

EGYPT STUDY CIRCLE

THE QUARTERLY CIRCULAR

Volume VI No. 10

Whole Series No: 70

MARCH 1968

REPORT OF MEETING OF THE EGYPT STUDY CIRCLE

The 120th Meeting of the Circle was held on Saturday, the 10th February 1968, at the premises of the Royal Philatelic Society, London, when J.H.E. Gilbert took the Chair. He was supported by E.H. Proctor (Hon. Secretary/Treasurer), and C.W. Minett (Keeper of the Philatelic Record). There were eleven members present, and one visitor - Mr. K.C. Brown - who applied for membership before leaving.

The meeting was informed of the death of George Mee in November last, and stood in respect to his memory. He had been a regular attender at the Study Circle meetings, and will be sadly missed by those who knew him.

After the despatch of the regular business, and hearing news of overseas members which is always most welcome, the discussion of the 1923/24 issue was continued, led by E.H. Proctor.

The scarcity of complete sheets of this issue is due to the loss by fire of the major stocks held by a dealer in Cairo, the late E.L. Angeloglou. Nevertheless, those present were able to view a number of complete panes together with proof sheets and imperforate examples.

It was noted in the case of the 5 milliemmes that the proof sheets have the watermark sideways and are not uncommon, while the imperforate Post Office sheets with watermark normal are much scarcer.

This was the first issue of Egyptian stamps to be printed by photogravure which at this time was a relatively new process to be used in the production of stamps. The numbers of flaws and retouches indicate something of the trials and difficulties the printers had to overcome especially with the lower values. Better results were obtained with the higher values, and in one sheet of 25 of the One Pound value only three minor flaws have been detected.

One imperforate sheet of the 10 milliemmes (thought to be a printer's "pull") has in manuscript "maximum pressure Rubber and Felt". Comparison with one mint Post Office pane has only given negative results so far.

The position of a pane of the sheet can be determined by the size and position of the control number relative to that of the stamps. A master list of those known was circulated.

The process used in the printing of this issue, which gives the appearance of a spattered screen in comparison with the vertical or diagonal screens of those to follow, was described by C.A. Gilders and it is hoped to include further details of this in

the completed study.

After tea, which is always a feature of our meetings at the "Royal", Charles Minett gave the report of the sub-committee dealing with the "Government Posts".

Early letters of the Posta Europea bear the dated handstamp of the office of receipt inscribed "Posta Europea" struck on the face only, but later ones also received back-stamps.

On the 2nd January 1865 the Egyptian Government bought the Posta Europea, but continued to use its handstamps and documents for another three months.

The handstamps of the Government Posts were introduced in April 1865 and inscribed "Poste Vice-Reali Egiziane", they are dated and include the Town name. Letters received the hand-stamp of the office of receipt on the front and the office of destination on the reverse. Many letters of this period were written in Syrian or Turkish Arabic, and the manuscript date inside could be Syrian, Lunar (al Hegira), or western Calendar - abbreviations of these complicate matters still further. These Government franks continued in use as cancellations after the issue of the first adhesive postage stamps on the 1st January 1866.

Known data is being circulated to those members with material of this period with the hope of making the completed list as comprehensive as possible. The keeper of the record mentioned how important it is to record as much detail as possible, such as position and colour of strikes, as at some time this information may prove to be of some significance.

The meeting closed about 6.30 p.m., after thanks had been given to the Chairman for his handling of what had proved to be another most successful afternoon session.

The next meeting of the Circle was arranged to take place on Saturday the 4th May 1968, again at the premises of the Royal Philatelic Society, London.

F.W. Benians. (L.S.C. No.123).

-----oOo-----

Correspondence which has been addressed to member No. 53, Henry T. Hardy, 14, Powers Avenue, Jesmond, Newcastle-on-Tyne 2, has been returned marked "GONE AWAY".

Can any member help with his new address so that he may receive "Q.C."s, etc. due to him?

-----oOo-----

NOTES FROM THE KEEPER OF THE RECORD

C.W. Minett (ESC No.77)

who is grateful to a number of members for their assistance.

