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REVIEW: United States Postal History Sampler. By Richard B. Graham. Published by Linn's Stamp News in Softbound and Hardbound Editions. VI + 186 pp. Both editions available from publisher, Linn's Stamp News, Sidney, OH 45365. SB edition \$14.95; HB edition $\$ 30.00$. Prices include postage and handling.

United States Postal History Sampler is a book that every serious and not so serious student of U.S. postal history should own. The seasoned postal history collector will savor a wealth of information in handy, easy to refer to form; the budding postal historian will learn what postal history is all about and will encounter innumerable possibilities for pursuing a worthwhile collection.
"Dick" Graham, as he is known to many of us, has been a prolific philatelic writer for years as well as a tireless worker and supporter of our Society. This book is based on approximately 500 weekly postal history columns he has written for Linn's over the past ten years. These pieces, some 60 of which were gathered together for this book, are representative of Dick's less formal writings, and are designed to appeal to the very broad and diverse audience constituted by Linn's readers. And he has obviously been very successful in this regard as his column enjoys one of the highest readership ratings of any of Linn's regular features.

The book is organized into 15 chapters which deal with a wide array of subject matter: domestic postal rates, town datestamps, machine cancels, special services, maritime mail, foreign covers, earliest usages, military mail, illustrated covers, plus other topics. Most chapters combine several articles, often updated and corrected from their original versions. The original source articles are noted at the end of each chapter.

The book is lavishly illustrated, portraying not only stamps and covers, but also people and postal equipment discussed in the text. There is an abundance of postmark tracings, laboriously prepared by Graham. This should please many old-timers who plied this special art form before the days of cheap photocopies and white-out fluid. It is a well edited and beautifully produced book for one so economically priced.

Dick's writing style is simple, straightforward, and easy to follow, reflecting the orderly thinking of an engineer, the profession which was his lifelong work. And still, his narrative is lively, and sometimes so interesting that it is difficult to set the book aside when other duties beckon. Because of its organization, it is also an easy book to pick up for a few minutes of reading between other activities.

If there is a criticism, and this is admitted in the forward by Michael Laurence, the reader is sometimes left yearning for more information on a given subject just as a section or chapter ends.

The book has a useful index, and a tabulation (by Douglas A. Kelsey) of all of Graham's postal history columns since they began appearing in Linn's in November, 1982. Those accumulators who own a complete run of Linn's since then can easily find any article Graham has written.

No doubt many Route Agents have already purchased United States Postal History Sampler. To those who have not, we can say - no need to hesitate any longer! It is a thoroughly enjoyable read, and it belongs on the stamp den shelf of every member of our Society.

Dale R. Pulver

REVIEW: The Postal History of Burlington, Vermont: The First 100 Years. By Dr. Donald B. Johnstone. Card Covers. $645^{1 / 2} \times 8^{1 / 2 "}$ pages. Well illustrated with halftones and tracings of postal markings. Published by the author and available from Leonard H. Hartmann, P.O. Box 36006, Louisville, KY 40233-6006 at \$6.00, postpaid.

Generally speaking, the first reaction on learning of a new work on the postal history of a town, even a historic city, is why do I need that? As was amply demonstrated by Tom Allen's recent monograph on Cleveland postmarks, each such work brings out postal history events that were unique to the particular city. Each author also has a somewhat different slant on his subject so that each such history makes its contributions. This work, as those who know Don Johnstone would expect, leaves few stones unturned relative to Burlington postal affairs and markings. But, it also reveals some lovely postal history research techniques, such as how even archival data can sometimes become confused and what needs to be done to learn the truth.

Johnstone's work brings out the Congressional authority for establishment of the Burlington post office in 1792, and shows its importance from its location on the route to Canada. The work shows all kinds of usages, from money letters and express labels to the steamboat markings stemming from Lake Champlain traffic and the development of Burlington as a railroad center. Registry, auxiliary markings, uses of postal cards and beginnings of home delivery are all discussed.

The book is divided into three major sections by eras, 1792-1840; 1841-1860; and 1861-1892. A compilation of Burlington postal markings is appended. This monograph reads well and is unexpectedly useful for other subjects than just Burlington postal history at times. And, it is a bargain price!

Richard B. Graham


## U.S. GOVERNMENT-AUTHORIZED PRIVATE MAIL SERVICE 1787-1800 PART I <br> ROBERT J. STETS

In the period following the United States Revolution, hardy pioneers and newly arrived immigrants looking for a new home pushed back the frontiers of the former colonies and settled in what was formerly wilderness or Indian country.

They were beyond the areas served by government posts, yet they wanted to maintain correspondence with their families along the Atlantic seaboard, or in Europe. To do this they had to rely on traveling friends, occasional passing traders, or sometimes a private post rider.

In this period after the Revolution, the U.S. Post Office did exactly what it now claims private posts would do if the government's postal monopoly were dissolved - it served only the heavily populated areas and left the sparsely populated areas to get along as best they could!

Congress looked upon the Post Office as a profit making enterprise that should pay its profits into the U.S. Treasury and thus help to reduce the war debt. Congress specifically restricted the Postmaster General (PMG) from setting up a postal route if he did not think it could at least pay for the cost of providing it. As a result, some areas of our young nation were nearly abandoned by the government posts. From about 1787 to about 1792, New York State, for example, had only one government-operated post office New York City! South Carolina had only two - Charleston and Georgetown. But tiny Delaware had three, Rhode Island had four and Connecticut had nine government-operated post offices!

To accommodate citizens in the more remote areas, in 1787 Congress gave the PMG authorization to contract for the carriage of the U.S. Mails to points beyond Congressionally authorized post roads so long as it did not result in an expense to the U.S. Government. This authorization was continued in succeeding "Post Office Laws".

In those early days, newspaper printers often hired young boys to distribute their papers, and sometimes such a printer would contract with the PMG to have his paperboys deliver the mail along with the newspapers. Owners of stagecoach lines, or those who wanted to start up a stagecoach line would contract to carry the mail for the postages collected along their route as a source of additional income. As part of the agreement, they were permitted to appoint postmasters at major towns along their route. Sometimes stagecoach operators carried personal correspondence in their stages without a contract with the PMG and as long as the road was not designated as a U.S. Post Road, it was perfectly legal. Then too, in certain areas, citizens would set up an "association" whereby each week one of the members was responsible to pick up the mails at the nearest post office and deliver it to all the members of the association.

Thus enterprising settlers in areas off the main post roads found various ways to maintain communication with the "civilized" areas.

It is impossible within the limits of this article to document all the non-U.S. government services that carried personal and business correspondence, but several types will be illustrated that will give a reasonable picture of those operations and perhaps explain that cover you found from an office that is not listed as operating at that date in current postal history references.

This information has been primarily located in the files at the National Archives where a huge 502 -volume file still exists which records many of the letters sent by the various Postmasters General from 1789 up to 1952.


Figure 1. U.S. POST OFFICES 1789 from Maine to Virginia.

## Setting The Scene

In 1789 , following the adoption of the Constitution, there were only thirteen states in the United States, stretching along the Atlantic seaboard. The U.S. Post Road extended from Wiscassett (District of Maine) to Savannah, Georgia with only a few cross posts, of which the post road from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh was the longest. Vermont was the Republic of Vermont until it joined the Union in 1791. Kentucky was the District of Kentucky (claimed by Virginia) until admitted as the fifteenth state in 1792. The area of Tennessee (early maps spelled it "Tennassee") was claimed by North Carolina until 1790 when it became the "Territory South of the River Ohio", and finally, the sixteenth state in 1796. The District of Maine was a part of Massachusetts until 1820.

An excellent report of this early period is found in The History of the United States Post Office to the Year 1829 prepared by Wesley Everett Rich as a part of the requirements for his doctorate degree at Harvard University in 1917 and first published by Harvard University Press in 1924. The publication was reprinted by Quarterman Publications, Inc. and can be found in many libraries. Dr. Rich provides an entertaining account of the early days of the U.S. Postal Service and frequently refers to the Letter Books of the Postmaster General.

On April 24, 1790, PMG Osgood made a report to Congress on the activities of the Post Office for the first three months under his administration, reporting a net loss of $\$ 34.84$ for the period. That report names 51 offices on the main north-south post road, and 24 offices on cross post roads, making the 75 offices frequently mentioned as the starting point of the U.S. Postal Service. But looking closer, Osgood's report also mentions a crossroad from Baltimore to Annapolis (Annapolis is not in the 75); a crossroad from Suffolk, Virginia to Portsmouth, Virginia (Portsmouth, Virginia is not in the 75); from New York City to Albany (Albany is not in the 75) and from Portsmouth, New Hampshire to Exeter and Concord (neither Exeter nor Concord is in the 75). So Osgood's report really lists 80 offices - not 75 ! Figures 1 and 2 show the locations of U.S. Post Offices operating in 1789. Albany is not shown because it was a "private" office at that time.

## Types of Private Posts

We can identify three types of private posts:

1. Those carried by an individual or group of individuals as indicated by the following examples from South Carolina:

Whereas this Province to the southward is pretty much settled, and no provision yet made for the certain and sure conveyance of Letters and Advices, a certain inhabitant of this Province offers himself to go once every week from Charles Town to Ashley Ferry, Dorchester, Stono and Pon Pon, and to carry any Letters and Paquets up and down, in case the inhabitants residing in those places that intend to reap the Benefit thereof, will subscribe a sum sufficient to make it worth his while.

Upwards of fifty Gentlemen at and about Pon Pon have agreed to send, each in his turn, a sufficient Boy and Horse to Charles Town with Letters, who is to carry back Gazettes, Letters, and other Papers, all of which are to be locked up in a proper Portmanteau, whereof one key will be kept at Jacksonboro by Mr. Samuel Davison, and the other by the Printer hereof.
The "Printer hereof" just happened to be Peter Timothy, at that time the U.S. Post Master of Charles Town (now Charleston, South Carolina).

These strictly private posts could, of course, charge whatever the operator wished to charge.
2. Posts operated by a local government.
a. The Republic of Vermont, beginning about 1784, set up its own postal service and established post offices at Bennington, Brattleboro, Newbury, Rutland and Windsor.
b. The State of New Hampshire established its own postal service as early as 1781. By 1791 nearly the entire state was covered by four riders serving eleven post offices.

Rates for these state posts were set by the individual state.
3. Government-authorized Private Posts.

These posts operated under contract with the PMG and were permitted to carry the U.S. mails at rates not exceeding those set by Congress. Most were permitted to retain all postages collected at post offices along the route, though some had special provisions for compensation specified in their contract. Each route was designated as an official U.S. post road and the contractor received the exclusive right to carry the U.S. Mails for a period of two to eight years. In addition, the contractor was given the authority to set up post offices along the route and to name the postmasters at those offices. Post offices on these "private" roads were really a part of the U.S. postal system. In 1789, in addition to the 80 post offices named in PMG Osgood's report, there were at least six additional "private" offices that handled the U.S. mails, making a total of 86 offices in the system, not 75. The six offices (as we shall see in later installments) were Claverack, Clermont, Kinderhook, Livingston's Manor, Poughkeepsie and Rhinebeck on the New York City-Albany route, and Marblehead in Massachusetts.

In succeeding installments we shall discuss state by state these "private" offices which handled the U.S. mails.
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## THE PRESTAMP \& STAMPLESS PERIOD FRANK MANDEL, Editor

## "HOMEMADE" 40 CENT INTEGRAL RATING MARKING: A SMALL TALE OF EAST AND WEST

FRANK MANDEL

The acquisition of vast territories in the West as a result of the Mexican War resulted in new rates covering mail to and from those distant points. Section 7 of the Act of March 3,1847 established a 40 cent rate "to or from any other place on the Pacific", such as Astoria, Oregon, and this rate was augmented by Section 3 of the Act of August 14, 1848 which authorized the Postmaster General "to establish a post office at San Diego, Monterey, San Francisco, and other places on the Pacific, from or to any place on the Atlantic, to be charged 40 cents postage; all letters conveyed from one to any other said places on the Pacific, $121 / 2$ cents." These high rates remained in effect until the dramatic rate reductions under the Act of March 3, 1851, effective July 2, 1851. This was a period of four years and included the early phase of the great Gold Rush of 1849 which generated a huge volume of mail between the coasts.

This correspondence theoretically embraced every post office then established in the United States. In actuality, the number of different offices showing these higher rates is surprisingly small. I would guess that 300 or 400 could be documented in a survey of major collections and auction catalogs. Of these, the majority are manuscript rating marks. Even larger offices, such as St. Louis, Missouri and Savannah, Georgia, sometimes used manuscript 40s when the need arose. On the other hand, a few smaller offices, such as Brookville, Maryland and Bristol, Rhode Island, sometimes used handstamp " 40 " rate markings. Most of the offices using such handstamp markings were the larger offices such as the port cities: Boston, New York, New Orleans and San Francisco.

About the time that these higher rates went into effect, a new style of circular date stamp appeared. The handstamp in addition to showing the date (day/month) also included the rate. I have speculated that this new style with an 'integral rate' came into existence as a result of the release of the first general issue postage stamps in July, 1847. The integral rate was a convenience feature. It combined two types of markings into one, and in many


Figure 1. Culloma, Alta California circular datestamp with integral " $\mathbf{4 0}$ " rate $\mathbf{( 3 1 m m}$ ) used on brown envelope to Athens, New York. Undated, but probably November 13, 1850. Note that part of the lettering in "ALTA CAL" has been trimmed away to provide for the large rate numeral. Sent collect. (Photo courtesy of David L. Jarrett)
instances the handstamp was sufficient to rate stampless letters, especially if unpaid (collect). Also these handstamps were used in many places to cancel the new adhesive stamps, even though such use was a technical violation of Post Office Regulations.

In a few larger offices the integral rate handstamps included the 40 cent coast-tocoast rate: New York City, San Francisco, Sacramento, Stockton, and Marysville, California, being notable examples. Figure 1 illustrates the scarcer "Culloma, Alta Cal" with large integral " 40 ". Culloma (or Coloma) was then an important post office of El Dorado County, situated on the left bank of the South Fork of the American River, on the road from Sacramento to Nevada City, California, not far from Sutter's Mill where the first discovery of gold was made. Its gross receipts in 1851 were greater than $\$ 7,000$.


