The loom seems high with the stand. Too high for a chair... Seems like with a stool you couldn't reach the treadle.. So are you expected to



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

stand! How do you all sit at this loom.  
So far that is all the questions.

For those interested, WeaveIt can now work with the Magic Dobby. I have had the box for quite awhile and a friend tested the program with her loom. I will test it with my loom as soon as I finish assembly, but its pretty simple so I don't anticipate problems.

Sally  
sallyb@weaveit.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 20 Oct 1998 21:41:50 +0200  
From: "Yehudit Abrahams" <gabraham@netvision.net.il>  
Subject: [none]

Shalom Everyone:

Thanks for inviting me to your list. I have been reading with delight and interest.

I have a 16-H CompuDobby, Home made 10 pattern, 6 ground drawloom, 24-H Dobby and Weave Planner (which runs the loom), Weave Point and Fiberworks Silver. Right now I am working on using Sheila O'Hara's technique for Synagogue tapestries.

I have been a production weaver for the past 15 years, before then a fiber artist. The production weaving really wore down my body. I have in the past year been training someone who is now doing all the production weaving I use to do plus the finishing. I now receive 3/4-2/3rds the income so it is worth it. However, as she gets better I will move to 1/2 the income. Actually it will be less because I have the overhead and materials expense.

But it has freed me to do other things like Sheila's technique. But I am a production weaver at heart and I plan to train her on this AVL loom when (hopefully) I start receiving orders. The design will be in the computer and I will have to do the warps at first since the warps are an important part of the design in this technique. She will then train someone to run the production loom ( I produce 165cm wide 200 cm long prayer shawls using 2/40's wool set at 14/cm) and I will begin my next project on the drawloom, etc. I have had these looms for a long time and could not work more than one at a time. Regarding the justification discussion I say this: I'm a old 60's person and before then a student of Marxism. I saw my father, a wonderful craftsman, perfect his art in a factory environment, with someone else's label. I say I was a student of Marx but actually I just took one thing: 'The alienation of man with the disappropriation of product in the factories.' I do not feel so strongly about anything now, lease of all, political ideologies.

But that's how I've justified spending all this money. (I actually acquired a grant that I pay back a small percent of the cost). My justification has been in spending all my time on weaving, not so much the costly equipment, because of the grants. So production was an answer for me and I liked it up till I started needing massages and chiropracter treatments. Also there is unfortunately a lot of wool in my lungs. I have a large studio now, very airy and spaceous; however, before four years ago I was in a carivan. I started wearing a mask when I do bobbbins, cones or use the electric skeiner, and try to keep the studio as lint free as possible. But there are hazards with production work, that is, production work that produces fast enough to earn more than \$15/hr.

Yehudit Abrahams

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

End of weavetech-digest V1 #30  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #29  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Tuesday, October 20 1998

Volume 01 : Number 029

yardage counters ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
Re: Tying on to a dummy warp [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
Re: Tying on to a dummy warp [AmyFibre@aol.com]  
Re: yardage counters [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: Tying on to a dummy warp [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
yardage counters [Beryl Moody <berylm@crl.com>]

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 05:38:28 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: yardage counters

>I find that I need both the yardage  
>counter when winding spools and the revolution counter when beaming

Can not one be used for both?  
Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 08:00:14 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

Just catching up after 4 days out of town.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

I, too, do a lot of tying onto dummy warps. Like Amy, my production warps at this time of year are chenille--both scarves & shawls. By the end of the holiday sales season, I feel I never want to see another cone of chenille. By the following June or so, I'm ready to plunge in again.

The best new hint I've gotten recently about tying on was from Doramay Keasbey by way of Janet Stollnitz (I love the weavers' grapevine!). Instead of draping the new warp over the front beam in the std f2b position, drape it over the castle, with the cut ends and cross facing you. In this position, the two ends that you're tying together (overhand knots) are in the position you need them to be in for tying the knot. After you've tied all the ends, flip the new warp back over the front beam and wind on f2b as usual.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 09:10:55 EDT  
From: AmyFibre@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

In a message dated 10/19/98 7:04:45 AM Central Daylight Time, rsblau@cpcug.org writes:

> Instead of draping the new warp over the front beam in the std f2b  
> position, drape it over the castle, with the cut ends and cross facing you.

Oh, this makes perfect sense!! <lightbulb!> One question, though, are you holding the cross in your hand as I do (learned from Debbie Redding/Chandler many moons ago)? I think it will work that way, and will try the next time, but wondered how you hold your cross.

Thanks for the great tip!

Amy  
amyfibre@aol.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 06:56:12 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: yardage counters

Pamela Marriott wrote:

> Can not one be used for both?

I suppose it depends on your equipment. The main part of the AVL yardage counter is a sort of little black box (1 1/2 " long by 1" deep by 1" high) that can be moved back and forth between the bobbin winder and the tension box. I find it quite easy to use while beaming, but of course I didn't know this when ordering everything so I do have the revolution counter which I haven't gotten around to installing. Before I ask if anyone wants one, can someone tell me how and under what situations I'll use it?

Margaret

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA

-----  
-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 12:28:50 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

>> Instead of draping the new warp over the front beam in the std f2b  
>> position, drape it over the castle, with the cut ends and cross facing  
you.  
>  
>Oh, this makes perfect sense!! <lightbulb!> One question, though, are you  
>holding the cross in your hand as I do <snip>

No, generally I have the cross on lease sticks. I don't quite see how you  
could hold the cross in your hand & have the ends that need to be tied  
facing you, but you're taller (and have longer arms!) than I am, Amy, so it  
might work for you.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 19 Oct 1998 14:34:55 -0700 (PDT)  
From: Beryl Moody <berylm@crl.com>  
Subject: yardage counters

Hi all,

I will jump right in here, because sectional warping is my current  
nemesis. I have a Louet Magic Dobby that I converted to sectional  
warping. The tension box that Louet sold had a yardage counter attached  
to the box itself. I found that after my warp had been woven, I had more  
revolutions on some sections than on others. This was often causing  
troublesome warp tension problems -- really unpleasant on a linen warp.  
Obviously, the yardage counter was not accurate enough for me to trust in  
this particular set up. I bought an AVL tension box and my SO made a  
special mounting device for it. I tried using another yardage counter --  
same problem of inaccuracy. Then I tried mounting a revolution counter,  
but have not been able to find a place to mount one that won't interfere  
with the winding on process, but will still trip once every revolution.  
Right now I have to have someone else operate a click counter every  
revolution while I watch the winding on of the sectional bout. Even so, a  
momentary distraction will cause you to forget to press the clicker and so  
there the problem will not be resolved until I can find a suitable place  
to mount a revolution counter. All suggestions appreciated.

I will take the time to introduce myself in a post within the next few  
days, but wanted to join in this discussion while it was still "hot".

Beryl Moody

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #29  
\*\*\*\*\*

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

```
From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #28
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net
Precedence: bulk
```

weavetech-digest

Monday, October 19 1998

Volume 01 : Number 028

```
sectional warping ["Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.>
Re: weavetech-digest V1 #20 [WC3424@aol.com]
Re: Tying on to a dummy warp [Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>]
```

-----  
Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 11:29:59 -0400  
From: "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>  
Subject: sectional warping

Many moons ago I taught myself to weave on a 4 shaft Norwood - hence sectional warping. As a result, I've been a dyed in the wool sectional warper ever since and am not really very good at other techniques. I wind spools, a mixture of cardboard, plastic and wood that I've collected from various sources, off of commercial cones or from skeins of my hand-dyed stuff. My 18 year old Norwood bobbin winder has an attached yardage counter. Winding spools goes a lot faster for me than using a warping reel or board, in part, I'm sure because of practice. Since I generally put on long warps (25 to 100 yards), the greatest advantage to me of sectional warping is that I NEVER have tension problems. Given my inexperience with reel or board, that's a major advantage.

I have found that, with such a mixture of spool weights (wood is lots heavier than cardboard), I get better results by using spools of the same material together. Since my warps are rarely uniform across the width, I can use spools of one material for one group of sections and another material for another group, adjusting the winding tension accordingly. My AVL tensioner has a mechanism for putting a cross in the warp - an invaluable feature.

I've designed a database file to keep track of all of the information on my warps. Among other things, this stores the yardage required for each spool and the beaming order. I refer to a printout of this when winding my spools and beaming the warp. I have AVL's revolution counter on my loom to count the yardage as it goes on. I find that I need both the yardage counter when winding spools and the revolution counter when beaming. Otherwise, how would I know how much to wind onto the spools? Believe me,

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

it's a major pain to have one spool out of 72 run out prematurely! At the same time, if my supply of one yarn is limited, putting too much on the spools means lots of short pieces left over rather than one longer piece left on the cone. The revolution counter is a necessity in making sure that every section gets the same yardage, especially when I'm winding on a long warp and the phone rings a lot or an interesting bird appears outside my window.

Speaking of my window, my studio, a renovated porch, measures 7.5' x 17'. Since my loom, with the 4-box fly shuttle, is very close to 7.5' wide, there's only one direction that it can face and allow squeezing room for me. When I put on a warp, my spool rack stands in the bay window and I crawl back and forth under the warp. It keeps me limber!

Martha

-----

Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 12:26:11 EDT  
From: WC3424@aol.com  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #20

Oh, my gosh...I've just returned from the Monastery in Indiana to discover I certainly caused a "stir" of email from my last post...making reference to Brother Kim having (as I understood it) taken an AVL doobby and not an AVL compu-dobby...assembling it for use with his Glimakra loom. I surely didn't intend to mislead any of you in the reference...I was simply going to attempt to see if it was working.

Now...to the issue of seeing the loom...it does have a doobby mounted. However, I was not able to spend time at the studio and ask any questions.

Charlotte

-----

Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 10:35:46 -0700  
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

>I love these hints. What knot do you tie? overhand?

ABSOLUTELY YES

-----

End of weavetech-digest V1 #28  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #27

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Sunday, October 18 1998

Volume 01 : Number 027

sectional warping. ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
Re: Tying on to a dummy warp [arwells@erols.com]  
Re: sectional warping. [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: sectional warping. ["Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>]  
costly looms [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 17:41:46 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: sectional warping.

Okay stupid question #3.

I have been toying around with the sectional thing, bought a second hand tensioner, have plans for a bobbin rack for DH to build and was hoping to buy the rakes second hand. Well I have looked for a year and no such luck so plan to buy them after Christmas weaving is done and hopefully good sales. Now for my question. When you warp sectional you have to have a bobbin for each "end per inch" Right. so 20 epi would mean 20 bobbins. do you wind these bobbins off your main stash of fibre, such as my cones of chenille. Having 20 cones of chenille in one colour would be out of my league. What is the best device for keeping track of yardage as you wind the bobbins and then the sectional warp. dose having to wind the bobbins slow down the process somewhat. Although lately I am taking a full day from hell putting on a warp I think should be on in half a day. As to practice, I get a lot of that as I put on lots of warps now, dummy and otherwise.  
Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 20:31:36 -0700  
From: arwells@erols.com  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

Sally-

I have been tying on for several years now. I can only say that the knot tying goes very fast, with practice. I am also extremely careful to tie the knots using the same amount of new warp/dummy warp for each knot. That means getting the "ends" of the knot the same length. Takes practice. For me, it is faster because I use it on the complicated threadings where I tend to make mistakes that take even \*more\* time to detect and fix!  
Anne in Annandale  
arwells@erols.com

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Sally Breckenridge wrote:

<snip> I have  
> only tried using a dummy warp once, but found it actually to be much slower  
> because it took so much time to tie new threads to the old ones. I also  
> seemed to loose more inches of the new warp than I wanted because the new  
> threads did not start all in the same place. When I figured out my time  
> versus loom waste, I decide not to mess with it again. But I continue to  
> wonder if I did it all wrong. So could some of you describe how you tie on  
> to a dummy warp efficiently.  
>

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 18:22:59 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: sectional warping.

Pamela Marriott wrote:

> When you warp sectional you have to have a  
> bobbin for each "end per inch" Right. so 20 epi would mean 20 bobbins.

This is correctm when the sections on the beam are at 1" intervals. Some beams have 2" sections in which case, following your illustration, you'd require 40 bobbins.

> do  
> you wind these bobbins off your main stash of fibre, such as my cones of  
> chenille.

Yes!

> What is the best device for keeping track of yardage as you wind the  
> bobbins and then the sectional warp.

The yardage counter for the AVL bobbin winder also fits on the tension box. There are also revolution counters available that close to the beam and count the number of times it is turned.

> dose having to wind the bobbins slow  
> down the process somewhat.

Not for me. I take the winder, yarn, and bobbins to a table with a comfortable chair and find winding them much, much faster and a whole lot easier than winding a warp (no cross, no choke ties, no stopping to count). Once the bobbins are wound, beaming is easy.

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 22:41:57 -0500  
From: "Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Re: sectional warping.

Having 20 cones of chenille is out of my league as well, but you can get little spools -- in cardboard from Robin and Russ, or in plastic. Keep an eye out at sales. I got four dozen of the little darlings in plastic for



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

\$14, at a guild garage sale.

That is what Marge is talking about when she says that she takes the electric winder and the main yarn packages somewhere else and relaxes while she winds.

Judith

Judith Favia  
Minneapolis, MN  
cronenorth@earthlink.net  
>do

>you wind these bobbins off your main stash of fibre, such as my cones of  
>chenille. Having 20 cones of chenille in one colour would be out of my  
>league

-----  
Date: Sun, 18 Oct 1998 01:33:58 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: costly looms

When I got into the Philadelphia Craft Show in 1986, I decided that whatever money I made there after costs would go to a new loom with more than 4 shafts, 60" width, and a fly shuttle. It helped; that's a good show, hard to get into. I heard myself tell a weaver there that my booth was a monument to the powers of coffee! My kids were then 10 and 16. The next summer I won 2 prizes (cash!) at MidWest Weavers Conference and put that with the money I won at MidWest the year before, and went to make a deposit on a 60" AVL at their booth. I told the AVL guys that I had figured out that if I continued to win cash awards at this conference every year at the same amount as 1986 and 1987, I would have made enough in awards to buy the AVL I wanted...by the time I was 96 years old, provided their price had not gone up in the meantime. I guess nobody had told them that before, from the looks I got! One guy was clearly trying to guess how old I was, but Peter said he expected the price to go up in the next year. I got the 60", delivered in October of 1987 (when I had been weaving exactly 20 years on 4 shaft looms, mostly weaving to sell at fairs) and saved again to get the compu-dobby box in 1990. It made a huge difference to my work. My stuff sold before, and won awards even, but I was getting bored turning it out. Pamela, there's tons you can do with 8 shafts. I think the color is what sells the piece and the structure is there to amuse me the weaver. I put on 20 yard warps and tie on and pull through another in different colors and the same threading, and make each piece different. Tying on is way more efficient, and gets faster the more you do it. One of the many times this topic came up on the big weaving list, Alan Fannin gave us his statistics on just how much time is saved. Lots, but especially with fancy threadings and multishaft looms.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #27  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Sat, 17 Oct 98 12:08:55 PDT  
From: "Laura Fry" <laurafry@netbistro.com>  
Subject: Re: intro

Hi All!

I've been lurking for a few days - guess it's time to pop out of the woodwork for a moment.

I'm a production weaver (AVL 16 s, fly shuttle, compu-dobby, just added air assist). Have been weaving for over 20 years, am mostly interested in weave structure.

As to Pamela's question, I up graded my equipment as I could "afford" to, given that I needed to borrow money on a couple of occasions. If it's the warping process that is the bugaboo, then I would go sectional, unless your preferred designing precludes that.

The AVL allows one to weave more quickly \*if\* all you are doing is throwing the shuttle. If you are big on inlays, then no big advantage. The AVL allows one to weave complex weave structures more efficiently - if you use mostly plain weave, then again, no huge advantage.

The cloth advance helps to keep your rhythm and tension on the cloth regardless of what else you are doing, so to me that was a big plus.

I financed my air assist on my VISA card. I'm still paying it off. :)

As Margaret said, some of us take "real" jobs - which I did do periodically over the years - some of us do production weaving - a mixed blessing. I am weaving, but not necessarily what I want. But then there is the cheque at the end of the month that pays the household bills and the VISA payment - but life is full of mixed blessings.....

Like Mary I'm considering writing a book but it's a huge investment of time and money with no guarantee of getting your money back. The things we do for love!!!

Laura Fry

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 15:32:48 EDT  
From: AmyFibre@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

In a message dated 10/17/98 10:48:04 AM Central Daylight Time, sallyb@weaveit.com writes:

> So could some of you describe how you tie on  
> to a dummy warp efficiently.

I don't think I do it any differently than most people, but here are some time-saving tips that work for me.

1- before cutting off prior warp, pull through so that at least 6 inches of dummy warp hangs in front of the beater as it rests against the shafts. I've

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

found 6 inches to be optimal for the way I tie knots -- more length just took more time to find the end, less length made the knot tying more challenging, and therefore took more time.

2- measure new warp on warping board (remember that these are two-scarf warps so it's only 6 yards) and \*take cross in hand\* directly to the loom. I don't even tie it unless I have to - I'm usually doing this all in one evening. And because these are warps are going straight onto the loom, I don't even tie choke ties anywhere on the warp. Saves time.

3- since these chenille scarves combined stripes of variegated and stripes of solid, I used a two color dummy warp. Ugly brown acrylic and uglier brown acrylic! Then I measure the two kinds of chenille separately and take one chain at a time to the loom. I tie knots across with one group of warp ends, picking up only the threads of that color brown and then do the other group of warp ends.

4- I did learn from my first dummy warp that it is important that the size of the dummy warp threads be approx. the same as the real ones or a little finer (so the knots don't get too big) and that a little texture in the dummy warp is a good thing to help hold the knots.

The only other suggestion is practice! :-)) After doing a lot of these, I can knot a whole lot faster than when I started. The tails on my knots are usually 3/4 to 1 inch long -- so I am wasting that amount of chenille.

As for uneven ends, since I'm warping f2b on these, I do a "haircut" after winding on the warp and before tying on to the front rod/beam. The most I've lost there is 3" I think, and for chenille I'm not too worried about that. When I cut the finished scarves off, I cut under a little tension and the knots are all pretty much lined up too. Actually, I put my rotary cutter mat on the front beam (precarious, but it works if I hold it with one hand and no cats come tearing through) and use the rotary cutter to take off the finished scarves, cutting about 1/2 inch or so into the dummy warp. Nice straight line which, along with fairly consistent knot tying, means that I don't have a lot of unevenness at the other end.

I hope this helps. At the risk of sounding repetitive, I do think a major key to my success is that I've done it, oh, at least 45 times in the last 18 months. My knots get more consistent, and I get faster all the time.

Amy  
amyfibre@aol.com

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 13:47:57 -0600  
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

I love these hints. What knot do you tie? overhand?

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 18:14:46 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: tying on

Hi

Regarding tying on.

I do it the traditional way for front to back, find it efficient and fast. My technique sounds much the same as Terri's.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

I also tie on after sectional warping.

First I place masking tape at the fell of the old warp, top and bottom, make a shed and insert a shed rod or keeper thread into the shed at the back of the loom. THEN I cut off the cloth.

Since I am often using silk, I then untie the old warp from the sections (I weave as far as I can so there may not be enough thread left if I were to cut.) Actually its not really untying, its loosening the loop from the sectional. And there is a cross back there, so I can pick the threads from the sectional cross and tie them to the cross of the old warp.

I sit on a stool right inside the AVL, having first to remember that I have to start tying on the brake side so that I can easily get out the other side. I tie for about 1 hour at a time before the bottom and the back go numb. This will usually take me about half way across.

Then I pull the knots through, cut off the waste warp, tie on to the front apron and am ready to weave.

I did this a lot when I was doing production weaving. The place was set up for long warps of 30 to 50 yards. For scarves and stoles. So making the warp took a while, especially doing the spools. If I had been into serious production I would have had to buy 1/2 lb cops of yarn. A lot of other time was spent in color play, because I did not use 1" repeats of colours.

But tying on is very fast and efficient. Still do it because for me the worst weaving activity, both mind and body is threading. If there were a threading fairy.....