1. PAYE/PAID. Peter Smith has found yet another type cancelling a 4 milliemmes adhesive of the 1914 Pictorial Issue. It consists of the word "PAID" with serif letters over the Arabic equivalent in black and is similar to illustration B(c) in "Q.C." 8/9 but is surrounded by a frame.
2. CONSTANTINIA. Lars Alund has sent in a "news bulletin" which records this date-stamp (Type VIII-1) on a 5 milliemmes rose De la Rue dated -.JA.00. Of the later spelling QOCONSTANTINIA (Type VIII-1.6) (but without "P" before the time figures) he has examples dated from 6.VII.07 to 18.I.03; and of Type VIII-1.8 he has an example dated 16.XII.09, and two further ones struck in blue dated -.V.17 and 14.VI.17.

It is of course the earlier spelling which may be mistaken by the Tyro (or the Rogue?) for CONSTANTINOPOLI.

3. SEAMAN'S HOME, ALEXANDRIA. Peter Andrews announces he is "bogged down" for want of information - doesn't any son of an old sailor know anything about it?

Incidentally, it was purely by chance that the note on this subject in "Q.C." 8/9 was followed by the reference to CH BOGMA!

4. WORLD WAR II. Jim benians has very kindly presented to the Record a copy of "The Battle of Egypt" - a profusely illustrated wartime booklet dealing with the preparations for, and the break-through at, Alamein. Published in 1943 it was prepared by the Ministry of Information for the War Office and sold at 7d. per copy.
5. NOSTALGIA. set in after reading the above, especially when we turned up the following "Thought for a Post-war Tourist" by "N.B.J.", published in "GEM" the R.A.F. Magazine widely read in the western Desert in those days

"After the war, when you hear Thomas Cook
Talking of tours to Matruh and Tobruk
And the various wonderful sights he has planned -
Wadis - Escarpments - the Moon on the Sand
And the beauties of Bug-Dug, Sollum and El Adem -
YOU go and look at them, Brother. I've had 'em."

So far as the Egyptian western Desert is concerned I have covers postmarked EL DALIA, IOKA, MATRUH and even SIWA, but has anyone examples from SOLLUM, SIDI BARRANI and EL ALAMIN? - and did Monty sell his the other week or was it a case of "well I was there but at the time I wasn't interested....."?

-----OoO-----

1927 - King Fuad Issue.Notes on the high values.

by

Ibrahim Chaftar (ESC No.42).

In the Quarterly Circular Volume VI No:6/7 (May 1966) Page 63, a comment on the £E1 value of the 1927 Issue was published informing that a purchaser of a block of four with control A/27 found that all four stamps are perfectly normal and that this block does not show the variety Zeheri 117a.

According to Zeheri 8th Edition (Page 85) the second stamp in the bottom row of this block should have a deformed "U" (giving it the appearance of an O) as a constant variety.

The explanation given by the writer of the query that this was the result of an early plate damage and that this block was part of a sheet first coming off the press before the damage to the plate occurred has to be corrected.

Give below some information giving all that I know about the 500 milliemes and £E1 values of this issue, worthy of note.

It will be noted that the £E1 value was successively printed from two different border plates A/28 and A/7 and one of them, faulty, was discarded in due time. I remember very well having had in my collection the two control blocks of four A/27, one showing the variety and the other not.

A careful examination of the control blocks of the 500 milliemes A/27 will probably show differences in the centre as this value also was printed that year with two different centre plates A.1 and A/28.