Figure 2. Red Burlington, Vermont circular datestamp with " 40 " added in dark blue manuscript ( 33 mm ) on 11 November 1850 folded letter to San Francisco. Like many large offices, Burlington does not seem to have used handstamp " 40 " rates on mail to the Pacific coast. They did, however, create an unusual "integral" rate. (Photo courtesy of David L. Jarrett)

By comparison, the gross receipts at Burlington, Vermont, a much older and well established post office, but not having the benefit of being in the middle of a gold rush, were a very respectable $\$ 5,244$ in 1851. The American Stampless Cover Catalog indicates this office used the following integral rate markings: " 5 " (1850-1852), " 3 " (1851) and " 3 PAID" (1854). There is no indication in ASCC nor have I recorded the use by Burlington of a handstamp " 40 ", integral or otherwise. Burlington was not to be denied, however. Figure 2 illustrates a November 11, 1850, folded letter from Burlington to San Francisco, a pious letter from father to son ("All the gold in a hundred Californias would be no equivalent for such a family as the goodness of God has granted to me..."), with a bright red circular datestamp and a dark blue " 40 " added in manuscript, precisely where one would expect to see an integral rate. The pious New England father sent his letter collect to his gold-seeking California son. The thrifty Burlington, Vermont Post Office was not about to spend the money (about $\$ 1.00$ ) to adapt their circular datestamp to include a handstamp 40 cent rate, but do you think they were going to be shown up by nasty little mud holes like Culloma (or Coloma), California? No way!

I hope to have more to say on the subject of 40 cent rate covers and markings in future editions of the Chronicle. Do you have any unusual examples of these interesting and scarce uses? I would be very pleased to provide you with a showcase.

## U.S. CARRIERS

ROBERT B. MEYERSBURG, Editor

## 1847 POSTAGE STAMPS USED IN COMBINATION WITH CARRIER AND LOCAL ADHESIVES ROBERT B. MEYERSBURG

(Continued from Chronicle 153:14)
Bouton's City Dispatch Post New York, N.Y.
$18 \mathrm{~L} 1+5 \notin 1847$ : four covers. (Figure 28).


Figure 28. Bouton's City Dispatch 2¢ black on cover to Albany, New York.
$18 \mathrm{~L} 1+10 ¢ 1847$ : one cover, Sept. 18,1848 , to Ithaca, N.Y.
Bouton handstamp $+5 ¢$ 1847: one cover, Nov. 20, 1848, to Boston.
$18 \mathrm{~L} 2+5 \notin 1847$ : one cover, Sep. 9, no year date, to New Rochelle, N.Y.

## Boyd's City Express

## New York, N.Y.

$20 \mathrm{~L} 4+5 \not$ 1847: eleven covers. (Figure 29).


Figure 29. Boyd's City Express 2c black on green on cover to Connecticut.
$20 \mathrm{~L} 7+5 \notin 1847$ : thirteen covers.
$20 L 7+2$ X5 $¢$ 1847: one cover, Jan. 27, 1849, cut to shape, to New York state. $20 \mathrm{~L} 7+10 \notin 1847$ : one cover, March 24, 1851, to Illinois.


Figure 30. G. Carter's Dispatch 2¢ black used to New York City.

## G. Carter's Despatch Philadelphia, Pa.

$36 \mathrm{~L} 1+5 \not+1847$ : three covers. (Figure 30).

> City Despatch Post New York, N.Y.
$40 \mathrm{~L} 2+10 \notin 1847$ : one cover, May 7 (no year date), to Farmington, Me.

> Dupuy \& Schenck New York, N.Y.
$60 \mathrm{~L} 2+5 \not \subset 1847$ : one cover, to Washington, D.C.


Figure 31. Eagle City Post 2¢ black on cover to Pennsylvania.

## Eagle City Post <br> Philadelphia, Pa.

$61 \mathrm{~L} 2+5 \not \subset 1847$ : one cover, March 3, 1849, to Carlisle, Pa. (Figure 31).
$61 \mathrm{~L} 3+5 \nmid$ 1847: one cover, July 25, 1850, to Providence, R.I.

Frazer \& Co.
Cincinnati, Ohio
$69 \mathrm{~L} 7+10 \propto 1847$ : one cover, April 24 (no year date) to New York.


Figure 32. Hall \& Mills Dispatch 2ç black on green on cover to Massachusetts.
Hall \& Mills' Despatch Post
New York, N.Y.
$76 \mathrm{~L} 1+5 \not \subset 1847$ : one cover, Oct. 5, 1847, to Newbury Port, Mass. (Figure 32).


Figure 33. Messenkope's Union Square 1c black on green, glazed, to Massachusetts.

## Messenkope's Union Square Post Office <br> New York, N.Y.

$106 \mathrm{~L} 1+5 \notin$ 1847: nine covers. (Figure 33).
106L1 + 2X5¢ 1847: two covers, Nov. 10, 1849, to Trenton, N.J.; Nov. 6 (no year date) cut to shape, to Chicago.
$106 \mathrm{~L} 2+2$ X5 4 1847: one cover, to Saratoga, N.Y.
G.A. Mills' Despatch Post

New York, N.Y.
$109 \mathrm{~L} 1+5 \not+1847$ : three covers.
109L1 + 10\& 1847: one cover.

## Stringer \& Morton's City Despatch Baltimore, Md.

$134 \mathrm{~L} 1+5 \not \subset 1847$ : one cover to Easton, Md.
134 L1 + 2X5 $\ddagger$ 1847: Oct. 21 (or 24), 1850, with pair of $5 \notin$ to Monson, Mass.

## Swarts' City Dispatch Post

 New York, N.Y.136L1 + 5ф 1847: one cover, June 12, 1849, to New London, Conn.
136 L2 + 5¢ 1847: one cover, June 12, 1849, to Burlington, N.J.
$136 \mathrm{~L} 4+5 \nmid$ 1847: two covers: Oct. 9, 1850, to Port Chester, N.Y.; Jan. 27 (no year date) to Washington, D.C.
$136 \mathrm{~L} 7+10 \notin 1847$ : one cover, April 1, 1849, to Drakestown, N.J.


Figure 34. Bouton's stamp with red manuscript "Swarts" at top, 2¢ black on gray blue to Baltimore.

136L13 $+5 \not \subset 1847$ : two covers. (Figure 34).
$136 \mathrm{~L} 13+2$ X $5 \not \subset 1847$ : one cover, Nov. 5,1849 , with pair of $5 \not \subset$ to Peoria Co., Ill.


Figure 35. Swarts City Dispatch handstamp on cover to Philadelphia.
Various Swarts handstamps $+5 \not \subset 1847$ : fourteen covers. (Figures $35 \& 36$ ).


Figure 36. Swarts B Post Office Chatham Square handstamp on cover to Pennsylvania. Swarts handstamp +2 X5 $¢$ 1847: one cover, Feb. 12 (no year date) to Port Chester, N.Y. Swarts handstamp $+10 \notin 1847$ : two covers: March 7, 1848, to Remsen, N.Y.; May 30 (no year date) to Philadelphia.

> Telegraph Despatch P.O.
> Philadelphia, Pa.

138L2 + 5¢ 1847: one cover to Middletown, Conn.


Figure 37. Dunham's Union Square handstamp on cover to Connecticut.
Dunham's Post Office
New York, N.Y.
Dunham's Union Square Post Office handstamp +5¢ 1847: two covers. (Figure 37).
Stait's Despatch Post
Philadelphia, Pa.
Stait's Despatch Post handstamp $+5 \not \subset 1847$, one cover.
Kenyon's Letter Office
New York, N.Y.
Kenyon's Letter Office handstamp $+5 \notin 1847$ : one cover, June 23, 1849, to Philadelphia. Harnden's handstamp $+5 \not \subset 1847$ : Sept. 12 (no year date) to Lenox, Mass.

Although this accounting records over three hundred covers, it is obviously not complete; but it does tend to revise the view that 1847 combination covers are extremely rare. Certain combinations are excessively rare, some unique, but the genre indicates quite a wide use of collection and delivery services during the life of the 1847 postal series.


## PHOTO CATALOG

My new net price catalog featuring hundreds of used $19^{\text {th }}$ Century stamps and covers will be available in December. Postal History, fancy cancels, choice stamps, markings and foreign destinations are included. All lots are photographed with a few in color. Reserve your copy now. Price \$5.

## Steven Hines

P.O. Box 422

Monee, Ill. 60449
(708) 534-1023


## PLATING CORRECTION: $3 R U=4 R S!$ ROBERT R. HEGLAND

New multiples from the distinctive stamps printed in the top rows of Scott \#26 (which bears the Classics Society designation of S5) are still being discovered. These usually add to our knowledge about the plating of those top row stamps from the A Relief with the damaged transfer by confirming what former students have discovered. It is unusual that we find an item that corrects prior plating. Figure 1 shows such a piece. The position with the recut inner right frame line has long been identified as being the third stamp from the right pane of Plate U (3RU). The discussion of this and a related piece will show that this stamp is not from Plate $U$ but rather from Plate $S$ and that it is not from Position 3 Right but from Position 4 Right. This major variety of S5 is not from Position 3RU but from Position 4RS.


Figure 1. A strip of 4 from the top row of the plate, evidenced by the damaged transfer above the lower left rosette. The first stamp shows a double transfer to the NE. The third stamp shows the recut inner right frame line.

The third stamp in figure 1 shows the "Q Recut." ${ }^{\text {" }}$ Figure 2 shows an enlargement of that recut from a different copy of that position. There is no other S5 that has a recut inner frame line on either the right or the left side. The Q Recut has been known for many years. The first indication in print of the relationship of this $Q$ Recut to Plate $\mathrm{U}^{2}$ that this collec-

1. During the many years that Dr. Carroll Chase was plating the S5, he identified the significant varieties with an alphabetic or numeric designation. Unplated top row stamps were identified by a "T" number (such as T106); unplated double transfers were identified by an alphabetic character and a number (such as E3); and recut inner lines were identified by an alphabetic character. When he first saw the stamp pictured in Figure 2, he had seen 16 different recut inner lines from S4 (Scott 26a) and designated them as Recuts A through P. When he saw this recut inner line, he identified it as "Recut Q". He subsequently found four additional recut inner lines on S4 but no other such recuts on S5. Over the years he was able to identify the plate and position from which most of these varieties came. We still, however, find copies with only his original designation.
2. Such an identification of a plate is based upon students finding a single stamp with a center line that did not match any other such copies. They identified it with an alphabetic designation until it could be related to a plate number. After an item was given such an identification, other identical stamps could be identified and pairs that contained a stamp with the center line could be used to reconstruct the adjacent copies. The top row copies that are related to a plate with such an alphabetic character have yet to have those top row reconstructions tied by plated copies to an imprint that includes a plate number.


Figure 2. An enlargement of the recut inner right frame line. This is the only position on any of the $\mathbf{S 5}$ (Scott 26) that shows a recut inner frame line.
tor has found was in the May, 1966, issue of the Chronicle. ${ }^{3}$
The appearance of the strip seems to confirm that the Q Recut is from Position 3R since stamps adjacent to the center lines were often cut in a way similar to the stamp at the left side of the strip. The recut inner line is the third stamp of the strip so the logical conclusion would be that the strip is $1-4 R U$ based on past published information.

The value of the pictured strip is greatly enhanced by its relationship to the pair pictured in Figure 3. This pair was provided to this collector by a fellow student who has been supporting my studies of the top rows of S5.

The stamp at the left of the strip and the stamp to the right of the pair are obviously identical double transfers and match the Chase designated E3. When overlapped, the pair and the strip represent a continuous strip of 5 stamps. The center line shown on the pair is that which has, for a long period of time, been assigned to Plate S. The center line of Plate U is quite different and cannot be confused with that from Plate S . Past research on Plate S has identified 1RS as being T106 and 2RS as being the double transfer E3. The top row reconstructions that I acquired from Tracy Simpson clearly show that the identification of $1,2 \mathrm{RU}$ was from a pair. His notes show that $3,4,5,6,7 \mathrm{RU}$ were from a strip. There is no indication in Tracy's notes, however, that 2RU and 3RU had been proven to be adjacent by a pair that showed that the stamp identified as $2 R U$ was actually adjacent to the stamp identified as $3 R \mathrm{R}$.

[^1]

Figure 3. A pair from the top row that shows the center line. The center line is from Plate $\mathbf{S}$ and the second stamp shows a double transfer to the NE. This double transfer exactly matches the double transfer on the strip in Figure 1. Thus, they were printed from the same position on the plate.

The evidence provided by the strip pictured in Figure 1 and the pair pictured in Figure 3 shows that the Q Recut is neither from Position 3R nor from Plate U. The Q Recut, which was known as 3 RU , must now be recognized as being 4 RS .

The plating of E3 being the identical position on both the strip and the pair and the plating of the center line being from Plate $S$ has been checked and substantiated by Tom Alexander. That the center line is from Plate $S$ has also been confirmed by Sam Dershowitz who has pioneered the plating of center line copies. The fact that both of the double transfers are, indeed, E3 has been confirmed by Philip Rose. This new evidence shows that the previous identification of $3 R \mathrm{R}$ as the Q Recut must have been tentative plating based on the character of the recuttings, the color of inks, a fragment from an adjacent stamp, or the known periods of use. All of these can be valuable as tentative plating aids but cannot be taken as final evidence. Evidently this type of evidence was used in placing what was known as 3 RU next to 2 RU with no confirming pair as evidence.

There are very few assumptions that have been made by past students that have been proven to be wrong. The accepted facts, however, must constantly be questioned and challenged by looking for new key pieces to either confirm or correct past platings. Certainly the vast majority of the work done by our serious students will be re-proved. The process of re-proving such work is, in itself, of value. When colleagues send me top row material to verify, I make a note of the fact that any multiples match the singles that are included in my reference collection.

This type of research and the chance to advance the knowledge about the platings of these positions would not be possible without the generosity and the sharing of material provided by students such as Tom Alexander, Wheeler Bowen, Bill Hatton, Bill McDaniel, and KG Taira. Many others have also allowed me to purchase pairs and strips from the S5 top rows and I also thank them for their support in helping with this continuing plating challenge.

The photographs of these items were made possible through the courtesy of E. Fritz and KG Taira.

A group of about 30 students interested in the 3 Cent 1857 Perforated issues has recently been formed to exchange information and ideas before that information is sufficiently comprehensive to be published in the Chronicle. We have found that we need to share our resources. We have been publishing a newsletter and welcome any other students who are interested in joining this research effort. If you share that interest, please write to this collector,
P. O. Box 1011, Falls Church, VA 22041.

## COMPROMISE OF 1850 ILLUSTRATED COVER JAMES W. MILGRAM, M.D.



Figure 1. Washington, D.C. August 10, 1861.
In a recent auction a very unusual cover, to my knowledge not previously described, was offered. This was the legal-size white envelope bearing two copies of the three cent 1857 series stamp tied "WASHINGTON D.C. AUG 10, 1861 " reproduced in Figure 1. There is a black and white illustration of famous Americans with the simple caption "UNION" underneath the picture. What impressed me was the fact that the viewer could identify well-known faces in the illustration. This is the only illustrated cover showing a large group of identifiable famous Americans. The design, Figure 2, appeared to be a reproduction of a painting made before 1855 . That turns out to be the correct analysis of this cover.


Figure 2. Enlargement of Figure 1.

The original painting, now owned by an unknown private collector, was done by Tompkins Harrison Matteson, a historical and genre painter from New York state. He did his best work in the decade after 1840 including "Washington's Inaugural" and "The First Sabbath of the Pilgrims". He continued painting until his death in 1884. This painting is called "The Compromise of 1850 ", also known as "Union".