Ingrid

~~~~~

When You Are Warped, What's Weft

<italic>

</italic>Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW

Visit us at: <http://www3.sympatico.ca/fiberworks.pcw>

-----

Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 16:51:54 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: rationalizing the exspense and stuff

>this year I did a dummy warp and tied on/pulled through.  
>The dummy warp stayed on for 14 months (it was 2.5 yards to start with and I  
>only cut off about 2" each time, if that). I can measure a two-scarf warp,  
>tie on, beam and be up and weaving in about 90 minutes (warping f2b).

Wow, it has got to take me that long to tie on the dang thing, let alone beam and be weaving. How do you deal with knots coming undone? I do use a dummy warp a lot when doing Christmas weaving for sale but to make up for the boredom I like to change threadings and sort of negates a lot of the advantages of the dummy warp. I am working on 8 harness shadow twills for



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 08:46:14 EDT  
From: Foresthrt@aol.com  
Subject: Re:waffle/collapse

Ann, you might get more of the collapse effect you are looking for if you mix bands of wool and bands of cotton in both the warp and the weft; and wash the bejeebers out of it to really shrink the wool. Susan Smith is doing a class on this at the studio in January- weaving for felting. She has studied all sorts of variations manipulating sett, treatments after weaving, mixing fibers, etc. She's working on samples for the class any minute now.

But I suspect the collapse we'd really like requires overtwisted yarn. That is an elusive product! I'm trying to establish a relationship with a mill that could provide us with a limited line of overtwisted fine yarn, maybe to have for sale at Cincinnatti? and a group of us sampling it beforehand? but don't hold your breath! I've even looked into getting a twisting machine. \$\$\$\$

In any event, we'd need to add twist on spinning wheels for sampling first to see what it is we want the mill to do. This is about 4th on my list of weaving projects, and moving up.

Mary Klotz foresthrt@aol.com  
Forestheart Studio (301) 845-4447  
200 South Main St. box 112, Woodsboro (near Frederick) MD 21798  
11-5 east coast time; closed Wed. and Sun.

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 11:28:34 EDT  
From: AmyFibre@aol.com  
Subject: Re: quesstion for complex loom owners

Pamela - your questions are ones I have been actively wrestling with for the last two years and here's where I am, at least for now.

> Do you weave to sell?

Yes, but not to completely support myself, and I need to be able to do that at this point in my life.

I've been in job/career counselling for a year or so, and one of the things we looked at were all the ways I could possible make a living weaving: weaving to sell myself, production weaving for others, teaching, fiber store, and every combination of the above. The bottom line for me is that while it is \*possible\*, it is not what I want to do. All the options I could come up with required something that felt "deadly" to me -- either production weaving (I can hardly stand repetitive warps that I design myself!) or too much pressure or too much sales (not my strong suit) or too big a sacrifice in living standard. So, I am still looking for a better fit in a non-weaving job than I have now.

That having been said, I am making a concerted effort to sell my weaving -- not sacrificing my own weaving dreams to the commercial market, but trying to marry the two. That is, when I want to weave something, I also ask myself how I could make this whatever into something that might sell.

As a result, I made myself into a business two years ago (more accounting but worth it, I found, at tax time). This year in addition to some commissions (mostly from family and friends) and the annual Guild sale (where I have been quite successful in the past), I am having a sale in my own home (next Saturday!! hence my silence these past few days) and will see how that works.



## WeaveTech Archive 9810

I also have a friend who sells vintage jewelry at a show twice a year and she has invited me to participate with my weaving at her spring show.

> How did you manage the cost of the equipment.

I was lucky for my "complex loom" (AVL) and bought it used with money inherited from my grandmother when she died last year. It felt right in that she herself wove and taught weaving in the years prior to WW2 although not thereafter.

I realize this is not helpful since no one can planned these type of financial events.

> If you are weaving to sell, are you  
> actually selling enough to make payments on that kind of loan?

I don't know about that, but my goal is to support my travels (Convergence, etc), workshops and personal fiber purchases -- and I'm pretty darn close to that. That's several thousand dollars a year, so conceivably I could be making loan payments with that money instead. If I can actually make a little money for "extras", I would love it, but my first goal is to make my weaving pay for itself.

> Does to really make your  
> weaving more efficient for selling? I know for me the warping process is  
> still my time killer,

For me, the biggest help in increasing efficiency, esp. in the warping process, is not necessarily the equipment although that helps -- it is \*practice\*. The more warps I put on, the faster I get. Since I do a lot of chenille scarves, this year I did a dummy warp and tied on/pulled through. The dummy warp stayed on for 14 months (it was 2.5 yards to start with and I only cut off about 2" each time, if that). I can measure a two-scarf warp, tie on, beam and be up and weaving in about 90 minutes (warping f2b). My sectional warping is getting faster, but I'll bet Laura Fry's sectional warping is faster than I can imagine because of all her practice.

I do longer warps now, in concession to efficiency, selling, than I used to -- but have to be careful because it turns out that long warps, if they are repetitive in weaving, have a negative effect on my creativity. Maybe it won't always be so, but a 30 yard warp at this point (as I have on the AVL now) is a dreary experience and that dreariness bleeds over into all parts of my life -- a sacrifice I'm not willing to make.

Sorry, Pamela -- no fascinating revelations here. And I suspect my story is not that uncommon, but there it is.

Amy  
amyfibre@aol.com

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 08:53:10 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Tying on to a dummy warp

>since I do a lot of  
>chenille scarves, this year I did a dummy warp and tied on/pulled through.  
>The dummy warp stayed on for 14 months (it was 2.5 yards to start with and I  
>only cut off about 2" each time, if that). I can measure a two-scarf warp,  
>tie on, beam and be up and weaving in about 90 minutes (warping f2b).



## WeaveTech Archive 9810

This brings up an interesting question that I have for the group. I have only tried using a dummy warp once, but found it actually to be much slower because it took so much time to tie new threads to the old ones. I also seemed to loose more inches of the new warp than I wanted because the new threads did not start all in the same place. When I figured out my time versus loom waste, I decide not to mess with it again. But I continue to wonder if I did it all wrong. So could some of you describe how you tie on to a dummy warp efficiently.

Sally  
sallyb@weaveit.com

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 12:11:17 -0400  
From: Sharon Steinberg <cd000910@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

Greetings! Tying on a dummy warp works for me; I warp the loom front to back. If I want to tie the new warp onto the old one and pull everything through the reed and the heddles, I do the following:

1. chain the warp off the board
2. Put two flat sticks on either side of the cross
3. Raise the two flat sticks on either side, resting them on the front of the loom.
4. Rest the sticks on bobbins to free the cross from the wood of the loom
5. Paper tape the sticks and the bobbins to the wood of the front of the loom
6. To secure the cross, make big square knots with handfuls of the warp.
7. untie the first handful; tie one warp end at a time to the existing warp, strong enough to withstand pulling through the reed and the heddles.
8. When you get all the ends tied to the previous warp, cut the old warp off; use a nylon hairbrush to brush the warp so that you don't lose a lot at the end.
9. I warp the loom alone with my trusty nylon hairbrush and pulling handfuls of the warp on the back beam to ensure equal tension.

I don't know how unorthodox this is, but it's worked for me ever since my divorcce when I lost my two-handed warp tensioner and realized that I had to do it myself -- a good thing!

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 10:42:05 -0700  
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>  
Subject: Re: Tying on to a dummy warp

I tie on to existing warps frequently and I have found that, although it is time-consuming to tie the knots, consider that you don't have to sley the reed or go through the heddles which I find not only as time consuming but back-breaking as well. There are some other factors to consider. One can eliminate the time spent fixing threading errors and sleying glitches which are do not exist when tying on to a warp. Also, the number of times I have had to resley a new warp because the sett wasn't quite right has eaten up time. If you tie on the same yarn size you know your sett will be right. So, for me.....over the long haul, I find tying on much more time efficient!

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 14:33:57 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: supporting the AVL

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Hi Pamela:

First. Those of us who own expensive looms have a talent the others do not. We are GREAT rationalizers. We can justify whatever we want.

Seriously. I went from a \$250.00 loom (1968) sold it for \$350.00. Bought a \$500.00 one (in 1974) and sold it for \$750.00 in 84. Then I got a \$1000.00 loom and sold it for \$1500.00 2 years later. Bought an AVL, bare bones doobby for \$6000 in 1986, added bits like Compudobby, sectional and equipment, fly shuttle over the next 5 years. In 1996 I sold it and bought another AVL with 24 shafts. Again more and more money. This one would now cost me \$15000 to replace, but it cost me about \$3000 over the cost of the previous one. By the way this is Canadian \$\$\$

And I have a Patron of the Arts that brings home a steady supply of needed green stuff. I teach to bring in extra money for toys and have done production weaving where I managed to go from great tax write off to a tiny profit for the taxman. But the body wore out and I can't do that anymore.

I now have an airlift on the AVL to make it possible to weave at all. Well its about to be hooked up, soon.....

Ingrid Boesel

~~~~~

Once you're warped, what's weft?

-----

End of weavetech-digest V1 #25  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #24  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Saturday, October 17 1998

Volume 01 : Number 024

Re: introduction [Foresthrt@aol.com]  
Collapse attempts [arwells@erols.com]  
question for complex loom owners ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplane>]  
Introduction [amsford@effect.net.au (Ford, Audrey)]  
Re: question for complex loom owners [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

---

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 07:50:59 EDT  
From: Foresthrt@aol.com  
Subject: Re: introduction

Guess it is my turn to say a bit about myself/my weaving.

I have a fiber arts supply shop, and true to my promiscuous muse, carry weaving supplies and equipment, as well as everything for rug hooking, beadwork, spinning, glass beadmaking, fusing and mosaics, dyeing, and a couple stray things like Ukrainian egg decorating. I have had a booth at the MD Sheep and Wool Festival for years; avoid selling supplies that I don't know how to use; have written for Shuttle Spindle and Dyepot, Rug Hooking, and Beadwork magazines. I got deeply into beadwork when I shattered my knee 6-7 years ago, and couldn't weave, spin, or drive for many months. All better now, but I'll never be free of beads! Diane Fitzgerald (co author with Helen Banes of BEADS AND THREADS) is coming to teach two bead workshops (Ginko Leaf Necklace, and Collage Necklace- JPEGs avail.) the weekend before Thanksgiving.

The studio has an exhibit space, currently showing "Chaos Glass", next up, illuminated paper cutting. I'm thinking maybe we could mount a Weavetech exhibit there? The exhibit calendar is open after Jan. 99. Ideas, thoughts? In any event, do visit if you get a chance to be in the mid Maryland area.

I just got Swiftweave software at Convergence, and have been working with 8 harness weaves a bit; now am lusting after more shafts and a computer interface. Several of the weavers in my area have big 24 shaft AVLs. That could be me one day, but it's not really a goal at this point. I've been repeated described as a colorist- I'm interested in studying more about weave structure. My signature work in weaving is (off loom) triaxial, which came out of basketmaking- have taught at Convergence San Jose, Washington, Minneapolis, and Atlanta. I'm thinking about writing a book about triaxial work in weaving and in other media, and as a surface design tool. In fall 1997 I did a large commission for John Hancock Insurance near Boston- 6 triaxial pieces for a 20' x 32' wall. Last Sunday I completed painting a labyrinth on my east parking lot, designed on a hexagonal (triaxial) grid. (let me know if you'd like to see a JPEG).

Also in the works: experiment with overtwist yarns/collapse fabrics (let me know if you want to be on the list of those interested in overtwist yarns, and/or the list of those wanting to do a collapse samples exchange). I'm moving toward finer threads, want to try some linen, honeycomb.... I have a couple 8 h baby wolf looms and a mighty wolf right now.

I may work in several media in the course of a day, and teach several in the course of a week. I began last winter to learn to throw pots (clay); when it gets chilly I'll fire up the kilns again. The mix of media I work with leads me to some nicely hybridized techniques and ideas- maybe I'll weave up some coarse cloth to use for pressing designs into clay. My glass fusing and raku beadmaking classes have spawned a couple lines of clothing with glass and raku buttons, done by the local weavers with AVLs.

You can see that I'll mostly lurk on Weavetech- how nice to have a group to stretch me!

Mary Klotz foresthrt@aol.com  
Forestheart Studio (301) 845-4447  
200 South Main St. box 112, Woodsboro (near Frederick) MD 21798  
11-5 east coast time; closed Wed. and Sun.

---

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 09:14:52 -0700  
From: arwells@erols.com  
Subject: Collapse attempts

Hi Mary -

Hope I'm still on your "collapse" list. Just FYI, I tried a full-size sample <g> to try to get some collapse. I had a wool warp (16/2 sett at 24 epi) and a cotton weft (the 8/2 variegated I got from you, actually!) and wove, on 8 shafts, an interlocking waffle weave. I washed it in the washer, on delicate, and even put it into the dryer for a while. It was marvelously resistant to any real collapse -- even that which I've come to expect as "normal" from waffle. The waffles do show, though! It was 92" on loom, 84" off loom, and 72" after finishing. Width went from 10" on loom in the reed to 7" after finishing (there was 1 inch draw-in while weaving). It's very soft and "cuddly", but not what I would think of as collapse. I'm now putting on a second wool warp to weave with another variegated cotton in all different colors (but same weight). Then, I plan to do an all wool one. For the second one, rather than interlocking waffles, I think I will try just a "ordinary" waffle. I was hoping that with the mixed yarns, something interesting might happen. Not so far.

I'm wondering if the sett might be too close?? Have you messed with waffle weaves?? I also thought about trying to weave waffles "on the diagonal" to see what that effect might be. I don't think I have enough shafts to do it, but am still thinking about it!

Anne in Annandale  
arwells@erols.com

-----  
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 10:52:05 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: quesstion for complex loom owners

Okay here is my question. Quite a few of you have mentioned that you own multishaft AVL's with compubdobby or the equivalent in another multishaft loom. Do you weave to sell? How did you manage the cost of the equipment. I know that even used I am looking at an 8 to 10 thousand dollar investment not including the computer and program, often not including fly shuttles etc, (Not to be invested in lightly). If you are weaving to sell, are you actually selling enough to make payments on that kind of loan? Did you buy it in your search for more complex weaves? Does to really make your weaving more efficient for selling? I know for me the warping process is still my time killer, what eats away at the little ( and I mean little) profit I might make. Thoughts?

Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Sat, 17 Oct 1998 13:34:44 +1000  
From: amsford@effect.net.au (Ford, Audrey)  
Subject: Introduction

Hi everyone

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

I have been following the discussion on advancing twills with great interest and am now experimenting myself with the aid of Weavemaker 1. To introduce myself, I first learnt to weave some 20 years ago, but only got seriously involved when I retired. Started with table looms, but two frozen shoulders later bought a floor loom.

I now have a 16 shaft, 40 inch A.V.L. for which I acquired CompuDobby 2 at Convergence. I have just taken off a pair of baby blankets for my first great grand child!

The next project is silk for a Japanese style jacket (that is what the advancing twill is for), I also intend to use some Kumihimo on this. The weaving group I am involved with has just completed a 1999 Calendar. 12 weavers each wove 100 10cm squares which are mounted on a page with the calendar for each month in such a way that they can be lifted to show the appropriate weave description. Sorry if that's not very clear but you get the idea!

This list is great and I am very glad to be on it.

Audrey in Australia

-----  
Date: Fri, 16 Oct 1998 22:40:38 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: question for complex loom owners

Pamela Marriott wrote:

> Do you weave to sell?

Nope--I'd like to but the odds just don't work for me. The world at large values and will pay more for some other skills though I don't enjoy practicing them anywhere near as much as weaving<g>.

Significantly, production weaving isn't particularly enjoyable for me either. So I rationalize: if I'm going to sit around doing something I don't enjoy I might as well opt for that which produces the largest amount of income so I can indulge in what I do enjoy.

> How did you manage the cost of the equipment.

See above. Actually Pamela, over the years I've taken all sorts of \*proper\* jobs, earned what I needed for whatever I'm after or for whatever our lives have needed. (In fact I'm about to venture into a couple of proper jobs as I type--DH is strongly hinting it's my turn he wants to take time off to pursue his muse.)

Some of us prefer to weave at all costs and don't mind the production blues; at least would rather be doing production weaving than sitting at a desk. Others of us (me) spend energy trying to be creative with \*proper\* jobs so we can have the time and money to spend weaving what and when we want. Some (me) have been lucky in that their partners are able to allow us that indulgence. Some of us have discovered weaving at different stages in our lives (e.g., children gone, or at least through college; or after retirement). Some support their weaving by opening fiber stores.

So many different approaches--so much seeming to depend on the fates. I don't think any of the approaches are any more valid than the others. We do what we have to do . . .

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #24  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #23  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Friday, October 16 1998

Volume 01 : Number 023

Intro

[Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>]

-----  
Date: Thu, 15 Oct 1998 20:44:24 -0500  
From: Cynthia S Crull <cyncrull@datasync.com>  
Subject: Intro

Well, I have finally gotten through the first 9 digests, I didn't get started until #10!

I am very delighted to be invited to join this list. I don't think I will contribute a lot right now but I am surely enjoying and I know I will learn a lot.

I have been weaving for around 28 years. I started with a back strap class at a local junior college, and advanced to a table loom at the same college. It was a loom owned by one of the class members (who was nice enough to loan it to me, though she had never seen me until that day), since the school didn't have such things as looms. Most were doing off loom sorts of things. I didn't know anything about warping so found the Little Golden Book of Weaving! to follow and I got a warp in with rug warp.

I used bits and pieces of my scrap yarns, mostly acrylics that I used to knit with. I still have the bag that I made. From there I just took off with the love of my life. I have gone several looms, 2 of which are with daughter and daughter-in-law, but currently have a 20 shaft 60" 4 box flyshuttle AVL with Compudobby, and a 28" Louet Magic with the Magic Box. I use Fiberworks and have the Baby Silver version, but tend to still weave with the older versions because they seem to work better right now.

I have a desk top computer at the side of the AVL. It sits back to the side because I don't feel the need to keep my eye on it for every shot. I

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

think that one right in front of me would be very distracting. I have a laptop that I use with the Louet. I took the Louet/computer to both LunaSea and Convergence 98 and it was very enjoyable.

My interests in weaving involve Moorman, Double Weave and combining several 4 or 8 shaft weave across the width of a fabric. I do fabric for clothing (jackets and vest mostly) and then towels and blankets. The clothes require more time to sew etc. and don't sell as well, so for the show I do more of the straight easy to finish items.

I have already learned or been stimulated so much on the list. Thanks to our founders!

Cynthia Crull

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #23  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #22  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest            Wednesday, October 14 1998            Volume 01 : Number 022

A little about me, Tom Beaudet  
dual lease pebble weave

[TBeau1930@aol.com]  
[cbrezine@standard.com]

-----  
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 08:35:15 EDT  
From: TBeau1930@aol.com  
Subject: A little about me, Tom Beaudet

My Father was layed off from the RailRoad in 1930 at the start of the depression. He took a job as Engineer in a Silk Mill power plant in Putnam CT. There I grew up.

Putnam was a Mill town. 3 Silk Mills, 4 Cotton Mills and a Woolen Mill. Within a 10 mile radius of the town there were more, too many to count.

When I was 15 I took my first job, part time after school winding filling bobbins on an old Jack Spool winder. Jobs in the Mills were plentiful. When I



## WeaveTech Archive 9810

graduated I just stayed on. My first real job was as a Warp Starter in a Woolen Mill. You learned to read drafts, set the Looms up and weave. I loved it.

1953 I came back from Korea and back to the Mill. I decided if I was to get where I wanted to go I needed more education. I enrolled in a Textile degree program at R.I.S.D. during the day and for the first two years wove in a Linen Upholstery Mill at night. The last two years I apprenticed to the designer in a fancy Worsted Mill( He also just happened to be the fabric design instructor at the school<G>). We would do the Sample Blankets(Gamps) for the Mill during my Labs at school and then I would go to the Mill at night, dress and weave the selected samples into sample yardage for N.Y.

I graduated with a B.S in Tex. Eng. and started chasing that career. Went with Milliken in their Woolen Div.(fancy Ladies and Mens wear), seven years later went with Albant Felt Div. Albany Inter.(Papermakers Felt and Ind. Fabric) Twelve years later went with Tetko Inc.(Silk and Synthetec Screenprint and Filtration Fabric). Retired as General Manager of the Mfg. Div.

Handweaving has been a part of my life since college. More so since I retired.

I have my own shop with a number of Looms. I do some consulting. Spend some time with the LIR groups of Elderhostel. Belong to a few Guilds, edit a Newsletter for one. Spend some time on the internet, offer advice if I think it will help<G>. More recently most of my weaving has been primarily to evaluate Loom performance. I have a close relationship with Leclerc.

When I weave, my preference is usually Wool of some type. I like it all but Wool is my favorite.

Currently I have a CotLin Honeycomb Drapery on one, and a Woolen Throw on another and a Cotton Warp, Nylon Fill Rag Rug on another, with misc. stuff on some others.

I usually weave Scarves or Table Runners or some such during the winter on two 22" Floor Looms I move next to my desk. This year I think I will change the venue.

I have noticed on both this List(for the short time I have been reading the posts) and on the weavers List over the past few years there has been an ongoing thread of some type centering on basic rules for laying out a Fabric, with a desired end use in mind. One that comes to mind is the confusion over how to select the correct stitching points for multiple layer fabrics. Another is whether or not a weaver can weave a selected fabric on the number of Shafts they have.

In the case of the stitching points, if you want effective stitching, the rules are clear. The most ideal is to place a stitching point between two risers on the face and two sinkers on the back. For obvious reasons, Satin weaves are usually selected to accomplish the stitching, but other weaves are used. There are formulas to arrive at the end result desired. There are then second and third choices if the most ideal is not workable.

In the case of Loom capacity, the weaver has to determine the shafts necessary in one repeat of the chosen Fabric. There are formulas to accomplish that for every Fabric known.

All of the information necessary to put these and most other aspects of weave formation down on paper is somewhere in my notes( I am a packrat). If I can find it all and organize it I will probably spend part of the winter putting together a collection of the basic single layer weaves and their derivatives , and the compound or multiple layer weaves and their derivatives in a booklet with the steps necessary to accomplish them.



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

We are all aware that Textiles have been around for many Moons<G>, and most probably everything we do today was probably done by someone else at some time in history. If we spend some time in a Museum we tend to get pushed into this revelation. And this is where the problems of communication get their roots and make it difficult to arrive at a given point without some visual route to keep us on the same page.

Much of the terminology and procedures commonly used in Textiles derive from a both objective and subjective source. To add to the mix, terms used may have different meaning depending on what part of the country or world we learned our craft in. Trying to select a language most will benefit from is always difficult in textiles. As a result, the best approach is probably a visual one with each weave presented in a monogram type format. (descriptive text with a draft layout<drawdown>) With so much interest for multiple Shaft designs now emerging, steps for laying out 16, 24, 28 or even more may be apropos.

At any rate, thats me, where I came from, what I'm doing and a little bit about what I plan on in the coming months.

Textiles in general and Handweaving in particular are a most interesting endeavor. The history is fascinating.

Keep those Beaters moving<G>

Tom Beaudet  
TBeau1930@aol.com

-----  
Date: Tue, 13 Oct 1998 09:35:49 -0800  
From: cbrezine@standard.com  
Subject: dual lease pebble weave

Hi Margaret,

I'll attempt to describe dual lease pebble weave. I haven't done much reading on this so it's quite likely that the terminology I use will be wildly inconsistent with the literature.

Pebble weave is a complementary warp structure. The warp is of (at least) two colors. I'll call them White and Black. Every warp end has a partner of the opposite color. The colors alternate across the fabric, W B W B etc. If you were to do plain weave on this arrangement, you'd get horizontal stripes of white and black: one shed is all white, one shed is all black. I should point out here that the structure is warp faced, the weft does not show.

A scrap of pebble weave with a white background would look like this:

```

                                pick
                                8
XX  XX  XX  XX  XX  7
                                6
  XX  XX  XX  XX  5
                                4
XX  XX  XX  XX  XX  3
                                2
  XX  XX  XX  XX  1
```

where the spaces are white warps and the X's are black warps. You can see that every even numbered shed is just the white plain weave shed. Shed 1 has WWBBWWBB.... on top; shed 3 has just the opposite: BBWWBBWW on top. The basic pebble weave structure is created by repeating picks 1-4.

Sometimes this structure is achieved by hand picking all sheds.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Dual-lease pebble weave automates the odd numbered sheds by tying heddles for sheds 1 and 3. "Heddles" here refer to continuous string heddles. On a floor loom each heddle would be a shaft. String heddles form a long (2 - 3") loop around each concerned warp end, like one long eye. They are unidirectional--if you pull up, the threads in the heddle are raised, but you can't pull down, unlike looms with heddles that have small eyes.

So this little piece of pebble weave can be done with three heddles (or "shafts"): one for pick 1, one for pick 2, and one for pick 3. If an end is in heddle 1 it is not on heddle 3. But \*every\* end in heddle 2 is also in heddle 1 or heddle 3. Thus "non-exclusive" heddles. Quite unlike the usual floor loom convention that each end is threaded on only one shaft. This does not impact the height of the shed, because of the length of the heddle loops/eyes.