-
1. Chromium plating resulted in important economies in time and production costs, many cylinders being utilised for the printing of postage stamp supplies in successive years. Where cylinders were so used for several years, the old control numbers were progressively cancelled and the current control added so that three or four control numbers often appear on one sheet of stamps.
 2. Until 1932, a celluloid 175 line screen had been employed in the photographic processes used in preparing photogravure cylinders for final etching, but in that year an engraved glass 175 line screen was obtained from England. This resulted in an improvement in the quality of the work, more technical certainty and

- effective economies due to the reduction in the time of exposure required.
3. The screen used for postage stamps produced photo-lithographically is a normal 150 line half-tone screen. This has not been changed.
 4. Until 1937 the stamp impositions were adapted to suit the cylinder sizes of the photogravure machines then in use - all low and intermediate high values being in two panes each of 100 stamps (10 x 10). These machine sheets were divided before being perforated, the post office sheet thus consisting of one pane of 100 stamps.
 5. The 500 milliemes and the £E1 value stamps were imposed and printed in sheets of 25 (5 x 5) only.
 6. The first issue of the £E1 and 500 milliemes stamps, Control A/27, were printed in two colours - both by photogravure. As the machines then in use were not adapted for printing to accurate register the percentage of spoils was unduly high, and it was decided to print the portrait centres only in photogravure while the frames were printed lithographically. This last method continued until new photogravure machines were installed in 1938.
 7. The stamps required for the manufacture of stamp booklets were imposed in a special manner to facilitate the make up and cutting of the books.
 8. This imposition comprised four panes, each of 60 stamps (6 x 10) of which in each pane 3 x 10 were upright and the adjacent 3 x 10 were inverted.
 9. Normally the line screen is exposed at an angle of 45 degrees to the frame of the stamps, but in 1925 and 1926 (following experiments to improve the appearance of the stamp and to lessen the degree of wear to the etched cylinder while printing) low value stamps were produced with the screen at right angles to the frame.
 10. Later, with the improvement in technique and to photo-originals, it was found possible to revert to the normal angle of 45 degrees.

There follows a check list of the control numbers and cylinder numbers of the high values - 200 milliemes
500 milliemes and
£E1.

King Fuad Issue : 1927 - 1934. Check list High Values.

<u>VALUE AND COLOUR</u>		<u>CONTROL</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>CYLINDER</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>DESPATCHED</u> <u>TO G.P.O.</u>
<u>200 mills.</u>	Mauve	A/26	A.19	130,000
	"	A/27	A.14	100,000
	"	A/35	A.35	60,000
	"	A/35 A/37	A.35	125,000
<u>500 mills.</u>		A/27	Border A.2 Centre A.1 A.28	9,000
	Border: Chestnut-brown			
	Centre: Blue-green	A/20	Border: Litho.plate Centre: A.22	10,000
		A/30	Border: Litho.plate Centre: A.22	10,000
		A/34	Border: Litho-plate Centre: A.6	13,000
		A/35	Border: Litho.plate Centre: A.6	25,000
<u>£E1.</u>	Border: Greenish-slate	A/27	Border: A.28 A.7 Centre: A.12	32,000
	Centre: Chestnut-brown			
		A/35	Border: Litho-plate Centre: A.20	25,000

-----oOo-----

-----o-----

NEW MEMBERS

We welcome the following new members, who have joined us since the publication of the last "Q.C.":

- 135 Carl Jordan, 8, Young Street, GUELPH, Ontario, Canada.
 136 Miss E.M.D. Herbert, Sunnyside, 9 Springfield Avenue, HARROGATE, Yorkshire.
 137 P.R. Bertram, 14, Barkston Gardens, ERMINE EAST, Lincolnshire.
 138 K.C. Brown, 4, Holmwood Grove, MILL HILL, London, N.W.7.
 139 Ed. P. Pritlove, 265 East 13th Street, HAMILTON, Ontario, Canada.

-----oOo-----

-----o-----

BRITISH FIELD POST OFFICES
IN EGYPT 1940-1941

by

J.A. Firebrace
(ESC No. 71)

For some years I have been recording the particulars of all covers which passed through the British Field Post Offices in Egypt from the apparent introduction of the datestamps during the last week of September 1940 until the end of the Military Postal Concession period on 30th April 1941.

