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## IN MEMORIAM



## D. SCOTT GALLAGHER

 NOVEMBER 7, 1922 - MARCH 31, 1998D. Scott Gallagher, a Classics Society member since the mid-'60s, died March 31 at age 75 from pneumonia and complications of brain cancer.

He was USPCS President from 1968-72 and Vice President the following year, and continued as an active member ever since.

Scott received the Lester C. Brookman Cup in 1971 for service to the society. In 1996, he was awarded the Stanley B. Ashbrook Cup for his more than 20 years of outstanding service as editor of the Cover Corner of the Chronicle. He thoroughly enjoyed researching and presenting problem covers.

His interest in philately began at age seven. Over the years his collecting interests focused on the Caribbean area (especially Puerto Rico) and on Kentucky and Tennessee during the Civil War. His gold medal collection of Tennessee was a name sale in 1987 at Robert A. Siegel Auction Galleries. His Grand Award winning Kentucky collection will be auctioned by Siegel in June 1998.

Scott was involved in philately on many levels. In addition to his strong participation in the Classics Society, he served for many years on the Board of Directors of the Philatelic Foundation and as a member of the Foundation's expert committee. He eagerly volunteered to share his knowledge in philately within several stamp clubs, including the Collectors Club (New York) and the Collectors Club of Chicago. He also gave presentations to various historical societies in Kentucky and Ohio. Over the past years he especially enjoyed passing his knowledge, along with samples of stamps and covers, to local school children.

Scott was a graduate of the Stevens Institute of Technology in mechanical engineering, and was elected to Tau Beta Phi engineering honor society. He was a partner in and CEO of H.P. Thompson Co. in Cincinnati, Ohio, which retrofits power plants, provides cogeneration and pollution control systems, and builds energy recovery equipment.

His survivors include his wife Shirley, daughter Rachael Hoskins, son Paul Gallagher, stepsons Douglas and Rodger Mouch, and sisters Sally Sheeran and Barbara Hannon.

- Walter Haag
(From the Editor-in-Chief: Scott was still planning Cover Corner submissions up to his final days, including pieces on P.F. expertising and John Fox fakes which unfortunately were never finished. But Scott was not only an accomplished philatelic scholar and writer. His interests were broad and his enthusiasms infectious, be they fishing or bridge, good stories, cars, food, golf, travel, friends or the "golden oldies." He left many legacies, not least the enjoyment he gave to those who were fortunate enough to know him. We will miss him.)


## Gold PhiLITex 92 Gold and Reserve Grand, Oropex '91

 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.

$\$ 50.00$ postpaid; please add $\$ 5$ for foreign address. Order: U.S.P.C.S., P.O. Box 445, Wheeling, IL 60090

# A PRELIMINARY CENSUS OF EARLIEST DATES AND LARGEST MULTIPLES ON SCOTT 1-245 <br> ELIOT A. LANDAU 

(cont. from Chronicle 176:223)
It was very heartening to have so many of our members respond, including many whom I had not previously known, and provide updated information on the preliminary census for Linn's 19th Century U.S. Stamp Facts. While new discoveries will always be made and no earliest date or largest multiple less than a full pane can ever be assured that its entry will be lasting, I am very satisfied. We have achieved the widest survey and assembled the most complete data ever yet put together in these categories, yet we do owe deep gratitude for the pioneering efforts of Ed Siskin.

Mike Laurence of Linn's gives his special thanks to our Editor-in-Chief for accommodating the census and getting it to press so quickly. He also joins me in thanking the 24 correspondents (two anonymously) who sent so much information and who will be acknowledged in the book when published in May 1998.

Dr. James Milgram has in preparation (almost complete) a major manuscript on registered markings of the early period (approximately 1845 through 1870). I have deferred my own publishing efforts in that area to him and assist him in providing postmarks. We would both happily welcome clean copies of any and all covers with clear markings from that period and of the few which we believe exist from just before that period. They will help our research efforts and will be shared back with all.

Our readers would also substantially help my efforts if they could provide cover copies in two more areas:

1) Actual-size copies of the Philadelphia " $R$ " markings on cover from the 1845 to 1855 period, together with indications of whether they are in red, blue or black as well as dates, where available. I am trying to complete work begun by an earlier collector to identify how many different handstamps were in use. Early evidence seems to show that there may have been as many as eight distinguishable large R's in use.
2) Clear copies (in color if possible) of 1883-1915 covers with U.S. REGISTERED labels, except those with printed town names of New York and San Francisco. I am working on a major article as a revision and update of Barbara Mueller's seminal studies in this area. This will include a census of all reported labels other than the New York and San Francisco ones. Many new ones have been discovered. There will also be a suggested plan of organization for listing those labels in the Scott U.S. Specialized Catalog.

All contributions to these efforts will be gratefully received and graciously acknowledged. Those wishing their assistance to be anonymous may be assured that their wishes will be respected. My address: 5329 Main Street, Suite 105, Downers Grove, IL 60515.

## THE PRESTAMP \& STAMPLESS PERIOD

FRANK MANDEL, Editor

## MANUSCRIPT TOWN MARKINGS/HANDSTAMPED RATING MARKS FRANK MANDEL

Without much difficulty, collectors of stampless covers can find examples of handstamped town markings used with manuscript rating marks. They are very common, even from the largest offices. The opposite arrangement, manuscript town markings used with handstamped rating marks, is a completely different story. They are quite scarce in comparison; a ratio of $1: 1,000$ might actually be conservative. It might be interesting to speculate on the reasons why this disparity exists.

Before the rates of July 1, 1845 went into effect, most rating marks were applied in manuscript. The rate structures of earlier periods were multi-tiered and complicated. The few covers that have any handstamped rating marks also have handstamped town markings. The most common pre-1845 examples are probably the so-called "attached rate" style, in use mainly in the 1830 s, and these, as the name implies, combined a rate and a town marking on the same device. Manuscript town markings generally originate in smaller offices, and these usually did not bother to privately order up rating mark handstamps without also obtaining devices for town markings.

Figure 1 is really a curiosity, though it is quite innocuous looking. Datelined at New Haven, Conn. on March 1, 1842, it appears to have a blue Milford, Conn. town marking in manuscript and a handstamped red " 6 " rating mark. I have by now studied rating marks for over 15 years, and this would be the only pre- 1845 example of an ordinary domestic rate in this combination I had yet been able to record. But there is some doubt: Milford was a fairly large New Haven County office with 1843 gross receipts reported at $\$ 796.19$. Circular handstamped town markings are reported there as early as 1838 by the American Stampless Cover Catalog, and with such high receipts use of such markings could be expected. This reference does not list rating marks from Milford before 1845.

The oddity increases when it is realized to where the cover is addressed. Bridgeport, Conn. was a huge office ( 1843 receipts at $\$ 6,052.02$ ), and significantly one of the few places where handstamped rating marks were used in the period 1838-1845, including all of the standard domestic rates: $6,10,12^{1 / 2}, 18^{3} / 4,25$. My collection of Bridgeport rating marks included a perfect match for the " 6 " on the Milford cover-used in 1842, but with the usual handstamped circular Bridgeport town marking.

Both Milford and Bridgeport were classed as seaports, but the Milford cover is not endorsed as a ship's letter. This possibility has to be entertained, since ship letters are usually rated upon receipt, as this one was, and $6 \notin$ is correct for ship letters addressed to the port of entry. It should also be noted that the "Milford Ct." marking is undated. This too is a bit unusual, as it is a technical violation of the postal regulations (although one often ignored). It does raise the question: is it a postmark at all? At this point, "the jury is still out," but it seems to me that I shall have to wait a bit longer to find an unequivocal pre1845 example with this odd combination of manuscript town marking and handstamped rating mark.

With the simplification of rates in July 1845, the use of handstamped rating marks became common in many offices, although it was more typical in larger ones. Figure 2 illustrates the earliest clear example of this unusual combination I have been able to record. Postmarked in manuscript at Cincinnatus, N.Y., July 31 [1845], with a bold red " 5 " rating mark, it originated in a small town office that reported a healthy $\$ 222.94$ in gross receipts in 1845. The office had been using a straightline postmarking device at least up to 1845 , but about that time it had a change in postmasters, from Barak Niles to Oliver


Figure 1. Ms. "Milford Ct " in blue, red $12 \times 8 \mathrm{~mm}$. " 6 " rating mark of Bridgeport, Conn., on letter datelined March 1, 1842; appears to be a rare pre-1845 combination, but status is uncertain (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 2. Ms. "Cincinnatus NY," red $15 \times 11 \mathrm{~mm}$. " 5 " rating mark, used July 31, 1845, a month after the new rates went into effect; earliest recorded example of this combinaton (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 3. Ms. "Lisbon, Wis.," black $8 \times 5 \mathrm{~mm}$. Roman style "V" rating mark, unpaid rate of 1851-55, marking quite crude and possibly of local origin (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 4. Ms. "Corinna Me," dirty black "PAID/3" in 21 mm. circle, used May 7, 1853, not long after Volney A. Sprague became postmaster (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)

Kingman. The change in rates and the change in administrations may also signify a change in postmarking procedures, resulting in this odd configuration.

Figure 3 illustrates another 5 $\phi$ rate cover, handstamped "V" in Roman style, used with manuscript town marking from Lisbon, Wis. While not year dated, the distance traveled to Cincinnati, Ohio fixes this as a collect rate of the period 1851-55. This office was in the north part of Waukesha County, about 62 miles east of Madison, and reported gross receipts of $\$ 68.14$ in 1853. This is low enough to be consistent with the use of a manuscript town marking, since the office was probably not entitled to a free handstamp. The Roman " $V$ " is very plain, almost crude. Perhaps the postmaster there, one Levi Russell, momentarily tired of contemplating the local delights of barley farming and blue limestone quarrying, desired to add a little classical affectation to his postal operations and ordered up (or even made) a very simple handstamp for that purpose?

Figure 4 illustrates another handstamped rating mark which appears to me to be a "one off" job, perhaps of local origin, rather than a universal "stock style." This slightly crude "PAID/3" is used with a manuscript town marking from Corinna, Maine, dated May 7, [1853]. This office was located in an active small Penoscot County town that boasted of its shingle and boot factories, but it generated total receipts of only $\$ 83.06$ in 1853, probably not enough to entitle it to handstamps at government expense. However, on Feb. 7, 1853, Volney A. Sprague assumed the Corinna postmastership from Jotham S. Pratt. Mr. Sprague should be well known to students of Maine postal history for his use of unusual markings, most notably a handstamped franking mark which includes his name, sometimes used as a fancy cancel on stamps. He appears to have started his career of using cus-tom-made handstamps early, producing the oddity under discussion about three months after having become postmaster. This may be one small indication of the importance of individuals, and their tastes and styles, in transacting the business of their offices in the days before complete bureaucracy enforced dreary, dreary standardization.

Figures 5, 6 and 7 illustrate universal "stock styles" of handstamped rating marks, all originating from the most prolific maker of wooden handstamp during the 1850 s, Edmond S. Zevely of Pleasant Grove, Md. Zevely's operations are sometimes a little difficult to understand. They are complicated by the fact that he was a government contractor providing his products to offices whose receipts entitled them to wooden handstamps, as well as an advertiser to and supplier of the small offices that had insufficient receipts but still wished to obtain handstamps at their own expense, whether for convenience or as a matter of pride.

Figure 5 shows a manuscript of East Corinth, Vt., used July 21, 1853, with the Zevely rating mark applied in the same brown writing ink as the town marking. This small Orange County office, located about 25 miles southeast of Montpelier, reported receipts of $\$ 124.13$ in 1853. It had a change of postmasters on June 19, 1853, from N.D. Blake to Reuben Page. It would appear that the office qualified for wooden handstamps at government expense via Mr. Zevely, and a circular town marking in Zevely style may have been used there as early as 1851 . Postmaster Page was new at his job when this cover was sent, and he apparently found it more convenient to postmark it in manuscript, but he continued to use the rating handstamp he inherited from his predecessor. He seems to have especially liked those little wooden handstamps, for he also used them frequently to cancel stamps, up until the 1860s, using a variety of pretty color combinations all neatly applied.

Figure 6 shows a manuscript Ferrisburgh, Vt., May 14 (no year date, but probably early 1850 s), with the Zevely dating mark in dark blue. The style of "PAID/3" is somewhat different than that used at East Corinth, but is one of Zevely's most common stock styles, associated with hundreds if not thousands of different towns. Ferrisburgh was a small office in Addison County, on the eastern shore of Lake Champlain, about 32 miles southwest of Montpelier, and reported only $\$ 84.84$ gross receipts in 1853 . The postmaster probably had to order his handstamp at his own expense. The overall impression one gets


Figure 5. Ms. "East Corinth Vt," brown "PAID/3" in 20 mm . circle, used July 21, 1853, Zevely style rating mark, used about a month after a new postmaster, Reuben Page, took over at this office (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 6. Ms. "Ferrisburgh Vt," blue "PAID/3" in 22.5 mm . circle, early 1850s use, Zevely style rating mark, strike nearly perfect and handstamp may have been newly acquired (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 7. Ms. "Wrest] Galway [N.Y.]," light red "PAI D/3" in 20.5 mm . circle, used on Christmas Eve, Dec. 24, 1855, a week before use of postage stamps became compulsory, Zevely style rating mark; this is the latest such combination in ordinary use recorded (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 8. Ms. "No Pownal Vt," black "PAID/3" in 20 mm . circle, early 1850s use, rating mark handstamp in the style of Collin \& Co. (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)
from this little "lady's cover" is one of neatness and precision, which may have been the object in ordering a handstamp. It is really very pretty in its own way.

Figure 7 has a manuscript "W.[est] Galway [N Y], Dec. 24 [1855]"; the Zevely rating mark is the same style as that used in East Corinth, in light red. This is the latest manuscript town/handstamped rating mark combination cover in ordinary domestic use I have recorded. (On Jan. 1, 1856 the use of postage stamps to pre-pay postage became mandatory. There were significant exceptions: drop letters, Western and foreign mails, etc.). West Galway's office was in Fulton County in the northeastern part of New York State; it reported 1853 gross receipts of $\$ 148.38$. The American Stampless Cover Catalog reports circular style town markings in use there as early as 1850 . The rating mark used on this cover may have been part of a set of Zevely handstamps supplied at government expense, possibly obtained by Postmaster Peter J. Hoes when he assumed the office on May 17, 1853. Why did he use a manuscript town marking? I would like to guess that it was Christmas Eve, 1855, and perhaps he could smell the goose and turkey cooking; everyone was getting into the mood, the carolers were crooning, the post was closing soon. The manuscript marking looks like it was written in great haste, abbreviating the town and omitting the state. Then he grabbed the rating handstamp and gave the letter a quick whack, and soon he and it were on their merry ways.

Zevely was not the only party supplying "stock style" devices to small post offices. Another distributor, known through its advertisements as Collin \& Co. of New York City, was also quite active during the 1850s. The actual manufacturer of the Collin devices may have been an established engraver, Edmund Hoole. Figure 8 illustrates a typical Collin "PAID/3" rating mark, used with manuscript "No Pownal Vt Nov 10" (no year date, probably 1852-54). This Bennington County office reported gross receipts of $\$ 121.34$ in 1853, and also had a change of postmasters-from Andrew Carpenter to Jonathan Brown-in the last quarter of that year. No. Pownal also used a Collin-style single line circular town marking, as early as 1851 . If this cover was sent in 1853, soon after Mr. Brown assumed control, he may have found it more convenient to write in the town marking (similar to the Corinna, Maine and East Corinth, Vermont covers previously described).