In 1852, Henry S. Sadd, a mezzotint engraver, produced the best known reproduction of the painting which is shown in Figure 3. This mezzotint was called "Union". It can be seen by comparing Figure 2 to Figure 3 that the cover was a copy of the mezzotint with but slight changes, such as the bust of George Washington. The mezzotint was published by William Pate of New York. There is an illustrated key to the people in the print which I will not illustrate, but it is possible to identify everybody in the picture.


A PREWAR PRINI WTIHJOHN C : पLIHO
Figure 3. 1852 Henry S. Sadd print.

The three most important personages are Henry Clay, seated in the center, who has been called "the Great Compromiser" because of his role in the Compromise of 1850, the long-haired John C. Calhoun, who is to Clay's right, and Daniel Webster, who stands to the right of Washington's bust. The other prominent person is Winfield Scott, seated in uniform at left, who in 1852 was the Whig Presidential candidate. His prominence in the picture suggests a political purpose in the issuance of the print as well as the original painting.

Next to Clay holding a white paper which reads "Protest, Quintuple Treaty" is Lewis Cass, former Democratic Presidential candidate in 1848 and a prominent supporter of the Compromise of 1850 . It was Cass who enunciated the doctrine of popular sovereignty, namely, that the people of the territories should decide for themselves whether or not they would allow slavery, a principle involved in the Kansas-Nebraska Bill of 1854.

Standing from far left are four other men, Howell Cobb of Georgia, James McDowell, Thomas Hart Benton, the famous Missouri senator, and John Middleton Clayton.

Between Calhoun and Webster are three men with James Buchanan, 15th President of the United States, in the center. Thomas Corwin is to Buchanan's left and Stephen A. Douglas, the Illinois senator, is to his right. Behind them are two others, Willie P. Mangum to the left and William R. King.

Behind the shield at the far right is Millard Fillmore, 13th President, who ran as a "Know-Nothing" in the 1856 Presidential campaign. To the right of Webster and behind Fillmore are John J. Crittenden, Sam Houston, and Henry S. Foote. Behind them from left to right are Daniel S. Dickenson, John McLean, John Bell and John C. Fremont, the latter two running for President in 1856 (Fremont) and 1860 (Bell).

But the story does not stop here. In 1861 the original 1852 Sadd print was modified by portraits of pro-Union public figures. The 1861 print is shown in Figure 4. Abraham Lincoln has replaced John C. Calhoun in the center of the picture. Edward Everett has replaced Howell Cobb, who became a prominent Confederate statesman, at the far left. Willie P. Mangum and William R. King have been replaced by William H. Seward and General Benjamin F. Butler (under angel's arm). Robert Anderson, the hero of Fort Sumter, has replaced Buchanan (behind Washington's bust). This suggests that the second state of Sadd's engraving was issued shortly after mid-April, 1861, although Lincoln had grown a beard by then. There is a third edition of the engraving showing Lincoln bearded that is thought to have been issued after Lincoln's assassination in 1865.

. BECOMES A PRINT WITH ABRAHAM LINCOLN
Figure 4. 1861 modified print with pro-Union public figures.
This brings us back to the envelope which depicts the original 1852 engraving. Although the usage in 1861 is clearly intended to express a patriotic support of the Union, I believe there is considerable doubt as to whether the envelope itself was produced in 1861. After all it would have been much more appropriate to have copied the second state of the engraving for a patriotic envelope. It is pretty certain that the engraving was made in late April or May of 1861 before the August postal usage. No Union patriotic stationery is known to exist before April 1861.

I would suggest that this is an 1852 Presidential campaign envelope for Winfield Scott which someone had around and used in 1861. That would explain its rarity because little Scott campaign stationery was generated. Of course, if some reader can show me another example used during the Civil War period, that would lend more credence to the envelope being a patriotic cover design, but I do not think it was one.

The large size of the envelope was necessary to reproduce an image that could be seen readily. This too could account for rarity of either an 1852 or 1861 date of production. The only legal-size patriotic covers are Charles Magnus' "Panorama of Washington" which was sold with a three foot illustrated enclosure, the Max Rosenthal camp scene series, and a few patriotic corner card envelopes for state offices or specific military units. There were many large Union patriotic lettersheets produced by various publishers, but these were generally folded to fit into standard envelopes when they were mailed, even the double paged sheets. The same is true of Confederate patriotic lettersheets, many of which were printed on large sheets of paper.

## REFERENCES

1. Dictionary of American Biography.
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3. H. Holzer, G.S. Boritt, and M.E. Neely Jr., The Lincoln Image.
4. James W. Milgram, Presidential Campaign Stationery 1840-1872.
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## Bakers' United States Classics

> The columns of Hugh and David Baker from Stamps (1962-69), reset in a pleasing typeface in $81 / 2 \times 11$ format matching Simpson's USPM

- Over 350 pages, hardbound
- Over 350 illustrations, including 200 cover photos, many from the Bakers' own collections
- Introduction and index
- Marginal notes updating references and correcting details
$\$ 35.00$ postpaid
Checks to USPCS

ORDER FROM

Richard B. Graham, Chairman Publications Com. P.O. Box 14338, Columbus, Ohio 43214

# THE U.S. THREE CENT POSTAGE STAMPS OF 1851-57 A COMPILATION OF RECUT AND PLATE VARIETIES <br> (Revised Edition) <br> WILLIAM K. McDANIEL <br> (Continued from Chronicle 155:180) 

## THE THIRTY-EIGHT MAJOR RECUT VARIETIES

1. Two inner lines.
2. No inner lines.
3. Inner line at right side only.
4. Inner line at left side only.
5. Right frame line takes place of the right inner line.
6. Two extra lines at left; Right frame line takes place of inner line.
7. Frame line takes place of left inner line.
8. One extra line at right (two inner lines).
9. One extra line at left. Right frame line takes place of inner line.
10. One extra line at right (no inner lines).
11. One vertical line recut in the upper left triangle.
12. Two vertical lines recut in the upper left triangle.
13. Three vertical lines recut in the upper left triangle.
14. Five vertical lines recut in the upper left triangle.
15. One vertical line recut in the upper right triangle.
16. One vertical line recut in the lower left triangle.
17. One vertical line recut in the lower right triangle.
18. Two vertical lines recut in the lower right triangle.
19. Recut bust and medallion circle.
20. Recut toga button.
21. Two horizontal lines recut at top of upper right diamond block.
22. One horizontal line recut at bottom of lower left diamond block.
23. Left inner line runs up too far.
24. Left inner line runs down too far.
25. Right inner line runs down too far.
26. Vertical line ties upper left corner of upper left diamond block to top frame line.
27. Top label and upper right diamond block joined at top.
28. Top label and upper left diamond block joined at top,
29. Bottom label and lower right diamond block joined at bottom.
30. Horizontal line ties top of upper label to upper right diamond block, and extends out to right frame line.
31. Top label and upper right diamond block joined at top and bottom.
32. Horizontal line joins upper right diamond block to right frame line.
33. Horizontal line ties top of upper right diamond block top of upper left diamond block of adjacent stamp at right.
34. Diagonal line runs from upper right corner of top label across diamond block, extending nearly to right frame line.
35. Lower label and lower right diamond block joined at top.
36. Lower label and lower right diamond block joined at top and bottom.
37. One horizontal line recut at top of upper left diamond block.
38. Vertical line recut along upper left side of upper left diamond block.


Figure 1. Illustration of the $\mathbf{3}$ cent stamp design used to point out the location of the various parts of the stamp design referred to in the text.
RECUT COMBINATIONSRECUT COMBINATIONS ON STAMPS HAVING TWO INNER LINES ANDONE VERTICAL LINE RECUT IN THE UPPER LEFT TRIANGLE
Combination Description ..... Total
1+11+8:One extra line at right1
Plate 3 ..... 88L ..... 1
1+11+15: One line recut in upper right triangle ..... 2
Plate 0 68,70L ..... 2
1+11+16: One line recut in lower left triangle ..... 13
Plate 3 13,26,41-43,84R ..... 6
Plate 0 52,58,82,90,91L; 28,98R ..... 7
$1+11+16+17$ : One line recut in lower left and lower right triangles ..... 1
Plate 1 L ..... 49 ..... 1
1+11+16+17+23: One line recut in lower left and lower right triangles; ..... 1
Left inner line up too far95R1
Plate 3One line recut in lower left triangle;2Left inner line up too far66L; 5R2
Plate 1L
1+11+16+24: One line recut in lower left triangle; ..... 1
Left inner line down too far
Plate 1L ..... 85L ..... 1
1+11+16+25: One line recut in lower left triangle; ..... 1
Right inner line down too far
Plate 0 98L ..... 1
1+11+17: One line recut in lower right triangle ..... 15
Plate 2E $\quad 50,87 \mathrm{R}$ ..... 2
Plate 2L $\quad 50,87 \mathrm{R}$ ..... 2
Plate 3 61,62,82,91R ..... 4
Plate 5E $\quad 47,48,68 \mathrm{~L}$ ..... 3
Plate 0 30,89L; 41,81R ..... 4
1+11+17+23: One line recut in lower right triangle; ..... 1
Left inner line up too far
Plate 1L 94R ..... 1
1+11+21: Two horizontal lines recut above upper right diamond block ..... 1
Plate 1E 66R ..... 1
1+11+23: Left inner line up too far ..... 21
Plate 1E $\quad 71 \mathrm{~L}$ ..... 1
Plate 1i 71L ..... 1
Plate 1L 78,98L; 4,50,53,56,81,95R ..... 8
Plate 2E $\quad 59,80 \mathrm{~L}$ ..... 2
Plate 2L 80L ..... 1
Plate $3 \quad$ 22,24,37,52,68,83,89R ..... 7
Plate $0 \quad$ 24L ..... 1
1+11+23+25: Left inner line up too far; Right inner line down too far ..... 2
Plate 1L 67,68L ..... 2
1+11+24: Left inner line down too far ..... 1
Plate 1E $\quad 84 \mathrm{~L}$ ..... 1
1+11+25: $\quad$ Right inner line down too far ..... 6
Plate 1L 94L ..... 1
Plate 2E $\quad$ 87L; 62,65R ..... 3
Plate 2L $\quad 62,65 \mathrm{R}$ ..... 2
1+11+26: Upper left corner of upper left diamond block joins left ..... 2end of top frame line
Plate 2E $\quad 45 \mathrm{R}$ ..... 1
Plate 2L 45R ..... 1
1+11+27: Top label and upper right diamond block joined at top ..... 5
Plate 1L 96L ..... 1
Plate 2E 48,52L ..... 2
Plate 2L 48,52L ..... 2
1+11+30: Line ties top label to top of upper right diamond block ..... 2and extends out to right frame line
Plate 2E 19L ..... 1
Plate 2L 19L ..... 1
1+11+32: Line connects upper right diamond block to right frame line ..... 2
Plate $3 \quad 83 \mathrm{~L}$ ..... 1
Plate 0 14L ..... 1
1+11+33: Line ties top of upper right diamond block to upper left ..... 2 diamond block of next stamp
Plate $0 \quad 95 \& 96 \mathrm{R}$ (Both stamps needed to show complete recut) ..... 2
1+11+37: One horizontal line recut at top of upper left diamond block ..... 3
Plate 1L 14 L ..... 1
Plate 2E $\quad 58,60 \mathrm{R}$ ..... 2
RECUT COMBINATIONS ON STAMPS HAVING TWO INNER LINES AND TWO VERTICAL LINES RECUT IN THE UPPER LEFT TRIANGLE
1+12+15: One line recut in upper right triangle ..... 1
Plate 2E 82L ..... 1
1+12+16: One line recut in lower left triangle ..... 3
Plate 1L 9L ..... 1
Plate 2E 94L ..... 1
Plate $0 \quad 92 \mathrm{~L}$ ..... 1
1+12+17: One line recut in lower right triangle ..... 5
Plate 2E 20R ..... 1
Plate 2L 20R ..... 1
Plate 3 65R ..... 1
Plate 0 67L; 29R ..... 2
1+12+17+24+25: One line recut in lower right triangle; ..... 1Both inner lines down too far
Plate 0 45L ..... 1
1+12+17+29: One line recut in lower right triangle; Bottom label and ..... 1 lower right diamond block joined at bottom
Plate 0 62L ..... 1
1+12+23: Left inner line up too far ..... 1
Plate 1L 75R ..... 1
$1+12+23+24: \quad$ Left inner line runs up and down too far ..... 1
Plate 0 93L ..... 1
1+12+24: Left inner line runs down too far ..... 2
Plate 1E 28L ..... 1
Plate 1i 28L ..... 1
1+12+24+25: Both inner lines run down too far ..... 1
Plate 0 87L ..... 1
1+12+25: Right inner line runs down too far ..... 1
Plate 2E 25R ..... 1
1+12+25+27: Right inner line runs down too far; Top label \& upper right ..... 1diamond block joined at top
Plate 2E 84L ..... 1
$1+12+25+28: \quad$ Right inner line runs down too far; Top label and upper ..... 1
left diamond block joined at top
Plate 2E 100R ..... 1
1+12+27: Top label and upper right diamond block joined at top ..... 2
Plate 2E 44L ..... 1
Plate 2L 84L ..... 1
1+12+28: $\quad$ Top label \& upper left diamond block joined at top ..... 1
Plate 2L 100R ..... 1
1+12+30: Line ties top of upper label to upper right diamond block ..... 1and extends out to right frame line
Plate 2L 7R ..... 1
RECUT COMBINATIONS ON STAMPS WITH TWO INNER LINES AND THREE VERTICAL LINES IN THE UPPER LEFT TRIANGLE
1+13+16: One line recut in lower left triangle ..... 1
Plate 3 ..... 82L ..... 1
1+13+17: One line recut in lower right triangle ..... 1
Plate 0 ..... 29L ..... 1
1+13+23+24: Left inner line runs both up and down too far ..... 2
Plate 2E ..... 98L ..... 1
Plate 2L 98L ..... 1
1+13+25: Right inner line runs down too far ..... 1
Plate 1L ..... 27R ..... 1
1+13+27: Top label and upper right diamond block joined at top ..... 2
Plate 2E 66R ..... 1
Plate 2L *66R Note: See "Inconsistent Varieties". ..... 1
1+13+38: Vertical line recut at left side of upper left diamond block ..... 1
Plate 2E ..... 24L ..... 1
MISCELLANEOUS RECUT COMBINATIONS ON STAMPS WITH TWO INNER LINES
$1+14+15+17 \quad$ Five lines recut in upper left triangle; One line recut ..... 1
+23+37: in upper right triangle; One line recut in lower right triangle; Left inner line up too far; Horizontal line recut at top of upper left diamond block
Plate 0 47L ..... 1
1+15+23: One line recut in upper right triangle; ..... 1
Left inner line runs up too far
Plate 0 21L ..... 1
1+16+17: One line recut in lower left and lower right triangles ..... 1
Plate 3 ..... 32R ..... 1
1+16+17+27: One line recut in lower left and lower right triangles; ..... 1
Top label and upper right diamond block joined
Plate 0 37L ..... 1
1+16+23: One line recut in lower left triangle; ..... 2
Left inner line up too far
Plate 1L 52L; 76R ..... 2
1+16+25: One line recut in lower left triangle; ..... 1
Right inner line runs down too far
Plate 1L 47L ..... 1
1+17+23: One line recut in lower right triangle; ..... 1Left inner line runs up too far
Plate 0 35L ..... 1
1+23+24: Left inner line runs both up and down too far ..... 4
Plate 2E ..... 58L ..... 1
Plate 2L 58,92L ..... 2
Plate 3 77L ..... 1
1+23+25: Left inner line runs up too far; ..... 2Right inner line runs down too far
Plate 1L 18,68L ..... 2
1+23+27: Left inner line runs up too far; Top label and ..... 1right diamond block joined at top
Plate 0 7L ..... 1
$1+23+28+29$ : Left inner line runs up too far; Top label and upper left ..... 1diamond block joined at top; Lower label and lower rightdiamond block joined at bottom
Plate 1L 14R ..... 1
1+23+29: Left inner line runs up too far; Lower label and lower ..... 1right diamond block joined at bottom
Plate 3 52L ..... 1
$1+24+25$ Both inner lines run down too far ..... 1
Plate 1L 22R ..... 1
1+25+28: $\quad$ Right inner line runs down too far; Top label \& upper left ..... 1
diamond block joined at topNote: The line connecting the label to the diamond block maybe broken, changing the combination to $1+25+37$, noted below.
Plate 1L ..... 79L ..... 1
1+25+37: $\quad$ Right inner line runs down too far; Horizontal line recut ..... 1
at top of upper left diamond block
Plate 1L 79 L (See comments on combination $1+25+28$ ) ..... 1
1+28+30: Top label joined to both diamond blocks; ..... 2Line at right extends across to right frame line
Plate 2E ..... 6R ..... 1
Plate 2L 6R ..... 1
1+30+33: Line ties top of upper label to upper right diamond block ..... 1and extends out to right frame line
Plate 2E 99R ..... 1
MISCELLANEOUS RECUT COMBINATIONS ON STAMPS WITH NO INNER LINES OR ONE INNER LINE ONLY, AT RIGHT OR LEFT
2+11+15: One line recut in upper left triangle; ..... 1One line recut in upper right triangle
Plate 1E 42R ..... 1
2+11+21: One line recut in upper left triangle; ..... 2Two horizontal lines recut at top of upper right diamond block
Plate 1E 21,27R ..... 2
2+15: One line recut in upper right triangle ..... 1
Plate 1E ..... 82R ..... 1
2+16: One line recut in lower left triangle ..... 1
Plate 1E ..... 53R ..... 1
$2+21$ : Two horizontal lines recut at top of upper right diamond block ..... 7
Plate 1E 23,25,26,27,29,30R ..... 6
Plate 1i 30R ..... 1
2+30+31: Top label and upper right diamond block ..... 1joined at top and bottom, with upper lineextending out to right frame line
Plate 4 ..... 68R ..... 1
3+11: Inner line at right only; One line recut in upper left triangle ..... 8
Plate 1E 46,47,65,69R ..... 4
Plate 1i Same as Plate 1E ..... 4
3+12: Inner line at right only; Two lines recut in upper left triangle ..... 4
Plate 1E
Plate 49,87R ..... 2
Plate 1i Same as Plate 1E ..... 2
4+11: Inner line at left only; One line recut in upper left triangle ..... 6Plate 1E
61,63,81R ..... 3
Plate 1i Same as Plate 1E ..... 3