The Postal Concession had been granted on 1st November 1932 and when it ended the use of the Army Post adhesives ended - or, more accurately, should have ended. The reason for limiting the dates in the check list which follows is that all the dates listed, except three, are those cancelling Egyptian adhesives. The three exceptions are records from covers which were franked by Great Britain adhesives (FPO 177) or which travelled postage free ("No stamps available", FPO's 244 and 246), and their dates depend on the strong circumstantial evidence, noted in detail later, of the double rectangle censor mark (FPHS Type A 3; ESC Type A5; OPAL de burca Type 2).

I hope that the dates which follow will be accepted as a firm base on to which can be built further data as it comes to light, including the study of the period beginning 1st May 1941 - which is the date on which the Egypt Postage Prepaid datestamps were first correctly used.

The 27 FPO's and BAPO 4 are listed in six chronological groups. Groups 1, 3 and 5 are static FPO's listed according to the dates first recorded. Material may well exist which warrants the transfer of FPO's in Group 3 to Group 1. and of FPO's in Group 5 to Group 1 or 3. This is likely from a glance at the numerical sequences. FPO's in Group 2 and 4 were probably used by 7th Armoured Division and 2nd Armoured Division respectively. The formation which used FPO's in Group 6 may well be known to one of our members.

GROUP 1. Static FPO's first recorded in September 1940.

169	26 Sep.1940	-	27 Apr.1941
170	? Sep.1940	-	5 Apr.1941
171	25 Sep.1940	-	4 Apr.1941
172	26 Sep.1940	-	23 Apr.1941
173	28 Sep.1940	-	22 Apr.1941
187	28 Sep.1940	-	25 Apr.1941
188	24 Sep.1940	-	23 Apr.1941

GROUP 2. Probably used by the 7th Armoured Division.

242	10 Oct.1940	-	29 Apr.1941
243	12 Oct.1940	-	10 Mar.1941
244	* 27 Sep.1940	-	26 Apr.1941
245	25 Sep.1940	-	23 Apr.1941
246	29 Sep.1940	-	*18 Jan.1941

GROUP 3. Static F.P.O.'s first recorded in October-November 1940.

186	7 Oct.1940	-	10 Apr.1941
189	23 Nov.1940	-	25 Apr.1941
190	22 Oct.1940	-	30 Apr.1941
191	8 Nov.1940	-	15 Apr.1941

GROUP 4. Probably used by 2nd Armoured Division on arrival from Britain.

368	14 Jan.1941	-	20 Jan.1941
372	29 Jan.1941	-	3 Mar.1941

GROUP 5. Static F.P.O.'s first recorded in 1941.

177	* 27 Feb.1941	-	27 Apr.1941
197	25 Apr.1941	-	30 Apr.1941
198	25 Jan.1941	-	5 Apr.1941
199	16 Mar.1941	-	6 Apr.1941
201	13 Feb.1941	-	10 Apr.1941
309	20 Apr.1941	-	
BAPO 4	30 Apr.1941	-	

GROUP 6. F.P.O.'s previously used in Palestine.

165	25 Apr.1941	-	30 Apr.1941
166	23 Apr.1941	-	25 Apr.1941
168	18 Apr.1941	-	27 Apr.1941

Evidence from Censor Marks. To confirm dates marked * above; comparison dates all known to be Egypt.

FPO 177 dated 27 Feb.1941. Censor A 3 No.47 was used with FPO 188 on 22 Jan. 1941 and with EPP 25 on 2 Jan. 1942.

FPO 244 dated 27 Sep.1940. Censor A 3 No.70 was used with MPC E601 on 7 Mar. 1940 and with FPO 244 on 28 Sep. 1940.

FPO 246 dated 18 Jan.1941. Censor A 3 No. 178 was used with FPO 246 on 18 Jan. 1941 and with FPO 172 on 8 Apr. 1941.

Having stated above that the earliest and latest dates are records of cancellations on adhesives, it is advisable to refer to the possibility of Egyptian adhesives being "used abroad". This may have happened through FPO 199, as I have three covers endorsed in manuscript

"Tobruk", dated between 9 March and 6 April 1941; this is mentioned again later. Another possibility is with the four FPO's which are reported as having been in Greece after being known used in Egypt. These are FPO's 170, 171, 177, and 190.