One of the main exceptions to the mandatory domestic use of postage stamps after January 1, 1856 was in California and other western parts of the country. Supplying and distributing adhesives to these remote regions was unsure and undependable, and stampless markings continued to be widely used, and apparently tolerated by the Post Office Department, well into the 1860s. Figure 9 illustrates a crude brown "PAID/3," probably from a wooden handstamp, used with manuscript Forbestown [Cal.], no year date but circa 1854-58. By eastern standards, Forebestown, a Butte County office in a small village, reported a whopping gross receipts of $\$ 732.82$ in 1857. The gold (and rosin?) found nearby may explain why a place with only 200 permanent residents kept things hopping down at the post office. Circular town markings were in use there as early as 1854. Irregular uses such as this do not seem especially unusual in the Western context, as that region produced many other exotic uses (e.g., Western expresses, fancy town markings, different transcontinental rates, bisects, etc.). All that gold (and rosin?) made people eccentric.

Most of the manuscript town/handstamped rate combinations encountered involve rating marks that are by most standards ordinary, especially those with common stock styles. Particularly fancy rating marks in combination with manuscript town markings are peculiar and illogical. One would think that an office with fancy rating handstamps would at least have some sort of handstamp with which to apply a town marking, even if only a common circular one.

Figure 10 illustrates the unusual "PA3ID" of Waterville, Conn., used May 5, 1853. Waterville was a New Haven County office, reporting $\$ 189.28$ gross receipts in 1853. It was a fairly active office, located in a town about 28 miles northwest of New Haven, known at that time mainly for the manufacture of pocket knives. By 1854, the office was


Figure 9. Ms. "Forbestown [Cal.]," brown "PAID/3," rather crude, approx. $13 \times 13 \mathrm{~mm}$., probably from a wooden handstamp, mid-1850s use (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 10. Ms. "Waterville Ct," fancy black "PA3ID," $13 \times 31.5 \mathrm{~mm}$. , used May 5, 1853 (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 11. Ms. "Larrabees Pt Vt," black "PAID" $6 \times 25 \mathrm{~mm}$., and negative " 3 " in approx. 15 mm . circle; negative rating marks are quite scarce, in this combination extremely unusual (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 12. Ms. "C[rystal]. Springs Miss," black Zevely style "PAID" $7 \times 19 \mathrm{~mm}$. and separate $8.5 \times 5 \mathrm{~mm}$. " 5 " rating mark, used in the Confederate period, Nov.23, 1861 (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)
also using a large double circle town marking with fancy ornaments at the sides. Perhaps the postmaster, William Pickett, who probably could have obtained ordinary and plain handstamps at government expense, opted for something a bit more exciting and stylish, thereby making Waterville notable for something besides "pocket cutlery," as 19th century gazetteers politely referred to switchblades and other such cute devices.

Figure 11 illustrates a bold handstamp "PAID" and separate negative " 3 " rating mark, used with manuscript "Larrabees P[oin]t Vt" (no year date, probably 1852-54). Negative rating marks comprise only a tiny fraction of all handstamped markings, so this combination is quite unusual. Larrabees Point was a small Addison County office, located on Lake Champlain, about 50 miles southwest of Montpelier, reporting only $\$ 29.84$ gross receipts in 1853. It was too tiny a place to be notable for anything, according to gazetteers of the period. However, it did produce some very nice postal markings, including a dimesized town marking in use as early as 1851, and an especially petite "PAID/3" in circle (which is also seen as a canceler of stamps, usually in a pretty greenish blue color). The postmaster, Henry S. Gale, seems to have been another of those hardy Yankee nonconformists who relished something special, despite-or perhaps because of - the small size of his domain. (By the way, you may have noticed that many of these unusual combinations originated in the state of Vermont, whose picturesque and sublime scenery seems to have been teeming with individualists.)

The circumstances of Southern post offices at the beginning of the Civil War necessitated the reintroduction of stampless markings of a wide variety, some carry-overs from earlier times, some created on a provisional basis, some handstamped, and some in manuscript. Even so, the general rules of the U.S. stampless period (before 1856) tend to apply:
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{cll}\text { Town marking } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Rating mark } \\
\text { manuscript }\end{array} & \text { manuscript }\end{array}
$$ \begin{array}{l}Scarcity <br>

common\end{array}\right\}\)| handstamped | common |
| :--- | :--- |
| handstamped | hanuscript |

Figure 12 illustrates the handstamped "PAID" and separate " 5 ," used with manuscript "C[rystal]. Springs Miss Nov. 23 (?) [1861]." This office was located in Copiah County, in bayou country, and was surprisingly large, reporting $\$ 277.69$ gross receipts in 1859 ( $\$ 406.44$ in 1861, but partial receipts only until May 31, when U.S. operations ceased). The adversity conditions under which Confederate offices must have operated are sufficient to explain why an anomaly such as this exists. The abbreviated form of the town marking points to haste; perhaps the mails to New Orleans were closing. The "PAID" is a pre-war holdover, one of the many styles associated with Zevely. The " 5 " was probably made to order when the Confederate rates went into effect. The Dietz Confederate States Catalog lists a circular town marking in use by 1862, but in November 1861 it is possible that the postmaster lacked, or perhaps was unable to replace, a pre-war town marking device, and given the dire circumstances of those terrible times it probably was not high on his agenda of things to worry about.

An inquiry such as this, into a very specialized aspect of what is, to begin with, a narrow topic, can easily become bogged down in technical and pedantic disquisitions. While it is wise to be familiar with rate structures, Postal Laws and Regulations and the trivia of the Official Register, I believe it is essential never to lose sight of the individual human dimension, for this surely provides the ultimate explanation of why certain anomalies exist. All the rest just helps us along in our conjectures.

# Matthew Bennett, Inc. 

## Serving the Philatelic World for 50 Years



Matthew Bennett, Inc.
(hile speaking at a meeting of a chapter of the U.S. Classics Society last week, one collector questioned me, "You do not produce an auction catalog-it is actually a book! Why is that?" I thought I would share my response to that remark while at the same time discussing my goals for our upcoming 50th anniversary auction.


Freeman \& Co.'s Express, New York (25c) Blue (164L1) one of the rarest of U.S. locals-Realized \$16,000

Certainly, when producing an auction catalog, there are some practical considerations that contribute to its size. However, the main purpose goes back to the philosophy I have been discussing, i.e., to serve all areas of philately.

The goal for this anniversary auction is


Unique original models of 5c and 10¢ 1847 issue-Realized $\$ 41,800$ to create the most varied sale we have ever assembled, with a particular emphasis on postal history and classic U.S. The items illustrated here are just two pieces we have recently offered in those areas.

I will be talking to collectors and traveling extensively from now through June, bringing together consignments for this special sale. I look forward to hearing from you and to having a chance to talk with you about how your holding might fit into this anniversary auction.

[^0]
## STAMPLESS MARKINGS HELP UNRAVEL A LITTLE 1847 ISSUE MYSTERY FRANK MANDEL

While it is not my intention to intrude into the domain of U.S. adhesive issues, I must admit that I have a strong personal interest in that field insofar as classic adhesives with interesting postal markings are concerned. One specific topic of interest is the use of rating marks as cancels, especially in the period 1847-1856. This is an interesting span, with much overlapping between stampless and adhesive uses and markings, though in matter of fact there are significant overlaps before and after these years as well. I have picked this span since it coincides with the release of the first general issue adhesives in July 1847 and the broad mandate to use adhesive stamps for pre-payment of postage effective January $1,1856$.

When I examined the cover illustrated in Figure 1, I was aware of a strong similarity to the stampless covers I discussed in the preceding article on manuscript town markings used with handstamped rating marks. Here we have a cover with manuscript "Centrefield NY" in blue, used July 27, 1848, with a $10 \notin 1847$ issue stamp canceled with a red marking which on close inspection proved to be a huge red " 5 " tilted to right about $30-35$ degrees.

This is analogous to the stampless examples previously described, except that in this case the handstamped rating mark is not serving its essential purpose but is used only to cancel the stamp. Such use at this period was not really rare. Many examples exist, sometimes with the rating being part of a town marking (such as the common integral rates of Philadelphia), and sometimes as a separate handstamp (such as the common rating marks used as cancelers in Baltimore). However, I had never encountered this combination before and was inclined to be skeptical, except that certain physical evidence tended to confirm its authenticity and led me to acquire it for study.

Centrefield, N.Y. was a small post village in Ontario County, located about 200 miles northwest of Albany. The office reported gross receipts of $\$ 91.26$ in 1849, so it is unlikely that it qualified for government issued handstamps. Manuscript markings are consistent with this. The American Stampless Cover Catalog lists no markings of any kind from this office, which may just indicate a low number of surviving covers in collector hands.

Mannel Hahn's monograph, Postal Markings of the United States, 1847-1851, lists 90 towns in New York State that were sent shipments of the 1847 issue, and quite a few of these received only $5 \phi$ stamps. Tiny Centrefield of course is not listed, and even a quick glance at the offices that are confirms that they were the largest and most active ones in the state. All of them used handstamped town markings during the period when the 1847 adhesives were available. None of this precludes the possibility that Centrefield might acquire handstamps at its own expense, or that 1847 issue stamps might have become available at the Centrefield post office. Every postmaster in the United States had the right to request the stamps, and the official record of distribution has long been suspected of being incomplete or inaccurate.

Eventually, I noticed that this cover was addressed to South Hadley, Massachusetts. Sensation! This was a large office ( $\$ 730.90$ gross receipts in 1849) and a user of rating marks. The office was located in a large manufacturing town of Hampshire County, and was the site of Mount Holyoke Female Seminary, the well known institution founded by Mary Lyon (see the current $2 \phi$ stamp at your post office). The contents of the Centrefield letter indicated that Miss Lucinda Williams, its recipient, may have been one of the lucky 200 young ladies this school accommodated. The letter is from her "affectionate mother."

More to the point, Figure 2 illustrates a cover sent from South Hadley, Mass. on Sept. 28, 1848, just two months later than the Centrefield cover, bearing a bright red circular town marking and a beautiful bold " 5 " rating mark that matches the cancel on the


Figure 1. Blue ms. "Centrefield NY," with $10 ¢ 1847$ tied by large red " 5 " rating mark [outlined to enhance visibility, approx. 21x17 mm., on July 27, 1848 cover to South Hadley, Mass. (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 2. Red "SOUTH HADLEY Mass." cds, 30 mm ., ms. "PAID," used with giant " 5 " rating mark, $21 \times 17 \mathrm{~mm}$., on stampless cover to Northampton, Mass., sent Sept. 28, 1848 (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 3. Green "SOUTH HADLEY Mass." cds, 30 mm ., with matching jumbo "10," 20x34 mm. (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)


Figure 4. Forwarded cover, used April 15, 1854 from Adams, Mass. with pen-canceled 3¢ 1851 issue adhesive, forwarded from South Hadley, Mass. with ms. "Fwd" and the still-in-use giant " 5 in black, probably originally intended for South Hadley Falls (Photo courtesy David L. Jarrett)

Centrefield item in every particular: color, size and shape. The conclusion would appear to be that the $10 \phi$ stamp was canceled on receipt.

To carry the South Hadley connection a bit further: This office seems to have liked large bold rating marks. Figure 3 illustrates a huge beautiful " 10 " bright green, used with the same circular town marking. Would it not be wonderful if it was used to cancel a $10 \phi$ 1847 ? This office continued to use large numerals even after the rates changed in 1851. Figure 4 illustrates the use of the large " 5 " on a forwarded cover, in blue, this being the collect rate on a letter used with a $3 \notin 1851$ stamp, sent April 18, 1854. (It probably should have been addressed to South Hadley Falls, another office. I have encountered other examples of this costly mistake.)

So what probably happened with the Centrefield, N.Y. cover? I believe it went something like this: Lucinda Williams' mama, who got her daughter into one of the most exclusive schools in the country, also craftily got her affectionate hands on a sweet $10 \notin 1847$ stamp and presented her letter in the usual way at the Centrefield post office. The postmaster, C.S. Knowles, had probably heard of these things (adhesive stamps) before, but really did not have much experience concerning what to do with them, and was probably contemplating retirement anyway (and would, on June 16, 1849), and so just sent it along its way, perhaps muttering something about "new-fangled things." When it arrived at the large office in South Hadley, the sharp-eyed and experienced postmaster there noted the lack of a proper cancel and recalled the magnificent prose of Regulations to be observed by Postmasters concerning Stamps for the prepayment of postage, issued July 22, 1847:
> 501. Stamps so affixed are to be immediately cancelled in the office in which the letter or packet may be deposited, with an instrument to be furnished to certain of the post offices for that purpose. In post offices not so furnished, the stamps must be cancelled by making a cross X on each with a pen. If the cancelling has been omitted on the mailing of the letter, the Postmaster delivering it will cancel the stamp in the manner directed and immediately report the postmaster who may have been delinquent, to the Department. [My emphasis]

Ignoring the letter of the Regulation, but adhering to the spirit, the South Hadley postmaster seized the first handstamp that came his way, possibly growling something about the incompetence of small town postmasters, and applied some bright red ink, terminally killing that stamp. Do you think that he also squealed on the poor old postmaster back at Centrefield to "the Department"? Would Miss Lucinda, fresh with transcendental philosophical affectations acquired at Mount Holyoke, have been appalled by the stern letter of reprimand from "the Department" to the likely geriatric and possibly incontinent C.S. Knowles ("We beg to inform you that it is the strict Regulation of this Department... etc., etc."), and the terror it would have generated? Why did he finally decide to retire? And what would mama think, in her affectionate way, of what her pretty little stamp did?

## GUIDO CRAVERI

## is buying at top prices

## 1847 issue

(covers only)
and 1851 issue (covers only) used in
Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, Oklahoma, Utah and Washington Territories

Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Texas and Wisconsin cancellations

> Rail Road cancellations
> Waterway usages and cancellations Way cancellations and foreign destinations and unusual covers

Please send your offer by fax or mail with the price requested.
Our fax no. is:

### 011.41 .91 .6494294

(Please do not send original items without prior notification)

## GUIDO CRAVERI

HARMERS AUCTIONS SA
Via Pocobelli, 16. CH-6815 MELIDE, Switzerland
Tel: 011.41.91. 649.42.85 Fax: 011.41.91. 649.42.94

# "T" CRACK ON THE 5¢ 1847 PLATED TO POSITION 69R WADE E. SAADI 

I have plated the "T" Crack variety on the $5 ¢ 1847$, whose existence I first announced in 1994. ${ }^{1}$ In September 1997, this plating was confirmed by both Mark Rogers and Keiji Taira, and I thank them for their assistance. Three months after plating the "T" Crack, I had occasion to examine the full right pane of the orange trial color proof ${ }^{2}$ of the $5 \phi 1847$. It did not show the "T" Crack on position 69R, which means the crack appeared after these proofs were pulled. Since I have the variety on an Oct. 23,1847 dated cover, which would place that stamp in the $1^{\text {st }}$ delivery, the crack in the plate must have happened before or during the printing of the $1^{\text {st }}$ delivery stamps and after the pulling of the above-mentioned proofs. However, in studying a $400 \%$ enlargement of the black trial color proof, ${ }^{3}$ there are very fine lines present in the critical position where the crack formed.

[^1]
## TYPE "A" DOUBLE TRANSFER REPORTED ON 5¢ 1847 TRIAL COLOR PROOF henry f. MARASSE, M.D.