Total number of multiple recut varieties: 67

$$
\text { Total number of recorded multiple recut positions: } 170
$$

(To be continued in Issue 157)

> Paper Restoration and Conservation
> Professional repair and improvement of philatelic material.
> - removal of stains, soiling and foxing •
> - tear repair • deacidification •
> - missing paper restored •

All work performed with the highest degree of integrity and respect for the uniqueness of the item. Philatelic references available.
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## Buying and selling via our international Public Auction Sales

Held every two months in the heart of New York City with over 15,000 lots offered annually, emphasizing world-class rarities and postal history from virtually every facet of philately.

For our international clientele, we are constantly seeking important collections and single rarities, postal markings, maritime and aviation, military history and political campaigns, documents and manuscripts, autographs of famous people, investment holdings of U.S. and world-wide stamps and covers.
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## DUPLEX HANDSTAMPS, MARCUS P. NORTON AND PATENT CANCELS OF THE 1860s RICHARD B. GRAHAM

Recent issues of the Chronicle have included articles by me in the 1851-61 Period, concerning Troy, New York inventor Marcus P. Norton and the development of the duplex type handstamps we still see used in post offices today.

The original articles on the subject appeared in Chronicle No. 126 of May, 1985. These were by Thomas J. Alexander and myself and discussed the original Troy, New York experimental duplexed marking used in 1859 and its counterpart, used at New York City January-March 1861, with a final gasp of use almost a year later.


Figure 1. The Troy Norton patent handstamp of 1859 on a cover sent during the experimental test period at Troy, New York in the Spring of 1859.

Figures 1 and 2 were shown with those articles. Figure 1 shows what was then the only recorded use of the Troy Norton marking and Figure 2 shows a carrier use at New York with $1 \not \subset$ and $3 \notin 1861$ stamps, used on January 30, 1862. The Troy example is on a $3 \not \subset$ Nesbitt envelope with an embossed colorless corner card of the flour manufacturer Loveland, Howland \& Co. of Troy. Since then, two covers with the Troy handstamp on $3 \notin 1857$ stamps have been reported.

All this was covered in the articles in Chronicles Nos. 151 and 152 of August and November, 1991, concerning the 1851-61 period usages. However, the cover shown in Figure 2, a carrier cover mailed at New York on January 30, 1862, plus a second example mailed to a different address but otherwise identical, including carrier use and date, are the only carry-overs of the original Norton handstamped markings into the 1861 period. The markings on these covers and the two dozen recorded examples of the New York Norton marking on covers of the 1851-61 period were all made with handstamps based upon the Norton patent, No. 25036, of August 9, 1859. The type of device used was shown in a drawing based upon the patent drawings shown on page 175 of Chronicle No. 151. (This drawing will be repeated in Figure 20, which will appear in a subsequent Chronicle, to compare later versions of handstamps claimed to have been made under the same patent.)


Figure 2. The Norton New York type "lazy date" handstamp, used 1861-2. This cover shows a use on a carrier cover some months after the latest known use of the marking on the stamps of 1857.

As with all patents of the period when the Norton patent was granted, a model of the device was a part of the patent application. The huge accumulation of models at the U.S. Patent Office was dispersed some years ago, but the Smithsonian Institution was given first pick and photographs were made of all or many of them. Donald B. Johnstone, who has been of immense help in this project, and, in fact owns the duplicate use of the cover shown in Figure 2, has shown me a set of photographs of the model. The photos show, as they should, that the model was an excellent representation of the device illustrated in the patent. Whether the model still exists I do not know, but if it does, it either is or was in the possession of the Smithsonian.

The career of Marcus P. Norton was marred by events connected with this patent caused by the fact that the claims and details of the patent did not fit a situation where one idea in the patent, had it been presented differently, could have been very valuable. This was the idea of combining the killer and postmark into one instrument. At the time the patent was granted on August 9, 1859, this was not particularly important, but only a little less than a year later, on July 23, 1860, Postmaster General Joseph Holt issued an order directing that postmarking devices could not be used for canceling stamps and requiring that a separate device had to be so used. As was discussed in the articles in the 1851-61 period section in Chronicle Nos. 151 and 152, this caused a great deal more labor and time processing mail since one or more strokes were required from each of two different handstamping devices on each piece of mail,


Figure 3. The device with rotatable datewheels patented by T.J.W. Robertson which preempted Norton's datewheel design.
thus in essence doubling the labor time needed. Thus, the use of the duplexed handstamps, which combined the postmark and killer elements in one handstamp, would save the additional time that was required.

Marcus P. Norton's original patent of 1859 was for a device with two main features, with the combining of postmark and killer more or less incidental. The two features apparently claimed were the use of the rotatable wheels integral in the handstamp to provide quick and easy date settings and an attached killer or "blotter" to not only cancel the stamp with ink but to cut into its surface so that the ink would penetrate. The first claim was not granted as it already had been patented on September 22, 1857 by one T.J.W. Robertson. A drawing of the device, for which I must thank both Don Johnstone and Bob Payne, is shown in Figure 3. This is taken from the Commissioner of Patents' Annual Report for 1859.

Norton's device, as may be noted from Figures 3 and 20, included a year date, which Robertson's did not. Markings from devices made under the original Norton patent can be distinguished by the arrangement of the year date, which lies on its side relative to the rest of the marking. Thus, it is called a "lazy" year date in the parlance of western cattle brands. See Figure 4.


Figure 4. The New York City Norton "lazy date" style postmark and Dix 1860 duplex townmark.

The other feature emphasized by Norton was the "blotter" of sharp blades intended to cut into the stamp when it was canceled. Norton's claim was summarized in the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Patents for 1859 as follows:

No. 25,036.-Marcus P. Norton, of Troy, N.Y. - Improvement in Post Marking Stamps.-Patent dated August 9, 1859. -The claim and engravings explain the nature of this invention.

Claim. - The blotter J, connected or attached to the main part of any 'post office post marking stamp,' for the purpose of cutting and inking, blotting and effacing, so as to successfully cancel the frank or postage stamp of any letter or any package at the same time and operation of marking upon such letter or package the name of the post office, the year, the month and the day of the month, substantially to and for the purpose set forth.
While the claim would seem to cover the duplex design well, it had a problem in that the wording implied that the blotter or killer portion was an attachment that could be attached to any postmarking datestamp. It did not imply a rigid construction of the two postal handstamps being all made as one device, nor do the patent drawings or model imply that feature.

Marcus P. Norton, about whom we know very little other than what was revealed over twenty years later when his claim of inventing the duplex handstamp was thrown out in a case before the United States Supreme Court, was described in that case as having been a patent attorney, as well as an inventor. Norton thus probably soon recognized that when Postmaster General Joseph Holt issued his order of July 23, 1860 requiring separate postal markings for postmark and killers, that his claim was not completely in tune with the kind of duplex handstamps that were needed. As was discussed in the articles in

Chronicle Nos. 151 and 152, Edmund Hoole of New York, who had been manufacturing postal markings handstamps for many years made both the Troy device for Norton and the New York versions for the New York post office to try out Norton's ideas.

The tests at Troy, New York for three months in 1859 indicated some problems with the blotter or killer section of the handstamp. It evidently did not cut, or, at least, no cuts were seen on the two examples of the marking I have seen and photographed. In any case, while the New York handstampers retained the datewheels and many other features of the design, the killer portion was made to produce a round grid killer nor do any of the example of those that I have seen show signs of cutting.

It is probable that both the Troy and New York instruments revealed defects in the design, in that it was too complex, costly and probably too fragile to withstand the pounding of constant use. According to letters written by Hoole when Norton or his assignees of his patents were making claims for compensation for use of the device before Congress, and included in Executive Document 27 of the 2nd Session, 38th Congress (1865), ten of the Norton style handstampers were made for use in the New York post office. Yet, in spite of this number of handstampers being available and their alleged convenience, less than two dozen examples have been recorded by me of covers with the Norton-type New York handstamp. These are, with two exceptions, all dated in the period January-March 1861 on covers of the 1851-61 period. The exceptions are the cover shown in Figure 2 and its virtual duplicate, dated the same day, but to a different address, reported by Donald B. Johnstone. Yet, hundreds of New York covers exist with duplexed handstamps of the Dix design, as was discussed in Chronicle Nos. 151 and 152. Also, as was also discussed in the previous articles, post offices other than New York had started to use duplex handstamps, their economic advantages being obvious. Cleveland had started to use them within a week or ten days after the Dix design first appeared at New York, and as was discussed in an article in Chronicle No. 153, Savannah was using them by the end of October. Further uses of the duplex concept, particularly those handstamps used at Chicago, are discussed in an article being submitted to Prof. Hubert Skinner for the 1851-61 Period and which will appear in a subsequent issue of the Chronicle.

Probably all the duplex handstamps that made their appearance in the early 1860s were manufactured by Edmund Hoole. Just what arrangements he or the Post Office Department made with Marcus P. Norton, if any, are not known, but apparently Hoole seized upon the idea of the duplex design and ran with it. In comparing the Norton and Dix versions of the duplex handstamps, as indicated by the markings they produced, it is obvious that the killer portions have a strong resemblance. Figure 4 shows photos of the earliest recorded use of the New York Norton design, courtesy of Robert R. Hegland, with an early example of the Dix style New York duplex used in September, 1860. In his description of how he had ordered the original Dix handstamps to be made by Hoole, New York Postmaster John A. Dix stated that the killer portions were "soldered" to the handstamps, which would have been a much more rigid and lasting attachment than simply attaching with a thumb nut as shown in the Norton patent. From the resemblance of the killers in Figure 4, it seems probable that they both were attached rigidly by Hoole.

Even before the 1857 stamps were replaced by those of 1861 , Hoole was supplying duplexed handstamps of a new design against requisitions for new postmarks from cities eligible for the government supplied devices of the highest category of quality. Hoole had the contract for supplying the devices at that time, and he apparently made the most of it by creating a demand for the new duplexed devices.

Figure 5 shows tracings of several types of duplexed markings from handstamps furnished under Post Office Department contracts by Hoole in the 1860s. Hoole's first type provided under such contracts had a one inch ( $25-26 \mathrm{~mm}$, if preferred) diameter outer circle, with varying sizes of inner circles with the town name in serifed letters between and a state name abbreviation at the bottom. The earliest example seen by me is on a cover
loaned by Mr. Leonard Piszkiewicz, a Chicago use of September 18, 1860. Tracing A in Figure 5 is from a cover sent a few weeks later with a marking more easily traced.


Figure 5. Duplexed postal markings of various cities from handstamps made by Edmund Hoole in the early 1860s.

Cleveland, which had been one of the first post offices to have used a duplex handstamp, also received the double circle type duplex with serifed letters while the 1857 stamps were still in use. The earliest known use from Cleveland of that type of duplex is of March 20, 1861 as recorded by Thomas F. Allen and published in 19th Century Cleveland, Ohio Postal Markings (See Chronicle 153:28 for a review). A tracing of a use from January 20 of a later year is shown as Tracing B in Figure 5. This style marking was in use in many large cities in the North during the Civil War.

Tracing C in Figure 5 shows a December 26, 1861 use from New York City. The use of the 4-ring target duplexed with the serifed letter double circle marking is a rather early example of the target's use as a duplex although its use as a separate killer was nearly universal during the 1860s.