The information which we have concerning the locations of the FPO's in Egypt and the formations and units which used them, with dates of use, is very scarce and I do not want to go into it at this stage. It should be possible in due course to suggest what censor marks were used with which FPO's, and at which dates.

It may help the progress of this study if I set down briefly some notes on the other FPO's numbered between 165 and 201. This sequence includes all the numbers in the three groups of static FPO's, except for 309, of which we have only one record, and BAPO 4 which appears only on the last day but one of our period. Nos. 179, 180 and 200 remained in Britain.

Possible use in Egypt.

FPO's 178, 192, 196, 370. Examples of use in Egypt may be found.
181, 182, 184, 185. Probably in reserve at GHQ Cairo and not used.

Used in the Sudan.

FPO 174 27 Sep.1940 - 17 July 1941 is the known period of use at Khartoum (de Burca). The first recorded date is as for Egypt, Group 1 above.
Not recorded in Egypt.

FPO 186 The last recorded date for Egypt, 10 Apr.1941, is 26 days before the first known date from Port Sudan, 6 May 1941 (de burca).

FPO 192 I have a cover dated 3 Feb.1941 endorsed by recipient "from Baie Oela, Soude"; censor mark A 3 No. 146. Censor mark A 3 No. 158 was used with this FPO three days later, on 6 Feb.1941, and had been used previously, 5 Sep.1940 with MPO B604, which is first reported in Sudan on 1 Feb.1941 at Tessenei. The recorded span of 192 is 6 Dec.1940 to 6 Feb.1941. Was it in the Sudan? It is not so recorded by de Burca.
Later reported in Greece.

Used in Libya.

FPO 178 30 Mar.1941 is the only date so far recorded for this FPO, and it appears on a large part of a captured Italian envelope, the crested flap of which bears the inscription "Prefecture of Benghazi".

FPO 199 This is mentioned earlier as a possibility that Egyptian adhesives were used in fobruk. I have three covers inscribed in manuscript "fobruk", dated and franked as follows:-
7 March FREE OAS; 6 April, 6 mills. Egypt definitive;
16 Apr.1941, 3d. Great Britain registered envelope;
all addressed to Egypt.

Used in Greece.

FPOs 170, 171, 177, 190, have been reported by Stobbs used in Greece, although all are recorded above as having been used in Egypt during April 1941.

FPOs 175, 192, 193, 194, 195. Not recorded used in Egypt.

A detailed list of the FPOs used in the Greek campaign of 1941 appears to be needed.

Used in Crete.

FPOs 176, 192. Not recorded used in Egypt.

Used in Palestine.

FPOs 165, 166, 168. Recorded by Crouch and Hill, not seen by me.

FPO 167. Earliest date known to me 29 Dec.1940.

FPO Datestamps Lost.

FPOs 175, 176, 183, 193, 194 and 195.

Acknowledgements.

I am grateful to have been able to record information from the Comber, Gilbert, Hamilton, Minett, Parker, Potter, Rawson and Revell collections.

Please see also:-

British Army Field Post Offices 1939-1950, by Col. G.K. Crouch and N. Hill.

The Postmarks of the Australian Forces from All Fronts 1939-53, compiled by S. Stobbs.

The Field Post Offices of the Sudan-Eritrean Campaign 1939-45 War, by Dr. B. de Burca, R.B.M..

Reporting of Further Information.

If any of our members have material or information that will enlarge our knowledge of any of the FPOs mentioned in these notes, will they please send it to me at "Little Chart", Walden Road, Chislehurst, Kent, and include the following details:-

FPO number, date, postal rate, with details of adhesives.
Censor mark number, colour and sketch of type.
Location where used - together with information of
formation, unit, and name of censoring officer.
Any other information.

-----oOo-----

The above article is reproduced by kind permission of the Editor of the Forces Postal History Society bulletin, in which it first appeared. It is hoped that some of our members may be able to add to the knowledge so far published. (Editor).