In practice, the even weft shots are picked up in various orders to form the pattern. Instead of weaving all whites up, the weaver would drop some white ends and replace them with black ends. This has the effect of "connecting the dots" of the pebble background to create anything imaginable. If the pattern is mirrored around some weft pick, the pickup sheds can be stored on sticks behind the heddles and then reused in reverse order when the mirror point is reached. Even if every even pick is different, automating half of the picks is a significant advantage over some structures where all sheds are manually picked.

I hope that gives you a starting point. I'm still pondering translating this to a floor loom--I don't have a good scheme yet but I'm unwilling to dismiss it as undoable.

Carrie  
Carrie Brezine cbrezine@standard.com

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #22  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #21  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Monday, October 12 1998

Volume 01 : Number 021

weaving mags ["Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.n>  
Re: weaving mags ["Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Unkown Technique [LDMADDEN@aol.com]

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

intro: carrie [cbrezine@standard.com]  
Re: Unkown Technique [Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]  
Re: Unkown Technique [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: intro: carrie [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Weaving mags (again) [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 07:48:32 -0400  
From: "Martha H. & Jeffrey D. Hubbard" <hubbard182@worldnet.att.net>  
Subject: weaving mags

Ruth Blau wrote:

"I hope you & Marguerite will offer the article to the CW newsletter ...  
I think it's too bad that Weaver's & Handwoven seem to be converging (no  
pun intended!)"

I agree with Ruth on both counts. I've always relied on Weavers' to  
provide advanced material not available in other periodicals. It's  
disappointing to see that compromised in favor of greater circulation. I  
hope the CW newsletter can continue to fill that widening void.

By way of introduction, My name is Martha Hubbard. I live in the Albany,  
NY, area, where I am active in the Hudson-Mohawk Weavers' Guild, Arachne  
Weavers and the Designer Crafts Council, a craftsman's guild based at the  
Schenectady Museum. I've been weaving for 17 years, weaving primarily  
clothing fabrics. I work on a 24-shaft AVL with CompuDobby. I've been  
enjoying this list for about a week. Thanks for the invitation to join in.

Martha

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 07:47:02 -0600  
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Subject: Re: weaving mags

I have looked at those increasing circulation numbers as an indication that  
Weavers will survive in the market. I would hate to lose the magazine.  
Doubling circulation is good for survival.

I think it is sad that the circulation with the old format was not higher.  
And it would be fun to see more articles in the CW newsletter.

Judie

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 16:40:43 EDT  
From: LDMADDEN@aol.com  
Subject: Unkown Technique

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

- --part0\_908224843\_boundary  
Content-ID: <0\_908224843@inet\_out.mail.aol.com.1>  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

The following question came to me via someone who saw my name and Complex  
Weaver Study Group affiliation on the big list. I do not have the answer but  
thought one of you surely would know. I made the wild guess that perhaps  
double ikat is what is being discussed. (There is a fantastic piece of double

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

ikat velvet at the Minneapolis Institute of Art.)

<< I'm looking for information  
on a technique (I don't even know the name of it) which involves weaving  
two or more lengths of cloth, printing and/or dyeing them, unweaving them  
and weaving them back into one piece with a complex image. I've seen an  
example of it once, in the "Muse of the Millennium" show in Seattle last  
winter, by an artist whose last name is Matsubara, and about whom I  
haven't been able to find a thing. >>

The questioner would also like to find more information on Matsubara. She has  
done some unfruitful research.

Linda Madden

- --part0\_908224843\_boundary  
Content-ID: <0\_908224843@inet\_out.mail.u.washington.edu.2>  
Content-type: message/rfc822  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit  
Content-disposition: inline

Return-Path: <rebop@u.washington.edu>  
Received: from rly-zb01.mx.aol.com (rly-zb01.mail.aol.com [172.31.41.1]) by  
air-zb03.mail.aol.com (v50.18) with SMTP; Sat, 10 Oct 1998 19:36:38  
-0400  
Received: from jason05.u.washington.edu (jason05.u.washington.edu  
[140.142.78.6])  
by rly-zb01.mx.aol.com (8.8.8/8.8.5/AOL-4.0.0)  
with ESMTMP id TAA10778 for <ldmadden@aol.com>;  
Sat, 10 Oct 1998 19:36:37 -0400 (EDT)  
Received: from dante05.u.washington.edu (rebop@dante05.u.washington.edu  
[140.142.15.7])  
by jason05.u.washington.edu (8.8.4+UW97.07/8.8.4+UW98.06) with ESMTMP  
id QAA50228 for <ldmadden@aol.com>; Sat, 10 Oct 1998 16:36:36 -0700  
Received: from localhost (rebop@localhost)  
by dante05.u.washington.edu (8.8.4+UW97.07/8.8.4+UW98.06) with ESMTMP  
id QAA50842 for <ldmadden@aol.com>; Sat, 10 Oct 1998 16:36:36 -0700  
Date: Sat, 10 Oct 1998 16:36:35 -0700 (PDT)  
From: "R. Cohen" <rebop@u.washington.edu>  
To: ldmadden@aol.com  
Subject: complex weavers  
Message-ID:  
<Pine.A41.4.05.9810101627280.12004-100000@dante05.u.washington.edu>  
Mime-Version: 1.0  
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII  
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit

Hi Linda-

I read your post regarding study groups on the weaving list at quiltnet,  
and was hoping you might be able to help me.

I'm looking for information  
on a technique (I don't even know the name of it) which involves weaving  
two or more lengths of cloth, printing and/or dyeing them, unweaving them  
and weaving them back into one piece with a complex image. I've seen an  
example of it once, in the "Muse of the Millennium" show in Seattle last  
winter, by an artist whose last name is Matsubara, and about whom I  
haven't been able to find a thing.

I'd like to try it, and would prefer to have at least a little info to go  
on, if I can get any.

I'd appreciate it if you could give me any info or leads on this.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Thanks a bunch, and happy weaving!  
Rebecca Cohen

- --part0\_908224843\_boundary--

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 14:23:04 -0800  
From: cbrezine@standard.com  
Subject: intro: carrie

Hello all and thanks for inviting me to join this list. I've been weaving about 6 years. My current looms are a 4-shaft LeClerc and an 8-shaft baby Mac. No computerization yet... but I use Swiftweave for design purposes.

I'm especially interested in mathematics and weaving and have been a member of the CW symmetry study group since the beginning. Laurie does a marvelous job with the newsletters for this group! When I first began weaving I was \*certain\* that I \*needed\* a 32-shaft computerized dobby loom asap. Needless to say this did not materialize so rather than pining away for it I'm concentrating on what I do have. For instance, I've been working on ways to achieve all of the symmetry patterns on 4 shafts.

In the past couple of years I've been fortunate to have two workshops with Ed Franquemont, and my ideas of complex cloth have been radically altered. I don't do as much andean weaving as I would like, but I'm fascinated by the structures and the patterns. Indeed, in this type of weaving structure and pattern are inseparable, which makes it all the more intriguing to me. This summer he introduced me to dual-lease pebble weave, and the concept of non-exclusive heddles finally crystalized for me. I'd be interested to hear about how anyone is using long-eyed heddles or other non-exclusive shedding devices in their weaving.

I'm enjoying this discussions on this list, and looking forward to more.

Carrie

Carrie Brezine cbrezine@standard.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 16:50:03 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Re: Unkown Technique

LDMADDEN@aol.com wrote:

> by an artist whose last name is Matsubara, and about whom I  
> haven't been able to find a thing. >>

Hi list.....I was a judge for a show in Whitewater, WI this fall, and the HGA award winner was F. Matasubara for a piece she had woven on an AVL loom, dyed, unwoven and rewoven. - which BTW was absolutely gorgeous! She lives in Madison, WI, but that is all I know. I do know someone who has made her acquaintance one time, and possibly could find a contact # or address for you. Will do my best if you are interested in persuing this.....  
Su :-)

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 15:04:56 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Unkown Technique

Linda

When in doubt check in your own backyard! Or, in this case, down the street a ways <g>.

Contact Marie Westerman in Northfield (she used to have a studio in Minneapolis but I'm not sure that she still maintains it). She has an extensive slide collection of double and triple weave pick up. I recall a couple of slides of work by an artist who wove, dyed, unwove, reweave, picked up--you name it! Incredible! Marie is a font of information on this technique and its artists. As you well know Marie's own work is a tour-de-force!

Anyhow, her address and phone should be in the WGM guild directory, if not, do let me know, I'm sure I can dig it up somewhere in this mess of boxes!

Marge

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 15:08:06 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: intro: carrie

cbrezine@standard.com wrote:

> This summer he introduced me to dual-lease pebble weave, and the  
> concept of non-exclusive heddles finally crystalized for me. I'd be interested  
> to hear about how anyone is using long-eyed heddles or other non-exclusive  
> shedding devices in their weaving.

I would too. And I'd be interested in learning something about dual-lease pebble weave! Is there anything about this you can pass on via the list?

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 12 Oct 1998 19:34:59 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Weaving mags (again)

I'd like to clarify the thoughts I expressed on the change in Weaver's mag. I don't mind that they now include 4-shaft drafts and other information for newer weavers, but it shouldn't be at the sacrifice of articles on complex subjects such as Bonnie and Marguerite are writing about. I'm truly sad when Weaver's tells authors that their subject is too complicated to publish, because if not in Weaver's, then where? I personally might not understand what Bonnie & Marguerite are saying, but it would stretch my capabilities as a weaver to read the article & try to figure it out. Madelyn certainly has the right to turn down articles for all kinds of good reasons (we covered that area too recently, someone else already has



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sun, 11 Oct 1998 10:26:12 -0500  
From: hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)  
Subject: Re: doobby names

>Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca> wrote:

>Remember that each doobby head has a trade name.  
> Lets use the right product name. They are each proud  
>of it and we should not use one as a generic name.

I certainly agree with this sentiment. It applies to \*all\* products, including software. I try to never use brand names as a generic name. As it applies to doobbies connected to computers, I use either "Computer Assisted Loom" or "Computer Controlled Dobby". The first of these is what is also used by Complex Weavers.

Dick Lindell, Weaver  
visit me at <<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>>

-----  
The first step to Wisdom is in calling things by their right name.  
-- Lao Tzu

-----  
Date: Sun, 11 Oct 1998 11:20:22 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: re doobby names

Ingrid Boesel wrote:

> There are others too. Lets use the right product name. They are each proud  
> of it and we should not use one as a generic name.

Thanks Ingrid, I always knew I was using a wrong name, but didn't know the right one! Is there a generic acronym for the unknowns, like CAL (Computer Assisted Loom), --if not, why don't we coin one? (I am rather patial to CAW <eg>)

In the UK we used to say "Hoover" for the act of vacuuming, ala Xerox for the act of copying. Later these companies had to spend mucho cash to retain use of their own names and identities! No one is making an assault on anything I've created with the possible exception of Dear Tabby <g>.

Marge

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sun, 11 Oct 98 15:29:46 PDT  
From: "Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>  
Subject: tie-ups for network drafted twills



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Bonnie wrote: ... no more than 3 in a row, anywhere, and if there are  
> steep places or skips ("fleas") in either threading or treadling then  
there  
> are additional requirements if you seek to avoid floats of more than 3  
> threads.

Bonnie told me: "it's your turn", so I will try to explain briefly what she meant. I will write only about a 4-shaft twill network, both in the threading and the treadling. All the time, the threading and the treadling stay on the network, the special places are correct according to the 4-shaft twill network.

- - Steep places: they occur when a networked twill goes down by "2's" or "1's", for example, ...5678 56 34 12...or ...5678 5 23... So Bonnie's descending sequence is not steep.
- - Skips: breaks of 5, 9, 13... in the networked twill sequence, for example, ...234 91011... There is no skip problem on 8 shafts.

Some tie-ups that have no more than 3 ties in every vertical or horizontal row will give floats of 4 or more when you have these things. Naturally special places in the threading will give weft floats and special places in the treadling will give warp floats.

To be sure that the maximum floats are 3-thread floats on both sides of the fabric when you have steep places or skips, the tie-up must contain a 1/3 twill both in the tied or black squares and the untied or white squares.

- - start with a 1/3 twill tie-up or 1/3/1/3/1/3 etc.
- - add other ties, to get no more than 3 in a row, but you must keep at least a 1/3 twill within the untied squares in each vertical and horizontal row, and you can't erase the original 1/3 ties.

It is easier than it looks. For example, I start with 1-5-9, add 2,3,6,11, but I keep untied 4-8-12.

Any tie-up you find can be checked: look at the groups that make the 1/3 twill, for example on 12 shafts 1-5-9, 2-6-10, 3-7-11, 4-8-12. You must find one group all black and one group all white and you can stop when you have found them. If the tie-up is straight and regular, it has to be done only in one vertical or horizontal row, but other tie-ups like plaited tie-ups have to be checked in every vertical and horizontal row.

It is logical to say that these tie-ups are safe with such special threading or treadling places because they are on the same network base as the threading and the treadling. You will find that some tie-ups with 1/2 twill places (3-shaft base) will give longer floats, for example 1/2/1/2/1/1 on 8 shafts. Maybe you have encountered such long floats. It would be interesting to know about them and check our theory!

Marguerite Gingras

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #20  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVENTECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVENTECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #19  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Sunday, October 11 1998

Volume 01 : Number 019

|                           |                                               |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| advancing twill reversals | ["Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>]       |
| reversals                 | [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]       |
| tieup for advancing twill | [Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>] |
| re doobby names           | [Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>] |

-----  
Date: Sat, 10 Oct 98 10:55:37 PDT  
From: "Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>  
Subject: advancing twill reversals

Bonnie has explained very well the reversal of design direction on the 4-shaft twill network base. I just want to point out that the "descending" sequence Ruth gave is on the 6-shaft twill network base (or 6-end initial) that can be used for triple weave (I did it once). With some tie-ups that are ok for the ascending part of the 5-end advancing twill (3-thread floats), we will get 5-thread floats going down this way. For example: going down with 45678 34567 - tie-up 2/2/1/3. Rising 1-2-5 will give a weft float over 67834.

Marguerite Gingras

-----  
Date: Sat, 10 Oct 1998 20:32:33 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: reversals

Ingrid, the visual effect of the offset reversal is quite different; you can't make real diamonds with it. But it's neat, I like it a lot. It's what we use for "frost crystal" type of drafts. If you use it with 12 or more shafts, and the tie-up has a place with 3/1/3, then you get 5 thread floats at the reversal again. This doesn't happen with 8 shaft drafts but it occurs in many tie-ups with 12 or more, including some of the plaited twill tie-ups.

Sally asked about tie-up choices with network drafted twills. I gave a CW seminar on this topic in 96, and Marguerite and I wrote an article on the subject that year and sent it to Madelyn but now she says it's too technical for that magazine, but we still think it's interesting and important. Bottom line: no more than 3 in a row, anywhere, and if there are steep places or skips ("fleas") in either threading or treadling then there are additional requirements if you seek to avoid floats of more than 3 threads.

Bonnie Inouye

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
Date: Sat, 10 Oct 1998 23:42:00 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: tieup for advancing twill

Hi Sally:  
The tieup for an advancing twill on a 4 shaft twill network.  
There should never be more than three tied or untied in a row.  
That means that you have to do it past the edges too.  
Otherwise anything goes.  
NO MORE THAN 3 in any one row in column

Ingrid Boesel  
~~~~~

Once you're warped, what's weft?

-----  
Date: Sat, 10 Oct 1998 23:42:02 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: re dobbie names

Hi:

>at the Archabbey in Indiana, having fitted his Glimakra with the AVL  
Dobby...I  
>don't think it was the Compu-Dobby.

Remember that each dobbie head has a trade name.  
Compu Dobby is strictly an AVL product  
Schacht is Comby  
Cyrefco has the Compu-Marche  
Louet is Magic Dobby  
J-Made is J-Comp  
Can't remember what Macomber is and I do not know what the LeClerc product  
name is yet.

There are others too. Lets use the right product name. They are each proud  
of it and we should not use one as a generic name.

Ingrid Boesel  
~~~~~

Once you're warped, what's weft?

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #19  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

This gives the same slope because you go up in 10 threads (2 groups of 5 each) the same amount (2 places) as you go down in 10 threads (group of 3, group of 4, group of 3). You can enter this version in your computer, and Ruth's, and compare them. Try the 1/3/1/3 tie-up, then try 1/3/3/1.

Regarding the problem of never-ending design possibilities on the computer... this is why we like weaving, no? Because there are so many things to try? (even after 31 years of weaving) If there is a need, set a timer so you can come up for air and get the duller stuff done.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
Date: Fri, 9 Oct 1998 14:37:12 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Re: reversals

> Here is how to make the reverse direction have the same slope as the 5-end advancing  
>twill: Suppose you are going up and you get to 3,4,5,6,7, then 4,5,6,7,8, and you  
>want to go down. Here are the next threads of the sequence: 5,6,7,  
>4,5,6,7, 4,5,6, 3,4,5, 2,3,4,5, 2,3,4, 1,2,3, 8,1,2,3...

Yes, I tried it out and its pretty cool. It is even easier to get the sequence right if for the 3-1 twill advance, you actually draw the 4-end initial on the threading/treadling. Then when you mark the sequences its more obvious where the next sequence starts. I suppose after years of doing this it gets easier, but with the initial it is more obvious.

So my next thought on this is how to vary the tieup. Clearly you can pick a standard straight twill tieup such as 1-3-3-1 but I see a lot of tieups where you see multiple directions of the tieup changes and variations in the tieup. Are there good rules (ways) of know how to draw these tieups and how to tell why one tieup doesn't work and the next one does. Hope I haven't confused the question too much.

Sally

-----  
Date: Fri, 09 Oct 1998 21:05:20 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: Advancing twill long float

Hi Peggy:

Bonnie wrote of two solutions to your long floats at the reversals.

>>>>

The solution is to avoid reversals, or change the tie-up. You can make a reversal of design direction without changing the direction of the twill lines, and this avoids the longer floats too.

Another solution is to make reversals very often, using the longer float as a design element.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

<<<<<<<<

Here is a third one

When making the reversal, use a broken sequence at the reversal. Threading draft below

@@Threading

1 2 3 4 5, 2 3 4 5 6, 3 4 5 6 7, 4 5 6 7 8,  
5 6 7 8 1, 6 7 8 1 2, 7 8 1 2 3, 8 1 2 3 4,  
1 2 3 4 5,\*\* 8 7 6 5 4, 7 6 5 4 3, 6 5 4 3 2,  
5 4 3 2 1, 4 3 2 1 8, 3 2 1 8 7, 2 1 8 7 6 ,  
1 8 7 6 5, 8 7 6 5 4, \*\* 1 2 3 4 5, 2 3 4 5 6 ,  
3 4 5 6 7, 4 5 6 7 8, 5 6 7 8 1, 6 7 8 1 2 ,  
7 8 1 2 3, 8 1 2 3 4 , 1 2 3 4 5 .....

I got a three thread float at reversals with tieup 3,1,1,3 and a 4 thread float with 3,2,1,2 tieup.

Woven as drawn in or as regular twill type treadlings.

Would work on expanded advancing twills too.

Ingrid

~~~~~

When You Are Warped, What's Weft

<italic>

</italic>Ingrid Boesel, the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW

Visit us at: <http://www3.sympatico.ca/fiberworks.pcw>

-----

Date: Fri, 09 Oct 1998 22:19:05 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: Quigley

Hi Linda:

>I am in the process of threading a 4-tie unit  
>weave (Quigley) for my annual 16's Sample.

I did my Master Weaver study for the Ontario Handweavers and Spinners on ....  
4 tie unit wave and had a whole section on supplementary weft (Quigley  
included)

The draft is

1,5,2,5,3,5,4,5 1,6,2,6,3,6,4,6 etc 8 thread blocks

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

The thing is 4 tie has the ties on 4 shafts, with the usual order being in straight twill order. Quigley is in a "rosepath " order or in a point order. Here one variation is  
1,5,2,5,3,5,4,5,3,5,2,5 1,6,2,6,3,6,4,6,3,6,2,6 12 thread blocks  
another is

1,5,2,5,3,5,4,5,1,5,2,5,1,5,4,5,3,5,2,5  
1,6,2,6,3,6,4,6,1,6,2,6,1,6,4,6,3,6,2,6 20 thread block

This allows you to do diamonds of various kinds with the pattern tiedowns. As you noticed the blocks go from large to huge!  
So unlink the ground from the patters.

I make a 4 shaft twill of interesting design, then make an interesting design on a draft that has as many shafts as the remainder of my shafts, in your case 12? In one design I used an undulating twill, in another a 6" wide line in another a network twill line, anything...<G>

Then I combined the two to get a Quigley draft. I can send you a PCW4 .dtx file privately if you would like to see what I did.

To all of you

Complex Weavers website  
<http://www.complex-weavers.org>

Ingrid Boesel

~~~~~  
Once you're warped, what's weft?

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #18  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #17  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Friday, October 9 1998

Volume 01 : Number 017

Re: reversals and intro ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>]  
Re: Computer Drivers for Leclerc [TBeau1930@aol.com]  
Re: Quigley [LDMADDEN@aol.com]

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Re: Perverted multi-tied weaves  
Re: AVL Compu-Dobby on Toika

[LDMADDEN@aol.com]  
[Grimi@aol.com]

-----  
Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 11:11:26 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Re: reversals and intro

Bonnie, those are great ideas and help explain to me what I am seeing in my designs. I seem to spend a lot of time designing at the computer and it is mostly "discovery learning", although I have read & reread the Weaver articles. I think a forum like this where we can ask specific questions is really great.

>Silk is addictive, by the way.

It sure is. Seems like anything done in silk comes out wonderful just by nature of the silk.

Anyway it back to the drawing board to design and play with more ideas.  
Sally

-----  
Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 15:02:35 EDT  
From: TBeau1930@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Computer Drivers for Leclerc

Hi weavetech Listers all, thanks for the invite.

Ruth wrote:

<<Mary wrote: Both situations make a compudobby look appealing to me! Never thought I'd >want one, but now I'm lusting after the (15"? 20"?) 16H computer driven >LeClerc \$2999- anybody have any experience with this one? I wove on it at Convergence and liked it--but can't say I gave it a thorough test-drive. We also have Sally B's recent info that the first interface Leclerc used discouraged software developers from writing drivers for this loom, so I'd certainly check out which products can drive the loom before I'd let myself fall in love with it. Sally also told us that Leclerc is modifying the interface, so perhaps Tom Beaudet can tell us what the status of that project is.

I also think that Margaret Coe gave this loom a good lookover at Convergence, so perhaps she'll add her \$.02. Ruth Arlington, Virginia USA>>

-  
I am not a Computer Guy and was not in on the original discussions with the software people, but as I understand it this is where we are.

Proweave provides the program/drivers to power Leclerc's entry into the CAD field. From what I understand all others will write it pending market demand. I don't believe the Interface had a bearing on the other software mfgrs. providing software, simply volume.