A second double transfer position on a trial color proof ${ }^{1}$ of the $5 \notin 1847$ has come to light. It is position 80R, known familiarly as Type "A," with a red "SPECIMEN" overprint. The first report of a double transfer on an 1847 plate proof was by this author, in Chronicle 170 (May 1996). ${ }^{2}$ There, the existence of the first $5 \not \subset 1847$ plate proof, position 90R or Type "B," was discussed, and the only known $10 \notin 1847$ plate proof showing a double transfer (position 31R, Type "B") was also first documented.

This $5 \not \subset$ Type " $A$ " double transfer is the lower right stamp in a block of four (Figure 1). ${ }^{3}$ A block of 16 (Figure 2) which was offered by Herman Herst, Jr., in his auction \#52, March 10, 1950, in Boston, apparently contained this block of four, which was subsequently cut from it. The subject block occupied the lower right corner of the former block of 16 . The current whereabouts of the double transfer block is unknown.

[^2]

Figure 1. Block of four with double transfer at lower right

It is quite likely that this double transfer is unique as a black plate proof. But, its importance as a rarity is eclipsed by its role in helping to substantiate an hypothesis widely held by students of the issue. That is, its existence further buttresses Stanley Ashbrook's theory that only the Type " $A$ " and Type " $B$ " double transfers should appear on a black plate proof which was pulled prior to the printing of the actual stamps (it is fairly certain that these proofs were pulled prior). These topics are thoroughly discussed in the May 1996 article, and this discovery acts as additional collateral.


Figure 2. Block of 16 from Herman Herst, Jr. auction \#52, March 10, 1950

# Whether It's Classic Stamps Or Postal History, You Can Count On Our Knowledge. 



Whatever United States classic philately you have for sale, we'd like to have the chance to make you an offer. In recent months, we've bought important holdings ranging from outstanding western postal history to New York Foreign Mail cancellations. What do you have for sale?

> In many cases, the best and fairest offer for your stamps will come from someone who truly knows your stamps like you do.

And with 37 years experience in buying stamps, our knowledge is virtually unmatched! We need every conceivable kind of stamp and/ or cover collection. From outstanding classic 19th century United States stamp collections and award-winning exhibits--to specific holdings of important postal history. Nothing is ever too large--and we love to purchase all types of smaller properties, too.

Our 37-year reputation for fairness and integrity assures that you will receive full market valuc for your collections when you sell to Andrew Levitt, and with our new NUTMEG STAMP SALES we have a voracious need that must be filled! Over $\$ 5$ million available. Call today for our bank letter of credit (203) 743-5291.

## We Are Ready To Compete For Your Stamps. Give Us A Call Today. <br> Give us the opportunity to compete for the stamps, covers and collections you have for sale. Over $\$ 5$ million is available now and, after looking at your material, payment from us is immediate. Find out why we are the most vigorous buyer in America. Call or write us...or if you're a computer user, just c-mail us and tell us about what you have to scll.



## Our Philatelic Heritage

By Andrew Levitt
Quite often during the years 1 first hegan in the stamp business with the Robert A. Siegel auction firm in the 1960s. I had the chance to attend the meetings of the Collectors Club of New York. These meetings were always a fascinating education into the depths of philately-for the
 meeting programs were always

Theodore Steinway presented by some of our
hobby's most renowned experts. And these experts were usually also people who not only studied their stamps. but gave both their time and money to further our pastime.

Such an individual was Mr. Theodore Steinway, the world-famous owner of the piano manufacturing company that, to this day, bears his family name. Mr. Steinway was not only an officer of the CCNY and a recipient of its coveted Lichtenstein Medal for service to philately, he was an avid topical collector of Music On Stamps. And as with many topical collectors, he had a wide and deep knowledge of the stamps of almost all countries of the world. His chief contribution to our hobby, though. was his founding of the Steinway Publication Fund which. for decades, has financed the publishing of many important philatelic books.

You Can Contact Us By E-Mail, Too!

Post Office Box 342
Danbury CT 06813


## THE 1851-61 PERIOD <br> HUBERT C. SKINNER, Editor

## A NEW ORNATE POSTMARK: CLOVERPORT KY JAMES W. MILGRAM

Numerous distinctive and unusual postmarks have been recorded from Cloverport, Kentucky, during the years 1838-1860. Many of these were hand-carved, and these intriguing markings are well illustrated in Alan T. Atkin's Postmarked Kentucky [1975, p. 149] and Tracy W. Simpson's U. S. Postal Markings 1851- '61 [1959, p. 18]; those known on stampless covers (1838-1855) are duly listed in the first volume of the American Stampless Cover Catalog [Fifth ed., 1997, pp. 109-110]. The postmarks listed previously include straight-line, curved and sinuous boxed markings, oval and circular townmarks, one negative marking, one with NOR, and one in a horseshoe-shaped frame; none of these is ornate or embellished with a pictorial design.

Now, a new townmark has been discovered, with an eagle in flight surmounting an oval frame which encloses what appears to be a hand-carved "CLOVERPORT KY" (see Figures 1 and 2). Ornate illustrated postmarks are rather scarce on cover during the 1850s. Only the well-known spread-eagle surmounted design recorded from such cities as Mechanicsburg, Indiana [see ASCC, Vol. I, 1997, p. 86] is known in any quantity; other ornate oval designs are rare. The Loachapoka, Alabama, Jefferson, Georgia, Mechanicsburg, Indiana, and many other ornate handstamps were produced from ready-made or "stock" printer's cuts with a slot or mortise into which a line of printer's type [town name and state] could be inserted and locked in place with a set-screw mechanism. The Cloverport, Kentucky, handstamp here described and illustrated, however, appears to be a single carved design with the town name an integral part of the stamping device. The date was added in manuscript as is characteristic for the ornate oval markings.


Figure 1. A new ornate oval postmark from Cloverport, Kentucky, dated (internally) November 1, 1852. The single letter rate to Walnut Hill Post Office in Fayette County, Kentucky, is prepaid by a $3 ¢$ stamp of $\mathbf{1 8 5 2}$. The month and day are added in manuscript within the oval marking.


Figure 2. An enlarged detail showing the postmark with a bird in flight (an apparent eagle) at the top of the oval. Note the large, prominent head and beak on this unusual eagle.

The Cloverport cover (Figure 1) is a folded letter dated November 1, 1852. It bears a manuscript canceled $3 \notin$ stamp of 1852 and the handstamped postmark is in a peculiar olive ink which cannot be termed black. The bird in flight at the top of the design, an apparent eagle, faces to the right (see detail, Figure 2).


Have you been STUCK with faked, fraudulent, forged, or otherwise counterfeit U.S. related philatelic material? Let us help you turn a disappointing situation into something positive, for yourself and the welfare of your hobby.

## DONATE YOUR SPURIOUS PHILATELIC MATERIAL TO THE

## U.S. Philatelic Classics Society

Stamp \& Cover Repository \& Analysis Program
(S.C.R.A.P.)

To arrange a potentially tax deductible donation, contact:

Michael J. Brown
S.C.R.A.P. Administrator
U.S. Philatelic Classics Society
P.O. Box 300

# Your Confidence is our Guiding Value! 

At Ivy \& Mader,<br>we take pride in our<br>integrity, reliability, and personal service.

But
all the principals can be summed up in one: your confidence that we are the right choice to handle the sale of your collection.

All of our efforts<br>are directed toward assuring you that your valuable stamps and covers are in the best of hands!

Call or write Walter Mader or Rex Bishop to inquire further how<br>Ivy \& Mader, Inc.<br>can assist you in the sale or the building of your collection.

Past or current catalogs available free of charge to
Classics Society Members

## 1-800-782-6771



Philatelic Auctions, Inc.

## INTRODUCTION TO A CENSUS OF THE 5¢ 1856 ISSUE © JOHN ZUCKERMAN

The $5 \phi 1856$ stamp is unlike its companion $1 \not \subset, 3 \phi, 10 \phi$ and $12 \phi$ imperforate $1851-55$ issues in two significant respects. First, the consistency of the subjects on the $5 \notin$ printing plate and scarcity of multiples makes it difficult, if not impossible, to plate. There is no $5 \phi$ plating study comparable to the works published by Chase, Ashbrook, Neinken and their followers, and there is no type classification that exists as for the $1 \varnothing$ and $10 \phi$. The only work that has been done is an identification of the four reliefs. The second significant difference is the relative scarcity of $5 \not \subset$ covers, which offers a greater possibility of achieving a meaningful census.

The only reference book on the $5 \notin 1856$ (and the 1857-61 Issue) was published in 1955 by Henry Hill. For the reasons just stated, Hill could not match the comprehensive work of Ashbrook and Chase. Other than minor plate varieties, multiples, a brief overview of usages and a discussion of the perforated shade varieties, there was little more for Hill to describe. The book is thin, both figuratively and literally.

Forty years after the Hill book was published, this author became interested in creating a census of $5 \notin 1856$ covers. Since 1995, a database has been built from a number of sources. These sources are as follows, in the order they were used:

- Past auction catalogues. A clipping file was constructed using auction photographs and descriptions.
- Keith Harmer kindly provided a set of photocopies of the collection formed by Frederick R. Mayer. This is the most comprehensive collection of the $5 \notin$ imperforate ever formed, and contains approximately one-third of all recorded covers.
- The records of the Philatelic Foundation, including the Ashbrook and Chase files. The Ashbrook files yielded several interesting pieces, including a single $5 \notin$ tied by a Wells, Fargo oval handstamp and used from San Francisco to Nevada City, Cal.
- William Crowe, head of the Expertising Committee at the Philatelic Foundation, kindly loaned me the Levi records. This valuable source of information, which was used at the end of the information-gathering process, added covers that have not been offered at auction in over 30 years, as well as further auction provenance. The Levi records yielded several important covers, including the only known example used to Russia. There are 253 covers or fronts in the Levi records.

Several of the covers included in the census may have met their fate at the bottom of a soaker's bucket, such as the imprint strip of four. However, they have been included in the census where full photos of the covers are available, as the information they provide is still useful.

Table 1 illustrates a single record from the census form created using a popular database program. Not all fields are relevant to all covers, and entries are tailored to the individual covers. A census is by definition an ongoing process, and is never truly complete. However, I feel confident that I have gathered enough relevant information to start drawing conclusions from the data. I intend to do this in a series of Chronicle articles. Each article will focus on a different area of usage. Some of the sections will include domestic usages, usages to B.N.A., to Italy, and to France. There will also be a separate article on rates.

# Census of the 5c Imperforate Stamp of 1856 



Table 1

## Basic Statistics

For this first article, I am limiting the scope to some introductory statistics regarding the general usage of the $5 \phi 1856$. Hopefully an examination of the data will call attention to the true rarity of the $5 \not \subset 1856$ on cover.

- Total number of covers or fronts in the census: 348
- There are 22 additional covers that need further inspection before being included in the census.
- Earliest recorded usage: March 24, 1856 (from Philadelphia to Halifax, Nova Scotia).
- Earliest recorded transatlantic usage: March 27, 1856 (from New Bedford, Mass. to Paris, France).
- Total recorded used to France from any origin: 194 ( $56 \%$ of all covers).
- Total recorded used from New Orleans to France: 155 ( $44 \%$ of all covers).
- Earliest recorded usage from New Orleans: May 5, 1856 (horizontal pair to Paris).
- Latest recorded usage from New Orleans: March 1858 (to France, exact date and town destination unconfirmed - see Knapp auction, lot 2474).
- Latest recorded usage: December 12, 1859 (from Sacramento City, Cal. to Marysville, Cal.)


## Summary of Covers By Destination



British North America usages are distributed as follows:

| To Canada - 7 | To New Brunswick - 1 | To Nova Scotia - 22 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

In the "Other" category are the following destinations (17 total):

| Belgium -1 | Bermuda -1 | Cape Verde Islands -1 | China (Shanghai) -1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cuba -1 | Denmark -2 | Greece -1 | Holland -1 |
| Hungary -1 | India -3 | Java -1 | Russia -1 |
| Scotland -2 |  |  |  |

## Usages by Origination

Following is a list of originations of the $5 ¢ 1856$, with a total for each state, and a breakdown of usages from each city or town:

Originating outside of the United States:
Total originating outside of the U.S. -4
Paris, France - 1
St. John, New Brunswick - 1
Mexico - 2
Tabasco-1
Vera Cruz - 1
By State and City:
Unidentified - 2
AL - 2
Mobile - 1
Montgomery - 1
CA - 3
Forbestown - 1
Sacramento City - 1
San Francisco-1
Todds Valley - 1
CT - 9
Bridgeport - 1
Hartford - 6
New Haven - 1
Norwich - 1
D.C. (Washington) - 3

DE - 2
Wilmington -2
GA - 1
Monticello - 1
IA - 1
Davenport - 1
IL - 11
Aurora - 1
Freeport - 2
Highland - 1
Nauvoo - 1
Palatine-1
Pekin-2
Peoria-2
St. Marie - 1
IN - 1
Washington - 1
LA - 188
Donaldsonville - 1
New Orleans - 186
St. Martainsville - 1
MA - 25
Boston - 20
Edgartown - 1
Lawrence - 1

New Bedford - 2
Springfield - 1
MD - 9
Annapolis - 8
Baltimore - 1
MO - 1
Weston-1
MS - 1
Vicksburgh - 1
NJ - 4
Trenton-4
NY - 38
Albany - 5
Auburn - 1
Buffalo - 4
Flushing - 1
Fordham - 1
Mayville - 1
New York City - 18
Orient - 1
Palmyra-1
Potsdam - 1
Troy - 4
OH-5
Baresville - 2
Columbus - 2
Portsmouth - 1
PA - 21
Unidentified within PA - 1
Bellefonte - 1
Bethlehem - 1
Erie - 1
Philadelphia- 16
Weedsboro-1
RI - 6
Newport - 2
Providence-4
SC-2
Charleston-1
Georgetown - 1
TX - 2
Galveston - 2
VA - 2
Richmond - 2
WI - 3
Milwaukee - 2
Mineral Point - 1

# INDEX TO THE CHRONICLE OF THE U.S. CLASSIC POSTAL ISSUES VOLUME 49 (1997) <br> Compiled by C.J. Peterson 

| Vol./Issue | Whole No. | Date | Pages | Editor-in-Chief |
| ---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $49 / 1$ | 173 | February 1997 | $1-72$, i-iv | Charles J. Peterson |
| $49 / 2$ | 174 | May 1997 | $73-144$, i-xii | Charles J. Peterson |
| $49 / 3$ | 175 | August 1997 | $145-216$ | Charles J. Peterson |
| $49 / 4$ | 176 | November 1997 | $217-88$ | Charles J. Peterson |

This index is in two parts: the Author Index includes precise titles of the articles, with parenthetical notation where necessary to indicate the primary subject matter; the Subject Index provides subject matter identification, avoiding unneeded citation of titles of articles.