-----oOo-----

G. W. Mee, BSC No. 120.

Members of the Circle who knew him, and were not present at the last meeting, will be sorry indeed to hear of the death of George Mee who passed away on the 5th November 1967 at the early age of 59.

George, who joined the Circle in the early '60s was a very enthusiastic member, regularly attending the meetings where his presence will now be sadly missed.

No world-famous collection to back up his name yet one of those people who attend the meetings, bringing along material of great use to those other members involved in particular studies or relevant to the subjects on the meeting Agenda.

George had the knack of picking up those choice items that were an envy to all, especially those interested in postal history.

The Circle, by his passing, has lost another member it can ill afford to lose. To those who knew him personally, they have lost a friend - a good friend and a convivial companion.

A.J. Revell. ESC No.78.

-----oOo-----

CHANGE OF ADDRESS:

Please note the further change of address:-

126 C.TH.J. Hooghuis, Philips Iberica,
P.O.B. 2065, MADRID, 17,
Spain.

-----oOo-----

Imperforate and Part-Perforated
in Egyptian Philately

by

Prof. P.A.S. Smith.
(ESC No.74)

This is an informal attempt to summarise the information known to me about Egyptian stamps in imperforate or partly perforated condition, in the hope of learning more from other members of the Circle. Please respond if you have anything at all to add, even just an opinion!

Although there have been no distinct issues of imperforate stamps in Egypt (barring miniature sheet souvenirs), nearly all issues have one or more examples in imperforate condition, from one provenance or another. Some are listed in the catalogues, some are not. Several questions come to mind:

- 1) How can imperforate or partly perforated stamps be safely distinguished from trimmed copies that were originally perforated?
- 2) Which were true errors (i.e. sold over the Post Office counter normally)?
- 3) Which have the status of proofs, remainders, or printer's waste?
- 4) Are any of them clandestine productions, and if so, which?

Both the Scott and Gibbons catalogues list imperforate stamps as singles through the 1879 (De la Rue) issue, but beginning with the 1923 King Fuad issue imperforate stamps are listed in pairs only. (Actually, Scott lists the 1879 imperforate varieties, but Gibbons does not). On the other hand, in both catalogues, partly perforated stamps are listed only in pairs, regardless of the period. What is the reason for this inconsistency? One can easily understand that pairs allow the unequivocal identification of an imperforate or partly-perforated variety, but it is hard to understand why the necessity should be different between stamps devoid of perforations on all four sides on the one hand, and on two opposite sides on the other.

The general reason for the desirability of accepting only pairs as unequivocal examples of a missing row or rows of perforations is that certain stamps are perforated one line at a time (often by hand) in such a way that there is a considerable variation in the perforation-to-perforation width. In extreme cases a stamp may be so wide (or tall) as to show portions of adjoining stamps on both opposite sides. Such a stamp would still show very large margins

after trimming off the perforations, and would appear to be a very convincing perforation error. This situation occurs with line-perforated stamps; comb-perforated stamps have an invariant distance between the perforations in one direction. In the direction of advance of the comb, the distance between the rows of perforations is also usually invariant, although maladjustment of the machinery resulting in slipping can in quite exceptional circumstances lead to an abnormally "long" stamp in that direction. Stamps perforated with a harrow machine show a fixed, invariant distance in both directions.

The foregoing considerations lead to the conclusion that only line-perforated stamps are especially susceptible to creation of faked imperforates by trimming, and that it is these stamps whose imperforate varieties should best be accepted only in pairs. Among Egyptian stamps, it is the issues before 1879 that were line-perforated; thereafter, comb perforation was generally used (the 1884-88 postage dues are an exception). The catalogues, however, have chosen exactly the opposite course of action, and list only the line-perforated stamps as imperforate singles! A comb-perforated stamp which cannot be converted by trimming into an imperforate variety with proper dimensions should give us no worry about the possibility of fake imperforate singles, yet it is precisely these issues that the catalogues require to be in imperforate pairs! In view of this confused and illogical state of affairs, it is worth while to examine the actual spacing of the perforations of the early issues of Egypt, those that were perforated on line machines.