Feedback from Atlanta, all of our field testing, and our in House evaluation show favorable results with Proweave. Leclerc is designing all of the Computer Driven retrofit Kits for existing floor Looms with this Interface and ProWeave software.

As I understand it, there has been sufficient interest presented from the field to Fiberworks that they are about to provide Drivers for their programs also.



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

The \$2995 mentioned in the question above is for the 24" 16s , with Stand and Interface, with Driver and Proweave software.  
(This is the same package we used to demonstrate in our Convergence Booth.)

Thanks again for inviting me to join in these discussions, an intro will follow

Tom Beaudet

-----  
Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 15:20:58 EDT  
From: LDMADDEN@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Quigley

In a message dated 98-10-08 06:07:53 EDT, you write:

<< I don't recognize the weave you reference, "Quigley" >>  
Anne,

Quigley is in the same category as Bergman weaves. Bergman uses three tie unit, with tie-downs threaded on a rose path threading. Quigley uses a 4 thread tie down unit with the tie-downs threaded straight draw or point threadings. Both are name for the weavers who developed these weaves. Depending on the tie-ups you can have points, twills, etc. in the ground as well any of the these in the pattern areas. The assignment for this years study for the 16's Study Group was to use either 3 or 4-tie unit weaves. Madeline van der Hoogt's drafting book has great directions.

They are easy to draft and such fun to play with. My goals for sample exchanges are to learn a new structure by doing my own original draft and each sample should have at least one full repeat and if possible two. This has pushed me to finer threads. I also have been led to try structures that I had no interest in and ended up having a great time and learning so much. In this case I used "straight draw" order on the pattern shafts and did my designing primarily in the tie-ups. Half-units that Judie mentions open up lots of possibilities.

Linda Madden

-----  
Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 15:21:03 EDT  
From: LDMADDEN@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Perverted multi-tied weaves

In a message dated 98-10-08 13:17:52 EDT, you write:

<< Subject: perverted multi-tied weaves  
>>  
Laurie,

You are reading my mind. I actually did think I might try a lace weave with the end of my Quigley sample weave. I was thinking in terms of a 4 shaft huck or Swedish Lace. I love this list.

Will report on results.

Linda



## WeaveTech Archive 9810

the last 5 threads (or picks) of the ascending sequence):

... 81234 3218 32187 21876 etc.

But it seems to me that you can also "descend" in the following way (again, picking up on the last 5 threads (or picks) of the ascending sequence):

...81234 78123 67812 56781 45678 34567 23456 12345 etc (now you're back to ascending again)

I have used this treading on a straight draw advancing threading, and you certainly get a visual reversal, though it's different from the perfectly symmetrical reversal. You also have shorter floats at the reversal.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Thu, 8 Oct 1998 12:08:09 -0500  
From: charuby@plainfield.bypass.com (Robin and Ken Leslie)  
Subject: Intro to WeaveTech List

Hi! Robin Leslie here (also known as Ruby Charuby--- I answer to all permutations of my names, though I prefer Robin or Ruby to being called Leslie, which is my last name).

I signed up for a weaving class 11 years ago when my middle child was not quite a year old, and the oldest was turning 3 (any idea WHY I might have needed to get out of the house?). I walked into the class, having no idea what weaving entailed, and almost lost it when it hit me that I had just spent \$50 to learn a skill that required TIME, EQUIPMENT, MONEY and HOUSE SPACE -- all non-existent at the time. As soon as I threw my first shuttle I fell in love, and found the time, equipment, money and space to continue! Funny how easy it is to overcome obstacles when love is involved! I love structure, but I also adore color and texture.

I never learned to sew, which is a real obstacle when it comes to designing clothing. Consequently, I tend to think in terms of samples, and items that don't need major restructuring once they're off the loom (read "scarves"). In fact, because I've always loved weaving in its entirety -- the process of creating a design, the act of winding a warp (yes, I really do like doing it!), the thrill of seeing and feeling cloth emerge, and the surprise of seeing the end product in its totality -- I've always been satisfied to simply produce a textile (which need have no further end purpose than having been created). But, it's time to make some clothing so that I can feel like a weaver, even when I'm not at the loom.

I have a 12-shaft 40" AVL modular loom (their dobby loom without the dobby), an 8-shaft 22" Harrisville (which belonged to my teacher's weaving school, and has seen metal fatigue and numerous upgrades, but is a true workhorse), and the 15" 8-shaft Voyageur ("it" made a beautiful Liz Williamson "crinkly" at Convergence). I also have 20 (!) Harrisville lap looms, which are great for teaching kids.

Last spring I set up an After School Enrichment program at our elementary school, and am slowly figuring out how to direct this enterprise while finding time to be in the weaving studio. Both yell for attention, so I sometimes find myself outside in the garden, trying to plant the overly extensive assortment of daffodil bulbs that I indulged in (serious

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

competition for the yarn addiction!)

Thanks for the invitation to be a part of this list. I hope WeaveTech stays a modest size--it feels like a neighborhood, rather than a metropolis!

Best,

Ruby from northern Vermont, where we've been scraping ice off the windshields every morning  
<charuby@plainfield.bypass.com>

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 12:15:01 -0400  
From: Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>  
Subject: perverted multi-tied weaves

Has anyone tried perverting quigley or other multi-tie weaves so that the ground/background/tie-down pattern is not a twill? I keep looking at this Beiderwand on my loom and thinking the finer layer of the doubleweave sections would be a fun place to have a lace pattern <eg> Not enough shafts on my loom to try it though. I've got a 4 block pattern on, and to get 4 blocks of lace I'd need 3-4 shafts beyond the 10 I have. Maybe Su's networked crackle could work? It seems to me that provided you have enough shafts and treadles you could use any structure for the tie-downs as long as it keeps the odd-even alternation in the tie-downs, though maybe this isn't even a necessity. Doing this on a Quigley type structure would give a very different result from doing it on Beiderwand but both approaches could be fun.

Hmm off to try it out on the computer. [My computer "loom" has lots more shafts and fewer limitations than my wooden one.] Linda, when you figure out how to get from the computer to the loom, let me know - I'm stuck there too <g>

happy weaving,designing...  
Laurie

-----  
Date: Thu, 08 Oct 1998 12:56:42 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: advancing, blocks, Quigley

Sorry, Margaret, I must have misread your message. Maybe it helped somebody else. I don't think in terms of an initial, but rather of having a network base, but I know both terms of course.

Margaret described an interesting threading,an advancing network drafted curve. I used a curve with an odd number of threads and advanced by 1, for the workshop "Advance!" before Convergence. Actually there were 2 drafts like that in the workshop (using different curves) and Amy Norris had one of them. The workshop drafts were for 8 shaft looms, looked very nifty, and had long repeats in the threading. Amy threaded hers perfectly :) and made lovely samples with many treadlings.

Last week there was some talk about block weaves. I'd like to point out that the 5-end (or the 4-end) advancing twill gives 8 blocks on 8 shafts. Marguerite noticed the 6-end advancing twill with an advance of 2: 1,2,3,4,5,6, 3,4,5,6,7,8, 5,6,7,8,9,10, (or 5,6,7,8,1,2 on an 8-shaft loom) etc. This gives 4 blocks on an 8-shaft loom, or 6 blocks using 12 shafts, and is a way to make a less bulky 24-shaft threading. But if you wanted to use 15 shafts, an odd number, it would give 15 blocks on 15 shafts I

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

believe-- have any of you tried this? It could be useful for satin.

The advancing twills can also be used instead of straight twills in other ways. The person exploring Quigley used the word "blocky", and this was my first impression of Lampas as well. When I used an advancing twill for the secondary warp, it allowed me to make smooth curves and larger designs. In this case you can use whatever initial you want, and I think you could do the same with Quigley. My goal was big designs for the Convergence 94 fashion show (a vest and a coat) but Marguerite used this idea for greeting cards so it could be done for the samples for a study group. Advancing twills make interesting profiles, for tied weaves and lace weaves.

Ingrid Boesel is the authority on 4-tie weaves. She gave a wonderful seminar on this for Complex Weavers in 1992, and she's on this list now. Her woven pieces are inspiring, and she used many different threadings.

Bonnie Inouye

[binouye@geocities.com](mailto:binouye@geocities.com)

[www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347](http://www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347)

-----

Date: Thu, 08 Oct 1998 12:56:48 -0400

From: Bonnie Inouye <[binouye@geocities.com](mailto:binouye@geocities.com)>

Subject: reversals and intro

Sally asked me about reversing the design without reversing the twill direction. It won't make a snowflake, Sally. Snowflake patterns rely on mirror symmetry to give that pretty, very feminine look. If I want to make a snowflake type of design, I do use a reversal, but I place it carefully. There are 2 reversals in these designs, so they repeat, and I place them in one area of the draft-- say, around shaft 12 treadle 12, and then I make that part of the tie-up have no more than 2 in a row. This gives a 4-thread float at the reversal, 3's elsewhere, and looks fine. The other way around this is the traditional snowflake, which makes 6-thread floats all along the advancing twill part and then has a 5-thread float at the reversal; your eye no longer catches the line of 5. You could do this with your 30/2 silk because it'll be sett very closely. I wove the clothes for my son's wedding using 20/2 silk for the warp, 30/2 for weft, and found that 32 epi was perfect for twills. Silk is addictive, by the way.

The reversal of design direction is done by making your design line go the other way. If you look at a normal network drafted threading you generally see curves. Squint and it looks like hills and valleys. You can make them as steep or as gentle as you want. The advancing twill threading taken in this light looks like a ramp. What you want is a mountain: a steep up and then a steep down, without any rounding at the top. I've got an example on my home page. If you are using Alice's method just draw a mountain (an upside-down V) as your design line.

I'd suggest you make print-outs of drafts using both techniques and compare them.

I should introduce myself. I've been weaving since 1967, teaching weaving and spinning and dyes since about 1974, selling woven items from the start.

I live in Maryland, near D.C., most of the school year and in a cabin in the mountains of Colorado for June, July, August, and usually January and October-- we arrived on Tuesday and will go back to the city on the 29th. I have a 16-shaft 60" AVL compu-dobby in Maryland and a 40" AVL 16 here in the cabin, which is on wooden bars now (I move the box here for the summer and just switched it back to bars). I miss the box but have figured out ways to weave long sequences without pegging so much. I give programs and workshops for guilds and conferences, and have enjoyed meeting many of you.

I'd like to add that if you are interested in weave structures, Complex

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Weavers is a great group and their seminars are tops. I don't remember their home page, but maybe Ingrid will tell us.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #16

\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #15  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Thursday, October 8 1998

Volume 01 : Number 015

Re: Introduction [LDMADDEN@aol.com]  
Re: advancing twills and networks [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: advancing twills and networks ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.c>]  
Re: Introduction [arwells@erols.com]  
Quigley ["Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>]

-----  
Date: Wed, 7 Oct 1998 14:36:37 EDT  
From: LDMADDEN@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Introduction

Hello list!

I am Linda Madden from Eden Prairie MN (Minneapolis suburb). I did a little weaving as an art education major in college and as an art teacher in the early '60s. My husband and I moved to Minnesota out of grad school and I took every class and workshop offered at the Weavers Guild of MN. I spent 13 years as a production weaver (garments, table linens etc) and as a teacher at the Weavers Guild of MN. For the past 8 years I was living in Central Minnesota doing menial clerical work and weaving my once a year sample for the 16's and very few other things. Now I am back in the Twin Cities trying to reinvent myself again and recharge my weaving brain cells.

One of the highlights of my summer was meeting many of you at Convergence and Complex Weavers Seminars. So many ideas so little time.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

I weave on a 16 shaft 40" AVL dobby loom and use Fiberworks PCW for Windows (the current Silver version). I am in the process of threading a 4-tie unit weave (Quigley) for my annual 16's Sample. I am using 16/2 cotton from Robin and Russ at 30 epi. and a pattern thread to be determined. (I have more yarn than any yarn store I visit) My biggest problem so far was that I could not find many articles regarding this weave. I used Madeline's drafting book and just played. It is so hard to stop playing, choose one draft and get to work. It is my understanding that the advantage of these structures is that you get a pattern in both the ground and pattern areas. The examples I have available seem very "blocky". I have done two designs, one a very sterile version of some things I saw in Bonnie Inouye's classes at Convergence and CW Seminars ( criss crossing curves) and a little fish design I doddled out myself. The first was too large to get on my little sample format so am going for the fish. I am going to loosen up the first design and do a fine silk scarf with it.

Questions for you:

Any tricks for warping fine threads?

How do you wean yourself from the wonderful drafting program to the real work?

Why did Margaret Coe and Sue Mansfield leave town just as I was getting back?

Peace,

Linda

-----

Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 11:40:23 -0600

From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>

Subject: Re: advancing twills and networks

Bonnie Inouye wrote:

> Maragaret mentions a 4 end advancing twill sequence.

Bonnie, thank you for such a detailed and informational response, but it missed the mark a little this time. Still it's all very useful information for those just venturing into advancing threadings and I did read your's and Ingrid's articles, cross my heart!

First though I have to correct the starting assumption--I'm not using a 4-end advancing twill sequence! I am using (used) a \*4-end initial\* an entirely different kettle of threads.

A 4-end initial forms a threading unit for 4-end twills (1/3, 3/1, 2/2, broken, straight, etc.) basket weave, plain weave, and others. With this network I plotted a curve and it was the entire curve, which I call an element, consisting of some 50 threads that I \*advanced\*. I advanced each 50-thread element by 4 shafts. So after four repeats of the element (200 threads) I arrived back at the starting point. The 200 threads therefore constituted one threading repeat.

My error came close to the beginning when I accidentally deleted a thread (in the computer) in the first element. Of course the error occured in each of the subsequent repeats repeats and I faithfully printed the threading and followed it faithfully, errors and all across the entire warp!

So how did I find the error? As I wove I realized there was something not quite right, a sort of subtle not quite right and I puzzled over it for a couple of yards--full size sample number 1 (SIL seasonal gift). Then I fuffed around with the treadling to little avail--full size sample number 2 (partner of SIL seasonal gift). Finally I went back to the screen and substituted a straight 2/2 twill tie up with a straight treadling and voila the threading was no longer on a network! Fooled around with the treadling some more and some of you saw



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

full size sample number 3 at Convergence (the purple scarf).

The tie up is a mixed 3/1, 1/3 twill with some areas of 2/2. The treadling is a 5 shaft advance (now suitably doctored to accommodate the aforementioned fiddling).

With three scarfs yet to go, I've learned to live with it!

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 7 Oct 1998 17:18:57 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Re: advancing twills and networks

>The solution is to avoid reversals, or change the tie-up. You can make a  
>reversal of design direction without changing the direction of the twill  
>lines, and this avoids the longer floats too.

How do you make a reversal of design direction without changing direction of twill lines? This might help solve the problem I have been having lately trying to design snowfalk like twills. Everytime I get one I like, the floats are too long in some places. By the time I clean up the floats I loose the attractiveness of the design.

Sally

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 20:29:51 -0700  
From: arwells@erols.com  
Subject: Re: Introduction

Hi, Linda -

I don't recognize the weave you reference, "Quigley". You mention that you get pattern both in the ground cloth as well as the pattern area. That's interesting. I wonder, is it anything like the Bateman weaves?? I wove some of those, and my observation (based on the few I worked with) was that the weave "blocks" were very interesting, just themselves, but the arrangement of the blocks creates bigger patterns seen from a distance that form a "secondary" pattern. Is this the kind of effect that you get from Quigley, or is it something else??

Anne in Annandale  
arwells@erols.com

LDMADDEN@aol.com wrote:

> <snip>  
> I weave on a 16 shaft 40" AVL dobby loom and use Fiberworks PCW for Windows  
> (the current Silver version). I am in the process of threading a 4-tie unit  
> weave (Quigley) for my annual 16's Sample. <snip>

-----  
Date: Wed, 7 Oct 1998 22:08:47 -0600  
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Subject: Quigley



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

> I am in the process of threading a 4-tie unit  
> weave (Quigley) for my annual 16's Sample.

I have played with this weave structure a little. I like using only a couple of pattern threads per block of pattern. Of course this means that you keep the ties in order. I have tried three different tie orders, straight, point, and rosepath. It is fun. What you are doing sounds wonderful. I liked the ties used in 2/2 broken twill order best on the straight draw. It looks like a little plaited twill. Fun. Then I tried an 8-tie and really did a plaited twill.

It is hard to quit trying things on the computer and get to weaving. I finally have to say, it is good enough and worth weaving. Deadlines help.  
<gg>

Fine thread warping. Attention to detail, back to front technique. Magic sizing for small problems and and spray starch and a blow dryer for major problems.

Judie Eatough

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #15  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #14  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Wednesday, October 7 1998

Volume 01 : Number 014

advancing twills ["Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>]  
Re: Dumb Question--loom width [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
dobby/compu doobby on 8 harness ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.n  
advancing twills and networks [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]  
Re: advancing twills ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>]

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 98 12:23:07 PDT  
From: "Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>  
Subject: advancing twills

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

I am not sure I understand the float problems some of you had with advancing twills, but here is how I understand advancing twills and avoid long floats. For me advancing twills are like straight lines drawn on a network, so they follow the same rules for tie-ups and have the same float lengths.

Let's start with the 5-end advancing twill: 12345 23456 34567 45678... It is on the 4-end initial network, because after 5 you have 2 (2, 6 or 10... on this network), after 6 you have 3, etc. You can add 4 thread units and get an expanded advancing twill. With this advancing twill you have to rise or lower no more than 3 shafts in a row in the tie-up and the floats will be limited to 3 threads, unless you have points (maximum float = 5). Bonnie Inouye wrote an excellent article in Weaver's issue 27 p. 18-21 about combining twills on this 4-end initial, and tie-up rules. The other sequence that was mentioned, 123456 345678... is on this network too and would give a steeper line, but the advance is not 1.

Similarly the 4-end advancing twill, 1234 2345 3456... is on the 3-end initial network and can be expanded by adding 3-end units and the floats (unless there are points) will be limited to 2 threads if in the tie-up we rise or lower no more than 2 threads in a row. Maybe you'll remember seeing tie-ups with 3 threads up or down with snowflake drafts using this advancing twill. In this case, you have to keep the simple sequence (floats will be 6 threads long), because expanding it with units of 3 threads will give very long floats.

You can also use a 6-end advancing twill for satin and limit the floats to 4 threads with 4 threads maximum up or down in the tie-up.

I hope this helps. Maybe somebody will have answered before I do.

Marguerite Gingras

-----

Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 09:36:42 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Dumb Question--loom width

Ruth Blau wrote:

> Is sectional the only way to go? I so  
> dread learning sectional warping (and buying the equipment to do it) that  
> it would probably kill this idea for me entirely.  
>  
> Any advice?

The digest Ruth's message was in found its way to Ann Sutton. She asked me to relay her .02 on this:

> I have a sectional beam and almost never use it as it is designed be used,  
> as I don't weave long wide warps. BUT no-one could part me from this beam:  
> I use it as a normal beam: making a warp on the mill, beaming from front to  
> back,tying on bouts of warp in each section (1" or 2" depending what you  
> have). NO MORE sticks or paper for me now, to put in or to pick up from  
> the floor! It is gorgeous, and of course is always there for me if I  
> decide to use it in the conventional way. It is 1 yard in circumference, so  
> there is so little build up of threads. Have never ever had a tension  
> problem working this way (6 - 10 yard warps).

Margaret

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 7 Oct 1998 10:56:48 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: doobby/compu doobby on 8 harness

Well thank you for all the wonderful responses to dumb question number 2. I understand now and of course want one. Ha, long time coming. so I sit in doobby envy now.....8^}  
Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 12:47:36 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: advancing twills and networks

If you take a sequence, which can be for threading or treadling, that starts on shaft 1 (or treadle 1), it can be advanced to make a new sequence. Margaret mentions a 4 end advancing twill sequence. I assume she used an advance of 1 (it moves up 1 shaft each time), so it would look like this: 1,2,3,4, 2,3,4,5, 3,4,5,6... This sequence falls on a 3-shaft twill network base. If you use a 1/2/1/2 tie-up (or 1/2/1/2/1/2/1/2, whatever it takes) and tromp as writ, you will get a boring 3-shaft twill, also known as a jeans twill. It goes over 1 and under 2. I much prefer to use a 5-end advancing twill, because it falls on a 4-shaft twill network base. What difference does it make? Well, if you take a threading that falls on a 3-shaft twill base, you can use any tie-up that also is on the same base (so it has no more than 2 rising or 2 sinking in a row) and any treadling that is on this base (which includes crackle and advancing crackle) and you can make designs that give the 1/2 and 2/1 contrast. If you use a threading that falls on the 4-shaft twill base (which includes twill blocks, by the way, and the 5-end advancing twill, and lots more) you can use a tie-up that has no more than 3 in a row (greatly increasing the tie-up choices here) and a treadling that falls on the 4-shaft base, and you can make a consistant fabric that includes areas of 1/3 and 3/1 twill, as well as 2/2 and true plain weave and true double weave and basket weave. Margaret, if you are combining a 3-shaft twill in the threading, and something else in the treadling, you are likely to get a very unusual-looking fabric, with the look depending greatly on the tie-up you choose. It is possible to get something you like, but be sure to run a float check before you weave. Traditional snowflake twills use a 4-end advancing twill with a 4-shaft twill tie-up, and this makes a long float that could be avoided by choosing a tie-up with no more than 2 in a row. But the traditional use of snowflake twills is for fine threads, tablecloths mostly, and that longer float becomes a decorative element giving a raised line to the design. If you want to work with larger scale designs and move to an expanded advancing twill threading, then it is much more important to use a tie-up with the same base. Reference: 2 articles in Weaver's issue 21, by Ingrid Boesel and myself.

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

Any time you put a point in a twill, you get longer floats at the point. The person who started this conversation said she used an advancing twill treadling with a reversal, which means she has a point right there at the reversal. Using more shafts will not get around this fact of having a longer float at the reversal. If her floats were longer on one side of the fabric, that tells me that her tie-up has longer floats on that side of the fabric. Maybe she is using a twill tie-up with the first treadle tied 2/2/1/3. Then there will be one face of the fabric having floats of 2 threads except at the reversal where they are 3 threads long, and the other face has 3 thread floats except at the reversal where they are 5 thread floats.

The solution is to avoid reversals, or change the tie-up. You can make a reversal of design direction without changing the direction of the twill lines, and this avoids the longer floats too.

Another solution is to make reversals very often, using the longer float as a design element.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
Date: Wed, 7 Oct 1998 10:55:54 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Re: advancing twills

> For me advancing twills are like straight lines drawn on a  
>network, so they follow the same rules for tie-ups and have the same float  
>lengths.  
>

As I previously said I am working on a design for a silk jacket for my daughter wedding. I have been playing a lot with both networked drafts and advancing twills but I had not thought of doing the advancing twill on the networked draft. Actually Bonnie did explain this to me but I don't think I caught it at the time. So instead of working this morning I played with weaving designs trying out some of the ideas that Maguerite (and Bonnie) mentioned. Sure does make it easier.