Citations are to Whole Number and inclusive pages. Thus, 176:257-62 refers to the article in Whole No. 176 (Vol. 49, No. 4, Nov. 1997), at pages 257-62.

| Author Index |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Alexander, Thomas J., "Demonetization of the 1847 Issue" corrected version, | 173:24-33; <br> corrected version, 174:i-xii |
| Allen, James A., see Skinner and Allen |  |
| Brown, Malcolm L., "Plating the 5c 1847" | 176:262 |
| Campbell, Alan C., "Plating the Official Stamps" | 175:199-203 |
| Campbell, Alan C., "24c Interior Double Impression" | 176:275-76 |
| Campbell, Alan C., "24¢ Justice Short Transfer" | 176:276-78 |
| Carlin, Raymond W. see Gallagher and Carlin, "Cover Corner" |  |
| Celler, Richard C., "Newly Discovered Plate Flaw on 3¢ 1857 [Type II—Scott \#26]" | 173:34-35 |
| Evans, Don, "In Memoriam: C.W. 'Bert' Christian 1905-1997" | 97" 173:7-8 |
| Forster, Jeffrey M., "1869 Pictorial Issue at ANPHILEX '96" | , 174:124-30 |
| Forster, Jeffrey M., "10¢ 1869 to France" | 176:273-74 |
| Gallagher, Scott and Raymond W. Carlin, "Cover Corner" 173:64-70; 175:208-15; | $\begin{array}{r} 173: 64-70 ; 174: 136-41 ; \\ 175: 208-15 ; 176: 280-87 \end{array}$ |
| Graham, Richard B., "Fraudulent Use of a Double Bisect Grilled Stamp" | illed Stamp" 176:267-69 |
| Hulme, W. Wilson, II, "The Chicago Perforations" 174:95-120; | 174:95-120; 175:157-96 |
| Kloetzel, James E., "The Scott Catalogue Editor Responds to William E. Mo (Chronicle 173, Feb. 1997)" | William E. Mooz 174:79-84 |
| Kramer, George J., "Wells Fargo Pony Express Usages" | 173:38-40 |
| Landau, Eliot, "A Preliminary Census of Earliest Dates and Largest Multiples |  |
| Lanphear, Lester C., III, "10¢, 2¢, 3¢ Executive Combination Usage" | n Usage" 173:45-52 |
| Lobdell, David H., "An Unusual Plate Mark on the 3c |  |
| McClung, Michael C., "Forwarding the Advertising Fee" | 174:122-23 |
| McClung, Michael C., "Review: The United States 14 Franklin 1861-1867" | lin 1861-1867' 176:270-71 |
| Milgram, James M., "Robbery of Mail in the Classic Period" | 176:232-42 |
| Mooz, William E., "Corrections to 1997 Scott Catalog Listings" | gss" 173:41-43 |
| Peterson, Charles J., "Go West . . . to PACIFIC 97" | 173:9 |
| Peterson, Charles J. comp., "Index to The Chronicle of the U.S. Classic Post Vol. 48 (1996)" | U.S. Classic Postal Issues, 173:i-iv |
| Roth, Steven M., "Census Covers Carried by Private Mail Posts in Baltimore (An Update)" | osts in Baltimore, Maryland 176:254-55 |
| Roth, Steven M., "Census, With Occasional Commentary: Covers Carried by Private Mail |  |

Posts in Baltimore, Maryland"
173:11-22
Saadi, Wade E., "The Knapp Shift-U.S. Philately's Great Controversy" 176:257-59
Saadi, Wade E., see also Skinner and Saadi
Skinner, Hubert C. and James A. Allen, "Extended Date for the Bold Single-Bar Integral Postmark of New York City" 176:265-66
Skinner, Hubert C. and Wade E. Saadi, "New Early Year-Dated Postmarks" 176:266
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## Usages by Year Dates

The following chart illustrates a breakdown of usages by year. As yet, 31 of the 346 are unidentified by year date. Fully 19 of these are domestic usages, where the year date is most often not incorporated into any postal markings.

The rapid drop of usage of the imperforate stamp after 1857 reflects the introduction of the perforated issue, which has an earliest known use date of August 23, 1857. It is interesting to note that only sixteen of the 144 usages recorded for 1857 are used after the introduction of the perforated stamps. The convenience of perforations, combined with changes in the postal conventions between the U.S. and France after April 1, 1857, make these late usages scarce; they are probably the result of the usage of stamps purchased earlier. Many of the later usages, 1859 in particular, are used in combination with perforated stamps to pay newer rates, such as $15 \phi$ to France.

Summary of Usages by Year


Within each year, it is interesting to see the breakdown by month:
1856-131 total
Unidentified by month: 3

| March - 3 | April - 5 | May - 5 | June - 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| July - 10 | August - 15 | September - 25 | October - 9 |
| November - 25 | December - 28 |  |  |

1857-144 total
Unidentified by month: 14

| January -16 | February -21 | March -27 | April - 7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| May -17 | June -7 | July -9 | August - 13 |
| September -3 | October -3 | November - 3 | December - 4 |

1858-28 total
Unidentified by month: 1

| January -4 | February -4 | March -6 | April - 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| May -1 | June - 1 | July - 1 | August - 2 |
| September - 1 | October - 3 | November - 1 | December - 0 |

1859-12 total
Unidentified by month: 5

| January -0 | February -0 | March -4 | April -0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| May -0 | June -0 | July -0 | August - 2 |
| September -1 | October -0 | November -0 | December -0 |

As in any census of a relatively small sample of the total population, readers must be careful in the conclusions they draw from the census statistics presented in this article. The sample may be biased in certain respects, based on circumstances that may have influenced the survival rates for the different categories used in this census.

Usages by Month 1856-1858


Analysis of the above data illustrates that, after an initially slow start, usage of the $5 \phi$ peaked during the period of the so-called "Open Mail" rate between the U.S. and overseas destinations. This rate required only pre-payment of the $5 \notin$ shore-to-ship rate on mail carried by British Open Mail. Foreign postage was collected from the recipient. A detailed analysis of the rates paid by the $5 \notin 1856$ will be the subject of another article. However, I will note a few statistics below regarding frankings.

## Frankings

As previously stated, the information below is of selected information only, and is not a complete listing of frankings. That will be the subject of another article. Here, however, are some of the basics:

Total covers with a combination franking of the $5 \notin 1856$ and other denominations of the 1851-57 Issues: 75

- Used with Scott No. 13: 4 (three paying $15 \notin$ rate to France)
- Used with Scott No. 14: 20 (eleven paying $15 \phi$ rate to France, one paying fivetimes $3 \not \subset$ domestic rate)
- Used with Scott No. 15: 10 (five paying 15ф rate to France)
- Used with Scott No. 31: 1, paying $45 \phi$ rate to Java (none paying $15 \phi$ rate)
- Used with Scott No. 32: 11 (four paying 15ф rate to France, one paying five-times $3 \not \subset$ domestic rate)
- Used with Scott No. 33: 6 (three, paying 15ф rate to France or Germany)
- Used with Scott No. 34: 2 (one paying 15ф rate to France)
- Used with Scott No. 35: 3 (two paying 5-times $3 \notin$ domestic rate, one paying $15 申$ rate to France)
Please also note that some categories are counted twice; for instance if a cover bears a Scott No. 12 used with Scott Nos. 13 and 14, I included the count for both the Scott Nos. 13 and 14 categories. By stating the number recorded with the $15 \phi$ rate, the reader is able to make some sense of the above information.

In light of the above statistics, it is interesting to note that there is a total of 60 covers paying a $15 \not \subset$ rate (including seven domestic usages). Of these 60,25 are paid using only $5 \notin$ stamps, two are missing $5 \notin$ stamps and one bears four Scott No. 9 s used on a $6 \notin$ entire (the only recorded usage to New Orleans, last seen in my records at a Shanahan's auction, Nov. 9, 1957, lot 492).

## Multiples

As stated previously, there is a very small survival rate for multiples of the $5 \notin 1856$. The largest recorded multiple, a block of eleven illustrated in Brookman, has since been broken into two blocks of four and three singles. This lack of large multiples makes plating all but impossible, and has stumped some of the greatest students of the classic U.S. imperforate issues.

During the course of gathering information, I have attempted to compile a separate clipping file of multiples off-cover. This is a huge task, and is nowhere near as complete as the cover census. The turnover rate for off-cover multiples is less frequent than for covers, making it difficult to compile a census. They are also more "common" than multiples on cover. It would be folly to consider the information complete or even near completion. However, an informal study of the off-cover multiples should help to determine whether the on-cover multiples are statistically relevant.

Following are the statistics for multiples on cover:

- Singles on cover: 202 ( $57 \%$ of total covers)
- Horizontal pairs on cover: 23
- Vertical pairs on cover: 11 (including one with two pairs on the same cover counted as one)
- Horizontal strips of three on cover: 12
- Vertical strips of three on cover: 11
- Horizontal strips of four on cover: 5
- Vertical strips of four on cover: 0
- Blocks of four on cover: 2
- Horizontal or vertical strips of five on cover: 0
- Blocks of five on cover: 1
- Horizontal strips of six on cover: 1
- Vertical strips of six on cover: 0
- Blocks of six on cover: 1

An examination of my records for off-cover pairs, both vertical and horizontal, shows that the percentages of horizontal to vertical pairs is similar. The records are insufficient to quote any numbers, but I am confident that the size of the overall pool of information is sufficient to draw this basic conclusion. The ratio of horizontal to vertical strips is also similar.

There is also a horizontal strip of six known off-cover, which is a tie for the largest recorded multiple.

## Summations

Rather than draw any overall conclusions, I thought that it would be better to quickly summarize the above information. Conclusions should be drawn after a more detailed examination of the various categories. The census data confirms a very limited period of peak usage. A majority of covers pay the applicable $5 \notin$ shore-to-ship rate. When this rate was changed, usage of the $5 \notin 1856$ fell off. There is a relatively wide spread of state and city originations. A total of 22 states or territories and 65 cities or towns are represented, but over half were used from New Orleans and just over two-thirds of the total were used from four cities (New Orleans, Boston, New York and Philadelphia).

The $5 \notin 1856$ is scarce on cover, even for typical usages. Future articles examining various categories hopefully will add to our understanding of this often under-appreciated stamp.

Comments, suggestions and any additional information are always welcome.
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## THE 6¢ STATE FOREIGN ENTRY VARIETY RALPH EBNER ${ }^{1}$

Since 1929, the Scott Specialized Catalogue of U. S. Stamps has listed with a modest premium a "double transfer" variety of the $6 \notin$ State official stamp (O60). This variety is known to occur at six positions on the extreme left side of the plate $(41,51,61,71,81$ and 91 , although positions 51,71 and 81 show only minor dots). Unfortunately, surviving photographs of the plate proof sheets once owned by the Earl of Crawford are not sharp enough to permit all positions to be confirmed. Luckily, there exists in the exhibit collection of Lester C. Lanphear III an unused margin block of twenty from the lower left corner of the sheet ( $5 \times 4$, the largest multiple recorded) which captures four positions manifesting different types of this variety (positions $61,71,81$ and 91 ). ${ }^{2}$ See cropped photograph in Figure 1. A fifth position can just barely be identified under magnification on the proof sheet photograph. At the booth of Columbian Stamp Company at PACIFIC 97, after examining the intact lower half proof sheets from the Earl of Crawford set on card and the Henry Mandel set on India paper, I was personally able to confirm these positions. Unfortunately, since the upper halves of the sheets were sold off and broken up long ago, it was not possible to check if this variety occurs at other positions on the left hand side of the plate.

Several years ago, I purchased an unused example of this variety, which through comparison with the Lanphear block and also due to the wide wing margins left and bottom has been confirmed as position 91 (Figure 2). Also, in a set of card proofs, I obtained a different type of the $6 \notin$ State "double transfer," which Mr. Lanphear tentatively identified as originating at position 41 (Figure 3). From his extensive reference collection of official plate varieties, Mr. Lanphear provided an unused example from position 61 (Figure 4). Most of the recorded double transfers on official stamps are of the same standard type, in which some traces of a previous defective entry were not entirely burnished off the plate, and consequently show through the new corrected entry, either inside or outside the design. In examining these $6 \notin$ State varieties under a powerful professional stereoscope, I was puzzled to find that in all three cases, most of the surviving extraneous lines from the original entry did not seem to duplicate or parallel corresponding lines in the new entry, although some were similar. In seeking to explain the different angle and contour of these lines, it dawned on me that perhaps these were the ghostly traces of another image altogether, the "pentimento" of a different stamp. After all, one of only four previously recorded foreign entries on U. S. postage stamps occurs on another official stamp, the $2 \phi$ Executive variety showing background traces of an erased $6 \notin$ Agriculture. This variety, first reported by Admiral W.V. Combs on a plate proof on card (O11P4), has subsequently

[^3]

Figure 1. 6¢ State, positions 61, 71, 81 and 91, courtesy Lester C. Lanphear III


Figure 2. 6¢ State, foreign entry, position 91

Figure 3. 6c State card
proof, foreign entry, position 41



Figure 4. 6¢ State, position 61, foreign entry, courtesy Lester C. Lanphear III


Figure 5. 6¢ Executive card proof
been found on the regular stamp (O11) and also on the 1875 special printing (O11S). In the 1998 edition of the specialized catalogue, this variety (but only on the regular stamp) gained a proper listing as a foreign entry for the first time. ${ }^{3}$

In both of my examples, I detected numerous extraneous dots scattered across the field, but none of these described a recognizable pattern. The faint partial lines floating outside the second entry were more revealing, and especially the extra dot outside the upper right frameline corner. Although a number of official stamps show this same extra dot, after examining all of them, I settled on the $6 \notin$ Executive as being the most likely culprit. In Figure 5, we show an enlarged photograph of a $6 \phi$ Executive plate proof on card. The fuzziness in parts of this image was caused by smeared ink, a typical problem with this carmine color. The dot at the upper right is definitely not a position dot, for it appears on proofs taken from the original die and hence on all one hundred positions of the plate. In Figure 6, we show the same proof in a half-tone illustration, with those lines and dots reinforced that reappear in the foreign entry varieties of the $6 \phi$ State. These fragments have been coded as follows:

1. Die construction dot, upper right corner.
2. Die construction dots, lower right corner (2a and 2b).
3. Wavy lower right tail of the value ribbon.
4. Portion of right frame line (4a, bending around upper circle; 4b, at fleur-de-lis; 4 c , tail of value ribbon).
5. Dots from circle at upper left.

A few other extraneous marks which did not originate in the $6 \notin$ Executive transfer roll are coded as follows:
6. Scratches through the "I" of "SIX" (Position 41).
7. Marks through the numeral " 6 " (Position 41).
8. Skewed double transfer in the upper left corner (Position 61).

At position 91, where the $6 \notin$ Executive foreign entry is shifted due south, the most obvious traces are the telltale dot at upper right (1), short shading lines in the right fleur-de-lis, and in the bottom margin, the wavy lower right tail of the value ribbon and shading below the numeral " 6 " $(3)$ and the die construction dots (2a and 2b). (See Figure 7 with these vestigial lines enhanced and coded.) At position 41, where the $6 \varnothing$ Executive foreign entry is shifted south and east, the more obvious traces are all down the right margin: the upper right dot (1), the upper right corner frameline bending around the circle (4a), and where the fleur-de-lis and the scrolling value ribbon both meet the right frame line ( 4 b and 4 c ). (See Figure 8, with these vestigial lines enhanced and coded.) At position 61 , the $6 \phi$ Executive foreign entry is again shifted south and east, with traces showing outside the right margin at the top and bottom (1, 2a, 4a, 4c). Mr. Lanphear noticed that in the upper left corner, the vertical lines are also doubled (8), suggesting in effect a triple transfer-a double transfer of the $6 \notin$ State, and a foreign entry from the $6 \phi$ Executive. No similar variety has ever been reported on another U. S. postage stamp. (See Figure 9, with these vestigial lines enhanced and coded.) In Figure 10, we illustrate this unusual variety on cover, courtesy of Lester C. Lanphear again. This cover, from a correspondence well-known to official collectors, represents the earliest recorded usage of this stamp, August 23, 1873. At all three positions, there are various minor dots scattered across the image, most of which correspond to lines in the $6 \not \subset$ Executive, and a few which frankly do not.