A line machine need not necessarily produce stamps of widely varying dimensions. A mechanical system of advancing the sheet exactly one row at a time can lead to very even dimensions, as can the careful hand of a good operator. The First Issue of Egypt shows moderately constant distances between lines of perforations, although there is some easily visible variation. The Second Issue shows even more constant dimensions. The Third Issue, however, was as miserably perforated as it was printed, and very large differences in dimensions can be found (the stamp with large dimensions tends to disappear: they are so tempting to the trimmer!). The postage due stamps, which were also line-perforated through 1888, have fairly constant dimensions. An important question is: Can any dimensional limits be set that will allow an imperforate (or partly perforated) single stamp to be recognised with a high degree of certainty? I think the answer is "yes" for the First and Second Issues, but "doubtful" for the Third Issue. Let us look at the available evidence.

Examination of the stamps in my collection (a few hundreds) discloses these limits in normally perforated stamps (from base to base of the perforation holes):-

First Issue: 19 to 20 mm. wide by 22 to 24 mm. tall
(nearly all under 23 mm.).

Second Issue: $21\frac{1}{2}$ mm. to $25\frac{1}{2}$ mm. wide by 20 mm. to $20\frac{1}{8}$ mm. tall.

Third Issue: up to 28 mm. wide by 22 mm. tall.

These dimensions at their upper limit are in every case as large or larger than the distance from the edge of one stamp to the corresponding edge of the next stamp, so that in no case can a stamp with margins exactly half the width between stamps be accepted with absolute certainty as imperforate. Stamps exceeding the maximum limits listed above would seem to be properly acceptable as legitimate examples of imperforate (or part-perforated) varieties. However, the limits in the case of the Third Issue are so large as to exclude virtually all imperforate singles that I have ever seen, and could allow a portion of the adjoining stamps to be seen on all four sides. One fares better with the First Issue, and the Royal Philatelic Society has issued certificates for stamps of slightly smaller dimensions than the maximum limits above. That is all right, because the "fat" stamps are really very uncommon (I would estimate much less than 1%), and even then are usually "fat" in only one direction. The Second Issue is even better, for the distance between perforations rarely varies much (usually on the short side) and a stamp with margins of half the width of the unprinted space between the stamps can fairly safely be taken as a true imperforate variety (even though certainty is not absolute).

To summarize, for my personal purposes, I accept for my collection the following minimum limits of dimensions:-

First Issue: over 20 mm. wide; over 23 mm. tall.

Second Issue: over $25\frac{1}{8}$ mm. wide; over 21 mm. tall.

Third Issue: over 27 mm. wide; over 22 mm. tall.

These limits I apply equally to imperforate and partly perforated varieties. I realise that it is possible in certain extreme cases for an item accepted by these criteria to have been made by trimming, but I think that the requisite starting material would be so rare as to make the risk negligibly small. The purpose of these notes, however, is to record my own views so as to elicit the views and experiences of others - I would be delighted to hear of their opinions.

Before going on to the later issues, it might be interesting to record some information about exactly what sort of material is known. I shall describe what I have in my collection, what I have seen, and what I have seen reliably recorded, such as in auction catalogues.

First Issue: Multiples (pairs or larger) exist for all values, although I know of nothing larger than an imperforate strip of three of the 5 piastre, and an imperforate pair of the 10 piastre. Examples

of such multiples are rare, of course, but some are illustrated in the catalogue of the Byam sale and in that of the sale of the Palace Collections. Partly perforated varieties are known in pairs, strips, and blocks; several are illustrated in the sale catalogues mentioned. In addition to these, I have a 5 para perforated horizontally and imperforate vertically on both sides; the width is $21\frac{1}{2}$ mm., quite enough to identify the stamp as a legitimate variety. I have the 10 para in a similar state, width 21 mm. (well over the borderline of full legitimacy). The 2 piastre and the 10 piastre imperforate vertically with widths of $20\frac{1}{2}$ mm. also qualify. Apart from several other imperforate varieties it is interesting to record that my 10 piastre imperforate has dimensions $20\frac{1}{2}$ mm. x $23\frac{1}{2}$ mm., and my error 10 piastre surcharge on 5 piastre imperforate has the same dimensions; both have Royal Philatelic Society certificates. It would thus seem that the Royal Philatelic Society Expert Committee accepts limits similar to those suggested here.