Hoole had started furnishing a small double circle, about $25 \times 12$ or 13 mm to many post offices entitled to them by volume of business as early as 1859 . These were normally not duplexed, but Tracings D, E and F in Figure 5 show examples with duplexed killers.

The Cincinnati duplex and the Louisville example with part of the outer circle not showing at the top (more or less normal for the Louisville handstamp) are duplexed with what appears to be cork killers, but the later Louisville marking has a four-ring target killer with it.

In the late summer of 1863 , Hoole started to supply postmarks duplexed with four ring-targets of a somewhat larger ( $1-1 / 8^{\prime \prime}$ or about $29-30 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) style of double circle. The earliest I have recorded was used at Nashville, but it is difficult to understand why a handstamp so arranged was sent out by Hoole. The target is on the wrong side of the postmark, so at first glance it would not appear to be a duplex handstamp.

However, I have about two dozen identically arranged examples of that type on covers dating from August 4, 1863 until the marking apparently was superseded by a more conventionally arranged handstamp in October. Tracing H in Figure 5 shows another Federal occupation post office in the seceded states to which Hoole supplied large double circle duplexed handstamps. New Orleans received the markings in December, 1863 and the tracing shows the earliest example I have recorded.

Several other occupation post offices also received this type marking. Among them are Norfolk, Virginia in October, 1863, although Norfolk was using a similar handstamp without a duplexed killer as early as July 17, 1863.

Hoole had held the contract for furnishing postmark devices to the Post Office Department for four years from April 1, 1859. Fairbanks \& Co. was awarded the contract succeeding Hoole, but Hoole continued to manufacture the handstamps as a subcontractor for Fairbanks. In affidavits submitted in 1864 and 1865 in connection with Norton's claims, Hoole commented that he had furnished about 500 duplexed handstamps as of January 1865 .
(To be continued in Issue 157)

# LETTERS OF GOLD 

 by Jesse L. CoburnThe absorbing story of the mails in California from Spanish control to 1869. Emphasis is placed on the Gold Rush period: mail routes by sea and overland, express companies and their markings, illustrated envelopes and letter sheets, and postal markings on stampless and stamped mail.
Over 1,250 photographs, with 16 pages in color, illustrate this fascinating chapter in our nation's history. Hardbound, 400 pages.

Winner of Gold for Literature in all competitions entered:

THREE INTERNATIONAL AND TWO NATIONAL GOLDS A bargain at $\$ 35.00$ postpaid from U.S.P.C.S., 2030 Glenmont Dr. NW, Canton, Ohio 44708

## USED 24-CENT 1869 INVERTS SCOTT R. TREPEL

The survey of used $24 ¢$ Inverts continues from Chronicle 153:39. The last of the $24 \propto$ Inverts centered between the top and bottom perforations were illustrated in the previous installment. In this article, all of the recorded stamps centered toward the top are illustrated in Figures 1 to 23 and listed in Tables K, L and M. These are classified as NorthCenter, North-West and North-East examples, depending on the position of the frame between the left and right perforations.

## The North-Center Inverts

To qualify for this category, the frame in green must be centered toward the top and equidistant to the right and left perforations. The stamps classified as North-Center Inverts have genuine perforations all around. Two stamps, Figures 2 and 3, have unusually wide side margins and similar centering, suggesting that they might have been positioned close to or next to each other in the same vertical row on one of the original sheets. Table K provides details for each North-Center stamp.


## TABLE K

Figure 1. Heavy cork cancel. No PFC. Large filled thin, pinholes. Ex Mozian sale (March, 1949), Wunsch (Siegel sale, May 12, 1978).
Figure 2. Cork cancel. PFC 12169 "extensively repaired", short perfs.
Figure 3. Segmented cork cancel. No PFC. Pinpoint thin spot. Ex Newbury (Part II, Siegel, October 17, 1961).
Figure 4. None.

## The North-West Inverts

The North-West $24 ¢$ Inverts are numerous, especially among the Inverts outside any of the South categories. This group of eleven stamps holds great promise for reconstructing pairs or larger multiples from one of the original sheets. The North-West Inverts' close similarity in centering high and to the left and their high survival rate are strong indicators that many, if not all, emanated from a single correspondence. However, no two are "tied" together by cancellations. The stamp in Figure 10 shows a trace of a red postmark at lower right, which is perhaps a foreign transit marking. Through further analysis and comparison of the perforations and vignette positions, the author hopes to identify multiples of any sort. Table L provides details for each North-West stamp.


Figure 5.


Figure 9.


Figure 6.


Figure 10.


Figure 7.


Figure 11.


Figure 8.


Figure 12.


Figure 13.


Figure 15.


Figure 16.

## TABLE L

Figure 5. Quartered cork cancel. Sound, perfs in at left and top. PFC 2952. Ex Fifield sale, May 31, 1961.
Figure 6. Circle of wedges cancel. Short perfs at top and bottom. No PFC. Ex Col. Green (Costales sale, October, 1946).
Figure 7. Circle of 8 wedges cancel. PFC 9656. Corner crease. Ex Fox sale, October 28, 1958 and March, 1984.
Figure 8. Cork cancel. PFC 15398. Sound.
Figure 9. Light cork cancel. Corner perf crease, left perfs touch. PFC 16731. Ex Daniels November 5, 1953 sale, Stolow May 23, 1963 sale, Wolffers September 16, 1976 sale.
Figure 10. Circle of 8 wedges cancel. Sound. PFCs 880, 137039.
Figure 11. Cork cancel. Sound. PFC 58870. Ex Spencer Anderson, Laurence \& Stryker March 22, 1955 sale, Fox June 30, 1964 sale, Stolow December 1, 1975 sale.
Figure 12. Cork cancel. Nibbed perf at bottom. PFC 3507. Ex Fox October 16, 1956 sale, Christie's October 6, 1987 sale.
Figure 13. Cork cancel. PFC 47177 "tiny defect at top".
Figure 14. Light cork cancel. No PFC. Ex Gerber April 7, 1957 "minor marginal faults". (No photo.)
Figure 15. Light cork cancel. Small creases. Ex Siegel February 24, 1966 sale.
Figure 16. Circle of wedges cancel. Perfs touch at left, closed tear at right, small repair. Ex Picher (Ward October 23, 1946), Apfelbaum, Mercury, Simmy June 19, 1964 sale.

## The North-East Inverts

The final category of $24 \varnothing$ Inverts centered to top is the North-East group. The seven North-East stamps share a common characteristic: the extreme downward shift of the vignette impression within the frame, leaving a white gap between brown vignette and green frame. The stamps differ in the horizontal orientation of the vignette: two are centered, three are slightly to the right, and two are slightly to the left. Two stamps have distinctive cancellations that should exist on dated covers: Figure 19 has part of a circular datestamp and a fully struck odd cork cancel, and Figure 22 has a red 5-bar open grid cancel. Table M provides details for each North-East stamp.


Figure 17.


Figure 18.


Figure 19.


Figure 20.


Figure 21.


Figure 22.


Figure 23.

## TABLE M

Figure 17. Cork cancel and part of red transit at bottom. Perfs touch at right, corner perf crease. PFC 20034. Ex Sotheby's November 20, 1978 sale.
Figure 18. Blue cancel (?). Closed tear, PFC 23993 "reperfed at left", light crease. Ex Fox September 24, 1957 sale, Siegel January 26, 1971 sale, Herst May 12, 1971 sale, Mohrmann October 15,1973 sale.
Figure 19. Odd Cork cancel and part cds. Small closed tear. PFC 15851.
Figure 20. Circular cork cancel. Few short perfs. PFC 5911. Ex Waterhouse.
Figure 21. Segmented cork cancel. Short perfs, closed tear. PFC 42475. Ex Harmer, Rooke March 6, 1963 sale.
Figure 22. Red 5-bar grid cancel. Described by Siegel as reperfed, corner crease, short perfs at right. Ex Siegel February 27, 1964, September 12, 1979, and June 1980 sales.
Figure 23. Cork cancel. Corner crease, short sealed tear. Recent discovery. Ex Christie's June 13, 1989.

## The Columbian and Trans-Mississippi Collections!

The Jack Rosenthal Columbian and Trans-Mississippi Collections are now available for acquisition by the serious collector who demands philatelic excellence. The Columbian Collection is the finest ever formed of this 1893 issue and is available for the collector who would own an important piece of American and philatelic history. The Trans-Mississippi Collection exceeds even The Columbian Collection in its depth, and contains almost every great piece in Trans-Mississippi philately.

To fully describe the depth and
 breadth of these two superb collections, a full-color brochure highlighting the many magnificent pieces in each has been prepared and is currently available for $\$ 1$ postpaid from Andrew Levitt, Philatelic Consultant, exclusive agent in the offering of these collections.

Horizontal imperforate upper plate block of the 8 cent Trans-Mississippi value

Working model of 8 cent TransMississippi value.


Full-Color Brochure Available for \$1 Postpaid. Contact: Andrew Levitt, Philatelic Consultant Box 342, Danbury, CT 06813 • (203) 743-5291 AA
"In The Tradition of the Great Philatelists"
When Buying or Selling, You and Your Great Collection Can Obtain the Same Superior Attention Accorded the Leading Philatelists and Collections of Our Time. Give Yourself the Advantage of More than 29 Years and $\$ 230,000,000$ in Philatelic Experience. Call Andrew Levitt.

# THE BANK NOTE PERIOD RICHARD M. SEARING, Editor 

## EXOTIC THREE CENT BANKNOTE DESTINATIONS RICHARD M. SEARING

For the last five years, articles of this Section have been primarily devoted to the Columbian Exposition stamps and covers. With the publication of my final listing of the dollar values on cover, we now return to the traditional stamps and covers of the 1870-90 Banknote era.

In Chronicle 110 (1981), I presented some unusual domestic usages of the $1 \phi-3 \phi$ banknote stamps on cover from my personal collection. I continued the series in Chronicle 113 by presenting unusual foreign usages of the same low denominations. At that time I had hoped to continue the series with reader contributions, but the response was not sufficient for an article, and I went on to other topics.

Thanks to the contribution of covers from two loyal readers, I shall be able to continue with the foreign usage series. This first article will involve unusual foreign destinations using the $3 \phi$ banknote stamp from the collection of Barbara Stever. Later articles will include selected covers using the $2 \phi$ banknotes from the collection of Barbara Ray. These ladies will supply the covers, and I will discuss the usage, rates and pertinent postal treaties based on their notes.

There are many exotic destinations for covers during the Banknote period, particularly before the Universal Postal Union Treaty of 1875. Much of the mail of this period traveled by either British or German steamship. The English boasted that "the sun never set on the British Empire". As we move toward the east from England, Africa, India, Dutch East Indies, Australia, New Zealand, and Japan are all accessible to British mail service.

Our first cover, Figure 1, is one of the least seen destinations - the Greek Islands. The cover was mailed to Athens, Greece from New York City on January 24, 1872 as a triple weight letter to the renowned archaeologist Heinrich Schliemann. He discovered and excavated the fabled city of Troy. The letter paid a triple $15 \phi$ rate under the North German Union (NGU) Treaty, which became effective in October, 1871. The letter departed on the Guion Line steamship Wisconsin to arrive in Queenstown, Ireland on February 2. Backstamps show passage through Vienna, Trieste, and arrival in Greece on February 9, 1872; total elapsed transit time was 16 days and represents excellent time for this service.


Figure 1. New York City to Athens, Greece mailed on Jan. 24,1872.

Among the more interesting destinations of the banknote period were ports on the African continent. At that time, Africa was still largely unexplored. Only a few port cities were available to the steamships of the day. The North African destination was often Egypt.

Figure 2 is a cover mailed from Fort Garland, Colorado Territory, to New York City (red New York Paid All, May 13) for transit to Cairo, Egypt on May 6, 1874. The letter was mailed under the $16 \not \subset$ NGU rate in effect from October, 1871 until July 1, 1875 and paid with 1,3 , and $12 \phi$ stamps. In contrast, the NGU direct transit rate to Cairo was $6 \phi$. The red manuscript " 10 " is a credit to Germany, the red MS "wf(weiterfranco) 4" indicates 4 silbergroschen for carriage to Egypt, and the black "PD" was applied in Egypt. The letter was backstamped as received in Alexandria and Cairo on July 4, 1874.


Figure 2. Colorado Territory to Cairo, Egypt mailed on May 4, 1874.
The cover in Figure 3 was mailed to French Equatorial Africa from Boston on September 25, 1875. The letter was paid at the $15 \phi$ treaty rate, effective for only one year after July 1, 1875, departed from New York on September 28 by the Guion Line steamship Wisconsin, arrived in Queensland, Ireland on October 8, and received the red London Paid on October 9. The letter was then carried on the steamship South Coast African SS and arrived in Gabon on December 29, 1875, a total transit time of 92 days.


Figure 3. Boston to Gabon, French Equatorial Africa mailed on Sep. 27, 1875.

Another even more remote destination from England than Africa was the Indian Ocean. This was a frequent operating location for whalers and trading companies. The islands of modern Indonesia then known as the Dutch East Indies included Sumatra and Java. The cover shown in Figure 4 was mailed from Boston on March 9, 1872 to Anjier (sic), Java where it was received on May 12. The $28 \varnothing$ rate was in effect from January, 1870 until July 1, 1875. The letter traveled by British mail via Southampton to London on the Cunard liner SS Siberia which arrived in Queenstown, Ireland on March 19. The manuscript " 24 " is a credit to England, the "12 $1 / 2$ cents" marking is a British Colonial Mail marking and may have been applied in Singapore. Can any reader verify this?


Figure 4. Boston to Java, Indonesia mailed on March 9, 1872.
In the last part of the nineteenth century, many whaling crews had their mail sent to the U.S. Consulate in Chile, Argentina, or other remote South American ports. The mail was generally held until the recipient called for it, perhaps months later, or was forwarded to a designated port by private ship.

The cover shown in Figure 5 was posted at Trenton, New Jersey on December 28, 1875 to Valparaiso, Chile in care of the U.S. Consulate. The stamps paid the $17 \not \subset$ rate in effect from July, 1875 until April, 1881. The letter was sent via American packet and transferred to a British packet for transport via Colon, Columbia, now Panama. The New York


Figure 5. Trenton, N. J. to U.S. Consulate in Valparaiso, Chile on Dec. 28, 1875.
red " 12 " mark (credit to England) was used between March 28, 1874 and July 15, 1875 according to the Winter/Hubbard listing of postal markings. Since the mail was delivered to the U.S. Consulate directly, the cover bears no backstamps or receiving markings in Chile.

Moving farther east of Indonesia, we arrive halfway around the world at Australia and New Zealand. Mail to this area in the 1860s was very uncommon. Most of the surviving mail is commercial in origin.