If, as I believe, most of the $6 \notin$ State "double transfers" are in fact "foreign entries," I feel compelled to speculate how such a bizarre phenomenon could occur. ${ }^{4}$ The most famous of the four previously recorded U. S. foreign entries is of course the $5 \notin$ carmine

[^4]

Figure 6. Halftone of $6 ¢$ Executive card proof, with lines and dots that reappear on the $6 ¢$ State foreign entries enhanced and coded


Figure 7. Halftone of $6 ¢$ State position 91, with foreign entry lines enhanced


Figure 8. Halftone of $6 ¢$ State card proof, position 41, with foreign entry lines enhanced


Figure 9. Halftone of 6c State position 6I, with foreign entry and double transferlines enhanced, courtesy Lester C. Lanphear III


Figure 10. 6ç State foreign entry and double transfer (position 61) on cover, courtesy Lester C. Lanphear III
"error of color" of 1917 (Scott Nos. 467, 485 imperforate, 505). ${ }^{5}$ In that instance, some time after the four hundred subject $2 \phi$ plate (\#7942) was completed, it was inspected and defective transfers found at three positions: UL74, UL84, LR18. Attempting to correct these, the original transfers were burnished out and new entries made, but from the wrong $5 \phi$ transfer roll. This type of mistake would most likely happen on an issue such as the Washington-Franklins where there is no design variation between different values except for the numerals in the lower corners.

A similar potential for confusion exists with the official stamps, where in order to meet the greatly accelerated schedule of production, Continental created mother transfer rolls from the original regular issue large Bank Note dies made by National. Recent ongoing research seems to indicate that for most stamps the portrait vignette, numeral of value and value wording were preserved intact on these master transfer reliefs, while the rest of the frame design was cut away. ${ }^{6}$ In the case of the $6 \notin$ value, nine new dies were laid down from this master relief, and new frames appropriate for each department engraved around them. The $6 \not \subset$ Post Office die, partially completed, was abandoned when the decision was made to substitute large numerals for portraits on all the Post Office stamps. But the dies and transfer rolls for the other eight $6 \notin$ departmental stamps would have looked quite similar, differing chiefly at the top where the names of the individual departments appeared.

The transfer rolls and plates for obsolete postage stamps and postal cards, which had been prepared by the various Bank Notes Companies and later transferred to the Post Office Department, were destroyed in 1897. Only the original dies were saved, and these were turned over to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. From the itemized records of destruction maintained by a committee appointed by the Postmaster General to oversee the destruction, we find that in addition to all the plates of the departmental stamps, "Thirty Official Department rolls $1 \not \subset$ to $\$ 20.00$ incl." were also destroyed. ${ }^{7}$ Assuming one roll contained reliefs for the Department of State dollar values (portrait, frame and value tablets),

[^5]that leaves 29 rolls for the remaining 88 different reliefs of the $1 \notin$ through $90 \phi$ values, or approximately three different reliefs per transfer roll. We can be reasonably confident that only a single relief was needed for each value, since in most cases only a single plate was laid down for each stamp. The only official stamp printed showing the distinctive characteristics of multiple reliefs, as typified by the $3 \notin 1851$ stamp, is the $3 \notin$ Post Office, which is the subject of ongoing research by the author.

Now, if for the purpose of economy, each transfer roll contained reliefs from three different dies, one is immediately tempted to explain the $6 \not \subset$ State foreign entries as having been caused by an accidental rotation of the transfer roll while the plate was being laid down, first resulting in a plate of mixed images which was later corrected by burnishing out the $6 \notin$ Executive transfers and reentering the $6 \not \subset$ State. This explanation presupposes, of course, that the $6 \not \subset$ State and $6 \not \subset$ Executive reliefs were on the same transfer roll, which unfortunately can no longer be verified. However, we do know that the $6 \phi$ Executive die was approved on May 24,1873, and the $6 \notin$ State on May 26, and it seems logical that dies completed about the same time might well appear on the same transfer roll.

However, since the transfer roll itself would have been securely locked onto the mandrel in the transfer press during the time the $6 \notin$ State plate was being laid down, it is hard to understand how the roll could have worked itself loose and spun around to the next relief without the siderographer noticing. It also would require a very inattentive workman to firmly rock in transfers of the wrong die at six positions or more without noticing his error. Finally, let us not forget that the reason the foreign entries are visible at all is that they were significantly misaligned relative to the subsequent corrective work, and this may be an important clue to tell us how this error came about.

In developing an alternative theory to explain how the $6 \not \subset$ State foreign entries might have occurred, it is critical to remember that all known positions come from the extreme left hand side of the sheet (positions 41, 51, 61, 71, 81 and 91). According to Baxter, after layout lines and position dots were lightly incised on the blank plate, the siderographer normally began work at the lower right corner (the lower left corner of the printed sheet) and worked his way upwards. ${ }^{8}$ Therefore, we must assume that the foreign entries on the $6 \nmid$ State plate represent the first work done on this plate.

In our second tentative explanation, let us assume the siderographer set to work, intending to produce a plate (\#83) for the $6 \notin$ State stamp. If the numbers assigned to the plates accurately reflect the sequence in which they were produced, then the $6 \phi$ Executive plate (\#76) would have already been completed, and the transfer roll used to prepare it would have been put back in storage. If, in setting to work, the siderographer were to mistakenly retrieve the wrong transfer roll from the vault, or lock in the not dissimilar $6 \notin$ Executive relief, then the first entries he would make would be for the wrong department. Thinking about this, it still seems improbable that a siderographer could become so absorbed in the technical perfection of his work, that he could enter at least six full positions before realizing in horror that he was working with the wrong relief.

Rejecting that scenario, in our third tentative explanation, let us assume that in the rush and confusion of a team of transfer men working side by side in laying down almost one hundred plates, one siderographer begins work on a $6 \notin$ Executive plate. It is then brought to his attention that a coworker has already completed the sole plate required for this stamp. In order to salvage this plate so that it can be reused for another stamp, the $6 \varnothing$ Executive transfers will have to be effaced, by hammering from the back and burnishing from the front. After the plate is restored to a seemingly virgin state, a new layout is made for the $6 \not \subset$ State plate. Minute shifts in alignment or spacing might result in the first row of

[^6]new $6 \not \subset$ State transfers being slightly misregistered from the previous $6 \notin$ Executive transfers. Therefore, telltale traces of the $6 \not \subset$ Executive entries will be exposed, high and dry, outside the framelines of the new $6 \not \subset$ State transfers. The principal defect with this theory is that the foreign entries are not all misregistered in the same way: position 41 is shifted right and slightly downwards, whereas position 91 is aligned horizontally but shifted strongly downwards.

In order to account for this variation, we need to advance a fourth tentative explanation, in which the $6 ¢$ Executive transfers were erased from the plate, not because they were the wrong stamp, but because they were too severely misplaced, and would throw off the rest of the plate layout. Problems of this sort were caused by the set screws working loose that hold the side point tight to the mandrel adjacent to the transfer roll. If the side point slips instead of revolves or becomes loose, it will be out of position when dropped into the guide dots for the first entries. Once it is clear that these transfers will have to be erased and the plate begun anew, the siderographer may decide that he can't afford to take the time to do this reconstructive work himself, or to stand idly by while an assistant does it. So instead, he makes the necessary adjustments to the side point, obtains a fresh blank plate or plate steel, and begins a new layout from scratch.

The work on this new $6 \not \subset$ Executive plate proceeds smoothly. In the meantime, the rejected plate is restored by hammering and burnished out the previous entries. A short while later, it is utilized for a different stamp, the $6 \notin$ State. The new plate layout registers closely with the original, but where the original entries were misplaced, traces of them appear in the margins alongside the new transfers. Even though the plate was burnished, pressure from the transfer press causes hidden cavities below the surface to break through at random in the interior of the new entries, and those cavities correspond to fragments of lines incised in the original $6 \not \subset$ Executive entries.

Although we will probably never know for certain exactly how these varieties were caused, the $6 \$$ State foreign entry of the $6 \phi$ Executive represents an exciting new discovery, the fifth foreign entry reported on United States postage stamps. In addition to the $5 \phi$ carmine of 1917 and the $2 \not \subset$ Executive previously mentioned, the others are the $10 ¢ 1861$ showing traces of a $90 \not \subset 1861$ (plate \#4, position 94) and the $2 \not \subset 1908$ showing traces of the $1 \notin 1908$ (plate \#5299). Since all except the 5¢ carmine represent single positions on the plate, they were most likely caused by mistaken reentries after the plate was completed. The $6 \not \subset$ State foreign entries, in contrast, occur in multiple positions where the plate was begun, indicating that this was probably a recycled plate. Because of the telltale trace lines outside the $6 \phi$ State frame, this variety will prove much easier to find than the $2 \phi$ Executive foreign entry of the $6 \not \subset$ Agriculture, a far scarcer stamp where the alien marks, being entirely internalized, are almost impossible to make out. Still, it did take 123 years before it was possible to prove using state-of-the-art equipment that this variety, while visible to the naked eye, is not what it appears to be, a straightforward double transfer. It is a subtle but fascinating variety, proving once again that, unlike the exhaustively studied classic regular issues, in the long-neglected field of United States official stamps many important discoveries can still be made.
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# BALTIMORE AND THE NORTH GERMAN LLOYD RICHARD F. WINTER 

The following article appeared in The Sun newspaper of Baltimore, Tuesday morning, 24 March 1868 :

BALTIMORE AND BREMEN STEAMERS

Arrival of the Steamship Baltimore, the First of the Line
About 9 o'clock yesterday morning the steamship Baltimore, the pioneer in the new line between Bremen and Baltimore, was announced in the river, and soon the tidings spread, creating a pleasant and congratulatory interest among all classes of the community, who had been anticipating her arrival in anxious expectation for the previous day or two. The reporter of The Sun took a tug at Fell's Point, in company with Dr. Hunt, the boarding officer, and other custom-house officials, and boarded the Baltimore off Fort McHenry. The Baltimore presented a beautiful appearance as she entered the port with the American flag flying from the mainmast, the Bremen flag beneath, and the magnificent flag of the German Confederation at the stern, with sixty-one flags and private signals flying from her rigging. As the noble ship passed Fort McHenry she fired a salute, and another was fired as she entered the extensive new dock at Locust Point, on the south side of the harbor.

In January 1867, at a general meeting of the officials of the North German Lloyd Line, a decision was made to order two new steamers from Caird \& Company of Greenock, Scotland, for a new service between Bremen and Baltimore. ${ }^{1}$ One half of the special shares, created to finance the new vessels, was subscribed to by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. The port of Baltimore was the eastern terminus of this gateway railroad, which channeled goods and passengers from Europe to the Midwest. Because of the railroad, Baltimore was an obvious choice for an expanding immigrant transport service, which the North German Lloyd Line wished to provide. The first of the new steamships was the 2,321 ton Baltimore, an iron screw steamer, 285 feet in length, 39 feet in beam, and drawing 17 feet of water when fully loaded. Construction of this vessel began on 27 February 1867, and the ship was launched only five months and four days later. However, she did not sail on her maiden voyage until 1 March 1868, having to wait in lay up in the Gareloch, River Clyde, for four months awaiting a propeller shaft from Germany. ${ }^{2}$ Two months after the launching of Baltimore, the second steamship, Berlin, was launched. Both vessels were used to maintain a monthly service between Bremen and Baltimore, with calls at Southampton in each direction. The service was expanded in 1869 when two slightly larger steamers, Ohio and Leipzig, were placed in service in March and May, allowing two sailings to Baltimore each month.

## Mail Service

I have not been able to determine exactly when mails were first carried by these steamers between Baltimore and Bremen. The Sun of Baltimore reported the arrivals and

[^7]departures of each North German Lloyd steamer, but only occasionally reported the presence of mails on an incoming or outgoing vessel. Baltimore was not designated as a United States exchange office for mails with the North German Union in the convention that was negotiated on 21 October 1867, and which went into effect on I January 1868. ${ }^{3}$ When the regulations for the execution of this convention were agreed to in June 1868 (Berlin) and July 1868 (Washington, D.C.), some changes were made to the list of exchange offices in each country, but they still did not include Baltimore. ${ }^{4}$ Additional changes to the convention and its regulations in April $1870^{5}$ and in March $1871^{6}$ did not add Baltimore as an exchange office either. In fact, Baltimore was never mentioned as a mail exchange office in any convention with the North German Union. At some point, however, there must have been an agreement for Baltimore to exchange mails with Bremen under this convention. The annual reports of the Postmaster General, in these years, always discussed the transport of foreign mails, but they did not provide any specific information as to when Baltimore was made an exchange office. They do show, however, evidence that Baltimore was handling mails carried on North German Lloyd steamers as early as 1872 . The annual report for that year, issued 15 November 1872, provided a listing of the payments made to specific steamship lines for conveying mails to Europe. In that report, the North German Lloyd Line of Bremen was compensated for "70 trips, from New York to Southampton and Bremen, and also for conveying mails from Baltimore and New Orleans to Bremen." ${ }^{\text {P }}$ The Annual Report for 1873 again reported compensation to the Line for an unspecified number of trips from Baltimore. ${ }^{8}$ Subsequent annual reports detailed 33 trips in fiscal year 1874, 20 trips in fiscal year 1875, and 21 trips in fiscal year 1876 from Baltimore to Bremen, for which sea postage compensation was made to the Line. So we know that, by at least 1872, the Postmaster General was acknowledging that mails were being carried between Baltimore and Bremen.

## Covers

Covers showing the direct exchange of mails between Baltimore and Bremen are quite scarce. To date, I have been able to confirm only four covers which were conveyed on that route, three to Germany and one from Germany. Each will be described in the following paragraphs. By presenting these covers and explaining their identifying markings, it is hoped that additional examples may be identified by the readers and reported.

Figure 1 illustrates the earliest cover which I have recorded showing service from Baltimore directly to Bremen. The cover is a distinctively intense orange colored envelope with no contents. About three-quarters of an inch of the right side of the envelope has been removed by tearing while being opened, and later trimmed. Despite this blemish, this is a very important cover which resides in the collection of Hubert Skinner. The letter has a dark blue, double circle, company marking on the reverse which provides the date of the cover and identifies the originating company. It reads BALT. COUNTY BREWING CO. Balt. Md./1869/NOV/2. The envelope was addressed to Dassel, Prussia (formerly Hannover) with an endorsement in the upper left, "By Steamer Berlin." It was posted in Baltimore on 3 November 1869 and received a red 24 mm . circular datestamp BALTIMORE M.D./NOV/3 with an unusual killer, also in red, which seems to be an oval, split grid. This killer is thought to be associated with the foreign mail section of the Baltimore

[^8]

Figure 1. Baltimore, 2 November 1869, to Dassel, Prussia, paid with $10 ¢ 1869$ adhesive for direct rate by North German Union mails. Baltimore foreign office cds, oval split-grid killer, and "Paid all" handstamp, each in red ink. Letter endorsed for and carried by NGL Berlin directly to Germany from Baltimore. Bremen arrival marking also in red. Note absence of New York exchange office datestamp. (Skinner coll.)