So for WeaveIt users, there is a trick to getting a network that is not entirely obvious. If you pick network drafting but don't actually make a design, just pick the initial and don't make a pattern line, then the grid in the main view will display a network in shaded gray. You can then use this network for designing advancing twills following the advice given in previous email.

Bonnie had previously explained to me to try the design with a twill setting (1-3) or what ever the sequence initial is and you should see the design simply as twill. So after doing my designs, I would change the tieup and check it. This does work and helps get rid of undesirable floats but it is easier to have the network displayed so that I can always be on the right square as I design instead of checking afterwards.

I think where using a network for the advancing twills is really helpful is when you want to vary the design so that the next advance sequence is not right in order of the previous. I always have a hard time knowing where its okay to put it. With the network, it is very easy.

Anyway I am excited to try more, but really must do real work (day job) instead.  
Sally



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Mary Klotz

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 06:55:42 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: networking

Pamela wrote:

>>Instead I refer you to Alice Schlein's book  
>  
> Name of the book please and I will get it... I only have a few weavers  
>issues so I will go through the ones I have.

Alice's networking articles in Weaver's were quite some time ago, and it's probably more efficient to have the info all in one place (her book). The book is "Network Drafting: An Introduction." I believe it's self published (Bridgewater Press, Greenville, South Carolina), but it's available from places like Unicorn--can you order from Unicorn into Canada, Pamela?

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 07:30:06 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Leclerc computobby

Mary wrote:

>Both situations make a computobby look appealing to me! Never thought I'd  
>>want one, but now I'm lusting after the (15"? 20"?) 16H computer driven  
>LeClerc \$2999- anybody have any experience with this one?

I wove on it at Convergence and liked it--but can't say I gave it a thorough test-drive. We also have Sally B's recent info that the first interface Leclerc used discouraged software developers from writing drivers for this loom, so I'd certainly check out which products can drive the loom before I'd let myself fall in love with it. Sally also told us that Leclerc is modifying the interface, so perhaps Tom Beaudet can tell us what the status of that project is.

I also think that Margaret Coe gave this loom a good lookover at Convergence, so perhaps she'll add her \$.02.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 07:42:06 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Re: dumb question #2

Pamela Marriott wrote:

>

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

> what is the point of a dobbie/compu-dobbie on  
> an 8 harness loom? Is it just less chance of treadling error?

Hi Pamela....not a dumb question at all! I believe it has more to do with the ability to have an "unlimited" number of treadle combos...when you weave with 8 shafts, there are umpteen patterns you can do with 14 treadles, but who has that many? Of course, eliminating treadling mistakes is appealing too! <BG>

Su :-)

-----  
Date: Wed, 7 Oct 1998 10:34:23 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Peggy Church <chweaver@ma.ultranet.com>  
Subject: Dumb Question #2

Dobbie on an 8 shaft loom? My Baby Wolf came with the AVL Baby Dobbie on it. I will switch to the compu-dobbie as soon as it is practical, as the dobbie unit is very heavy. There are just too many picks in some of the things I want to weave. The subtle design I am weaving now is about 60 picks. The mechanical dobbie is limited by the number of slats you own. So it is not very practical for overshot weaves. The dobbie on the Baby Wolf is an exception, because it allows 4 treadles to remain on the loom. Treadle a tabby pick, then use the dobbie, then another tabby shot, then the next dobbie pick. I prefer to weave twills or plain weave on the treadles because their action is much lighter.

There was some controversy when the Baby Dobbie came out. The shed size with the dobbie on it is a typical minimal AVL sized shed. Some people prefer a large shed. The loom becomes noisy, too, and it is heavy to fold up. So some of the good features of the Baby Wolf are negated by the device. But if you can find a Baby Dobbie, go for it! I love it.

Peggy  
Peggy Church  
Homespun & Handwoven  
chweaver@ma.ultranet.com

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 07:48:52 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Incredible Hammock Site

When you have an opportunity, do visit the site of the Rupununi Weavers Society. They handweave the Wapishana Hammock in Guyana. They are struggling to be self-sufficient. As the hammocks are entirely handspun cotton, handwoven, on frame looms they can only make a very limited number in a year (like 9 or so).

This is museum quality work, truly! The British Museum bought one for their collection of tribal art and two were purchased by a commercial concern for presentation to the Queen and Prince Philip.

The Rupununi Weavers Museum has been given the web site and it's worthwhile visit--you can even order a hammock there, they just forget to mention the price of it! I hear they sell for \$1,000 plus \$100 shipping.

<http://www.gol.net.gy/rweavers/>

Margaret

- -----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Tucson, AZ, USA

-----  
-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 08:05:48 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Leclerc compudobby

Ruth Blau wrote:

> I also think that Margaret Coe gave this loom a good lookover at  
> Convergence, so perhaps she'll add her \$.02.

You did ask! ProWeave software has a driver for LeClerc and I just happen to have the software though I never use it for running a loom. (Of the softwares I have, and I have many, I thus far prefer Fiberworks PCW for the loom, but to be fair I should say that my loom is attached to an old, old PC that can't handle the Windows 95 softwares.) One advantage is that ProWeave has a MAC and a PC version.

Back to LeClerc. The demo loom worked very smoothly with its computer interface being self-contained. At Convergence it was mounted on a two-treadle stand. I'd definitely advise buying the stand; it's much speedier to use one's feet to change sheds. In workshop situations, it appears one can take the loom from the stand and operate it on a table with one lever for shed changes.

I was attracted to it as its size meant I could contemplate using it in a local workshop situation. I don't know though that it'd easily travel on an airplane. I can see room in my life for both this and the AVL Studio what I can't see right now is room in my pocket book--but I'll find a way!

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 1998 08:09:07 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: A first but not the last!

Ok, I admit it, I meant to send the Hammock message to the \*big\* list. Most of you will get it twice! Sorry!

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 07 Oct 98 11:10:27 PDT  
From: "Lucie Gingras" <lucieg@webnet.qc.ca>  
Subject: introduction

Hi everybody,

I am Marguerite Gingras from Quebec. I have been weaving since 1980. I have a 12-shaft Clement table loom (bought in 1983) and a 4-shaft Leclerc



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

floor loom. I began using the computer (PCW 3.5 now) for designing and drafting 5 years ago and it has changed my weavings. But more complex treadlings are difficult to follow on a table loom so I don't weave a lot (yes, a compu-dobby loom would be very useful and I am thinking about it).

I love structure and some of the techniques I have studied more are: networked drafted twills, advancing twills, crackle, Summer and Winter and double weave. I also taught overshot last year and my local study group here near Quebec City is studying it this year. I like to understand things, and because I teach I have to understand them.

I have been weaving mostly clothing but recently I have woven items that don't need so much sewing, like scarves and runners, greeting cards, and also a lot of samples... I use cotton (16/2 and 20/2) and cottolin, plus wool and silk.

Thank you for inviting me. This is my first list. Since my first language is French, please forgive my mistakes in English.

Marguerite Gingras

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #13  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #12  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest      Wednesday, October 7 1998      Volume 01 : Number 012

8-shaft doobby      ["Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>]  
Re: dumb question #2      [Hinze/Wood <sharlin@uswest.net>]  
networking      ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 21:08:58 -0600  
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Subject: 8-shaft doobby

In using a 4 shaft loom, there are only 14 different shaft combinations. If you tie a skeleton tie-up-- 1, 2, 3, 4, 1-3, 2-4, with two feet is possible

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

to produce all 14 combinations. Very nice, although not always the easy way to treadle.

With 8-shafts there are 254 shaft combinations. And while you would never use all of them in one design, you can easily plan a weaving that uses more than your number of treadles. That is what you get into with networked twills, too many combinations to easily treadle. There is nothing like re-tying every few inches to remind you to think about how many treadles you need next time. <g>

Some common structures that require more treadles than the standard 10 or 12.

When doing Rep weave, there are 16 treadles needed. Although there is a skeleton ti-up that will work, a dobbie is easier. Huck lace is another one that requires lots of treadles, and double weave is another.

With 12 shafts there are 4094 combinations. That dobbie could be very useful in doing a number of structures.

Judie Eatough

-----

Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 20:59:20 -0700  
From: Hinze/Wood <sharlin@uswest.net>  
Subject: Re: dumb question #2

>Not wanting to insult anyone but what is the point of a dobbie/compu-dobby on  
>an 8 harness loom? Is it just less chance of treadling error? I wonder as  
>Leclerc has developed a compu-dobby for my colonial 12 harness and I wonder  
>what the advantage would be. I thought that after 12 harnesses you get into  
>a too many treadles and big stretch thing and that is why dobbie was put on.  
>Hope I have not offended, just wondering. Think of it as a musing while we  
>are having our latte in the cafe.....  
>Pamela

Also Pam using the compu-dobby increases the number of treadles you can use in a pattern...dramatically. I only had ten before or whatever would work with a skeleton tie up...now its true I still have only 8 shafts but as many treadles as you can get from having each harness independent of the others...I think like 250 combinations or some such. So, the compu-dobby increases the number of possible patterns I can weave AND keeps track of the treadling too (to a degree, at least, since the dobbie can drop a shaft sometimes too ). On a 12 harness loom there would be even more possibilities. S

Sharon C. Hinze, M.S., ASOTP  
Spokane, WA  
sharlin@uswest.net

-----

Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 23:09:59 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: networking

>Yep--but note that this is more accurately an advancing \*draw\*, i.e., a  
>5-end  
>straight draw advancing one end. The structure becomes a twill once tied  
>up and  
>treadled as a twill.

Treadled as a twill would be when you are going over 2 under one - and so

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

on- . I realize this is basic but I want to make sure I understand what is going on here. Can you make an advancing twill out of a multiharness undulating twill? I guess if it climbs the harness scale it is an advancing twill with the correct treadling of course....?

>Oelsner

Ah Olsner, have not cracked that book since college and it shows doesn't it?

>Instead I refer you to Alice Schlein's book

Name of the book please and I will get it... I only have a few weavers issues so I will go through the ones I have.

>Any help?

Sort of Margaret. I am brain blocked today so probably come off like an idiot. I have not played with networking before so it is new ground.  
Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #12  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVENTECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVENTECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #11  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Tuesday, October 6 1998

Volume 01 : Number 011

a Weave with no name  
Re: a Weave with no name  
dunb question #1  
dumb question #2

[Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
[Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Re: dumb question #2 ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>]  
Re: dumb question #2 & intro [AmyFibre@aol.com]  
Re: dumb question #1 [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]

-----  
Date: Tue, 06 Oct 1998 17:04:47 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: a Weave with no name

Al and Su Butler wrote:

> Could you describe your trouble spots  
> on your networked advancing twill please?

Ouch, I just knew someone would ask! I have to admit that it just could be caused by this 'ere little error! Here goes:

First I drafted a relatively small curve widthwise and turned it into a network using a four end initial.

Next I took this what I call "networked element" and advanced it in four shaft increments across the project! Then I designed a twill tieup and an expanded advanced treadling. How about that for mixing stuff up?

What I did wrong was \*accidentally\*, and significantly without me noticing, erase a warp in the very first element (on the 'puter that is). So the missing warp is missing from each element all the way across!

I noticed that the \*extended\* part of the treadling causes a repeat of anything including ladders, so I dickered with the treadling sort of repeating somewhat the error. This means of course that to the purist the network isn't truly a network anymore and the advance isn't truly an advance. But whatever they are, they don't look that bad and the basket weave selvages worked like a charm.

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Tue, 06 Oct 1998 17:10:51 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: a Weave with no name

Oops I forgot to mention that the whole project was an idea I had of mixing what I learned at different workshops or different influences (Alice Schlein for the network and Bonnie for the twill tie up design system and Ingrid for advancing twills).

I'd intend writing this up and submitting it to Weavers--well I can still write it up but I'm going to have to reweave the thing even though I doubt very much that the error is discernable!

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 18:48:25 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: dunb question #1

Okay just so I am on the same wave length, Advancing twill is when the line moves on up the scale while coming back on itself? Like 12345 34567 56789 78910 etc???? so what is networking twill?  
Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 18:51:51 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: dumb question #2

Not wanting to insult anyone but what is the point of a doobby/compu doobby on an 8 harness loom? Is it just less chance of treadling error? I wonder as Leclerc has developed a compu doobby for my colonial 12 harness and I wonder what the advantage would be. I thought that after 12 harnesses you get into a too many treadles and big stretch thing and that is why doobby was put on. Hope I have not offended, just wondering. Think of it as a musing while we are having our latte in the cafe.....  
Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 18:40:37 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Re: dumb question #2

Before I had a compu doobby, I wove a table runner on my 8 shaft 10 treadle loom that required 16 treadles. So I used a 12 treadle skeleton tieup, but I still only had 10 treadles. So every three inches, I got under the loom and retied the treadles. I will only do that once!  
Thus a compu doobby would have really helped when I did this project.

Right now I have my 8 shaft baby wolf warped in a rosepath threading. I created all kinds of designs, teddy bears, trees, flowers and got many from Carol Strickler's 8 shaft pattern book. When I have visitors who are intrigued with weaving, I drag out this loom, hand them a shuttle, connect and turn on the laptop. I usually don't see or hear from them for hours as it is a lot of fun. They are really amazed that they can weave these designs. The sampler is looking pretty cool too, although there are a lot of mistakes in it. Most of these designs take more than 10 treadles so would be difficult on a treadle loom.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

You can do a lot of network drafted designs with 8 shafts that require more than 10 treadles.

Of course, given I choice, I would choose more shafts but it is useful and fun with 8.

Sally

- -----Original Message-----

From: Pamela Marriott <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
To: weave tech <weavetech@List-Server.net>  
Date: Tuesday, October 06, 1998 5:52 PM  
Subject: dumb question #2

>Not wanting to insult anyone but what is the point of a doobby/compuobby on  
>an 8 harness loom? Is it just less chance of treadling error? I wonder as  
>Leclerc has developed a compuobby for my colonial 12 harness and I wonder  
>what the advantage would be. I thought that after 12 harnesses you get  
into

>a too many treadles and big stretch thing and that is why doobby was put on.  
>Hope I have not offended, just wondering. Think of it as a musing while we  
>are having our latte in the cafe.....

>Pamela

>

>

>

>Pamela Marriott

>Dancing Sheep Studio

>Weaving & Graphics

>Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada

>pmarriot@telusplanet.net

>

>

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 21:57:07 EDT  
From: AmyFibre@aol.com  
Subject: Re: dumb question #2 & intro

In a message dated 10/6/98 7:52:38 PM Central Daylight Time,  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net writes:

> Not wanting to insult anyone but what is the point of a doobby/compuobby on  
> an 8 harness loom? Is it just less chance of treadling error?

Not a dumb question, Pamela. I wondered that too, until I started weaving on a compuobby myself. Now I can say that, for me, that "less chance of a treadling error" is a big plus. Since I have the option of a compuobby, I find myself unwilling to put long shadow weave treadling sequences, or long anything treadling sequences, on one of my treadle looms -- even if that means I am using less than the total 16 shafts on the compuobby loom.

Another huge plus for a compuobby -- when I am working in summer & winter or any with lots of blocks, I don't have to worry about endless variations of combining blocks because I know I won't run out of treadles (or have to figure out a weird skeleton system).

I do find the compuobby very freeing in that sense -- and I found that I got spoiled really quickly!!

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

While I'm here opining, I might as well introduce myself although I know many of you already from my various list admin duties now and in the past.

The basics -- I have been weaving since 1987 although the first five years or so were pretty uninteresting, follow-the-recipe-in-Handwoven stuff. Since 1992, though, I have been investing more and more time and energy into weaving, growing in leaps and bounds (I think, I hope), and also realizing how little I know.

In the last two years in particular, I have been focusing on designing my own cloth -- which means I have been trying to get a handle on 1) basic design; 2) structure and 3) color with structure. At this point, I feel like I've bitten off much more than I can handle and am trying to make sense of it all.

My looms are: a 4-shaft Harrisville 40" (my original loom and still a steady workhorse); an 8-shaft 48" AVL Home Loom and, since summer of 1997, a 16-shaft 60" AVL CompuDobby. I design in Fiberworks Silver.

Right now, I am very busy weaving for two shows/sales in late October and early November, so am having to postpone designing dreams until after that. At this point, it's production crunch time.

I hope by now you all have read your welcome message (<g>) and know that I am the Admin person for the list -- so if you have any problems, questions or comments, please feel free to write. (BTW -- I do have a full-time job outside the home where I do not have access to e-mail, so if you write in the morning and don't hear back immediately, that's why. I will get back to you, I promise.)

Back to twisting fringe on chenille scarves,

Amy  
amyfibre@aol.com

-----

Date: Tue, 06 Oct 1998 19:42:10 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: dunb question #1

Pamela Marriott wrote:

> Like 12345 34567  
> 56789 78910 etc????

Yep--but note that this is more accurately an advancing \*draw\*, i.e., a 5-end straight draw advancing one end. The structure becomes a twill once tied up and treadled as a twill. In Goerner they are called "stepped drafts" and Oelsner defines them under Intermittent Drafts with the skip being in a progressive order--in other words they've been around quite a while.

>so what is networking twill?

Network drafting is a method for plotting a curve and describing it is beyond the scope of an e-mail message. Instead I refer you to Alice Schlein's book and various articles published in Weavers--yes methodically going through the steps in Alice's book will tell you how.

Once again a network is not necessarily a twill. A curve or line can be plotted in 4-end straight draw and woven as a twill, but it can also be woven in plain weave or basket weave and almost anything else that would work with a 4-end initial. The same curve could be plotted on a 5-end straight draw and woven as

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

satin, or? And there are all sorts of other structures Alice has written about over the years lots of exploration here.

Any help?

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #11  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #10  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Tuesday, October 6 1998

Volume 01 : Number 010

Intro [hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)]  
Re: Advancing twill float problem [hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)]  
Re: Greetings to all! [Hinze/Wood <sharlin@uswest.net>]  
Re: Greetings to all! [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]

-----  
Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 09:29:39 -0500  
From: hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)  
Subject: Intro

Hi All,

I'm Dick Lindell. I weave on a 16 shaft, 40 inch AVL with Compu-dobby. The weaving software I use is unremarkable at best. I'm still waiting for Ingrid & Co to come up with the promised Mac version.. My mother always told me: "Patience is a virtue, get it if you can; Seldom in a woman, never in a man". She's right!!!!

I'll try to weave about anything but rag rugs. No problem except that they hold no appeal for me. Most of my things are woven at 20 epi and higher - the higher the better. My latest efforts have been in Double Weave. My



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

planned winter project is a large 4 block double weave, probably in silk. I also have a large Liturgical parament in development. It's a hanging of wool with silk supplementary warp. I'm waiting for the OK from the people with the purse strings. Currently on the loom is some 4 harness integrated double weave - Place Mats for my wife. Then the napkins to match. Not really very high tech - but fun.

I'm looking forward to good things from WeaveTech.

Dick Lindell, Weaver  
visit me at <<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>>

- - - - -

The first step to Wisdom is in calling things by their right name.  
-- Lao Tzu

-----

Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 09:35:23 -0500  
From: hataori@writeme.com (Dick Lindell)  
Subject: Re: Advancing twill float problem

>Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net> wrote:

> When I do a drawdown on the computer, (I use Fiberworks PCW Silver), I  
>try and locate the floats and eliminate them by manipulating the  
>threading. One other alternative might be to use two or more shafts to  
>tie down your threads. I know this technically eliminates the structure  
>of advancing twill, but you can achieve the look without the float  
>problem. Case in point is the crackle I have been studying lately...I  
>am doing networked crackle, and can achieve an advancing twill look with  
>no float longer than 3 threads.....  
> Would like to discuss this further....

And so would I. Su knows that I've done some advancing twill but perhaps not enough. I don't understand the problem. So far I've not had any reverse side problems. However, I sure would like to reduce my float sizes some. Su, would you care to elaborate on your crackle that looks like advancing twill, keeping in mind that I'm not very well versed in crackle.

Dick Lindell, Weaver  
visit me at <<http://www.angelfire.com/il/dickshome>>

- - - - -

The first step to Wisdom is in calling things by their right name.  
-- Lao Tzu

-----

Date: Tue, 6 Oct 1998 07:31:09 -0700  
From: Hinze/Wood <sharlin@uswest.net>  
Subject: Re: Greetings to all!

I'm also  
>fascinated by double-weave, but I can't imagine understanding what that is  
>and how to do it. I look forward to reading about everyone's projects and  
>will chime in when I know something. All best to you for a great October!  
> -- Sharon

Whoops, looks like there are two of us both with S last names...I usually sign my posts with the initial S if that will help keep us straight. I have been weaving since '67 when I built a back strap loom I still have with popsicle sticks and tongue depressors in a Home Demonstration Class in Minneapolis. I have never had enough time to weave and was not able to afford my floor loom until 1994. In about '79, I did purchase a Rasmussen

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

(now Dundas) 4 Harness table loom, and have since purchased and 8 harness Mountain Loom (used). I have an 8 harness Mighty Wolf with no compudobby and a most recent purchase (this summer), and 8 Harness Mighty Wolf with Compudobby, both of which reside in the dining room/weaving room. I also have an old, built in 1930, Gravander countermarche that needs restringing and some refurbishing if it will ever weave again. Presently I'm weaving napkins with my first linen weft and it's going well. Am just wondering how best to finish them as the warp is cotton. Using huck. Personally, I tend to be more adventurous with structure than with color but am presently planning a six hue, two shade cotton fabric with the emphasis on the eggplant, violet, lavender range, then a cranberry, rose, and finally, a blueberry, sky blue combo as accent. I'm using a twill structure and fabric idea from Weavers and experimenting with the colors this time (oh the original used silk, I'm using mercerized cottons in 20/2 and 14/2 sizes).

Question: I'm cogitating using 30 epi for all of the yarns...anyone have any other suggestions? I also thought I'd use 30 epi across the board although the sizes are slightly different. Will that work?? Thanks. "S"

Sharon C. Hinze, M.S., ASOTP  
Spokane, WA  
sharlin@uswest.net

-----  
Date: Tue, 06 Oct 1998 12:03:10 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Greetings to all!

Hinze/Wood wrote:

> I'm using mercerized cottons in 20/2 and 14/2 sizes).  
>  
> Question: I'm cogitating using 30 epi for all of the yarns...anyone have  
> any other suggestions? I also thought I'd use 30 epi across the board  
> although the sizes are slightly different. Will that work?? Thanks. "S"  
>

I'd not worry too much about the different sizes as long as they're mixed in. A solid block of one or the other grist will produce a distinct stripe (denser or looser)--could be quite interesting! If done by accident I call it a design element. I do question the 30 epi unless you're doing plain weave or want something lacey. My current (though it's been lingering around a while <g>) warp is 14/2 network twill sett at 36 epi which, after finishing, produces a good drapable fabric.