Figure 6 illustrates a double weight letter mailed from Newburyport, Massachusetts, to Aukland, New Zealand on March 1, 1880 and paid with 3, 5, and 30ф Banknote stamps (either Continental or American printings). The $19 \notin$ rate paid was in effect from April, 1877 through January, 1883. The letter left New York City on March 2 by British mail via Brindisi. The red manuscript " 140 " expressed in centimes represents a $28 \not \subset$ credit to either England or New Zealand, and the manuscript " $/ 2$ " indicates double weight. The letter was received and backstamped in Aukland on May 4, 1880.


Figure 6. Newburyport, Mass. to Aukland, New Zealand mailed on March 1, 1880.
On the far southern tip of Africa were the remote British colonies of South Africa and Natal. These were among the last nations to join the UPU in 1893. Natal was a separate British Crown Colony until 1910 when it joined the Union of South Africa.


Figure 7. Iowa Falls, lowa to Natal Colony, South Africa mailed on Nov. 12, 1872.

Figure 7 shows a letter to Natal, South Africa. The letter was mailed from Iowa Falls, Iowa to New York City and on to The Cape of Good Hope on November 12, 1872. The $5 \notin$ stamps are by this date probably the 1868 F-grills and make up a very rare mixed franking. The $28 \not \subset$ rate to the Cape was in effect from 1870 until July, 1875. The letter traveled via Southampton to London where the red "Paid, Nov. 30, 1872" was applied. Various manuscript markings indicate confusion in rates. The letter is backstamped with a seldom recorded marking "Received open and resealed at GPO" and has a wax seal applied with PO imprint.

The last cover, Figure 8, is to St. Helena Island in the South Atlantic Ocean. This island is nearly 1,500 miles from Africa and South America and is one of the most remote destinations for mail in this period. The letter was posted at Westport, Massachusetts on January 24; the year is unknown but it is after 1875. The bark Sarah out of Foster, New Brunswick was certainly a whaling ship. The letter traveled by British mail from Boston to Southampton. The manuscript " 110 " represents $22 \phi$ credit (in centimes) for England; the "11d" marking is for British colonial postage credit.


Figure 8. Westport, Mass. to St. Helena, South Atlantic Ocean on Jan. 24 (after 1875).
We will continue the series in future Chronicles. If any reader has a cover of this type, please send a clear photo and I will include it in the series.

## REFERENCES

Charles Starnes, United States Letter Rates to Foreign Destinations (Leonard Hartman Pub., Louisville, KY, 1982).
George E. Hargest, History of Letter Post Communication Between the United States and Europe (Smithsonian Institute Press, Washington, D.C., 1971).
Walter Hubbard and Richard F. Winter, North Atlantic Mail Sailings (U.S. Philatelic Classics Society, 1988).


| $?$ | 06/03/94 | NYC | NYC | 241, 242 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\square}{\square}$ | 07/01/94 | Baltimore, MD | ??, Germany | 242 |
| 少 | 07/02/94 | NYC | ??, ?? | 241 |
| - | 07/04/94 | NYC | NYC | 242 |
| 9 | 07/07/94 | Marion, OH | Washington, DC | 244 |
| $\checkmark$ | 07/25/94 | Baltimore, MD | Baltimore, MD | 241 |
| - | 08/06/94 | San Francisco, CA | San Francisco, CA | 242 |
| $\pm$ | 09/18/94 | Marion, OH | Washington, DC | 245 |
| $\stackrel{+}{-}$ | 12/04/94 | NYC | NYC | 241, 242 |
|  | 12/08/94 | NYC | Baltimore, MD | 242, 238, 240 |
|  | 12/11/94 | Lynn, MA | Denver, CO | 241-243, 240, U339 |
|  | 12/18/94 | Lynn, MA | Denver, CO | 243, U338 |
|  | ??/03/94 | NYC | NYC | 241 |
|  | ??/??/94 | NYC | Milwaukee, WI | 241 |
|  | ??/??/94 | NYC | Milwaukee, WI | 242 |
|  | ??/??/94 | ??, ?? | ??, ?? | 241-242 |
|  | ??/??/94 | NYC | Milwaukee, WI | 243 |
|  | ??/??/94 | NYC | N. Market, NH | 245 |
|  | 01/07/95 | Washington, DC | N. Ulm, Germany | 242, U348 |
|  | 03/26/95 | NYC | Paris, France | 244, 258 |

Tied NY Station K, magenta boxed REG, date; MS reg; rtn addr C. Witt
Tied town; N. Am. Lloyd cc; creased, nick
Tied black town to registered env
Tied black $=/ \mathrm{K} /=$ oval; MS to left (C. Witt); magenta Reg backstamp
Tied target duplex on legal size cover; addr to Treasury Department
Tied YTD canc; overpaid loc env; N. German Lloyd return addr

Tied =1 = canc; Wilkens \& Co. printed address
Tied target canc to wrapper addr to Comptroller of Treasury
Tied Station K grid duplex; addr to C. Witt Siegel 596/292
Registered mail on US Navy envelope Wunsch collection
Tied black town on large entire; MS reg \#2372 Siegel 679/276
Tied black cir town; MS REG \#2373; Kelleher 572/603 magenta boxed REG, date UL
Tied oval grid Station K duplex; to C. Witt
Tied NY REG oval on 7"x4" wrapper; boxed REG; book pub. addr
Tied to 5 "x7" book wrapper; Houghton, Muffin Co; boxed REG
Tied black target town; horizontal pair
Tied 4"x7" book wrapper; magenta boxed REG; book Pub addr
Tied black oval "J"; MS REG at UL "Florist" Wolffers 103/2429 at LL; rec backstamp
Tied on 1c Col. entire; REG \#67029; Wash. Reg oval, 1/9/95, \#2

Tied oval " 4 " on large legal env; per steamer Majestic; NY REG \#27702

Siegel 560/191
Kelleher 569/416
Kelleher 569/421

Siegel 560/192
Siegel 307/605

Siegel 695/1571
Siegel 421/370
Collector

Collector
W. Fox 5/26-91

Southby Parke Bernet S41/1591
Collector

Kelleher 569/428

RKaufmann/Priv.
Postal History
Sale
Christie's 9/82-463

CENSUS: COLUMBIAN \$ STAMPS USED ON COVER

| - |  |  |  | LUMBIAN \$ STAMP | USED ON COVER |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Date | Origin | Destination Stam |  | Remarks | Source |
|  | 04/09/95 | NYC | NYC | 243 | Tied Station K, town; Ms REG, purple REG boxed; addr to C. Witt | Siegel 618/158 |
|  | 05/04/95 | NYC | NYC | 243 | Tied NYC duplex Station K on registered env | Siegel 307/615 |
|  | 05/25/95 | NYC | NYC | 245 | Tied double oval, purple REG box; MS reg, <br> C. Witt; stain | JKaufmann GOP/161 |
|  | ??/??/95 | St. Louis, MO | St. Louis, MO | 243 | Tied black oval on McKeel Stamp Weekly cc | Siegel 410/657 |
|  | 06/01/96 | E. Mt. Vernon, NY | S. Mt. Vernon, NY | 243 | Tied black oval "R"; st line REG \#10; philatelic favor | Collector |
|  | 09/25/96 | Stony Point, CA | Petaluma, CA | 245 | Tied town dated canc; addr to H. Schluckenbeir | Wolffers 100/773 |
|  | 01/12/97 | NYC | Basle, Switzerland | 245 | Tied town, black duplex " 50 "; NY REG lb \#92103; Eur size env; fake? | Siegel 660/165 |
|  | 02/09/97 | NYC | NYC | 244 | Tied NYC duplex Station K on Reg env <br> (C. Witt) | Siegel 679/282 |
|  | 02/19/97 | Bangor, ME | Southampton, Grea | Complete: <br> one each 230-241, <br> three each 242-244, <br> four 245 | Tied to REG Package wrapper; \$49.34 paid on $30 \mathrm{lb}+1 \mathrm{oz}$; via SS St. Paul | H. Hagendorf |
| O | 06/14/98 | NYC | Hamburg, Germany | 244, U351 | Tied NYC REG oval; boxed REG, date; Reg label \#94041 | Wolffers 158/? |
| $\frac{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{n}}{\leftrightarrows}$ | 08/15/98 | NYC | Sumatra, E.I. | 241 | Tied REG oval; Ins Co. cc; rec 08/23/98; " 15 " Ms transit | Siegel 545/268 |
| - | 12/05/98 | N. Oxford, PA | Washington, DC | 242 | Tied black target on prtd addr env to C.F. Rothfuchs; corner margin stamp | RKaufmann 5/175 |
|  | 12/05/98 | N. Oxford, PA | Washington, DC | 242 | Tied black target on prtd addr env to C.F. Rothfuchs; another $\$ 2$ cover | RKaufmann 9/388 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ | 12/05/98 | N. Oxford, PA | Washington, DC | 242 | Tied LR of env; prtd addr C.F. Rothfuchs | Siegel 611/545 |
| - | 12/30/98 | N. Oxford, PA | Washington, DC | 241 | Tied black town, cork; prtd addr <br> C.F. Rothfuchs stamp dlr | McCoy-95 |
| + | 03/25/99 | NYC | ??, Germany | 242 | Tied Kingsbridge Station oval; purple boxed REG YTD on part cover; C. Witt | Ivy 6/91-806 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { z } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 09/09/99 | Grayson, NE | Naumberg, Germany | 241-242, 287, U371 | Tied black targets, YTD to U371 legal env REG Ms \#453 | Ivy 6/91-1036 |


| ？ | 10／20／00 | NYC | Seine，France | 241，U73 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{\text { e }}{}$－ | ？？／？？／01 | Richmond，VA | ？？，？？ | 242，U350 |
| Ğ | ？？／？？／01 | NYC | ？？，？？ | 244，230，U350 |
|  | ？？／？？／01 | NYC | NYC | 244 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Z } \\ & \hline ⿸ 厂 ⿱ 二 ⿺ 卜 丿 口 ~ \end{aligned}$ | ？？／？？／02 | NYC | Frankfort OM，Germany | 241，232，237， 239 |
| 亭 | 10／26／06 | St．Louis，MO | Gappingen，Germany | 242 |
| $\stackrel{\text { B }}{ }$ | ？？／？？／27 | NYC | Wien，Austria | 241 |
| ¢ | ？？／？？／27 | NYC | Wien，Austria | 242 |
| 3 | ？？／？？／？？ | ？？，？？ | ？？，France | 241，234（2） |
|  | ？？／？？／？？ | ？？，？？ | ？？，？？ | 242， 239 |

Tied duplex town on large env； Ms per S．S．Lucania；REG label \＃85392

## Tied to 5 c entire

Tied small targets on registered 5c entire
Tied town circle；publishing house cc
Tied on 11 ＂x5＂cloth env；per Steamer Umbria；REG label \＃4251
Tied purple St．Louis Reg \＃65； NY REG label \＃27773
Tied SON cancel on registered letter； MS REG U1 \＃？？；late use
SON cancel on registered letter； MS reg marking UL；\＃6985；late use 1927
Tied to REG env
Tied to cover front

RKaufmann 55／624
Siegel 307／610
Siegel 307／620
Koerber 9／74－440
Siegel 674／572
lvy 8／87－776
Siegel 410／963
Frajola 8／87－656
Harmer Rooke 5／62－462
Harmer Rooke 5／63－470

# CANCELLATIONS ON UNITED STATES OFFICIAL STAMPS, 1873-1884 ALAN C. CAMPBELL 

## Introduction

Since the first edition of 1923, the introduction to the section on official stamps in the Scott Specialized Catalogue of United States Stamps has carried the following warning:

Odd or Town cancellations on Departmental stamps are relatively much scarcer than those appearing on the general issues of the same period.
Since this remark could intimidate the novice collector from venturing into a field where, as they say, "the only thing scarcer than the material are the people who collect it", this article will offer a corrected viewpoint by introducing the scope and variety of material encompassed in the collecting of cancellations on United States official stamps. Examples illustrated are from an exhibit collection assembled over a period of ten years by the author, in whose experience even the humblest of bourses can yield a few decent copies to redeem the cost of gas and parking.

A common misconception about departmental usages is that official mail was somehow handled through different channels than ordinary mail and was therefore subject to receive different cancellations, postmarks, and postal markings. The truth is that, with a few exceptions, official mail of this time was handled at the same post offices under the same postal regulations, with respect to rates and markings, as ordinary mail. Therefore, any student of the large Bank Note regular issues would be familiar with the cancellations to be encountered on the parallel official stamps, even though the bounds of his or her collection may exclude these specific issues. In this article, we will first consider how the distribution of official stamps limited the variety of cancellations to be found, and how the originating town for a given obliterator or killer can be identified. Then, in sequence, we will address postmarks, colored inks, cut cork cancelers, and commercial metal cancelers, and end with some general observations on what one can expect to find in the way of cancellations for any given department.

## Distribution

The variety of cancellations to be found on official stamps is limited by where and when they were used. A very large proportion of all official mail, perhaps as much as half, originated in Washington, D.C., and certain departments had a very narrow distribution beyond our Capitol. All Executive Department mail was posted from Washington, D.C., except for a few letters sent from Long Branch, New Jersey, where President Grant had a summer home. Excepting the despatch agent in New York, essentially all State Department mail originated in Washington, D.C. (overseas consular mail came in diplomatic pouches to the Capitol where stamps were applied to individual envelopes in order for them to enter the regular mail stream). Navy Department stamps were chiefly used at yards along the Eastern seaboard. While the stamps of the Justice Department were more widely dispersed, they were never used in great quantities.

In contrast, the stamps of the Agriculture, Interior, Post Office, Treasury, and War Departments were used all across the country and in large quantities. The Agriculture Department sent out prestamped envelopes to farmers for their annual seed orders and crop reports; the Interior Department had pension agents and land offices in all the frontiers. Wherever there was a post office, the postmaster was furnished Post Office Department stamps for his official correspondence; Customs officers and Collectors of

Internal Revenue from the Treasury Department were widely distributed; and Signal Service officers filed weather reports with War Department stamps from across the country. ${ }^{1}$

Although official stamps were valid from July 1873 through parts of July 1884, penalty envelopes were introduced in 1877 and gradually gained widespread acceptance. During the transitional period, official stamps and penalty envelopes were used simultaneously. Some departments, such as Executive and Post Office Departments, converted immediately to use of penalty envelopes nearly exclusively; others, such as Agriculture and State Departments, made little use of penalty envelopes during the transitional period. It was during this transitional period that commercially-prepared canceling devices began to be widely used. Thus many of the familiar commercial killers of the 1880s are difficult to find on Post Office, Justice, and Navy Department stamps. The $3 \notin$ Post Office Department stamp (with over $65,000,000$ issued) was used far more often than all the other official stamps combined, yet oddly there is a very limited range of cancellations to be found on that stamp. In general, the more collectible cancellations are found on lower values used on domestic first class mail. Unlike the regular Bank Note issues, where pre-UPU overseas mail yielded many high values with striking cancellations (e.g. New York foreign mail geometrics), nondescript package type cancels are typical for official high value stamps.