Figure 2. Baltimore, 17 November 1869, to Spangenberg, Hesse-Cassel, readdressed to Cassel. Envelope paid with 10¢ 1869 adhesive for direct rate by North German Union mails. Red Baltimore foreign office cds, oval split-grid killer, and "Paid all" handstamp. Carried by NGL Leipzig directly to Germany from Baltimore. Note absence of New York exchange office cds. (Walker coll.)
post office. The Baltimore office also marked the red, script style "Paid all" handstamp, a marking required by the convention with the North German Union. ${ }^{9}$ This style of marking was used only at Baltimore. Later that day, the North German Lloyd steamer Berlin departed Baltimore for Germany, calling at Southampton on 15 November 1869. While I don't have the reported arrival date of the steamer at Bremerhaven, the red boxed arrival marking of Bremen, BREMEN/17/11 69/FRANCO, is consistent with the expected transit time to Germany of the steamship. Another backstamp in black shows arrival at Dassel on 18 November 1869. The letter was prepaid $10 \not \subset$ with an 1869 adhesive (Scott No. 116) for the single, direct rate to Germany by Bremen or Hamburg steamer. Note the absence of a New York exchange office circular datestamp. Of the 13 covers with the Baltimore "Paid all" marking that I have recorded, only three covers are missing a New York exchange office marking. This marking was struck on all letters which were made up in the mails at this exchange office and placed on board the mail steamers at New York. The three covers without the New York markings each have Baltimore dates that match the departure dates of North German Lloyd steamers from Baltimore. These covers were placed in the mails put on board the German steamers in Baltimore and not sent to New York to catch the German steamers. While the date of this cover is a little earlier than the first mention in the Baltimore newspapers of an outgoing mail being placed on the German steamships, there is no doubt in my mind that this letter was carried directly to Germany from Baltimore on a North German Lloyd Line steamship. Finally, this cover has a red crayon " 2 " in the upper left corner. The regulations to the United States - North German Union postal convention required that the despatching office mark in the upper left corner the number of rates charged on letters of more than one rate. The red crayon " 2 " was undoubtedly marked by the Baltimore foreign office for two rates. The missing part of the envelope to the right side must have contained another adhesive.

Figure 2 shows a second example, posted just two weeks later. This cover resides in the collection of Patricia Stilwell Walker. It is another orange envelope without the letter contents. The envelope entered the mails at the Baltimore post office on 17 November 1869, where it received the same red circular datestamp and killer shown on the Figure 1 cover. Because the orientation of the killer, relative to the datestamp, is somewhat different than in Figure 1, I suspect that the killer was not attached to the datestamp in a duplex manner, but was a separate device. The letter was addressed to Spangenberg, a town in Hesse-Cassel, Germany, sixteen miles S.S.E. of Cassel [now Kassel]. Later, it was readdressed to Cassel. The envelope was endorsed "via Bremen" in the lower left corner. Ten cents in postage was prepaid with an 1869 adhesive (Scott No. 116) for the single, direct rate to Germany by Bremen or Hamburg steamer. Again, a script style red handstamp, "Paid all," was struck in the lower left corner, later to be overstruck by a Bremen arrival marking. The letter was in the mails taken on board the North German Lloyd steamer Leipzig, which departed Baltimore on 17 November 1869 and arrived at Southampton on 29 November 1869. Even though I don't have the steamer's recorded arrival date in Bremerhaven, the Bremen arrival on 1 December 1869, shown in the red boxed BREMEN/1 12 69/FRANCO marking, is consistent with the expected time to complete this voyage. Backstamps in black ink on this cover showed arrival at Spangenberg on 2 December and at Cassel on 4 December 1869.

The third cover from Baltimore to Germany, Figure 3, is also an envelope, without contents. It, too, resides in the collection of Ms. Walker. This envelope entered the mails at
${ }^{9}$ U.S. 16 Statutes at Large, 984.


Figure 3. Baltimore, 8 May 1872, to Berlin, Prussia, paid with ungrilled 6¢ 1870 National Bank Note adhesive for direct rate to Germany in 1872. Baltimore foreign office duplex cds and 4-ring target killer and "Paid all" markings in red. NGL Baltimore carried letter directly to Germany, where Bremen struck red boxed arrival marking. (Walker coll.)


Figure 4. Bremen, 5 April 1875, to Baltimore by NGL steamer Ohio. Envelope paid with 50 pfennige 1875 adhesive for double rate. Red BALT. PAID ALL foreign office cds (Diesner coll.)

Baltimore on 8 May 1872, where it received a red, 25 mm . circular datestamp with attached four ring target killer. This was a duplex marking which has been identified with the foreign mail section of the Baltimore post office. The letter was addressed to Berlin. A red "Paid all" handstamp was struck by the Baltimore office and tied the adhesive to the cover. Note, again, the absence of a New York exchange office marking. At 2:00 PM on 8 May 1872, the North German Lloyd steamer Baltimore departed the Baltimore harbor for Southampton and Bremerhaven. This letter was undoubtedly on board the steamer, reported by The Sun as having sailed with mails. Baltimore reached Southampton on 22 May 1872. Again, I do not have the steamer's actual arrival date at Bremerhaven, but the red, boxed arrival marking of Bremen, BREMEN/245 72/FRANCO, shows a date consistent with the time to complete this voyage. A black backstamp shows the letter's arrival at Berlin on 26 May 1872. In Baltimore, the letter was prepaid $6 \not \subset$ with an ungrilled, National Bank Note Company adhesive, Scott No. 148. This amount properly prepaid the single, direct mail rate to Germany in May 1872.

I have recorded only one cover from Germany to the United States by the North German Lloyd mail service to Baltimore. This cover resides in the collection of Wolfgang Diesner of Köln, Germany, a well-known international judge and expert on the Bremen mails, and is shown in Figure 4. This outstanding item is an envelope from Bremen to Baltimore. It was posted in Bremen on 5 April 1875 and was endorsed "p' Str. Ohio." The prepayment was a 50 pfennige adhesive (Scott No. 34), equivalent to $12 \phi$, and paid the double rate by direct steamer from Germany to the United States. A small "2" in blue crayon in the upper left corner showed the letter required two rates. On 7 April 1875, the North German Lloyd steamer Ohio departed Bremerhaven for Baltimore with a call at Southampton. Ohio arrived at Baltimore on 26 April 1875, the date in the red circular datestamp of the Baltimore exchange office, BALT./APR/26/PAID ALL. The cover also has a backstamp in black ink struck by the Baltimore post office, BALTIMORE MD RECEIVED/APR/26/9AM.

## Sailing Data

Table 1, which follows, lists all the voyages of the North German Lloyd steamers directly to Baltimore from the start of their operations in March 1868 through 1875. The source of this data was the microfilm records, located in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., of the following newspapers: a. The Sun: Baltimore (daily); b. The Times: London (daily). In addition many of the missing Southampton dates were filled in from reports in the weekly newspaper, Southampton Observer and Winchester News, kindly supplied by the noted British maritime postal historian, Colin Tabeart. The Sun faithfully reported the arrival and departure of each North German Lloyd steamer at Baltimore. Accompanying articles in The Sun sometimes indicated which outgoing vessels carried mails to Germany, and when occasional mails were carried to the United States by the German steamers arriving at Baltimore. Although the North German Lloyd steamships called at Southampton, no mails were put off there on eastbound voyages or taken on board on westbound voyages. Any mails carried by these steamers were mails between Germany and the United States under the United States-North German Union conventions, including mails sent beyond Germany through this mail arrangement. The asterisk $\left(^{*}\right)$ is used in the sailing table to show those voyages which were reported in The Sun as carrying mails. Where parenthesis ( ) are used, the dates shown are the expected arrival dates, based on other printed information in the newspaper, but confirmation of the date was not found. The absence of a date means it was not located. Abbreviations used in the table are: BABaltimore; BR- Bremen/Bremerhaven; F/V-First Voyage; SO-Southampton.

TABLE I
NORTH GERMAN LLOYD TO BALTIMORE

| DEP BR | DEP SO | ARR BA | STEAMSHIP | DEP BA | ARR SO | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1868 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Mar | 4 Mar | 23 Mar | Baltimore | 1 Apr | 14 Apr | F/V |
| 1 Apr | 4 Apr | 22 Apr | Berlin | 1 May | 14 May | F/V |
| 1 May | 6 May | 19 May | Baltimore | 1 Jun | 16 Jun |  |
| 1 Jun | 4 Jun | 18 Jun | Berlin | 1 Jul | 15 Jul |  |
| 1 Jul | 4 Jul | 17 Jul | Baltimore | 1 Aug | 15 Aug |  |
| 1 Aug | 4 Aug | 19 Aug | Berlin | 1 Sep | 16 Sep |  |
| 1 Sep | 4 Sep | 18 Sep | Baltimore | 1 Oct | 15 Oct |  |
| 1 Oct | 4 Oct | 20 Oct | Berlin | 1 Nov | 13 Nov |  |
| 1 Nov | 4 Nov | 19 Nov | Baltimore | 1 Dec | 15 Dec |  |
| 1 Dec | 4 Dec | 24 Dec | Berlin | 1 Jan | 15 Jan |  |
| 1869 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Feb | 4 Feb | 23 Feb | Baltimore | 1 Mar | 15 Mar |  |
| 9 Mar | 12 Mar | 27 Mar | Ohio | 3 Apr | 16 Apr | F/V |
| 7 Apr | 10 Apr | 26 Apr | Baltimore | 5 May | 19 May |  |
| 21 Apr | 24 Apr | 8 May | Berlin | 19 May | 1 Jun |  |
| 5 May | 8 May | 23 May | Leipzig | 2 Jun | 15 Jun | F/V |
| 19 May | 22 May | 4 Jun | Ohio | 16 Jun | 29 Jun |  |
| 16 Jun | 19 Jun | 2 Jul | Berlin | 14 Jul | 27 Jul |  |
| 30 Jun | 3 Jul | 17 Jul | Leipzig | 28 Jul | 10 Aug |  |
| 14 Jul | 17 Jul | 31 Jul | Ohio | 11 Aug | 25 Aug |  |
| 28 Jul | 31 Jul | 14 Aug | Baltimore | 25 Aug | 7 Sep |  |
| 11 Aug | 14 Aug | 28 Aug | Berlin | 8 Sep | 21 Sep |  |
| 25 Aug | 28 Aug | 10 Sep | Leipzig | 22 Sep | 5 Oct |  |
| 8 Sep | 11 Sep | 25 Sep | Ohio | 6 Oct | 20 Oct |  |
| 22 Sep | 25 Sep | 11 Oct | Baltimore | 20 Oct | 2 Nov |  |
| 6 Oct | 8 Oct | 22 Oct | Berlin | 3 Nov | 15 Nov |  |
| 20 Oct | 23 Oct | 5 Nov | Leipzig | 17 Nov | 29 Nov |  |
| 4 Nov | 7 Nov | 21 Nov | Ohio | 1 Dec | 14 Dec |  |
| 1 Dec | 4 Dec | 17 Dec | Berlin | 30 Dec |  |  |
| 15 Dec | 19 Dec | 1 Jan | Leipzig | 12 Jan* | 25 Jan |  |

1870

| 12 Jan | 15 Jan | 30 Jan | Baltimore | 9 Feb * | 24 Feb |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 Feb | 12 Feb | 25 Feb | Ohio | $9 \mathrm{Mar}^{*}$ | (22 Mar) |
| 9 Mar | 12 Mar | 28 Mar | Berlin | 6 Apr* |  |
| 23 Mar | 26 Mar | 8 Apr | Leipzig | 20 Apr* | 2 May |
| 6 Apr | 9 Apr | 21 Apr | Ohio | 4 May* | 16 May |
| 20 Apr | 23 Apr | 7 May* | Baltimore | 18 May* | 31 May |
| 4 May | 7 May | 22 May | Berlin | 1 Jun* | 14 Jun |
| 18 May | 21 May | 3 Jun* | Leipzig | 15 Jun* | 28 Jun |
| 2 Jun | 4 Jun | 16 Jun* | Ohio | 29 Jun* | 11 Jul |
| 15 Jun | 18 Jun | $1 \mathrm{Jul}{ }^{*}$ | Baltimore | $13 \mathrm{Jul}{ }^{*}$ | 28 Jul |
| 29 Jun | 2 Jul | 16 Jul | Berlin | 29 Sep |  |

${ }^{10}$ The Franco-Prussian War began a few days after Berlin arrived in Baltimore. North German Lloyd telegraphed their U.S. agents to cease operations for an undisclosed period until the war came to an end as there was no protection for their steamships against French cruisers. Berlin did not sail again for Bremerhaven, the eastern terminus of the Line, until 29 September 1870.

| DEP BR | DEP SO | ARR BA | STEAMSHIP | DEP BA | ARR SO | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 Jul | 22 Jul | 4 Aug* | Leipzig | 26 Oct | 11 |  |
| 13 Oct | - | 1 Nov | Ohio | 9 Nov | 12 |  |
| 30 Oct | - | 16 Nov | Berlin | 23 Nov | 13 |  |
| 9 Nov | - | 26 Nov | Baltimore | 15 Dec | 14 |  |
| 8 Dec | - | 24 Dec | Leipzig | 11 Jan 15 | 15 |  |

1871

| 5 Jan | - | 22 Jan | Ohio | 2 Feb |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 Feb | - | 21 Feb | Berlin | 1 Mar | (13 Mar) |  |
| 2 Mar | 5 Mar | 21 Mar | Baltimore | 29 Mar | 12 Apr | 16 |
| 15 Mar | 17 Mar | 1 Apr | Leipzig | 12 Apr* | 24 Apr |  |
| 29 Mar | 1 Apr | 14 Apr | Ohio | 26 Apr* | 9 May |  |
| 12 Apr | 15 Apr | 1 May | Berlin | 10 May* | 24 May |  |
| 26 Apr | 29 Apr | 14 May | Baltimore | 24 May* | 6 Jun |  |
| 10 May | 13 May | 26 May | Leipzig | 7 Jun* | 19 Jun |  |
| 24 May | 26 May | 8 Jun | Ohio | 21 Jun* | 4 Jul |  |
| 7 Jun | 10 Jun | 25 Jun | Berlin | $5 \mathrm{Jul} *$ | 18 Jul |  |
| 21 Jun | 24 Jun | 9 Jul | Baltimore | 19 Jul* | 1 Aug |  |
| 5 Jul | 8 Jul | 21 Jul | Leipzig | 2 Aug |  |  |
| 19 Jul | 23 Jul | 5 Aug | Ohio | 16 Aug* | 28 Aug |  |
| 2 Aug | 5 Aug | 18 Aug | Berlin | 30 Aug* | 13 Sep |  |
| 16 Aug | 19 Aug | 3 Sep | Baltimore | 13 Sep* | (26 Sep) |  |
| 30 Aug | 2 Sep | 16 Sep | Leipzig | 27 Sep | (10 Oct) | 17 |
| 17 Sep | 20 Sep | 3 Oct | Berlin | 19 Oct* |  |  |
| 4 Oct | 7 Oct | 22 Oct | Baltimore | 1 Nov* | 15 Nov |  |
| 18 Oct | 22 Oct | 6 Nov | Ohio | 15 Nov | 30 Nov |  |
| 1 Nov | 3 Nov | 18 Nov | Leipzig | 29 Nov* | $(12 \mathrm{Dec})$ |  |
| 15 Nov | 18 Nov | 5 Dec | Berlin | 13 Dec | 26 Dec |  |
| 29 Nov | 2 Dec | 17 Dec | Baltimore | 27 Dec* | (9 Jan) |  |
| 16 Dec | 19 Dec | 5 Jan | Ohio | 10 Jan | 25 Jan | 18 |

1872

| 10 Jan | 13 Jan | 2 Feb | Berlin | 8 Feb | 22 Feb |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 14 Feb | 17 Feb | 3 Mar | Ohio | 9 Mar | 23 Mar |  |
| 6 Mar | 9 Mar | 28 Mar | Frankfurt | 3 Apr | 17 Apr | F/V |