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #10  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #9  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Tuesday, October 6 1998

Volume 01 : Number 009

Re: loom drivers [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
Intro [Miriam Grabois <MGrabois@MAIL.COLGATE.EDU>]  
Intro [Peggy Church <chweaver@ma.ultranet.com>]  
Re: Intro [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: loom drivers [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: intro too [Grimi@aol.com]  
Re: AVL programming station [Grimi@aol.com]  
intro ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
Re: weavetech-digest V1 #8 [Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>]  
Computer vs Cartridge [Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>]  
Advancing twill float problem [Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]  
Advancing Twill Float problem [Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]  
Re: loom drivers [Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]  
Intro ["Sue Mansfield" <mansfield.susan@usa.net>]  
Re: Magnifying glass [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
multishaft challenges [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]  
Intro [Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>]  
Re: 24 affordable shafts [Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>]  
Greetings to all! [Sharon Steinberg <cd000910@mindspring.com>]

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 06:48:47 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: loom drivers

Sally wrote:

>One of the problems for me at least with the Leclerc is that the  
>specification for writing the loom driver is incredibly complex so that the  
>only program you can get to work with it is ProWeave. Both Bob Keates  
>(Fiberworks) and I looked at the spec. and said "no way". This has  
>actually prompted Leclerc to change the interface, however I haven't heard  
>anything yet.

At the risk of posting a me-too type post, I want to thank Sally for this information. It's the kind of information the average loom/computer user doesn't come by easily. When our software is slow to come up with drivers (this is true for drivers for peripherals as well as for looms), we tend to blame the software developers. We should perhaps also be needling the equipment mfgs to ask: what is it about your equipment that makes the software developers so slow to come up with drivers. And kudos to Leclerc for listening to the software folks and being willing to modify their requirements.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sun, 04 Oct 1998 12:01:23 -0400  
From: Miriam Grabois <MGrabois@MAIL.COLGATE.EDU>  
Subject: Intro

Hi, Weavers,

I'm Miriam Grabois from Hamilton, New York, a tiny village equidistant from Syracuse and Utica and 4 hours west of Webs. I can't remember quite how long I've been weaving, maybe 15 years, beginning in Williamstown, Mass., where I lived for many years and where I still have a house (that's only an hour west of Webs).

I've knit, seemingly forever, and after starting to weave took up spinning (which I do on a Louet S-10) and some dyeing. My primary loom is an 8-shaft 40" Norwood (I'm so glad I got it while they were still made in cherry) though I have an anonymous folding 4-H 24" floor loom and a Schacht 21" table loom (a mistake--it's too heavy to drag around easily to workshops; narrower would have been fine and much more portable).

I belong to the Foothills Spinners (I'm the only one) and Weavers Guild, a very small group (approx. 20) of caring and supportive women with weaving skills ranging from beginner to professional, who meet monthly in Clinton NY. The programs are quite rich for such a small group, and we have a yearly guild challenge plus at least two major workshops and some quicker in-meeting workshops each year. I also attend the Interest Group subgroup monthly meetings of that guild but hope to inject a little more rigor into those meetings; they have become quite unstructured but at least the chat is always about weaving. Instead of studying a weave structure with each member making samples, for example (which is what the interest group has done in the past), meetings tend to be a monthly show and tell plus problem-solving get-together. That's fine, but I'd prefer more focus.

I almost never wrote to the old weavelist, and probably will not write often here (that not being my personality), but I expect to learn a lot and solve many problems through your experience.

This list is a great idea and it's obvious that a lot of careful thought has gone into the mission statement. Congratulations to the instigators on their planning and best wishes for success.

Miriam

-----  
Date: Mon, 5 Oct 1998 10:14:28 -0400 (EDT)  
From: Peggy Church <chweaver@ma.ultranet.com>  
Subject: Intro

I am Peggy Church. Thank you to the initiators! This is just what I need. I weave on a 60" AVL compudobby, 48" doobby (both 16 shafts), a Baby Wolf with an AVL doobby and a couple of Dorset 4 shaft looms. They are little work horses for color stuff.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

I approached weaving from spinning in the mid seventies. I was on the first plateau for a very long time. When I was able to weave full time, I grew into a structure emphasis. That was the beginning of my AVL period. I knew I could put the selvedge threads on shafts 5 and 6 and have them do something else. I didn't know about being able to have a different structure in the middle of the warp...yet.

As a pharmacist this structure emphasis is the expected. Well...I just discovered color and the other side of my brain. My last warp was silk scarves, painted with natural dye extracts (Wipplinger) and woven in an advancing twill. My next problem to solve is the floats on the back of these scarves that are too much like ladders to suit me. I want to needle weave them all down. They occur where the twill reverses. I was weaving on the 8 shaft doobby...maybe I can eliminate this problem with 16 shafts?

Peggy Church  
Peggy Church  
Homespun & Handwoven  
chweaver@ma.ultranet.com

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 07:30:20 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Intro

Peggy Church wrote:

> My next problem to solve is the floats on the back of  
> these scarves that are too much like ladders to suit me. I want to needle  
> weave them all down. They occur where the twill reverses. I was weaving on  
> the 8 shaft doobby...maybe I can eliminate this problem with 16 shafts?

Go ahead needle weave them in! Settle yourself in a comfortable chair with good lighting and, depending on fineness and sett, grab a magnifying glass (or if you're myopic take off your glasses and bring the work real close--watch the nose when wielding the needle). I remind myself that burling and mending is an integral part of the weaving process; it's part of finishing the cloth not cheating!

I suspect more shafts does help with the ladder effect, but I've a couple of such areas in a networked advancing twill that my eyes seem to zoom in on! Back to the design screen!

Margaret  
-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 07:38:49 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: loom drivers

Ruth Blau wrote:

> We should perhaps also be needling the  
> equipment mfgs to ask: what is it about your equipment that makes the  
> software developers so slow to come up with drivers. And kudos to Leclerc  
> for listening to the software folks and being willing to modify their

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

> requirements.

Let's needle both! It behooves independent software developers to include as many drivers as they can this serves to increase their potential customer. I suggest it would be equally profitable for AVL to market their software independently of their looms, ergo it should also include integral drivers for the other major looms. Does it? Then we'd be left with only the eternal, "Do you have a Mac or PC?" to addle us.

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 5 Oct 1998 10:41:12 EDT  
From: Grimi@aol.com  
Subject: Re: intro too

Hi. I'm Tom Greminger and have worked at AVL Looms for about 16 years now doing everything from building the looms to assembling them to a variety of administrative and management duties. I'm currently Vice President of Sales. I think that I've met or at least talked with most of you at this point and look forward to the new list.

Tom @ AVL  
info@avlusa.com  
grimi@aol.com  
800-626-9615

-----  
Date: Mon, 5 Oct 1998 10:46:33 EDT  
From: Grimi@aol.com  
Subject: Re: AVL programming station

Putting an inexpensive PC next to each loom has certainly turned into a good choice for those with more than one Compu-Dobby. The chief advantage to a Programming Station is the Weaving Cartridge itself that is included with the P.S. It holds up to 10 patterns for a total of 3500 picks and allows you to easily switch from one pattern to the next by pushing a button. A bit easier and quicker than exiting your current pattern and opening another from the computer. So, if you switch patterns often, the P.S. may be a better alternative than the cheap P.C.

You can also buy the cartridge separately. In that case the P.C. must be hooked up to the Compu-Dobby to program the cartridge. After that, you can use the computer for another purpose while continuing to weave. Hope this didn't get too commercial. Just trying to outline the features of the product in question.

Tom @ AVL  
info@avlusa.com  
grimi@aol.com  
800-626-9615

-----  
Date: Mon, 5 Oct 1998 08:54:45 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: intro

Wow, reading all the intro's this morning I am feeling overwhelmed. I have been weaving for a long time, but not consistently. I upgraded my leclerc

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

60" colonial to 12 harnesses about 13 years ago which involved having the side pieces remade as this model only went to 8. I love weaving, colour and structure, and have a hard time pigeon holing myself into one mode or the other. Now that my daughter is older and I have worked through some personal stuff I have started weaving seriously again, as most of you know. My biggest obstacle is procrastination. Right now I am a flurry of chenille and silk, readying for Christmas sales but I am determined to get into some complex stuff after Christmas. I have my silk warp that I painted at Michelle's workshop in May and I want to really stretch with that one. I also have in line, some silk piano scarves, some yardage to make for my hubby out of silk/merino/cashmere, I have some beautiful Irish linen given to me earlier this year by another generous lister, to inspire me to work with this intimidating fiber and some upholstery for our dining room chairs. I want all those projects to stretch my weaving knowledge and be a chance to explore structure.

I also have a 12 harness Dorothy that I only use if I have too. I really want a AVL 16/24 harness loom, dose not have to be too wide and I am also pinning for a single thread drawloom. I got to play on one at Joanne Halls two summers ago and fell in love. The artist side of me really soared and I came home and sketched ideas for images for a week. Now I have the extra computer to run a computerized loom, as my DH purchased a new 400 MHz last May . But for me money is an issue. I do not make enough to purchase one as a company purchase so must be content with pictures.

I am looking forward to this forum on weaving and thank you for the invitation to join.

Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 11:38:02 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: Re: weavetech-digest V1 #8

Hi All:

Here is my introduction.

I'm Ingrid Boesel. I've been a weaver since 1967 (but I started as a mere baby!) I'm a structure person with a strong bent to colour and I'm Canadian so you will see extra "u"s in some words. And cotton is 2/20 not 20/2.

I have a 24 shaft AVL, 30" production with a CDII and air drive and 2 fly beater

The other loom is a 24 shaft 16" Louet Magic Dobby. I love both looms for different reasons. (Have to get rid of the Louet this year though.) I don't admit to any other looms, but then one doesn't count table looms or....

I have woven for clothing and accessories for the most part. I use silk and cotton for most weaving and usually in finer threads. 20 epi and up. More up. I even own a 1.5 kg cone of 2/220 silk that still is unused but well loved.

Now I find it physically difficult to weave at all, so am doing some samples and much virtual weaving and a lot of teaching. You know those who can, weave. And those who can't.....



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

I'm the weaving half of Fiberworks PCW and spend an incredible amount of time away from the actual loom to do PCW work.

Thanks for making the Weave Tech list available. I'm sure that it will keep us all communicating more and weaving less.

Ingrid Boesel

~~~~~  
Once you're warped, what's weft?

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 11:38:01 -0400  
From: Ingrid Boesel <fiberworks.pcw@sympatico.ca>  
Subject: Computer vs Cartridge

Hi Marge

The advantage of the cartridge for the AVL is only one. Its less expensive than a laptop.

With a computer you get to see what is going on, you get to do longer drafts, or more files.

Lap top is not the only option. Laptops are neat and expensive. The lighter they are the more they cost, the bigger the screen the more they cost. My new lap top (not top of the line, but about 2 steps under was \$4500 CDN Could have got the SAME desk top for \$2500 + \$250 CDN for a tiny monitor that is still tons bigger then the notebook.

A low end or used desktop computer will come in under \$1000 easily. A 486 with enough RAM to run win 95 will be dead cheap.

(1\$ CDN right now buys about 66 American cents - but we get better prices on computers by about 10% once translated)

I would go for the computer and look at desktop, unless there is a burning need for a laptop for some other reason.

my 3 cents worth (canadian funds)  
Ingrid Boesel

~~~~~  
Once you're warped, what's weft?

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 11:00:35 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Advancing twill float problem

Peggy Church wrote:

> woven in an advancing twill. My next problem to solve is the floats on  
> the back of these scarves that are too much like ladders to suit > me... (snip)maybe I  
can eliminate this problem with 16 shafts?

Hi Peggy,

I hope I am not jumping the gun without thoroughly thinking this through....I am curious as to how you threaded your advancing twill. I have also been working with advancing and networked twills, and while there are floats on the reverse, and especially long ones where the pattern reverses, I have been able to cope with this by the following



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

method:

Example: threading goes as follows: 123456 5678910 9 10 11 12 13 14 etc.. I change the threading so there is more "overlap" of the individual twill lines as follows.....123456 23456789 5678910.....I try to use at least four threads which occur in each twill grouping. I am still trying to work out why this keeps the ladder effect from happening, and my first guess is a standard twill line is more intact as opposed to a broken twill line, which creates the floats which are the ladders.

(I hope I am making sense)

When I do a drawdown on the computer, (I use Fiberworks PCW Silver), I try and locate the floats and eliminate them by manipulating the threading. One other alternative might be to use two or more shafts to tie down your threads. I know this technically eliminates the structure of advancing twill, but you can achieve the look without the float problem. Case in point is the crackle I have been studying lately....I am doing networked crackle, and can achieve an advancing twill look with no float longer than 3 threads.....

Would like to discuss this further....  
Su :-)

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 11:02:43 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Advancing Twill Float problem

Marge Coe wrote:

> I suspect more shafts does help with the ladder effect, but I've a  
> couple of such areas in a networked advancing twill that my eyes seem  
> to zoom in on!

Hi Margaret,

While I agree that darning and mending with a needle is an integral part of the process, I am a wee bit too lazy to do it if it is not necessary! <big sheepish grin!>. Could you describe your trouble spots on your networked advancing twill please?

Thanks!  
Su :-)

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 11:06:01 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Re: loom drivers

Marge Coe wrote:

> It behooves independent software developers to include as  
> many drivers as they can this serves to increase their potential  
> customer.

Hi all....I am so grateful this discussion has come up...I am researching the computerization of my Toika loom, and the first consideration is the LIPS computer unit offered by Toika themselves. While I have yet to research whether Fiberworks PCW will function with this particular unit, I would like input from anyone who may have used or demo'd this particular system. I have an older PC dedicated to my loom room...DH just upgraded it to a 486 for me, and I think that will be adequate for running a loom.....comments appreciated from all you computer weavers!

Su :-)

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

P.s. Tom - is it possible to use an AVL CompuDobby with my loom?

-----  
Date: Mon, 5 Oct 1998 12:54:11 -0400  
From: "Sue Mansfield" <mansfield.susan@usa.net>  
Subject: Intro

My name is Sue Mansfield. I've been weaving since 1972, buying and selling a number of looms in the process. Most of this time I was a member of the Weavers Guild of Minnesota. There are always new things to learn about weaving. I'm hoping this group will help. Some of you I already know; I'm looking forward to meeting the rest of you via e-mail and in person.

Currently I weave on a 40" ten shaft Macomber, eight shaft Structo-for workshops and samples, a frame loom, and an inkle loom, crafted by my husband. I enjoy designing my own drafts using Fiberworks PCW. After attending Bonnie's seminar at Convergence and my previous readings of her articles, I decided to do a eight shaft networked twill with a five end advancing twill treadling in 16/2 aqua, lavender, and grey ramie warp and white cotton/rayon weft blouse. (The difficulty of weaving this without a computer controlled loom had made me procrastinate.) I entered her draft from the handout in PCW and turned it to make it a one shuttle weave with an easier pattern to follow for forty picks. (No interruptions please-my loom still isn't computer controlled.) Recently other drafts on the computer have allowed me to make a double weave spot Bronson for a baby blanket and to check the floats in a spot window pane plaid dress yardage. Drafting these with graph paper would have been laborious to say the least. I'm anxious to get export functions for PCW.

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 12:59:43 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Magnifying glass

Margaret wrote:

>Go ahead needle weave them in! Settle yourself in a comfortable chair with good  
>lighting and, depending on fineness and sett, grab a magnifying glass <snip>

As my eyes become more & more farsighted (I was farsighted \*before\* I started getting the normal old-folks problem of increasing far-sightedness), I've found repairs, particularly on fine-ish threads (I can't say \*really\* fine b/c I don't weave with \*really\* fine threads), much more difficult. Recently, I bought a lamp that has a 3x magnifier in the middle with a circular fluorescent bulb around it. It mounts onto a table with a clamp, and can be angled in any number of ways. It's been a godsend for mending, as it gives me hands-free magnification. It was about \$50 at an Office Depot.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 14:48:46 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: multishaft challenges

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

Marge said, "The dichotomy is that after a Convergence workshop with Ann Richards I'm still intrigued by collapse, which really does not require many shafts!"

There are lots of fabrics that do not \*require\* many shafts. The challenge for those of us with more than 4 is to find ways to make ever more interesting fabric, using our wonderful looms to take the basic ideas into new territory. Collapsed stripes or rectangles can be done with 2 or 4 shafts, but collapse with patterns-- curves, diamonds, how about tessellated shapes-- this takes some drafting skills and sometimes more than 8, depending on the shapes and the structure used.

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
Date: Sun, 04 Oct 1998 18:39:39 -0400  
From: Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>  
Subject: Intro

Hi! I have been weaving since 1985, minus about two years when my son was born. My main loom is a 10S Macomber with 18 treadles, plus small 8H and 4H looms. The loom of my dreams is out of reach of my pocketbook - a 32S computobby (priced out around \$11,500 US from Macomber). I never seem to catch one of these at a yard sale <g> I'm a structure junkie and generally prefer fine white linen and lace weaves. Lately I am trying to learn how to combine complex color schemes with complex weaves. I have some 4 Block Biederwand on the loom now with a striped warp (yellow, peach, rose, magenta) and like the way the color is playing with the structure as I change wefts. On the other looms are a pick-up lace Bronson on opposites (would take 34 S to do loom controlled) border symmetry study and some fingerlace placemates in complex designs. I became intrigued with symmetry from taking classes in crystallography in graduate school years ago. Right now I'm coordinating the Complex Weavers Symmetry Study Group and working my way through the 2-color versions of the basic symmetries. I'm also interested in overlaying different kinds of symmetries and in systematic asymmetry. Having weaving software (Fiberworks, will upgrade to silver sometime soon) really has helped and changed my drafting and designing. It's also a great help when preparing handouts for classes and lectures. The next two years will be busy for me as I am now in my 5th year of a 6 year master weaver program through Hill Institute.

I'm happy to see this group up and running and hope we can have some interesting and challenging discussions.

happy weaving,  
Laurie Autio

-----  
Date: Mon, 5 Oct 1998 17:14:25 -0700  
From: Terri Tinkham <arachne@humboldt1.com>  
Subject: Re: 24 affordable shafts

Reply to Marge Coe's 24-shaft musings  
Hi! I got a Louet Magic doobby about 2 years ago and I have never regretted it. I too thought I'd never need "all those shafts" but now that I have them I could never go back to a mere 16. So, if you want a great little sample loom I can recommend this one. Then you can join my 24-shaft study group/sample exchange in Complex Weavers. The loom is portable-I took it to A Convergence workshop and having doobby pegs instead of levers to keep track of was a blessing. Good luck, Sincerely, Terri Tinkham

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

>  
>I'm trying to solve two problems with one set of dollars! I really need  
>another  
>loom, something smaller. The AVL studio is high on the list but it has two  
>major detractors, weight and price! The LeClerc 16 shaft wins on the weight  
>and price but is 8-shafts shy! There again do I need 24 shafts for this  
>mythical loom, i.e., what am I using it for--samples before warping up the big  
>loom or samples in learning situations?  
>  
>Let's face it I really need two other looms a 24-shaft to use for sampling and  
>playing and something somewhat portable and I need a computer. So let's hear  
>about how others have solved this problem (no winning the lottery isn't viable  
><g>).  
>  
>Margaret  
>-----  
>MargeCoe@concentric.net  
>Tucson, AZ, USA  
>-----

-----  
Date: Mon, 05 Oct 1998 23:56:50 -0400  
From: Sharon Steinberg <cd000910@mindspring.com>  
Subject: Greetings to all!

Thank you for inviting me to this list; I look forward to learning and sharing info about weaving and making some 'net friends. I have been weaving since 1972 when I bought a 15" Dorothy and wove sitting with it on my bed as I watched the tube, weaving endless placemats and scarves, slowly and painstakingly. Then I bought an early Clement, a 60" Cranbrook and was in business. I am now down to a fairly new, 48", 4-harness Clement (direct tie-up) and a 22-inch Artisat. I have a loom in the den and another in the dining room, shelves in nooks and crannies and file drawers, and my trusty Ashford wheel (circa 1971) still spinning away. At this point, I weave pillows and hangings, scarves and shawls. I long to understand Weaver Rose patterns, but my math is awful and I get lost in blocks, which I have never understood. I weave no more than 10 to the inch, mostly 6 or 8. I'm also fascinated by double-weave, but I can't imagine understanding what that is and how to do it. I look forward to reading about everyone's projects and will chime in when I know something. All best to you for a great October!  
-- Sharon

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #9  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #8  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Monday, October 5 1998

Volume 01 : Number 008

Intro [Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>]  
Intro of a weaver ["Elizabeth tritthart" <Etritthart@wyellowstone.com>]  
intro ["Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>]  
Intro ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>]  
Intro - Judith Favia ["Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>]  
Another Intro [arwells@erols.com]  
not so fine rayon ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
weaving width ["Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>]  
RE: discussion on getting computer for use with loom ["Sally Breckenridge"  
Intro [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
Laptops [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: Laptops ["Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>]  
Intro [Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com]

-----  
Date: Sun, 04 Oct 1998 07:28:34 -0700  
From: Al and Su Butler <apbutler@mc.net>  
Subject: Intro

Thanks for the invitation to participate !!

A breif bio: Been weaving for 24 years, and am very interested in textural and color complexities in cloth. I think my ideas can be achieved with both color and stucture, and I am learning to use structure in new ways via the computer. I have a 16S Toika loom, which I hope to computerize in the near future. I have been doing a study on networked crackle of late, and am intrigued with the possibilities I can generate on screen, which appear to translate well to woven cloth.

The computer has been a breakthrough tool for me, as I am too lazy to do drawdowns by hand anymore. I think the quality of what I weave has imporved since I can edit and explore so quickly via technology!

Looking forward to this discussion, and I would like to thank those responsible for setting up this forum!!

Regards,  
Su Butler @ apbutler@mc.net

-----  
Date: Sun, 04 Oct 1998 09:07:31 -0600  
From: "Elizabeth tritthart" <Etritthart@wyellowstone.com>  
Subject: Intro of a weaver

I am primarily interested in complex weaving. I have two floor looms. An AVL 60" Technical Dobby, that I run with a laptop computer. (It is indeed flexible) and a newly purchased under construction Andersson 164" cm 100 shaft drawloom. Can you tell that I am a structure junkie? Plain weave is only in my vocabulary for short warps of incredible color.

I am presently studying Angstadt, and his double weave possibilities.

Computer software used, Weavepoint 5.0, Fiberworks PCW (waiting for the Gold also.) and Proweave. I also integrate with other software for documentation and

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

illustration purposes. Especially for the web.