## Identification

The definitive method of attributing an obliterator to a particular town on the basis of a proving cover with originating postmark does not work well for official stamps because of the simple lack of extant covers. Departmental covers are much scarcer than covers with regular issues because many of them went to other Government offices where the cover might survive for a while, docketed with its contents in a file, until the archives were purged. And mail of a personal nature was more likely to be saved for sentimental reasons down through the generations than official mail addressed to private citizens. For example, we know that a clerk at the Agriculture Department in Washington, D.C. tore off the stamps on incoming mail from farmers all over the country and sold them in quantity to collectors. ${ }^{2}$ So while there are many used copies surviving, it can literally take years to find an Agriculture cover intact at any price in any condition.

Fortunately, the same canceling devices were used on official mail as on regular mail, so parallel attributions can be confidently made on the basis of regular issue large Bank Note covers. Until James M. Cole's book, Cancellations and Killers of the Banknote Era, is published, one is forced to refer to various specialized monographs ${ }^{3}$ in the hope of positively identifying the town of origin for a particular obliterator. In addition, a study is currently being undertaken of the cancelers used in Washington, D.C. during the 1873-1884 period. The Washington, D.C. cancellation study naturally will prove an invaluable resource in the identification and dating of Washington, D.C. cancellations on Departmental stamps and covers.

## Postmarks

Having established that official mail was handled under prevailing postal regulations, since the obliterator was required to deface the stamp and not the postmark, the

1. Rae D. Ehrenberg, "Authorized Use of the U.S. Official Stamps by the Various Departments", 33rd American Philatelic Congress Handbook (1967), for detailed information on which Government officers and employees were furnished official stamps.
2. Official Chatter, July 1987, Rollin C. Huggins, Jr. citing an article from Mekeel's Stamp News, March 23, 1899.
3. Useful references include Huber and Wagner, The Great Mail: A Postal History of New Orleans (1949); Paul C. Rohloff, The Waterbury Cancellations, 1865-1890 (1979); Blake and Davis, Boston Postmarks to 1890 (1974); Towle and Meyer, Railroad Postmarks of the U.S. (1968); Doane-Thompson, Catalog of U.S. County and Postmaster Postmarks (1990).
same explanations for datestamps being struck on large Bank Note regular issues - ignorance, carelessness, contrariness, multiple strikes of a duplex canceler on a cover with several stamps - must also apply to official stamps. It follows then that while the variety of postmarks occurring on official stamps will have been limited by their distribution, the relative frequency of this occurrence should not differ much from the general issues.

In reality, almost any legible datestamp outside of Washington, D.C. (with the possible exception of New York City) should be deemed highly collectible. What one can find usually but not always corresponds to what one would expect to find from the known distribution of these stamps. Figure 1, top row. For example, postmarks outside of New York City and Washington, D.C. for the State Department, and Long Branch, New Jersey and Washington, D.C. for the Executive Department are great novelties. Much greater diversity is to be found on the stamps of the Interior, Treasury, and War Departments due to their widespread usage. But the most widely dispersed stamps of all, those of the Post Office Department, have yielded very few legible postmarks, presumably because postal clerks took scrupulous care in correctly canceling their own official mail.


Figure 1. Top row: a. Carollton, Miss.; b. Ottawa, Canada; c. red San Francisco Paid All; d. Ashley, Utah Territory. Bottom row: a. Fort Bridger, Wyoming Territory; b. Fort Wingate, New Mexico Territory; c. Fort Fred Steele, Wyoming Territory; d. Fort Assinaboine (sic), Montana Territory.

The most popular and best-researched area of the departmental postmarks is certainly the Fort cancels. These occur predominately on War Department stamps, although Indian Agents did post mail with Interior Department stamps from the Fort post offices. Figure 1 , bottom row. Active research in this area is ongoing, and the inventory of known Fort postmarks on official stamps is gradually being expanded. Among collectors in this field, it is generally agreed that the premiums in the catalogue rightly apply only to legible Fort postmarks and not to such characteristic obliterators as the Fort Leavenworth honeycomb, even though these are desirable in their own right. Given the size of these military installations and of most Western towns of this era, it would seem that a remarkably large and disproportionate number of Fort and territorial postmarks have survived. Perhaps Fort mail clerks were less meticulous than their Eastern brethren in how these cancelers were wielded. It also may be that generations of collectors have winnowed out the exotic Fort postmarks and discarded the chaff of less historically intriguing towns, thereby disturbing the historical record and what a random sampling of usages ought to have revealed.

While county and postmaster postmarks and even railroad postmarks occasionally are found, surely the most prestigious postmarks on Departmental stamps are the New

York Steamship cancellations found exclusively on Navy Department stamps. Figure 2, top row. U.S. Navy vessels were furnished with Navy Department stamps, and official mail from them overseas was transferred to contract carriers. The "steamship" postmark was applied on the date they docked back in New York. The catalogue does record Express Company markings on several different official stamps but these have not been seen by the author. Also of interest are the oval and double oval cancellations used on third class, fourth class, and registered mail: in accordance with postal regulations, these devices normally did not include the date. Figure 2, bottom row.


Figure 2. Top row: a. Chatfield, Fillmore Co., Minn.; b. Camden and Burlington Co. R.R.; c. B.\&O. R.R.; d. New York Steamship. Bottom row: a. Chicago, III.; b. Boston, Mass.; c. New York, N.Y.; d. Chicago, III.

Various types of other miscellaneous mail service markings also can be found on Departmental stamps, including "FORWARDED" handstamps, "CARRIER" and "RECEIVED" backstamps, postage due markings, foreign transit markings, and penalty handstamps. Figure 3, top row. The "FORWARDED" handstamp generally is found on Navy Department stamps and was probably applied when mail was rerouted in Washington, D.C. and forwarded with Navy Department stamps to personnel at sea. The "correct"


Figure 3. Top row: a. FORWARDED; b. penalty handstamp; c. FORWARDED; d. CARRIER. Bottom row: Washington, D.C. cut cork obliterators.
handstamp (See future Chronicle, Figure 13, bottom row, item a) is a marking intended to be used by R.P.O. clerks on the route slips accompanying registry mail bags showing their contents. ${ }^{4}$ Receiving marks, along with pen cancel straightlines or crosses, were used to demonetize presentation sets of official stamps. The blue town premiums listed for all the State Department values generally refer to the handsome "RECEIVED" favor cancels since only between the first part of May 1879 and the last part of June 1880 was a blue canceling ink used for ellipse cancels by the post office in Washington, D.C. ${ }^{5}$

## Colored Inks

On the basis of the surviving inventory, the standard colors were employed in the following order of frequency: black, purple (including violet and magenta), blue, red, pink, green and brown. As different canceling devices required different types of ink, the colors varied accordingly. Many commercial obliterators can be found struck in purple, while blue inks were popular in the Midwest, most notably in Chicago. A quartered-circle killer with vivid purple ink was used in Washington, D.C. in 1878 and can be found on stamps of all departments. Red cancellations are much scarcer than purple or blue and were struck principally in Washington, D.C. with cut cork obliterators. It is much more common to find low values $(1 \phi, 2 \phi, 3 \phi$ and $6 \phi)$ with red cancels than high values, and the $2 \phi$ value, a local rate usage, is the most common of all. Red cancels on any value of the Agriculture, Justice, and Executive Departments are fairly rare, yet it is possible to find all values of the State Department stamps up to the $90 \phi$ with red cancels. A vivid pink target cancel was used at Plattsburgh, New York, and can be found on Treasury and Post Office Department stamps. While many blue-green cancels exist, true green cancels are much scarcer than red and are usually found indistinctly struck on Treasury Department stamps. Brown has been reported as a relatively common colored ink used in the 1880 s on the $2 \phi$ red brown (less common only than black or magenta). ${ }^{6}$ But in the author's experience, a true brown as opposed to a washed-out or faded red is extremely scarce on official stamps.

It would be a worthwhile exercise to inventory the current major collections to determine exactly which shades of canceling ink are known on which values because no attempt has been made to update this information in the Specialized Catalogue since the first edition of 1923. Also, the premiums quoted for unusual cancellation types and colors have remained constant since 1982 when they were first quoted as surcharges above the base price for used copies. As one can well imagine, the combination of different colored canceling inks used on the stamps of different departments can yield many beautiful permutations that would be pointless to illustrate in a black-and-white format.
(To be continued in Issue 157)
4. Clyde Jennings, "U.S. 1847-1900 Mail Cancels and Postal Markings" (1991 exhibition photocopy), p. 64.
5. James M. Cole, "Washington, D.C. Ellipses" Cancellation Club News (Summer 1988), pp. 51-54. Also, to-be-published, James M. Cole, Cancellations and Killers of the Banknote Era (USPCS, 1993).
6. Edward L. Willard, The United States Two Cent Red Brown of 1883-1887 (1970), Vol. II, p. 2 - an invaluable resource for Bank Note cancellations.

## RETURNED LETTERS UNDER UNITED STATES - BRITISH TREATY OF 1848 RICHARD F. WINTER

Two unusual letters sent from Abraham Bell \& Company of New York to the United Kingdom offer an opportunity to examine the returned letter procedures established under the United States-British Treaty of 1848. Although one example originated before the Convention became effective, both letters were returned to the United States originator during the treaty period. This article will discuss the returned letter operations in effect for each country prior to the Treaty and then outline the specific procedures introduced under the Convention. Finally, the relevant postal markings and enclosures associated with the two returned covers will be described.

In February and May 1990, a series of articles appeared in the Chronicle related to the Dead Letter Office in the United States. ${ }^{1}$ These articles described the operation of the Dead Letter Office and showed the markings used by that office during the 1851-61 period. Section 26 of the United States Congressional Act of 3 March $1825^{2}$ set the stage for the appropriate actions of United States postmasters by stating:
... and at the expiration of the next three months, shall send such of the said letters as then remain on hand, as dead letters, to the General Post Office, where the same shall be opened and inspected; and if any valuable papers, or matters of consequence, shall be found therein, it shall be the duty of the Postmaster General to return such letter to the writer thereof...
The "three months" in Section 26 refers to the period in which a list of letters remaining at their respective offices was published in local newspapers.

The Congressional Act of 3 March $1849^{3}$ slightly changed these instructions stating "that letters refused, or which cannot be delivered, may be immediately returned to the dead letter office." The General Post Office referred to was in Washington, D.C.

Numerous extracts from the United States Postmaster General's Letter Books indicate that letters were returned to the Postmaster General in England before the United States-British Treaty of 1848 . One such extract, ${ }^{4}$ dated 1 April 1846, gives a detailed listing of ten letters from the United Kingdom that, for various reasons, remained undeliverable in the United States, and were being returned to London. In the Postmaster General's accompanying letter, each returned item was assigned a record number, and information was provided concerning the intended address, the identification of the writer and a general description of the item's contents. The latter two categories reveal that the letters must have been opened at the Post Office Department in Washington and that each was selected for return because of its valuable contents. It is presumed that similar letters, transferring returned mails from England to the United States, also existed before the United StatesBritish Treaty of 1848 , although I have not seen examples of such letters.

[^2]The London Dead Letter Office was established in 1784 to deal with letters that were undeliverable or had been refused by an addressee. ${ }^{5}$ One of the earliest sets of instructions to local postmasters ${ }^{6}$ was dated 20 March 1793 and provided direction for forwarding letters back to the General Post Office in London. It referred to other detailed instructions sent at the same time to postmasters for the management of missent, dead and returned letters or other undeliverable mail. Many subsequent instructions followed over the later years. A sample of the 7 January 1824 Summary Instructions included: ${ }^{7}$
5. Be careful to assign on the Front the real Reason, in red Ink, why the Letters or Newspapers cannot be delivered, as 'Refused.' - 'Dead.' - 'Gone away, not known where.' - 'Cannot be found.' - 'Not called for.' - And write on the Back the Day of the Month when you find you cannot deliver them, that you may know how long they have been in your office.
The period for retaining undeliverable letters in each category, before returning them to London, varied over the years, but the requirements for marking the letters remained about the same. In March 1846, dead letter instructions were modified as follows: ${ }^{8}$

The Dead Letters instead of being transmitted on the 8 th, 15 th, 22nd, and last day of the month, are in future to be made up and sent with a Form No. 4, to the Inspector of Dead Letters every Monday, to commence with Monday the 6th of April next.

At those towns where the Undeliverable Letters for persons 'not known', or 'not to be found', have hitherto been kept three weeks, they are now only to be kept one week.
When the Detailed Regulations for the 1848 Postal Treaty between the United States and Great Britain were signed in Washington, D.C. on 14 May 1849, the following instructions for the mutual return of letters between the two countries were included: ${ }^{9}$

Article XIX. Dead letters, newspapers, \&c. which cannot be delivered, from whatever cause, shall be mutually returned after the expiration of every month, or otherwise, as the regulations of each office will admit. Such of those letters, \&c. as shall have been charged in the account shall be returned for the same amount of postage which was originally charged by the sending office, and shall be allowed in discharge of the account of the office to which they were transmitted. The forms ( K and L ) to be used in claiming the return of postage, and to accompany such dead letters, newspapers, \&c. are annexed to the present articles.

Article XX. With respect to dead letters, \&c. which may have been received in closed mails, or which cannot be produced by the office which has to claim the amount, they shall be admitted for the same weight and amount of postage which was originally charged upon such dead letters, \&c. in the accounts of the respective offices, on a declaration or on lists vouching for the amount of postage demanded, signed by the inspector of the dead-letter office, or other officer duly authorized for that purpose.

Article XXI. Letters misdirected or missent, or which may require the prepayment of the postage, shall be reciprocally returned without delay through the respective offices of exchange, and credit taken in the letter bill for the amount of postage originally charged upon them. Redirected letters, or letters addressed to persons who have changed their residences, shall be mutually returned by the first post, charged with the rates of postage which would have been paid by the parties to whom they are addressed.
From the above it can be seen that all dead letters were to be returned each month between the two countries regardless of the estimated value of their contents. In addition,

[^3]the accounting in the exchange office books was to restore the debits or credits put on the books when the letters were originally sent. Special forms on which the proper accounting corrections were made also were prepared to accompany the returned letters. These procedures were applicable to dead letters contained in the closed mails that passed through each country, and misdirected or missent letters were to be returned without delay with the appropriate accounts marked on the letter bills.

Figure 1 illustrates the first of two letters returned from London. This folded letter was written on 27 March 1848 from the New York firm, Abraham Bell \& Son, and was addressed to Macklesfield (sic), Cheshire, England. Two days later, the letter departed New York on the Black X Line sailing ship Margaret Evans, arriving at Gravesend, England on 19 April $1848 .{ }^{10}$ Later that day, the letter was sent to London, rated for 8 pence ship letter fee postage due, and forwarded on to the expected destination, Macclesfield, England, a manufacturing town 17 miles S.S.E. of Manchester in Chester County. A blue backstamp shows arrival at Macclesfield on 19 April. The postmaster at Macclesfield was unable to find the addressee and marked across the upper left of the letter face "Can't be found," reposting the letter to London on 24 April 1848. Across the left side of the letter face is a notation that shows the letter was opened in the London Dead Letter Office on 2 May 1848 and assigned record number " 80 281/1," noting that valuables to the extent of £6.0.0 were included.