[^9]| DEP BR | DEP SO | ARR BA | STEAMSHIP | DEP BA | ARR SO | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 Mar | 16 Mar | 30 Mar | Berlin | 10 Apr | 24 Apr |  |
| 30 Mar | 2 Apr | 15 Apr | Ohio | 24 Apr | 6 May |  |
| 10 Apr | 13 Apr | 27 Apr* | Baltimore | 8 May* | 22 May | ${ }^{19}$ |
| 1 May | 4 May | 20 May | Berlin | 25 May* | 7 Jun |  |
| 8 May | 11 May | 23 May | Leipzig | 5 Jun | 18 Jun |  |
| 22 May |  | 9 Jun | Köln | 19 Jun | 3 Jul | F/V |
| 5 Jun | 8 Jun | 23 Jun | Ohio | 3 Jul | 16 Jul |  |
| 19 Jun | 22 Jun | 6 Jul | Berlin | 17 Jul | 30 Jul |  |
| 3 Jul | 6 Jul | 19 Jul | Leipzig | 31 Jul | 13 Aug |  |
| 20 Jul | 24 Jul | 5 Aug | Ohio | 14 Aug | 27 Aug |  |
| 31 Jul | 3 Aug | 17 Aug* | Baltimore | 28 Aug* | 10 Sep |  |
| 16 Aug | 19 Aug | 2 Sep | Berlin | 11 Sep | 25 Sep |  |
| 28 Aug | 31 Aug | 13 Sep | Leipzig | 25 Sep | 8 Oct |  |
| (11 Sep) |  | 27 Sep | Ohio | 9 Oct | 23 Oct |  |
| 25 Sep | 29 Sep | 15 Oct | Baltimore | 23 Oct | (5 Nov) |  |
| 9 Oct | 12 Oct | 26 Oct | Berlin | 6 Nov | (20 Nov) |  |
| 23 Oct | 26 Oct | 11 Nov | Leipzig | 20 Nov | 3 Dec |  |
| 6 Nov | 9 Nov | 24 Nov | Ohio | 4 Dec | (17 Dec) |  |
| 20 Nov | 23 Nov | 14 Dec | Baltimore | 19 Dec |  |  |
| 19 Dec | 22 Dec | 8 Jan | Leipzig | 15 Jan | (1 Feb) |  |

1873

| 19 Jan | 22 Jan | 11 Feb | Baltimore | 14 Feb | (24 Feb) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 Feb | 15 Feb | 2 Mar | Berlin | 8 Mar | (22 Mar) |
| 5 Mar | 8 Mar | 24 Mar | Leipzig | 29 Mar | (12 Apr) |
| 18 Mar | 21 Mar | 5 Apr | Ohio | 12 Apr | 26 Apr |
| 1 Apr | 4 Apr | 18 Apr | Baltimore | 27 Apr | 9 May |
| 15 Apr | 18 Apr | 3 May | Berlin | 10 May | (24 May) |
| 29 Apr | 2 May | 17 May | Leipzig | 24 May | 6 Jun |
| 13 May | 16 May | 30 May | Ohio | 7 Jun | 20 Jun |
| 27 May | 30 May | 13 Jun | Baltimore | 21 Jun | (5 Jul) |
| 10 Jun | 13 Jun | 28 Jun | Berlin | 5 Jul | (19 Jul) |
| 24 Jun | 27 Jun | 11 Jul | Leipzig | 19 Jul | 31 Jul |
| 8 Jul | 11 Jul | 26 Jul | Ohio | 2 Aug | 16 Aug |
| (22 Jul) | 25 Jul | 8 Aug | Baltimore | 16 Aug | (30 Aug) |
| 5 Aug | 8 Aug | 22 Aug | Berlin | 30 Aug | (13 Sep) |
| 12 Aug | 15 Aug | 30 Aug | Leipzig | 6 Sep | 19 Sep |
| 19 Aug | 22 Aug | 5 Sep | König Wilhelm I | 13 Sep |  |
| 2 Sep | 5 Sep | 19 Sep | Ohio | 27 Sep | (11 Oct) |
| 9 Sep | $\begin{array}{r} 12 \text { Sep } \\ 4 \text { Oct } \end{array}$ | 27 Sep | Braunschweig <br> Berlin | 4 Oct | $\begin{aligned} & 18 \mathrm{Oct} \\ & (8 \mathrm{Nov}) \end{aligned}$ |
| 23 Sep | 26 Sep | 10 Oct | Baltimore | 18 Oct | (1 Nov) |
| 7 Oct | 10 Oct | 24 Oct | Leipzig | 1 Nov |  |
| 21 Oct | 24 Oct | 8 Nov | Ohio | 15 Nov | (29 Nov) |
| 28 Oct |  | 16 Nov | Braunschweig | 22 Nov | 4 Dec |
| 11 Nov | 14 Nov | 30 Nov | Baltimore | 6 Dec | (20 Dec) |

${ }^{19}$ Baltimore was reported as arriving with three sacks of mail. Captain Fischer, commander of the vessel, died on board the day before arrival in Baltimore.
${ }^{20}$ König Wilhelm I was placed on the Baltimore route temporarily for one voyage to replace Braunschweig which was in construction and not yet ready.

| DEP BR | DEP SO | ARR BA | STEAMSHIP | DEP BA | ARR SO | NOTES |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 Nov | 28 Nov | 16 Dec | Berlin | 20 Dec | (3 Jan) |  |
| 9 Dec | 13 Dec | 28 Dec | Ohio | 3 Jan | (17 Jan) |  |
| 28 Dec | 31 Dec | 15 Jan | Nürnberg | 24 Jan |  | F/V |

1874

| 8 Jan | 12 Jan | 29 Jan | Baltimore | 4 Feb | 17 Feb |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 Jan | 24 Jan | 10 Feb | Berlin | 14 Feb | (28 Feb) |  |
| 3 Feb | 7 Feb | 21 Feb | Leipzig | 28 Feb | 16 Mar |  |
| 17 Feb | 20 Feb | 11 Mar | Nürnberg | 18 Mar | 31 Mar |  |
| 3 Mar | 6 Mar | 20 Mar | Baltimore | 28 Mar | (11 Apr) |  |
| 17 Mar | 20 Mar | 10 Apr | Berlin | 15 Apr | (9 May) |  |
| 31 Mar | 3 Apr | 19 Apr | Leipzig | 25 Apr | 7 May |  |
| 15 Apr | 17 Apr | 4 May | Nürnberg | 9 May | 24 May |  |
| 21 Apr | 24 Apr | 10 May | Baltimore | 16 May | (30 May) |  |
| 28 Apr | 1 May | 13 May | Hermann | 23 May | 4 Jun | $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{V}^{21}$ |
| 5 May | 8 May | 22 May | Braunschweig | 30 May | (13 Jun) |  |
| 13 May | 16 May | 29 May | Berlin | 6 Jun | 20 Jun |  |
| 20 May | 23 May | 5 Jun | Leipzig | 13 Jun | (27 Jun) |  |
| 27 May | 30 May | 13 Jun | Ohio | 20 Jun | 3 Jul |  |
| 3 Jun | 6 Jun | 21 Jun | Nürnberg | 27 Jun | (11 Jul) |  |
| 10 Jun | 13 Jun | 28 Jun | Baltimore | 4 Jul | 19 Jul |  |
| 17 Jun | 20 Jun | 3 Jul | Minister Roon | 11 Jul | (25 Jul) | 22 |
| 24 Jun | 27 Jun | 10 Jul | Braunschweig | 18 Jul | 30 Jul |  |
| 1 Jul | 4 Jul | 19 Jul | Berlin | 25 Jul | (8 Aug) |  |
| 8 Jul | - | 23 Jul | Leipzig | 1 Aug | (15 Aug) | 23 |
| 15 Jul | 18 Jul | 1 Aug | Ohio | 8 Aug | (22 Aug) |  |
| 29 Jul | 1 Aug | 19 Aug | Baltimore | 23 Aug | (4 Sep) |  |
| 12 Aug | 15 Aug | 27 Aug | Braunschweig | 5 Sep | 17 Sep |  |
| 19 Aug | - | 4 Sep | Berlin | 12 Sep |  | ${ }^{24}$ |
| 26 Aug | 29 Aug | 12 Sep | Leipzig | 19 Sep | (3 Oct) |  |
| 2 Sep | - | 18 Sep | Ohio | 26 Sep |  | 25 |
| 9 Sep | 12 Sep | 26 Sep | Hannover | 3 Oct | (17 Oct) | ${ }^{26}$ |
| 16 Sep | 19 Sep | 2 Oct | General Werder | 10 Oct | (24 Oct) | F/V |
| 23 Sep | 26 Sep | 10 Oct | Nürnberg | 17 Oct | (31 Oct) |  |
| 30 Sep | 3 Oct | 17 Oct | Braunschweig | 24 Oct | ( 7 Nov ) |  |
| 7 Oct | 10 Oct | 26 Oct | Berlin | 31 Oct | (14 Nov) |  |
| 21 Oct | 25 Oct | 8 Nov | Ohio | 14 Nov | 27 Nov |  |
| 4 Nov | 7 Nov | 20 Nov | Nürnberg | 28 Nov | (11 Dec) |  |
| 18 Nov | 21 Nov | 6 Dec | Braunschweig | 12 Dec | 1 Jan |  |
| 2 Dec | 5 Dec | 27 Dec | Leipzig | 26 Dec | (9 Jan) |  |
| 16 Dec | 19 Dec | 6 Jan | Ohio | 9 Jan | (22 Jan) |  |
| 30 Dec | 2 Jan | 22 Jan | Nürnberg | 27 Jan | (6 Feb) |  |

[^10]1875

| 14 Jan | 30 Jan | 14 Feb | Braunschweig | 20 Feb | (6 Mar) | 27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 27 Jan | 30 Jan | - | Leipzig | - | - | 8 |
| - | - | 27 Feb | Hohenzollern | 7 Mar | (20 Mar) | 29 |
| 10 Feb | 5 Mar | 22 Mar | Leipzig | 27 Mar |  |  |
| 10 Mar | 13 Mar | 28 Mar | Nürnberg | 3 Apr | (17 Apr) |  |
| 24 Mar | 28 Mar | 9 Apr | Braunschweig | 17 Apr | 29 Apr |  |
| 7 Apr | 10 Apr | 26 Apr | Ohio | 1 May | (14 May) |  |
| 21 Apr | 24 Apr | 8 May | Leipzig | 15 May | 28 May |  |
| 28 Apr | 1 May | 16 May | Nürnberg | 22 May | 4 Jun |  |
| 12 May | 15 May | 29 May | Braunschweig | 5 Jun | 17 Jun |  |
| 26 May | 29 May | 12 Jun | Ohio | 19 Jun | 3 Jul |  |
| 9 Jun | 12 Jun | 28 Jun | Nürnberg | 3 Jul | 16 Jul |  |
| 30 Jun | 2 Jul | 16 Jul | Braunschweig | 24 Jul | 5 Aug |  |
| 14 Jul | 17 Jul | 30 Jul* | Ohio | 7 Aug | (21 Aug) |  |
| 28 Jul | 31 Jul | 13 Aug | Leipzig | 21 Aug | (4 Sep) |  |
| 11 Aug | 14 Aug | 27 Aug | Nürnberg | 4 Sep | (18 Sep) |  |
| 25 Aug | 27 Aug | 10 Sep | Braunschweig | 18 Sep | (2 Oct) |  |
| 8 Sep | 11 Sep | 25 Sep | Ohio | 2 Oct | 16 Oct |  |
| 22 Sep | 25 Sep | 12 Oct | Leipzig | 16 Oct | (30 Oct) |  |
| 6 Oct | 9 Oct | 25 Oct | Nürnberg | 2 Dec | $(12 \mathrm{Dec})$ | 30 |
| 20 Oct | 24 Oct | 6 Nov | Braunschweig | 13 Nov | (26 Nov) |  |
| 3 Nov | 6 Nov | 23 Nov* | Ohio | 28 Nov |  |  |
| 18 Nov | 21 Nov | 7 Dec | Leipzig | 11 Dec |  |  |
| 15 Dec |  | 3 Jan | Braunschweig | 8 Jan |  |  |

[^11]
## ANSWERS TO PROBLEM COVERS IN ISSUE 177

The three problem covers in the February Chronicle 177 elicited no response from our Route Agents. So I'll give you an editor's opinion and await comments from our readers.

The Figure 1 envelope has a $2 \phi$ stamp canceled by a duplex "Miami / DEC / 22 $/ 1898$ " plus a "SHIP" handstamp. It is addressed to Pittsburgh and charged "Due $2 \phi$." Why was postage due collected and does the "Admiral Sigsbee" notation have any significance?


Figure 5. 1898 "SHIP" cover from Miami to Pittsburgh
This cover could have originated from Admiral Charles Sigsbee on the cruiser U.S.S. Saint Paul, which was in Cuban waters during the Spanish - American war. Admiral Sigsbee was the Captain of the battleship U.S.S. Maine when it blew up in Havana harbor in January 1898. He then became Captain of the Saint Paul, but was not promoted to the rank of Rear Admiral until 1903. However, he could have been referred to as "Admiral" of one of the U. S. fleets which blockaded Cuba during the war.

The problem cover apparently arrived at Miami as a ship letter where it received the "SHIP" marking and required postage of two times the regular rate, or $4 \phi$. The $2 \not \subset$ stamp was accepted and the balance assessed "due $2 \phi$ " as a ship letter. It went to Pittsburgh in a normal way where the two $1 \phi$ Postage Due stamps were added and $2 \phi$ collected from the addressee.

The front and back of an 1860 cover from London to New York are shown in Figures 2 and 3. The cover is franked with a 1 shilling stamp, the usual $1 / 2$ ounce transatlantic contract mail rate, which is tied with a bold black "6." A perfect Liverpool Ship Letter handstamp is struck in black across the back flap. Was this cover correctly paid and what is the meaning of the black " 6 "?


Figure 2. Front of 1860 cover from London to New York


Figure 3. Back of $\mathbf{1 8 6 0}$ cover via Liverpool to New York


Figure 4. Cover to San Francisco endorsed "Via Charges \& Panama"

This cover was endorsed " p . City of Washington." a ship of the Inman Line (British). In 1860, the Cunard Line still had a monopoly in carrying British mail. The U. S. mail contracts with the Havre and Ocean Lines expired in 1857, and the Collins Line (U.S.) ceased operating in 1858. The U.S. Postmaster General made individual trip contracts with British steamship companies to carry mails as substitutes for the Collins Line on the Liverpool route. However, the City of Washington did not have a contract to carry mails on its 10 October 1860 sailing from Liverpool. ${ }^{1}$

The cover was posted in London and paid with a one shilling stamp, the contract rate between Britain and the U. S. It could have been sent by the post office on the Cunard ship Asia which left Liverpool for New York on 13 October. Instead the post office followed the endorsement and sent the cover as a ship letter on the Ciy of Washington, departing Liverpool on 10 October as shown by the clear "SHIP LETTER/LIVERPOOL" black handstamp. Since the outgoing ship letter fee was 8 pence, the cover was overpaid 4 pence.

Upon reaching New York, the cover was rated as a ship letter, handstamped with a black " 6 " for a single ship letter addressed to the port of arrival, and $6 \not \subset$ collected.

The well worn envelope to San Francisco, California in Figure 4 is endorsed "By Steamer Via Chagres and Panama." It has a red " $50 \not \subset$ " marking which is crossed out and an " 80 " written in red ink. There are some difficult to decipher notations in the upper left and upper right corners of the cover, but nothing on the reverse. Explain the postage markings and lack of a date stamp and where this cover could have originated.