Elizabeth Tritthart  
Whimsical Weaver  
wyellowstone.com/users/ww/weaving.htm  
West Yellowstone Web Works  
wyellowstone.com

-----  
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 09:55:16 -0600  
From: "Judie Eatough" <jeatough@cougar.netutah.net>  
Subject: intro

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

- =====\_NextPart\_000\_002C\_01BDEF7D.16635140  
Content-Type: text/plain;  
    charset="iso-8859-1"  
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

This looks like a fun forum. Thanks. =20

I appreciate the information on how to download the library files. =  
Since I had never tried a list before, I needed the help.

Bio: I'm Judie Eatough, been weaving 11 years. I love structure and =  
want to learn to use color more effectively. I have a 24 shaft loom and =  
8 shaft looms and have been teaching using 4 shaft looms. The fabrics =  
at convergence -- wow -- my goal: To design and weave something that is =  
good enough to enter. I love computers and weaving programs. I use =  
Fiberworks, Patternland and WeaveIt. Lots of other programs too. =20

Comments on stripes and blocks. In our university collection of =  
textiles, we have several stripe fabrics that are created by plain weave =  
and denting techniques. One structure, one yarn, just spacing that =  
creates the stripe. Blocks created by sett. I tend to think of stripes =  
or color as blocks. I have this picture of structure blocks, color =  
blocks, and other blocks. When I see some of the 4-shaft double weave =  
where color is as important as structure, I see blocks. =20

We use a list of 6 things that can be changed to design textiles. =  
Fiber, Yarn, Color, Structure, Sett, and Beat. I have not been able to =  
come up with any others. But I tend to design using only structure and =  
color. =20

Regarding Alice's article: It is possible to cut and paste from some of =  
the programs. WeaveIt will let you do it, and those programs that let =  
you do fabric analysis will do it-- but you may need more steps. Some =  
of the dos programs are good for this. =20

Regarding computers: Computers change so fast, that I would not buy for =  
the future, but what will do what I want to do right now. =20  
With the chip price drops- you can get a powerful computer for the AVL =  
cost or less. (See www.compstop.com for price ideas) And old used =  
computers that will run a loom are very cheap. The monitor can be the =  
most expensive part. (As many update - old 486s or low end pentiums are =  
available) New laptops are the most expensive choice. You can usually =  
get the same features in a regular computer for half the cost. =20

Judie Eatough

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

- -----=\_NextPart\_000\_002C\_01BDEF7D.16635140

Content-Type: text/html;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">

<HTML>

<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 =

http-equiv=3DContent-Type>

<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.72.3110.7"' name=3DGENERATOR>

</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>This looks like a fun forum.&nbsp;Thanks.&nbsp;=

</FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>I appreciate the information on how to download the =

library.&nbsp;Since I had never tried a list before, I needed the=20

help.</FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>Bio:&nbsp;I'm Judie Eatough, been weaving 11 =

years.&nbsp;I=20

love structure and want to learn to use color more effectively.&nbsp;I =

have a=20

24 shaft loom and 8 shaft looms and have been teaching using 4 shaft=20

looms.&nbsp;The fabrics at convergence -- wow -- my goal: To design and =

weave=20

something that is good enough to enter.&nbsp;I love computers and =

weaving=20

programs. I use Fiberworks, Patternland and WeaveIt.&nbsp;Lots of other =

programs too.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>Comments on stripes and blocks. In our university =

collection=20

of textiles, we have several stripe fabrics that are created by plain =

weave and=20

denting techniques.&nbsp;One structure, one yarn, just spacing that =

creates the=20

stripe. Blocks created by sett.&nbsp;I tend to think of stripes or =

color as=20

blocks.&nbsp;I have this picture of structure blocks, color blocks, and =

other=20

blocks.&nbsp;When I see some of the 4-shaft double weave where color is =

as=20

important as structure, I see blocks.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>We use a list of 6 things that can be changed to =

design=20

textiles.&nbsp;&nbsp;Fiber, Yarn, Color, Structure, Sett, and =

Beat.&nbsp;I=20

have not been able to come up with any others.&nbsp;But I tend to =

design using=20

only structure and color.&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>

<DIV><FONT size=3D2>Regarding Alice's article:&nbsp;It is possible to =

cut and=20

paste from some of the programs.&nbsp;WeaveIt will let you do it, and =

those=20

programs that let you do fabric analysis will do it-- but you may need =







# WeaveTech Archive 9810

My mother is sewing pearls on the dress, over 1000 so far... its really =  
amazing. =20

I bought 30/2 Treenway silk at Convergence to weave a jacket that I will =  
wear to the wedding. So far, I have played with all kinds of designs =  
and will probably send more discussion on this project to the list. I =  
seem to be "blocked" (literally) as I feel I must have the "perfect" =  
design for the project. This is why the looms are empty.

My current computing project is writing a driver for the Louet Magic =  
Dobby. I am also improving the peg plan editing in WeaveIt. This is, =  
as usual, driven my own desires to design.

Oh, in when I am not working on my projects, I have a full time job as a =  
Computer Software Engineer. This part of my life does seem to get in =  
the way of the more important part.

I have some more thoughts for the list but will send those in separate =  
messages. I am really looking forward to exchanging ideas and thoughts =  
with everyone.

Sally Breckenridge  
sallyb@weaveit.com

- -----\_NextPart\_000\_000E\_01BDEF86.419FF4E0

Content-Type: text/html;  
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">  
<HTML>  
<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html; charset=3Diso-8859-1 =  
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>  
<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.72.3110.7"' name=3DGENERATOR>  
</HEAD>

<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Hi,</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>I am Sally Breckenridge and I =  
appreciate being=20  
asked to join the list.&nbsp; Most of you know me as the person who does =  
the=20  
weaving program WeaveIt.&nbsp; But I also seem to be very busy doing =  
many other=20  
things.&nbsp; I own 4 looms and in the process of purchasing =  
another.&nbsp; My=20  
main loom is a 24 shaft JComp and initially I felt I had to use every =  
shaft when=20  
doing a project.&nbsp; I am finally over that phase and can now create =  
designs=20  
without regard to the number of shafts.&nbsp; My other looms are&nbsp; =  
Baby Wolf=20  
with Comby-8, 8 shaft Fireside loom WITH Treadles and a mountain table=20  
loom.&nbsp; I am currently purchasing a 24 shaft Louet Magic Dobby for=20  
sampling.&nbsp; I have looms in every room of the house.&nbsp; I get to =  
justify=20  
it because its part of the business!</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>&nbsp;</FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Normally they are all full of =

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

various weaving=20  
but currently the only loom threaded is the Baby Wolf with rosepath =  
which I use=20  
to play with and to let visitors try out weaving.&nbsp; All my other =  
looms are=20  
empty.... and I am feeling a great sadness and withdrawal... Hopefully =  
this=20  
won't last long.&nbsp; </FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>I do have many projects =  
though.&nbsp;</FONT></DIV>  
I am making a wedding dress (sewing, not weaving) and 2 bridesmaid =  
dresses for=20  
my daughters wedding.&nbsp; My mother is sewing pearls on the dress, =  
over 1000=20  
so far... its really amazing.&nbsp; </FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2>I bought 30/2 Treenway silk at Convergence to weave =  
a jacket=20  
that I will wear to the wedding.&nbsp; So far, I have played with all =  
kinds of=20  
designs and will probably send more discussion on this project to the=20  
list.&nbsp; I seem to be &quot;blocked&quot; (literally) as I feel I =  
must have=20  
the &quot;perfect&quot; design for the project.&nbsp; This is why the =  
looms are=20  
empty.</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2>My current computing project is writing a driver for =  
the Louet=20  
Magic Dobby.&nbsp; I am also improving the peg plan editing in =  
WeaveIt.&nbsp;=20  
This is, as usual, driven my own desires to design.</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2>Oh, in when I am not working on my projects, I have =  
a full=20  
time job as a&nbsp; Computer Software Engineer.&nbsp; This part of my =  
life does=20  
seem to get in the way of the more important part.</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2>I have some more thoughts for the list but will send =  
those in=20  
separate messages.&nbsp; I am really looking forward to exchanging ideas =  
and=20  
thoughts with everyone.</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2>Sally Breckenridge</FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2><A=20  
href=3D"mailto:sallyb@weaveit.com">sallyb@weaveit.com</A></FONT></DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>  
<DIV><FONT size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV></BODY></HTML>

- =====\_NextPart\_000\_000E\_01BDEF86.419FF4E0--

-----  
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 13:54:55 -0500  
From: "Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Intro - Judith Favia

Thanks Marge for reminding all of us to get our introductions in and not  
assume that everyone knows us.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

I have been weaving since 1988, although it is only in the past two years that I have been doing so intensively. However, I have been extremely fortunate in my weaving friends and have had wonderful inspiration from people like Ruth Blau, Sally Knight, Amy Norris, Janet Stollnitz and Margaret Coe. My current goal is to get two warps on and off the loom each month for the next year.

I have a 48" Macomber, just upgraded to 8 shafts and a Voyageur 8 shaft. I love weaving household textiles -- tablecloths, runners, mats, napkins, dishtowels. Until recently, I have steered away from fabric that would be cut and tailored, but I am now thinking about some kinds of silk/wool fabrics for jackets and vests.

I am trying to hone my warping skills as well as explore a few structures more intensively, including overshot and lace weaves. With additional shafts, I am also interested in working on turned drafts. I have WeaveIt and I am beginning to use it for planning rather than documenting a project.

On this list, I expect to be mostly a listener and learner.

Judith

Judith Favia, Minneapolis, MN  
cronenorth@earthlink.net

-----  
Date: Sun, 04 Oct 1998 15:29:44 -0700  
From: arwells@erols.com  
Subject: Another Intro

Here's my brief intro to this list:

I am Anne Wells, mother of two young boys (one of whom is already weaving regularly!). Small brag, there ... I have several looms from various places. I am mostly self taught, and I love to read anything having to do with weaving. Mostly, I weave finer threads and panic a bit about weaving wool. I've just started experimenting with linen and ramie and have been having pleasurable experiences with both -- so far. I weave mostly household items, and am on the brink of actually cutting and sewing some handwoven material. yikes! Takes nerve to do that!

I suppose I am more of a structure person than a color/texture person. It's hard for me to do anything without understanding all the underlying principles (maybe why I read so much). I am looking forward to this list, and hope it attracts many serious weavers from whom I can learn new things!!

Anne  
arwells@erols.com

-----  
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 13:50:10 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: not so fine rayon

>I got some VERY fine rayon <

I am the opposite. I have used and would like some more quite thick rayon. I then doubled it, wove it in a 12 harness twill I designed then went back after weaving and painted on it. This was a long time ago, found the rayon

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

in a fibre store and have not seen any since. I still have some images I want to complete that way. So if you run across any large diameter rayon, works out to about 5 6 threads to the inch I would love to know!

Oh and by the way, hi everyone and thanks for the invite. I look forward to the discussions and hope I can keep up!

Pamela

who is FINALLY joining complex weavers.

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

-----  
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 13:51:12 -0600  
From: "Pamela Marriott" <pmarriot@telusplanet.net>  
Subject: weaving width

>What do those of you who have wide looms use for warp  
>separators?

Ruth, I use heavy 6 or 8 mil plastic. It comes as wide as the loom or I have it sawn to width, the roll I mean. I use a bathtub curtain rod to hold it at the bottom of my loom and wind away. It seems to work just fine. this is for full width weaving for smaller width I use banquet paper same holder.

>Is sectional the only way to go? I so  
>dread learning sectional warping (and buying the equipment to do it) that  
>it would probably kill this idea for me entirely.

You know now that I am weaving some what full time now I think sectional is the way to go just for ease. Although I believe the first few warps will be hell till I get the hang of it. Course I still need to buy the sectional rakes for my loom, the separators, reel rack and them I am ready. OR I could just spend half the amount of money buy Fiberworks and continue the wrestling.

Pamela

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio

Pamela Marriott  
Dancing Sheep Studio  
Weaving & Graphics  
Swan Hills, Alberta, Canada  
pmarriot@telusplanet.net

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 13:04:25 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: RE: discussion on getting computer for use with loom

In regards to the discussion on the list about getting a computer for a loom or buying the AVL cartridge attachment, I thought I would comment on some ideas I had.

Last spring when I was working on the loom driver for WeaveIt, I was using the Sandra Rude's new AVL loom. She was having a difficult time positioning her computer so she could see it easily while weaving; the fly shuttle and loom frame were in the way. At about the same time I went to a computer conference about a new Microsoft Windows platform, Windows CE. It's Windows but on a tiny hand held computer. If you haven't see one, they are about 4 inches by 7 inches in size. They have a tiny screen, about half a normal 14" size in VGA, certainly not big enough to do weaving design but definitely big enough for driving a loom. They are cheap and getting cheaper. They use the standard Windows platform with some modifications. This means a modified version of the weaving program can run on it. The beauty is that is small and can be easily mounted on a ledge right in front of the loom where the Compu Dobby box is now. At convergence, I mentioned the idea to Peter Strauss at AVL. He really got excited and immediately saw the beauty of the idea. I could see the \$\$ ringing in his head. These devices use serial & printer interfaces so can interface to any loom using that type of connection.

Anyway this is not a this year kind of project, maybe next year, but it will come. Consequently, I would not buy a cartridge unit but instead invest your money into a laptop. You can use the laptop for many other things and carry it to the loom when you need it. I love my laptops and can even write code on my new fast one.

Now my break is over so it's back to my sewing,  
Sally

-----

Date: Sun, 04 Oct 1998 17:57:52 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Intro

My name is Ruth Blau, and I'm one of the eight people who got their heads (or keyboards) together this summer to get an internet list going for intermediate & advanced weavers. I'm so tickled to see so many of you responding to our invitation by joining this conversation.

I've been weaving for about 6 years. I have a 36", 8-shaft Schacht floor loom (not Wolf), a Gilmore 8-shaft Little Gem (folding), and a 32" 12-shaft Macomber. I'm in the very early stages of beginning to think about buying a computer-driven loom because I'm a structure junkie. I use Fiberworks PCW for designing.

I do a lot of rag weaving, mostly to make carryalls and pocketbooks. Since structure is what attracts me about weaving, I've been trying to push rag weaving in new (at least to me) and interesting directions. Last year, after Bonnie Inouye showed our multishaft study group how she was using a combination of certain twill structures plus differences in grist between warp and weft to get ridges, pleats, and other textural effects, I decided to try the technique with rag, since there's an inherent large difference in grist between the warp & weft. I did one warp of 12-shaft advancing twill (and return) with 8/4 carpet warp for warp and 3/4" cut cotton fabric for weft and got wonderful horizontal pointed ridges. This is great for bags or clothing, but of course would be inappropriate for rag rugs (unless

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

you want to be sued by the people who trip on the ridges & fall).

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sun, 04 Oct 1998 16:17:08 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Laptops

Sally

I'd just about reached the laptop conclusion and Ruth's and your messages have solidified it. Yesterday I went to the new Gateway store to drool and today I dropped by another store to price Compaq. Next week I'll troll the superstores.

I'm trying to solve two problems with one set of dollars! I really need another loom, something smaller. The AVL studio is high on the list but it has two major detractors, weight and price! The LeClerc 16 shaft wins on the weight and price but is 8-shafts shy! There again do I need 24 shafts for this mythical loom, i.e., what am I using it for--samples before warping up the big loom or samples in learning situations?

Let's face it I really need two other looms a 24-shaft to use for sampling and playing and something somewhat portable and I need a computer. So let's hear about how others have solved this problem (no winning the lottery isn't viable <g>).

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 17:27:14 -0700  
From: "Sally Breckenridge" <sallyb@weaveit.com>  
Subject: Re: Laptops

>Let's face it I really need two other looms a 24-shaft to use for sampling and  
>playing and something somewhat portable and I need a computer. So let's  
>hear about how others have solved this problem (no winning the lottery  
isn't >viable

I agree that one needs a sample loom with many shafts. I am not eager to try out my samples on my JComp which uses a lot of waste yarn (especially with silk). So I have been using cross-stitch cloth and making 2 inch squares, pretty tedious. So I have been looking at both the Leclerc and the Louet Magic Dobby. I think the Leclerc has a better price but not as many shafts (16 vs. 24 for the Magic Dobby). I have decided on the Magic Dobby which I think is much improved over the original a couple years ago. Both of these looms use a serial interface so it is easy to hook up laptops. The AVL studio loom also uses serial interface but it is bigger and more expensive.

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

One of the problems for me at least with the Leclerc is that the specification for writing the loom driver is incredibly complex so that the only program you can get to work with it is ProWeave. Both Bob Keates (Fiberworks) and I looked at the spec. and said "no way". This has actually prompted Leclerc to change the interface, however I haven't heard anything yet.

I can get these looms more cheaply because they are tax write-offs. I suppose production weavers can also write them off. Anyway I tend to like having them around in-order to better support my customers. So after working with quite a few computerized looms, I would say you get what you pay for. The more expensive, the better made and more you will like it. In order to reduce the price, the loom makers must cut corners and the loom is not as good. So obviously I like my JComp much better than the Baby Wolf. The AVLs are wonderful and the Louet & Leclerc are similar but not as nice as the AVL or JComp.

My thoughts would tell me to spend most the budget on the loom and get the cheapest computer. You can replace the computer next year with a better one for even less money but the loom will retain its value.

Sally

-----

Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 21:14:34 EDT  
From: Xu4Gpy9cQl@aol.com  
Subject: Intro

I want to thank the founding group for inviting me to this list.

My name is Clyde Sydnor. I got interested in weaving indirectly, in 1965. I had made several rya rug kits from C.U.M. in Denmark and from Borgs of Lund, Sweden (now just "Borgs.") I thought it would be interesting to weave these from scratch so looked in the yellow pages, of course. Under "weaving instruction", found Mary Snyder. So my wife-at-the-time and I got started from Mary and I have been weaving ever since, with varying levels of intensity.

I have woven table linens, wall-hangings, pillows, upholstery, and much, much, yardage, for women's clothing and men's sportcoats. I wove my cousins wedding gown in reel silk, and a bedspread in ramie for a friend, but my favorite is linen. I was fortunate enough to start weaving when Irish and Scottish linen, wet-spun, mercerized, and gassed was readily available.

I like to try different things, spending more time thinking than weaving. The last few years, my perspective in my life and, therefore, in my weaving, is "less is more." That is, I am moving toward sumi-e rather than Chinese brush painting.

I am glad to be a part of a group of serious weavers, and will contribute if I can.

My working life was spent in science, engineering, math, and computers, and the last few years were spent in developing instrumentation apps for space research on the Mac, PC, and especially the Sun (Unix platform). We linked high-end data acquisition packages and their appropriate cards with analysis and display packages in what we called "Hyper-Applications," in analogy with hyper-text, so I am very much aware of the attraction of computers for exploration of possibilities in weaving, but that is not my path (much.)

I hope I will not be shunned if my inclination seems retro (i.e....before computers).



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Clyde

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #8  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #7  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Sunday, October 4 1998

Volume 01 : Number 007

Re: Multishaft Weave Design [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
Intro [Charlotte Winter <dogstar@mail.teleport.com>]  
Re: Multishaft Weave Design [Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>]  
AVL programming station [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
Re: Intro [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
ADMIN - Archive Command Update [AmyFibre@aol.com]

-----  
Date: Sat, 03 Oct 1998 07:46:04 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Multishaft Weave Design

Margaret wrote:

>Additionally,  
>the bronze version doesn't go beyond 16 shafts--how about the silver  
version? I  
>know when I upgraded I was supposed to get this stuff when it was  
released, but  
>it's almost a year later and it's still not released.

I picked up my copy of what Ingrid called "Baby Silver" at Convergence.  
Since I don't (yet) have a compudobby, I don't know about drivers, but Baby  
Silver does allow you to design for 24 shafts.

Incidentally, I've been corresponding with Ingrid over the past week about  
what I perceived to be a bug in Baby Silver. Here's the situation: you  
create a design and save it to a .dtx file. Now suppose you want to play  
with other tieups, treadlings, whatever. You start saving the new designs  
as separate files under different names. The new name shows up in your  
listing of files and on the title bar of the design, but if you print the



## WeaveTech Archive 9810

design, it will always print with the title of the first file you saved. This is true even if you close out the program and then go back into it.

According to Ingrid, this is due to a quirk in Windows for which Bob hasn't yet come up with a workaround. However, there *is* a cure. On your new design, go to the "Cloth" menu, then to the "Notes" menu. Change the title of the design in the "Notes" menu, and when you print, you'll get that title. I've tried this, and it works.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sat, 03 Oct 1998 11:36:27 -0700  
From: Charlotte Winter <dogstar@mail.teleport.com>  
Subject: Intro

Hi All,

Thanks for the invite to the list. Brief info on weaving interests: Hmm, problem, I like it all. Latest interests: Boulevard, Park and Chevron weaves, though because of an extremely busy work schedule currently, I haven't actually woven anything in these structures yet. Have been mulling over some Boulevard towels, though, in a honey brown, light turquoise blue and a gold accent in there somewhere, maybe some dark blue as well.

Looking forward to reading the postings,  
Charlotte Winter

-----  
Date: Sat, 03 Oct 1998 15:45:21 -0400  
From: Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Multishaft Weave Design

At 10:54 AM 10/2/98 -0600, Marge wrote:  
>I just got my Complex Weavers newsletter and am intrigued by Alice's article on  
>designing for a 24-shaft loom.

Not the same, but perhaps a variation on a theme is Alice's article, "Lucky Eight", in Weaver's, Issue 40. Both articles give rise to interesting design possibilities--especially for small scale motifs. With increasing numbers of shafts you can have a more intricate, larger motif or more than one motif--blocks?

Janet

-----  
Janet Stollnitz  
Silver Spring, MD  
-----  
jstoll@cpcug.org

-----  
Date: Sat, 03 Oct 1998 17:09:06 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: AVL programming station

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

A day or so ago, Marge raised the question of whether anyone had worked out the economics of buying AVL's programming station vs. buying a regular computer. Since I'm beginning to consider the purchase of an AVL (or other computer-driven loom), I find this an interesting question. Computer prices are dropping fast, and there's now a glut of chips on the market. With the holiday approaching, I bet there will be great buys on computers. It seems to me that a laptop (or notebook) would be great for a loomside application. If you ended up with more than one AVL (for example, a large loom and a studio loom), a laptop wouldn't be so hard to move from loom to loom. In addition, you could use it for other purposes (like reading email when you travel <vbg>). The programming station has just the one purpose.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sat, 03 Oct 1998 16:28:53 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Intro

It occurs to me that we failed to introduce ourselves though didn't flinch at suggesting the we invited send a brief intro.