Figure 1. New York, 27 Mar 1848, to England by sailing packet, entering the mails at London 19 Apr 1848. Postage due of 8 pence in manuscript. Addressee could not be found and letter returned to U.S. over three years later in July 1851.

For unknown reasons, this letter was retained at the London Dead Letter Office for more than three years, then finally was returned to the United States Dead Letter Office in Washington, D.C. in late July 1851. Here the letter was struck with a black 30 mm circular marking "P.O.DEPT. DEAD LETTER OFFICE" with a manuscript date of 31 July 1851 and record number 3834 assigned. Later it was opened and examined and found to contain valuables. Since this letter did not originate in the New York Post Office but was taken directly to a ship letter bag in New York, I believe that it was not sent to the New York Post Office by the Dead Letter Office to "find" the originator as described by Graham. ${ }^{11}$ More likely, the Dead Letter Office in Washington, D.C. initiated the notifica-

[^4]tion directly to the letter originator based on its findings when the letter was opened and inspected. A notification was sent to the originator that the letter would be available for return if its postage from Washington, D.C. to New York was sent to the Dead Letter Office.

Figure 2 shows the top portion of the inside of the letter, a check for six pounds sterling made payable to Mary Boland from Abraham Bell \& Son. This check was intended to be cut out from the letter and redeemed at the London firm of John \& Edward Corderoy, No. 31 Tooley Street, London. Across the check in red ink is the manuscript notation "Open in d/L Book $8 / 1151$ " and the check signature scribbled out. This would seem to indicate that this letter was entered in the Dead Letter Office books on 11 August 1851, perhaps the date the letter was opened, the originator identified, and the notification process initiated. The letter finally made it back to Abraham Bell \& Company in New York, having been returned from the Dead Letter Office in Washington, D.C. under separate cover. Docketing written on the letter by clerks at Abraham Bell shows that it was check No. 139 to London containing £6.0.0, was returned through the Dead Letter Office, and was received in New York on 11 September 1851.


Figure 2. Top portion of inside letter sheet shows unused check for $\mathbf{£ 6 . 0 . 0}$ sterling, payable to Mary Boland, the addressee of the letter. Check, datelined "New York 3d. Month 27th 1848", intended to be cut from letter and redeemed in London.

The second returned letter is illustrated in Figure 3. This folded letter, again originating from Abraham Bell \& Son of New York, was written on 26 November 1849 and was addressed to Carduff Kelly, County of Monaghan, Ireland. The letter dateline included the Quaker dating style, "New York 11th Mo. 26th 1849." The Company used their own red $41 \times 23 \mathrm{~mm}$ oval forwarder's handstamp on the letter face as a corner marking, although they were not acting in the capacity of a forwarding agent as the marking would suggest. The letter was sent unpaid and was included with the mails carried on the Cunard steamer America, which departed New York on 28 November and arrived at Liverpool on 12 December 1849. The New York exchange office debited England 5\&, which was the United States share of the treaty postage for a letter carried on a British packet from the United States. The letter was marked at Liverpool with a black one shilling postage due handstamp and was sent to Dublin, where an orange backstamp was struck to show a 13 December arrival.


Figure 3. New York, 26 Nov 1849, to Ireland sent unpaid. Abraham Bell \& Co. forwarder mark used as a corner marking only. New York debited England 5¢ and Liverpool marked for 1 shilling postage due. Addressee could not be found in County of Monaghan, Ireland and letter returned to U.S. in May 1851.

With the assistance of Patricia Stilwell Walker, a noted Irish postal historian, we have examined two excellent sources of information on possible destinations in Ireland. ${ }^{12}$ No place name of Carduff Kelly, County of Monaghan, or anything similar, was found. I believe the same problem presented itself to the postal employees in Ireland in December 1849. A portion of the back sheet of the folded letter is missing. It contained half of the Dublin circular datestamp and most of a blue green impression of a Monaghan circular datestamp. So, we know that the letter got as far as the City of Monaghan, the capital of the county with the same name, where some attempt was made to find the addressee before the letter was sent back to the London Dead Letter Office. The endorsement across the top left "Try C: Blany" is believed to be a postal clerk's reference to Castle Blayney, a small post town twelve miles S.S.E. of Monaghan.

Although it was standard to mark letters the date of return to the London Dead Letter Office, this one was not marked in this manner, but the reason for return was inscribed in red ink across the bottom, "Not Known". Since all mail not delivered was returned under the United States-British Treaty of 1848, there was no need to open this letter in the London Dead Letter Office. It was sent under separate cover in the mails directly back to Washington, D.C., but like the first example, not very promptly. The Dead Letter Office in Washington, D.C. recorded this letter and its valuable contents as No. 1746 on 17 May 1851, illustrated in Figure 4, and sent the letter to New York, where the letter was first posted in November 1849, to notify the originator that it was being held at the post office there.

[^5]

Figure 4. Tracing of U.S. Dead Letter Office, Washington, D.C. receipt marking showing arrival there on 17 May 1851 and assignment of record number 1746.


Figure 5. Top inside letter sheet showing unused printed check for $£ 7.0 .0$ payable to Hugh Hanretty to be charged to the Belfast Banking Company.

Figure 5 shows that the inside top of this letter was also a preprinted check, this time to Hugh Hanretty, for seven pounds sterling, to be charged to the Belfast Banking Company on Abraham Bell \& Sons’ account. Docketing on the letter by the originator shows that the letter was received back at Abraham Bell \& Son on 30 May 1851, having come from the Dead Letter Office.
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## NORTH ATLANTIC MAIL SAILINGS

 1840-75by Walter Hubbard and Richard F. Winter

Detailed information on contract mail sailings in 31 chapters. Listings and illustrations of New York exchange office markings. Five appendices. Hardbound; 430 pages; over 250 illustrations in text.
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## ANSWERS TO PROBLEM COVERS IN ISSUE 155



Figure 1. 1861 cover to Maine from Papal States.
Figure 1 shows a cover from the Papal States to the U.S. in 1861. Our only responder is H.L. (Butch) Arnold, who has a splendid collection of Papal States, which he exhibits. He starts the explanation by stating that 100 bajocchi equals 1 scudo, which was worth about $\$ 1.07$; and since this letter bears a total of 64 bajocchi, the U.S. equivalent was about 70 cents. Butch further explains that Vaccari's Stato Pontificio Tariffe Postali Generali states that the basic single weight letter to the U.S. was to be prepaid 32 bajocchi and that this letter is thus double weight. The basic 32 bajocchi was split 13 bajocchi for internal (inside Europe) postage, and 19 bajocchi for the sea transit. This was almost 18 cents, so Butch opines that it had 15 cents for British vessel, plus 3 cents U.S. inland, both doubled for this cover, for the 30 cents and 6 (cents) shown. He feels that it was fully paid to the destination in Indiana from Maine, even though marked "P.P.", for 6 cents credit to the U.S., not 6 cents due from the recipient. If others can add to this analysis, comments will be published in the next issue.

Figure 2 shows a Civil War patriotic which has elicited considerable response, some verbal and some written from Richard Graham, Mike McClung, Michael Morrissey and Robert Stets. Since the letter is undated, the major controversy was if the latter was delivered at Boston before or after the abolition of the carrier fee of 1 cent in 1863. The con-
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Figure 2. Civil War patriotic.
sensus is that this letter, with 4 cents due, was delivered by a carrier, with 1 cent charged, and not to a box. Bob Stets suggests the marking that looks like "Box" is in fact "Bo. 4" for 4 cents due at Boston. Mike McClung suggests that the 1 cent carrier fee could have been charged to the recipient's box account. Michael Morrissey adds that the recipient may not have paid his monthly box account, and that the cover may have been advertised. These are all cogent comments. Dick Graham has written a thorough analysis, which reads:

This cover, shown in the Cover Corner for August on page 223, offers a nice puzzle and also several other quite interesting features that have been part of my ongoing Civil War research effort for many years. The two markings involving the word "SHIP" were the subject of an article in Chronicle No. 58 (May, 1968) by me called "The Ship 3 Rate of Civil War Days." I have written occasional notes a few times since as an update. As these were a long time ago, it seems desirable to comment that the "SHIP" marking is one of two markings discussed in that article that are found on mail brought in by despatch and supply steamers from Federal troops on the coast of the Confederacy and the blockaders lying off the ports.

This brings us to the question of the " 4 cts due" and "Box" or whatever it is that appears on the cover. The " 4 cts due" in manuscript was applied at Boston, and obviously indicates carrier delivery with the extra penny being added to the 3 cents indicated by the "U.S. SHIP/ 3 CTS" marking, which I suspect was applied at New York where the cover was received by steamer after being sorted at Old Point Comfort at Fort Monroe, Virginia. I have several other examples of U.S. Ship combinations with an extra penny due for carrier service at Boston.

If the other manuscript word on the cover is "Box", this doesn't fit with the carrier service as none would have been needed if the cover was sorted to a box for pick-up. While I doubt that anyone can prove what this marking was meant to indicate, I think that since the cover is addressed to a street number it was indeed delivered by a carrier. A possible reading of the presumed "box" marking is that it was applied at Old Point Comfort and really is a somewhat strangely written " 3 cent". Another (probably more valid) idea is that the cover was accompanied by a box, sent by express or that the enclosed letter requested a box to be sent and the marking is really a docketing. In any case, I think it is not important as I don't see how it could be pertinent to the postal handling of the cover unless it is indeed a badly written " 3 cent".

The late Henry A. Meyer and I called this "SHIP" marking the "condensed" SHIP marking, and it is known on covers with postmarks of Philadelphia, Old Point Comfort and, possibly, Port Royal, South Carolina. The point is that it and a counter-
part "box oval" SHIP marking were applied at points where mail from the blockaders was gathered or placed in the mail system. In the case of the condensed "SHIP" type, while I have no evidence, I suspect it was applied at Old Point Comfort.

The point of all this is that Blake Davis' Boston Marking to 1890 lists it as a Boston marking, but it isn't. Rather, it was applied at some point where mail was brought in from the blockaders etc. during the Spring and Summer of 1862 so that the covers would not be charged the 2 cent ship captains' fee. This idea was confirmed by the round "U.S. SHIP/ 3 CTS" marking on the cover. The source of the cover, the U.S.S. Mississippi, was one of the ships with Admiral Farragut in the assault and capture of New Orleans and subsequent operations up the Mississippi River in 1862.

I own and illustrated another cover from the U.S. Ship Supply with identical markings in the article in Chronicle No. 58. That cover is endorsed "From the U.S. ship Supply, Mississippi River".

## PROBLEM COVERS FOR THIS ISSUE

Figures $3 a$ and $3 b$ show the front and back of a letter from Bolivia to the United States in 1892. Mail from Bolivia to the United States is scarce, and it could have come to the U.S. by several routes. The postage paid on this post-U.P.U. cover gives a clue as to the rating. Other than Norman Hubbard or Jim DeVoss, will a reader attempt an explanation?


Figure 3a. 1892 cover from Bolivia


Figure 3b. Back of Figure 3a.

With over a dozen candidates, it is difficult to choose the next problem. Here is one to honor our new President, Richard F. Winter, whose knowledge of trans-Atlantic mails is surpassed by very few. The folded letter in Figure 4 was sent in 1866 from Netherlands (Holland) to the U.S. The Rotterdam and London markings are in red, and all others in black. There are no markings on the back. The stamps of the second issue are the 10 cents and three of the 15 cents orange, for a total of 55 cents. The Philadelphia "Br. Pkt." marking does not show a credit, but there is a black " 5 ", nearby. Will a reader identify the ship, explain the rate, and tell how much each of the three countries involved received of the postage paid?


Figure 4. 1866 cover from Netherlands.
Please send your answers by mail to the P.O. Box or FAX to 513-563-6287 within two weeks of receiving this issue.

The photographer for problem covers in the past eight years has been John Payne, a Cincinnati Public School teacher and child psychologist, who has taken retirement and purchased a Civil war site near Bowling Green, Kentucky. This means that he will not be able to process the hundreds of photos of covers per year he has done, with about one in ten being published.

Photographing covers is an art. There may be pale rose, blue, brown or other colors all on one cover. Getting a print with good black and white contrast suitable for the Chronicle is difficult. Knowledge of filters, exposure time, type of film and paper are all necessary. In extreme cases multiple shots are made and the negatives are superimposed to get a print for publication.

If you have a problem cover to submit for publication, please send a glossy black and white print to this Editor, together with a description of the cover. If a quality print is unavailable, send the cover. If it is deemed usable, we will arrange to photograph it. Some submitters are sending Xerox-type copies of covers. While these are legible, they are not suitable for publication.
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From colonial letters to classic 20th century first day covers, this Seminar Textbook No. 3 from The Philatelic Foundation (PF) expands on material and information that seven leading students and collectors of U.S. postmarks and cancellations presented at a PF seminar in November 1990. Nearly 300 black and white photos highlight this sweeping but comprehensive survey of town markings, circular date stamps, rate notations, fancy cancels, transit marks and special handstamps.

In addition, guest editor Scott Trepel has compiled a group of covers with fake markings from the PF's Reference Collection. He has also created a time-line that places postmark and cancellation developments within the context of U.S. economic, political and postal history.
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## CLASSIFIED

WANTED: Yellow cancels on 19th century U.S. or stampless covers. Will buy or trade high-quality U.S. Steven Hines, P.O. Box 422, Monee, III. 60449.

SPECIAL EVENT COVERS OF 1930-40s WANTED, individually or by the box. Dealers: I'll pay postage both ways. Phil Sager, 411 Sparta, Ruston, LA 71270. 318-2552073.

BUYING NEVADA, post office cancellations on picture postcards, covers, small towns prior 1920. $\$ 25.00$ minimum paid. Also need Arizona, New Mexico, Alaska, obsolete post office cancellations. Send photos or approvals. Peterson, Box 17463, Holiday, UT 84117.

BUY, TRADE: Octagonal postmarks to 1870, fancy penned markings, college stamps, patent punch and stencil usages,
early precancels, Ohio and \#65 fancies, 20th Cent. fancy registered. Kesterson; 3881 Fulton Grove; Cincinnati, OH 45245.

WANTED: Fort Wayne, Indiana advertising covers, trade cards, post cards, letterheads, medals, trade tokens, etc. All types of paper, celluloid or metal advertising items. Myron Huffman, 12409 WAYNE Trace, Hoagland, IN 46745.

WANTED: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania pre 1900 advertising covers specifically with illustrations of buildings or street scenes. All correspondence answered. MemberAPS. Gus Spector, 750 Main Street, Suite 203, Phoenixville, Pennsylvania 19460.
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