This is a difficult cover to analyze with any certainty. I would guess that it originated in the Caribbean area and was taken by non-contract steamer to Chagres where it entered the mails. It transited the Isthmus to Panama where it went by Pacific Mail Steamship to San Francisco.

The " $50 ¢$ " and " 80 " markings in red (the " 50 " crossed out) are apparently postage charged, the " $50 \not \subset$ " being in error and the " 80 " being charged in San Francisco for a double weight letter from the East coast. The lack of any datestamp is a puzzlement. Any other thoughts?
${ }^{1}$ Walter Hubbard and Richard F. Winter, North Atlantic Mail Sailings, 1840-75.

## PROBLEM COVER FOR THIS ISSUE

Figures 5 and 6 show the obverse and reverse of a cover to St. Petersburg, submitted by Bill Ainsworth. It was lot \#640 in the Robert Kaufman auction \#68, July 14,1990 and was described as follows:
$6 \not \subset$ dull pink \#159 tied by 3 bar cancel on 1873 cover to Russia with missing stamp either removed or fallen off in transit. Russian CDS where stamp was, cover readdressed within country (pmks on back); interesting usage.

The cover is an embossed Philadelphia corner card envelope. The stamp is canceled and tied by three crude black bars. A red "NEW YORK / SE 12414 " cds, a red "Wfr. $11 / 2$ " handstamp, blue crayon marks (one where stamp is missing), and a line in manuscript complete the markings on the front. The back has what appears to be the forwarding address in Russian at the top, two S. Petersburg cds's with dates of " 30 HOR 73 " and " 27 CEH 1873", a Russian notation at the bottom, and an overinked indecipherable blue oval.


Figure 5. Obverse of $\mathbf{1 8 7 3}$ cover to St. Petersburg, Russia with missing stamp

The questions are:

1) What was the correct rate? Explain the rate markings on the cover.
2) Where was the $6 \notin$ stamp canceled? Is this a NYFM cancel?
3) What was the value of the missing stamp?
4) Was the missing stamp removed accidentally or purposefully?
5) Explain the Russian manuscript writings on face and back, and also the dates in the Russian cds's.
6) Identify the blue oval backstamp and its purpose.

Please send your answers to these problem covers, and any further discussion of previous answers to other problem covers, within two weeks of receiving your Chronicle. The "go to press" deadline for the August Cover Corner is July 10, 1998. I can receive mail at 9068 Fontainebleau Terrace, Cincinnati, Ohio 45231, as well as by Fax at (513) 965-4474 (Note: this is a new FAX number).

We need some new examples of problem covers for The Cover Corner. We have successfully experimented with using copies of covers produced by high resolution copiers, either in black and white or in color, instead of requiring black and white photographs. This should make it easier to submit covers. Please send two copies of each cover, including the reverse if it has significant markings. It is also important to identify the color of markings on covers submitted in black and white.

Thanks.
-Ray Carlin

## Bibliopole

Since 1965

## PHILATELIC BIBLIOPOLE <br> http://pbbooks.com Authoritative Philatelic Literature

US, CSA, Maritime, Forgery, GB and the Empire, etc.
Purchaser of major and minor philatelic libraries, stocking new titles from over 100 publishers. 112 page Stock Catalog: $\$ 3$ to a US address, Foreign by air $\$ 5$.

PB Blank Pages, Mylar and Page Boxes
The state of the art for both archival preservation and appearance, our pages are $100 \%$ cotton rag, neutral pH and buffered; blank and quadrille. Custom steel engraved page heads and paneling available. Will run on most Laser Jet Printers. All made exclusively for us in the US. Page Sampler: \$3 to a US address. Foreign by air \$7.
P.O. Box 36006, Louisville, KY 40233

Leonard H. Hartmann
Phone (502) 451-0317, Fax (502) 459-8538

For PHILATELISTS, NUMISMATISTS, EPHEMERISTS, ARCHIVISTS, COLLECTORS AND SAVERS.
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## CLASSIFIED

WANTED: Carriage, wagon, harness, livery stable, blacksmith, all horse goods - advertising covers, trade cards, post cards, letterheads, catalogs, nameplates, medals, tokens, etc. All types of paper, celluloid or metal advertising items. Myron Huffman, 12409 Wayne Trace, Hoagland, IN 46745, 219-639-3290. (183)

WANTED: Common stampless covers in large quantities. U.S. only. Write with description. Don Nicoson, P.O. Box 2495, Phoenix AZ 85002. (180)

WANTED-AUCTION CATALOGS: Harmer Rooke, N.Y., 1940-49; H.R. Harmer, N.Y., 1941-49; Robert A. Siegel 1931-48; Daniel F. Kelleher, 1937-60; H.R. Harmer, London, 1925-69; Robson Lowe, London, 1936-76. Also any Colonel Green sales, 1942-46, any of Sylvester Colby's literature sales, and all sales of Fred Kessler. Dan Barber, P.O. Box 23055, Lansing, MI 48909. (184)
\$1.00 PAID FOR EACH front and back photocopy of 1860 thru $186824 ¢$ (single or with others) cover. Census being conducted. E. Mangold, Box 380, Jacksonville VT 05342. (179)

## YOUR AD HERE FOR 50ç A LINE

Send payment to: Richard M. Wrona, P.O. Box 7631, McLean, VA 22106-7631. Next Deadline: July 5, 1998.

| THE |
| :---: |
| FANCY CANCEL |
| SPECIALIST |
| Send \$2.00 (stamps OK) |
| for color photo lists |
| of fancy cancels and |
| choice stamps 1851-1890. |
| Tell me your interests. |
| STEVEN HINES |
| P.O. Box 422 |
| MONEE IL 60449 |
| (708) 534-1023 |

## For the postal historian...

## The Full Library of Theron Weirenga Titles Is Now Available From Us.

Unavailable for a number of years, these important titles contain original data on American postal history. Here is your unique opportunity to acquire these vital reference titles. We own the entire remaining stock of them.

- American State Papers. Post Office Department: 1799-1833. Small atlas-sized volume; includes various listings of P.O.'s from 1799 to 1830. Has wide variety of reports \& documents on the USPOD; wealth of early postal history. $\$ 85.00$.
- Postal Laws \& Regulations of the U.S.A., 1832 and 1843. These are two important handbooks from the stampless period, bound into one volume. Very difficult to obtain. $\$ 40.00$.
- The U.S. Postal Guide and Official Advertiser, 1850 to 1852 . Complete run in 2 vols; rare monthly periodical, few original copies exist outside Library of Congress. Along with postal information there are Executive Dept. notices, Appointments by the President, Consuls Recognized by the State Dept., Reports of Secretary of War, Navy, Postmaster General, new postmasters \& locations. Rare source for postal history student, genealogist and historian. Only 37 sets left. $\$ 100.00$.
- Pratt's Post Office Directory: 1850. Very accurate list of P.O.'s during the 1847 era; also contains foreign postage tables for the new British Postal Convention of 1849. \$35.00.
- Postal Laws \& Regulations of the U.S.A.: 1852. New handbook issued after the rate changes of 1851. Also contains newspaper clipping file about postal laws and foreign mail rates. $\$ 45.00$.

Shipping \& handling: \$3 first book, $\$ 1$ for each additional book. VISA and MasterCard accepted.

## Get our newest philatelic literature

 catalog \#26! Only \$5 refundable with purchase. Call, write, fax or email us today! Attn: Dept CL.- Colton's Post Office Directory.: 1856. Unique volume contains $25,000+$ post offices with postmasters' names, showing revenue of each office. This is important source data to assist in judging the relative scarcity of townmarks from various states. $\$ 45.00$.
- List of Post Offices, Postal Laws \& Regulations of U.S.A.: 1857. Wonderful handbook; contains list of P.O.'s and P.L.\&R.'s. This volume was first produced after the French Postal Convention of 1857 \& has up-to-date foreign postage tables including French mail rates. $\$ 40.00$.
- List of P.O.'s in the U.S.A.: 1862. List of post offices specifies those under Confederate control. Also several important P.O.D.-issued pamphlets of 1861, 1863, 1864 \& 1865. \$55.00.
- Postal Laws \& Regulations of the U.S.A.: 1866. First P.L.\&R. after the Civil War and first since 1859. Much excellent information with updated foreign mail rates. $\$ 55.00$.
- U.S. Incoming Steamship Mail by Theron Weirenga, 1983. 242 pgs. Hardbound. Important directory of dates and times of all incoming foreign steamship mail in the 19th century. Vital postal history source. Illustrated. $\$ 45.00$.
- The Gold Rush Mail Agents To California, 1849-52 by Theron Weirenga. Detailing the vital communications to/from the California mining boomtowns. Illustrated. 288 pgs. $\$ 40$.


> E-Mail: philately2@earthlink.net Website: www.jameslee.com


Great collections have one name in common.
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[^1]:    'Wade E. Saadi, "The Discovery of a Plate Crack on the 5¢ Stamp of 1847," The Chronicle of the U.S. Classic Postal Issues, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Whole No. 162)(May 1994), pp. 94-102.
    ${ }^{2}$ Wade E. Saadi, "The Proof Panes of 100 of the $5 \notin$ and $10 \notin 1847$-First Impressions," The Chronicle of the U.S. Classic Postal Issues, Vol. 50, No. 1 (Whole No. 177)(February 1998), p. 55.
    ${ }^{3}$ For a copy of this enlargement, please see Figure 2 in the accompanying article by Dr. Henry Marasse, "Type 'A' Double Transfer Reported on 5\& 1847 Trial Color Proof."

[^2]:    'As the difference between the terms "plate proof" (a proof in the issued color of the stamp) and "trial color proof" (a proof in a color other than that of the issued stamp) is irrelevant for the purposes of this article, the editor has used "plate proof" universally.
    ${ }^{2}$ Please see Henry F. Marasse, M.D., "A Report of Two Rare 1847 Plate Proofs Each Showing Double Transfers," The Chronicle of the U.S. Classic Postal Issues, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Whole No. 170)(May 1996), pp. 79-82, for the full details of these plate proofs and as a prologue to this article.
    ${ }^{3}$ The author is grateful to Mal Brown for his research support and to Keiji Taira for the photograph of the block of four. As well, thanks to Gini Horn, APRL librarian.

[^3]:    Editor's note: The author, a young and extremely astute German student of the U. S. official stamps, was able to reclassify this variety through excellent photographs of his own material. Because my command of the English language is better, he asked that I finalize the draft of this article. In doing so, I received invaluable advice from my assistant section editor, Lester C. Lanphear III, who just happens to be the preeminent collector of plate varieties on these issues. Ironically, the copy of the $6 \$$ State stamp on which Mr. Ebner based his theories once belonged to me. To my chagrin, I sold it to him back in the days when I had no interest in plate varieties.
    ${ }^{2}$ A larger block of 25 , consisting of the lower left quarter sheet, was sold in the Christie's sale of the Weill brothers' stock, December 14, 1989, lot 788. Tragically, it has since been reduced to a $4 \times 4$ block of 16 .

[^4]:    ${ }^{3}$ Alan C. Campbell, "Plating the Official Stamps," Chronicle, Vol. 49, \#3 (Whole No. 175) (August, 1997), p. 201-203.
    ${ }^{4}$ The explanations that follow were developed in conversation with the section editor and the assistant section editor.

[^5]:    ${ }^{5}$ Actually, according to the definition first set forth in the catalogue in 1996- "When original transfers are erased incompletely from a plate, they can appear with new transfers of a different design which are entered subsequently on the plate."-this is not technically a "foreign entry."
    ${ }^{6}$ Alan C. Campbell, "The Design Evolution of the United States Official Stamps," Chronicle, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Whole No. 169) (February, 1969), p. 50.
    ${ }^{\prime}$ National Archives, Committee Report dated August 7, 1897, courtesy Lester C. Lanphear III.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ James H. Baxter, Printing Postage Stamps by Line Engraving (State College, Pa.: The American Philatelic Society, 1939), p. 59.

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ N. R. P.Bonsor, North Atlantic Seaway, Volume 2, rev. ed. (Jersey Channel Islands: Brookside Publications, 1978), p. 513.
    ${ }^{2}$ Ibid., p. 514.

[^8]:    ${ }^{3}$ U.S. 16 Statutes at Large, 979-1002.
    ${ }^{4}$ Ibid., 983.
    ${ }^{5}$ Ibid., 1003-1004.
    ${ }^{6}$ U.S. 17 Statutes at Large, 63.
    ${ }^{7}$ Report of the Postmaster General, 1872, Wierenga Reprint, p. 11.
    ${ }^{8}$ Report of the Postmaster General, 1873, Wierenga Reprint, p.IX.

[^9]:    "Leipzig was detained in Southampton for about a week while it was decided whether it would be safe to proceed to the United States. Finally, the Company left the decision to the Captain who elected to proceed immediately to Baltimore, departing Southampton on 22 July 1870. Leipzig remained in Baltimore until 26 October 1870 before returning to Bremerhaven.
    ${ }^{12}$ No call was made at Southampton as it was still too risky for the steamers to proceed that close to France. The voyage track was north of the British Isles and then directly to Baltimore.
    ${ }^{13}$ No call at Southampton.
    ${ }^{14}$ No call at Southampton.
    ${ }^{15}$ No call at Southampton. Leipzig called at Grimsby on 25 January and at Bremerhaven on 27 January 1871.
    ${ }^{16}$ Calls at Southampton resumed with this voyage. Captain Voeckler, the commander of this steamship and the one who inaugurated the service to Baltimore in 1868, died at sea of illness on 9 March 1871, four days out from Southampton.
    ${ }^{17}$ On the return voyage, Leipzig arrived at Bremerhaven on 12 October.
    ${ }^{18}$ On the westbound voyage, Ohio was detained three days in Bremerhaven due to thick fog.

[^10]:    ${ }^{2}$ 'This was Hermann's first voyage on the Baltimore service, having previously been on the New York route. There were now seven steamships on the Baltimore service and the Company announced weekly service departing Bremen on Tuesdays and Baltimore on Saturdays.
    ${ }^{22}$ Minister Roon was transferred from the West Indies service and made three round voyages across the North Atlantic, one to Baltimore and two to New York.
    ${ }^{23}$ Westbound, Leipzig went directly to Baltimore from Bremen.
    ${ }^{24}$ Westbound, Berlin went directly to Baltimore from Bremen.
    ${ }^{25}$ Westbound, Ohio went directly to Baltimore from Bremen.
    ${ }^{26}$ Hannover was used principally on the New Orleans service but made at least one round voyage to Baltimore.

[^11]:    ${ }^{27}$ Braunschweig left Southampton on 16 January for Baltimore, met disabled Deutschland of the New York service at Lat. 4630 N, Long. 4117 W and towed her back to Southampton, arriving there on 27 January. Deutschland had lost all the blades of her propeller. Braunschweig departed Southampton on 30 January for Baltimore.
    ${ }^{28}$ Leipzig, which sailed from Southampton on the 13th, on her way down the channel, went aground off Start Point, in fog, bow on. Passengers and cargo were transferred from forward to aft, then she got off on her engines. She anchored in Start Bay, established that the leak was not excessive, then reembarked her passengers and ran back to Southampton for repairs. She transferred her freight and passengers to Braunschweig at Southampton, then returned to Bremen.
    ${ }^{29}$ Hohenzollern departed Bremen on 6 February with mails for New York, arriving there on 22 February. On 26 February she proceeded in ballast to Baltimore to make one voyage from Baltimore to Bremen as a substitute steamer.
    ${ }^{30}$ Nürnberg delayed departure from Baltimore for four and one-half weeks while a replacement shaft was fitted in Baltimore.