I'm Margaret Coe. I'm pushing myself to take use all 24 shafts on my loom. At the same time I give myself the pep talk of, "Just because I have them doesn't mean to say I need to use them \*everytime\*. . ." The dichotomy is that after a Convergence workshop with Ann Richards I'm still intrigued by collapse, which really does not require many shafts! I'm also very much intrigued by using computers to enhance our weaving experience, to do things we are unable to do without them. Other than that I lust after a smaller loom!

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Sun, 4 Oct 1998 01:04:04 EDT  
From: AmyFibre@aol.com  
Subject: ADMIN - Archive Command Update

end  
Hi all --

Robin/Ruby Charuby just found a glitch in our welcome message (which I will correct first thing tomorrow when I'm a bit more awake), but in the meantime, please note that the command to get an archive file \*must also include the name of the list\*. So, it looks like this:

I'll need to update the welcome message and instructions, but here's the answer. In addition to specifying the file, we need to specify the list name too -- so here's the command needed (looks weird, but it works):

```
get weavetech weavetech.9809  
end
```

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

The first weavetech is the name of the list; the 2nd is part of the file name being requested.

Looks weird, but it works. Without that first "weavetech", majordomo just sends an error message.

I will correct the welcome message to reflect this tomorrow.

Goodnight,

Amy  
amyfibre@aol.com

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #7  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #6  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Saturday, October 3 1998

Volume 01 : Number 006

|                             |                                       |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| variegated yarns            | [Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>]       |
| Multishaft Weave Design     | [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>] |
| Re: Multishaft Weave Design | [AmyFibre@aol.com]                    |
| Re: Multishaft Weave Design | [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>] |
| Re: Multishaft Weave Design | [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>] |
| Re: Multishaft Weave Design | [AmyFibre@aol.com]                    |

-----  
Date: Thu, 01 Oct 1998 09:39:33 -0400  
From: Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>  
Subject: variegated yarns

Swivel is really neat, I like the way it puts little dots of color onto the surface (longer floats on the back). Since it is a treadling technique rather than a structure you can do it on many different structures. But, if I had an expensive variegated yarn I wanted to have seen, I'm not sure I would want most of it on the back.

There's a form of shadow weaving on overshot. That may not be the correct

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

name, but it's the one I have. You use what would normally be the pattern yarn as the tabby and the usual tabby yarn as the pattern. It requires adjusting the block sizes if it needs to be square but can be used on any weave structure that has a pattern and tabby thread, even laces. It gives a very interesting, shadowy version of the pattern. If the variegated were used as the heavy tabby with a fine black (or other high contrast color) warp and pattern weft, you could get really interesting results.

To some degree I think the best use of the variegated depends on how much value variation there is in it. You can get away with a lot more if the values of the colors are quite similar (so that you can choose a warp or weft that contrasts with all of them). I've tended to not be bold enough in my contrasts and that just doesn't work the way I want it to with variegated yarns.

Laurie Autio

-----

Date: Fri, 02 Oct 1998 10:54:01 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Multishaft Weave Design

I just got my Complex Weavers newsletter and am intrigued by Alice's article on designing for a 24-shaft loom. Hold it before you delete, this applies to other shafted looms. Really it does, it does, I'll get to it!

Alice starts out by commenting that those with 24 shafts have a tendency to "use a versatile threading and very long warps." She continues that many keep a straight draw threading on the loom, but can become bored running out of ideas with what to do next.

Her article explains a method for designing tied weaves for the straight draw threading. This is accomplished by dividing the threading into two 12-shaft sections (not in real life, on the computer or on paper), creating the design, and converting it back to the straight draw before weaving.

Preamble over.

The first comment is that there are precious few resources for users of looms with more than 8 shafts. So this article strikes me, as does Bonnie's book, as something to help the weaver design her own weavings in the multi-shaft environment. I can't see why Alice's exploration isn't applicable to 16 or perhaps 12-shaft designing.

The second comment is in the converting \*back\* to the straight draw. One way is to "copy the drawdown area and use it as a peg plan." Excellent, provided one's software allows this, by hand it'd be torture! ProWeave does this function really well--do any others? I am going to check my other software, but I thought I'd save some test time by posting the problem to you.

Whenever I'm asked which weaving software I recommend, I quibble and dither, and end up giving a none answer. Mainly because I feel to give a decisive answer is doing a disservice to the questioner. It all depends on the type of weaving one does, the type of designing, the type of loom one has, etc. It's been my experience that those who unequivocally recommend a software generally have minimal or no knowledge of other software available. They're recommending merely that with which they are familiar (with the exception of software designers, of course they have a preference). All programs have their areas in which they excel. So which other allows one to copy the draw down area and create a peg plan?

Marge

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 18:58:31 EDT  
From: AmyFibre@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Multishaft Weave Design

In a message dated 10/2/98 12:52:17 PM Central Daylight Time,  
MargeCoe@concentric.net writes:

- > Whenever I'm asked which weaving software I recommend, I quibble and dither,
- > and
- > end up giving a none answer. Mainly because I feel to give a decisive
- > answer is
- > doing a disservice to the questioner. It all depends on the type of
- > weaving
- > one
  
- > So which other allows one to copy the draw down area and
- > create a peg plan?

Fiberworks PCW version 4.0 (the newest/Windows version) allows you to copy/cut the tie-up from one drawdown and paste it into the peg plan of another drawdown (could be blank). One specific drawdown cannot be in both pegplan and tie-up mode at the same time, hence the need to copy from one drawdown to another.

Also, for playing with tie-ups, I have found that PCW's ability to rotate the tie-up area by pasting it 1/4 or 1/2 or 3/4 turn is pretty nifty. Some totally unweavable designs, naturally -- but some are weavable and it is one of those ways to shock myself into seeing very different possibilities in the cloth.

- > It's been my
- > experience that those who unequivocally recommend a software generally have
- > minimal or no knowledge of other software available.

I agree and, like Margaret, tend to avoid "recommending" software although I will happily share my own personal experience. However, early in the summer, at the request of Catherine Markey with whom I was corresponding re: her new AVL, I did a comparison of Fiberworks and WeavePoint. Granted, it is still subjective, but I did try and do a thorough comparison of WeavePoint's features as described in their marketing literature (and found through my playing in their demo) to Fiberworks. I would be happy to share this if it is of interest. My conclusion is that if I ever have the extra money, I'd like to have both, but for now I am content with Fiberworks.

Amy  
amyfibre@aol.com

-----  
Date: Fri, 02 Oct 1998 18:05:08 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Multishaft Weave Design

AmyFibre@aol.com wrote:

- > Fiberworks PCW version 4.0 (the newest/Windows version) allows you to copy/cut

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

> the tie-up from one drawdown and paste it into the peg plan of another  
> drawdown (could be blank).

Thanks Amy, but I didn't phrase my question very well. I'm talking about being able to select a specific portion of the the actual drawdown, not the threading, tie up or peg plan, but the cloth part, and from that create the peg plan. In what other programs can I do that? If you can refer to Alice's article in Complex Weavers newsletter you'll understand not only what I'm clumsily trying to explain but why anyone would want to do that!

I would have liked to stay with Fiberworks, but because it doesn't have the necessary AVL driver for the enhanced dobbie and/or the cartridge. Additionally, the bronze version doesn't go beyond 16 shafts--how about the silver version? I know when I upgraded I was supposed to get this stuff when it was released, but it's almost a year later and it's still not released.

Marge

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Fri, 02 Oct 1998 18:16:01 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Multishaft Weave Design

AmyFibre@aol.com wrote:

> My conclusion is that if I ever have the extra money, I'd like  
> to have both, but for now I am content with Fiberworks.

I do have both (Weave Point was a real bargain at Convergence, due in no small part to Janet's very good negotiation skills). Now I'm in the midst of solving hardware problems, i.e., I need something more powerful near the loom to run most of these windows programs. Or, I need to get a programming station.

Help me think this through. A programming station costs about \$875 a computer costs a little more (though not much when you think about all you get). The answer would seem obvious but it's not.

The programming station can program cartridges for more than one loom which means should I ever have more than one loom I wouldn't have to have a computer on wheels running between them (I'm thinking of the studio loom here). The station can sit by the biggest, best computer in the house (in the office) freeing up space and equipment near the loom not to mention removing the cords I constantly trip over. Additionally as programs develop, and they do they always do, requiring more power only one computer in the house need be up-to-date!

But there are drawbacks to the programming station/cartridge. The cartridge must have limits as to how big a pattern can be. It can hold 10 patterns, but surely not of unlimited size. And AVLs technology will improve and change and it's even more costly to stay on top of that than to buy computers. I know I need to pose these questions to AVL, but I'm still at the chewing it over stage. Any thoughts?

Marge

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Date: Fri, 2 Oct 1998 23:33:23 EDT  
From: AmyFibre@aol.com  
Subject: Re: Multishaft Weave Design

In a message dated 10/2/98 8:03:21 PM Central Daylight Time,  
MargeCoe@concentric.net writes:

<<I'm talking about being able to select a specific portion of the the actual drawdown, not the threading, tie up or peg plan, but the cloth part, and from that create the peg plan. >>

Ah, got it. (Hope to get my CW newsletter soon -- must be in the mail.)

No, Fiberworks allows me to select part of the threading, treadling, tie-up or peg plan, but not part of the drawdown itself. Sorry.

<<Additionally, the bronze version doesn't go beyond 16 shafts--how about the silver version?>>

Silver goes to 24 shafts. Don't know about drivers for the new AVL Dobby though.

<>

Did you buy the upgrade to Silver and have the Bronze in the meantime? If so, just ask Ingrid -- I got Silver from her at Conv/CW this summer (after having paid for it in Portland along with a lot of other people) and since then have gotten one more debugging upgrade. I find that they are not terribly proactive about notifying me of available updates, etc., but that if I ask, I get a prompt reply and an upgrade by e-mail, if appropriate.

Amy  
amyfibre@aol.com

-----

End of weavetech-digest V1 #6  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #5  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Friday, October 2 1998

Volume 01 : Number 005

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Re: Marking Heddles [Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>]  
Re: Subject: non-unit weaves ["Jim/Penny Peters" <pjpeters@earthlink.net>]  
non-unit weaves [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]

-----  
Date: Thu, 01 Oct 1998 07:00:26 -0400  
From: Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Marking Heddles

At 09:15 PM 9/30/98 -0500, Judith wrote:  
>I have just added the four additional harnesses to my Macomber to make it  
>eight. And while I have everything taken apart, it would be a great time to  
>make any adjustments or special markings that would be helpful.

I marked the shafts, not the heddles, on my Macomber. Since the frames are black, I used white rub-on numbers to mark each shaft. If you apply them in a diagonal pattern, they are easy to see when the shafts are raised or even when they are at rest.

Janet

-----  
Janet Stollnitz jstoll@cpcug.org  
Silver Spring, MD  
-----

-----  
Date: Thu, 1 Oct 1998 04:07:00 -0700  
From: "Jim/Penny Peters" <pjpeters@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Re: Subject: non-unit weaves

Laurie wrote:

Bonnie, that's an interesting question. Trying to think it through the best I can come up with is that any structure can be "unblocked" or "blocked" depending on the way you treadle it.

I have always thought of the block in the threading. Once it is threaded, that's it. You can disguise the block, you can create a strip (I still think the stripe is strictly color) with a block, but underneath, you can always come back to that block, treadling and tying it traditionally. so for me the fundamental is the threading. Penny

-----  
Date: Thu, 01 Oct 1998 12:04:34 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: non-unit weaves

I understand the distinction between unit weaves and non-unit weaves. My question about non-block weaves was indeed rhetorical, I think. Laurie said that any structure can be unblocked in the treadling or tie-up, and I want to add that it can also be unblocked in the threading. Any structure can be used as a block weave if you accept overlapping blocks. Sometimes it's a kick to figure out how to do it, but I think it can be done.

Yes, I remember the question about variegated weft yarn. In fact, I had just made a sample I like a lot using variegated rayon in a swivel weave fabric. Swivel is one of those odd variations on how to treadle overshot; it's in Helene Bress, among others. makes little dots of the pattern weft



# WeaveTech Archive 9810

color. My friend Marguerite said they were like her "light bright" game from childhood when she did it on a black warp. You can do polychrome swivel, but using variegated weft is quicker by far. I thought about posting this to the other list at the time, and decided I didn't want to get bogged down in what is swivel, even what is overshot (which I was asked at least 2ce on Weave Lite in the past year).

Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
End of weavetech-digest V1 #5  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]  
END

From: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net (weavetech-digest)  
To: weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Subject: weavetech-digest V1 #4  
Reply-To: weavetech@List-Server.net  
Sender: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Errors-To: owner-weavetech-digest@List-Server.net  
Precedence: bulk

weavetech-digest

Thursday, October 1 1998

Volume 01 : Number 004

Re: wide loom warp separators [Foresthrt@aol.com]  
Re: Dumb Question--loom width [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: Dumb Question--loom width [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Subject: non-unit weaves [Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>]  
wide loom [Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>]  
Re: Subject: non-unit weaves [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: Dumb Question--loom width [Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>]  
Re: non-unit weaves [Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>]  
Re: non-unit weaves [Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>]  
Re: Stripes as blocks ["Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>]  
Re: Fine Threads ["Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>]  
Marking Heddles ["Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>]  
Sectional Warping ["Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>]

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 08:40:05 EDT  
From: Foresthrt@aol.com  
Subject: Re: wide loom warp separators

photographer's paper backgrounds come in very wide widths (up to 12 feet?), nicely sturdy paper too. You could likely cut it down to the width you need, no overlap. Maybe even get some used from a photog.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Kraft paper comes wider than 30"- try Antidam Paper 800-638-3457 in Hagerstown, MD.  
They deliver to me from time to time.

Mary Klotz

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 06:36:23 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Dumb Question--loom width

Ruth Blau wrote:

> Is sectional the only way to go? I so  
> dread learning sectional warping (and buying the equipment to do it) that  
> it would probably kill this idea for me entirely.

You can warp semi-sectionally. The same as you do now, but tying the bouts into the 1" or 2" sections, using water jugs and all! All you have to do is make sure the warp doesn't get hung up on one of the section thingys and you won't need any separating material at all. (You might feel a tad stupid surrounded by high-tech toys and water jugs but . . .)

Then again you could use warp flanges--sort of cuffs that fit around the beam and keep the warp in place.

Or how about long sticks?

Marge

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 06:52:14 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Dumb Question--loom width

Ruth Blau wrote:

> OK--now to the question. I've never worked with a 60" loom.

Hope you're considering a fly shuttle. I'd be much more daunted throwing and catching a shuttle 60+" than I would tackling the warp separating problem.

I'd also plump for two beams--one sectional; one plain. You can amass the necessary extra sectional equipment (tensioner, spool rack) later. With some looms you can add a second beam later but not always easily.

Margaret

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Tue, 29 Sep 1998 10:39:11 -0400  
From: Autio <autio@pssci.umass.edu>

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Subject: Subject: non-unit weaves

Bonnie, that's an interesting question. Trying to think it through the best I can come up with is that any structure can be "unblocked" or "blocked" depending on the way you treadle it. Can't think of any that I can't work my evil way with, one way or the other. As you say, twills can be blocked or put into overlapping blocks by altering the tie-up and/or treadling, conversely, a block weave, such as huck, can be "unblocked" by using a non-standard tie-up and twill (etc.) treadling. If you want to stick to only traditional interpretations, with simplest tie-ups, the only group of unblocked weaves I know are the twills (and you have to leave out advancing, M's and W's, twill blocks, etc.). Another way to potentially unblock a block weave would be to use a doobby or compudoobby and gradually change from one kind of treadling to another. The intermediate area, depending on pegplan, could end up unblocked.

You might want to take a look at Paul O'Connor's work on networking with doubleweave, where he explores all possible intermediate structures between two areas. Some of these are very unblocked looking. I'm not sure even, after taking his class at CW (super brain food!), that there is a hard line between what is blocked and what is unblocked. I think he has the material on his website if you don't have a hardcopy.

Laurie Autio

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 11:21:19 -0400  
From: Bonnie Inouye <binouye@geocities.com>  
Subject: wide loom

Ruth, I have a 60" AVL and before that a 60" LeClerc, and I'm only 61" tall (which means my reach is short too). My advice is: get a fly shuttle. I've never had sectional, because of the dyed warps I normally use. I wind in sticks, not paper. Flat sticks are easy to find/buy, I cut mine to fit the width of the back beam, and they allow me to see what colors are approaching on the warp, too. I worked out treadling for reversing the twills in doublewidth blankets; you have to skip something but it certainly can be done. Might be in my article in Weaver's issue 2, on doublewidth. Interestingly, I found the same approach being used by Paul O'Connor in threading a direction reversal in double weave, which he included in his Complex Weavers seminar this summer. Bonnie Inouye  
binouye@geocities.com  
www.geocities.com/Paris/Bistro/4347

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 08:41:15 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: Subject: non-unit weaves

> I think he has the material on his website if you don't have a hardcopy.

Quite correct Laurie, this book is available on Paul's website. Apparently at CW he took a little drubbing for his approach to giving these last two books to us via Internet. I sent the information to the list shortly after Convergence, but here it is again just in case. Go to Paul's web site:

<http://www.paul.oconnor.net>

And click on books.

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

Marge

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 18:20:38 -0400  
From: Ruth Blau <rsblau@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: Dumb Question--loom width

>> OK--now to the question. I've never worked with a 60" loom.

>

>Hope you're considering a fly shuttle.

Absolultely! I've woven at 45" and even that was a stretch. If I go for 60", it will definitely have a fly shuttle. The only question there will be single or double, since I also love to weave shadow weave--perhaps my favorite structure.

Ruth

-----  
rsblau@cpcug.org  
Arlington, Virginia USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 18:53:28 -0400  
From: Janet Stollnitz <jstoll@cpcug.org>  
Subject: Re: non-unit weaves

When I posed the question about a stripe being a block, I was thinking (or perhaps I wasn't thinking) not of color differentiations but structural differentiations. Alice Schlein combines barley corn, 2/2 twills and basketweave in a single warp on 4 shafts. Is not each one of theses considered a block even if each structure is woven as a stripe the entire length of the warp?

On a 3-shaft loom couldn't you have two blocks by changing the threading, tie-up and treadling orders? The difference between the blocks would be very subtle.

Janet (who is foggy-headed with a nasty cold--good excuse!)

-----  
Janet Stollnitz  
Silver Spring, MD  
jstoll@cpcug.org  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 16:42:20 -0600  
From: Marge Coe <MargeCoe@concentric.net>  
Subject: Re: non-unit weaves

Janet Stollnitz wrote:

> Is not each one of theses  
> considered a block even if each structure is woven as a stripe the entire  
> length of the warp?

Assuming I even understand the question, then I'd definitely say that \*one of

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

those\* no matter how long it is woven is one block. But I'm lost as to the original question!

To clarify, say you have two blocks of double weave each on four shafts--each block has a dark layer and a light layer. You could weave a stripe with dark upper and light lower in block A, light upper and dark lower in block B--this would give a stripe, no? You could weave with dark up in both blocks creating two joined tubes, not necessarily producing a stripe but still two blocks, right? Then you could weave so it's all one tube, but in this instance no matter what the stripe I'd consider it one block as the same could be accomplished on four shafts.

I know what I'm trying to communicate here, but I'm not doing a good job of it!

Marge

-----  
MargeCoe@concentric.net  
Tucson, AZ, USA  
-----

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 21:06:59 -0500  
From: "Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Re: Stripes as blocks

I am thinking back to my Summer and Winter class with Donna Sullivan. That is a block weave structure. However, certain treadling sequences result in stripes -- where you thread blocks A, B, C, etc, but only treadle A throughout. Is that an example of a block that is also a stripe (or vice versa, since if you didn't know the structure at all, you would just see a stripe)?

And Penny's comments about blocks of specific structures threaded into a single warp reminded me of that black and white bomber jacket at Convergence -- that was a set of twill stripes that were created by the structure itself.

Am I on the right track?

>>In thinking about the topic, I've been wondering if I could call a stripe a  
>>"block"?  
>  
>Janet gave me this question to ponder several days ago (I'm in the same  
>multishaft study group she is), and what I've come up with is that a stripe  
>generally isn't a block, and it certainly doesn't \*have to be\* a block, but  
>it \*can\* be a block

>Can anyone come up with another instance?

Judith

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 21:29:02 -0500  
From: "Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Re: Fine Threads

I just received one of the two yearly mailings from Karen Selk at Treenway, and she mentions that they currently have the following fine threads on special:

## WeaveTech Archive 9810

- - fine cord, 3-ply reeled silk; 6230 mt/kg; 3100 yds/lb
- - Australian 22/2 Merino wool; 13,700 mt/kg; 6800 yd/lb

You can email her at <treenway@coastnet.com>. The merino in particular sounds wonderful -- she recommends using the silk as warp with the wool as weft.

>Laurie asked:

>>Does Ian Bowers carry fine wool and silk in addition to the  
>>overtwisted versions?

Judith

Judith Favia  
Minneapolis, MN  
cronenorth@earthlink.net

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 21:15:19 -0500  
From: "Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Marking Heddles

I have just added the four additional harnesses to my Macomber to make it eight. And while I have everything taken apart, it would be a great time to make any adjustments or special markings that would be helpful.

I remember reading suggestions for color marking heddles by the harness number, and some general rules for number of heddles per harness. Have any of you found these kinds of things helpful in threading? This would be a perfect time to reallocate heddles or to mark them.

Judith Favia  
cronenorth@earthlink.net

-----  
Date: Wed, 30 Sep 1998 21:51:35 -0500  
From: "Judith Favia" <cronenorth@earthlink.net>  
Subject: Sectional Warping

Ruth -

This is the method that I have been using. I have created the individual bouts with paddle warping on a reel. It is a little putzy tying off all the crosses individually. But where you are mixing the warp within a section, you don't even have to do that; you can just use paddle crosses.

I have been working very systematically on developing a warping system that works with my loom, and my last warp was absolutely perfectly tensioned right down to the last six inches. I was able to weave until the back rod was against the back heddles.

However, if you do decide you want to try sectional warping, my friend Cecil has done plans for a spool rack based on the LeClerc one that I showed him a picture of. Or if you want one in finished form, I can ask him to make you one.

I am approaching sectional warping gradually as I can afford each piece of equipment. Which reminds me -- Marge? bobbin winder?

# WeaveTech Archive 9810

>You can warp semi-sectionally. The same as you do now, but tying the  
bouts  
>into the 1" or 2" sections, using water jugs and all!

Judith

Judith Favia  
Minneapolis, MN  
cronenorth@earthlink.net

-----

End of weavetech-digest V1 #4  
\*\*\*\*\*

-To stop mail temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST NO MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```

-To restart mail after stopping it temporarily (i.e., for vacation):

```
SET WEAVETECH-DIGEST MAIL [your e-mail address here]
END
```