Horizontally imperforate stamps of the First Issue seem to be much rarer than vertically imperforate, and I do not recall seeing a single example of any value. Is this experience general?

Second Issue: The 5 para I have seen imperforate horizontally, with a sufficiently wide margin at top as to indicate an imperforate sheet margin. I know of no fully imperforate multiple, and have not seen an imperforate single of legitimate dimensions. The 10 para lilac I have seen as an apparently imperforate single only. The 1 piastre, on the other hand, can be found in imperforate blocks. The few that I have seen are on paper bearing the proper impressed "watermark", but the impression is weaker than that seen on most perforated stamps. This may only mean that but one sheet was issued in imperforate condition, and it happened to be one with a weaker than usual "watermark" impression. These imperforates should be distinguished from unwatermarked proofs in the issued colour, and from printer's waste printed on both sides.

The 2 piastre I have in a marginal imperforate block of four, and a full sheet is known. I also have a horizontal pair imperforate vertically, cancelled at Ponta with Type III date stamp. Partly perforated examples of this stamp without "watermark" are also known; they are presumably of proof status.

I have a single 20 para yellow-green imperforate at top and bottom, $22\frac{1}{4}$ mm. tall - far more than sufficient to establish legitimacy.

Third Issue: Although imperforate singles of all values of this issue are listed in the major catalogues with rather modest prices, and although examples of them are no more than scarce, I have never even heard of a fully imperforate pair! If any reader can report one, it would be most interesting news. One might be tempted to conclude that there were no legitimate imperforates, and that the many existing

examples are all the result of the trimmer's hand. I believe this is not so for the following reasons:

Pairs imperforate between (and thus perforated otherwise all round) are known of the 20 para (1872 and 1874) and the 1 piastre (1875); and the 5 para (1875) is known in a vertical pair imperforate horizontally. If one or more parallel rows of perforations could be omitted, then several perpendicular rows might also have been omitted in some cases, producing at least a few imperforate stamps.

More convincingly, I have examples of imperforate singles of the 1 piastre (1875) used on piece or cover, in such a way that it is virtually certain that the original user had to cut the stamps from the sheet with scissors or a knife. One of these has dimensions 28 mm. x 21 mm., another $26\frac{1}{2}$ mm. x 21 mm..

Finally, I have some very large used singles with dimensions $27\frac{1}{2}$ mm. x 25 mm., 28 mm. x 21 mm., and 27 mm. x 23 mm.; the ink of the cancellation appears to run over the imperforate edge.

There are in addition examples of Third Issue stamps with one row of perforations missing, leaving the stamp imperforate at the sheet margin. The 5 para (1875) and the $2\frac{1}{2}$ piastre (1874) are known in this condition. Although such stamps would make very convincing imperforates if trimmed, they are valuable varieties in their own right.

The 1879 provisional surcharges are occasionally seen imperforate; I have examples measuring 28 mm. x 20 mm., and $26\frac{1}{2}$ mm. x $20\frac{1}{2}$ mm., as well as a single perforated horizontally imperforate vertically $26\frac{1}{2}$ mm. wide. They may be legitimate, but one cannot be sure.

Let us now turn to the first three issues of postage due stamps, which were also perforated on a line machine. The dimensions of perforated copies (measured, as usual, from base of hole to base of hole) are 24-25 mm. wide by 20-22 mm. tall (the width of an imperforate stamp with margins exactly half the space between stamps would be 25 mm. the height $21\frac{1}{2}$ mm.). Gibbons lists only the 2 milliemmes of 1888 fully imperforate and prices it mint and used (as pairs); the Scott catalogue lists none. Zeheri lists only the 10 para of 1884. A three-way discrepancy of this sort is hardly satisfactory!

I can confirm the Zeheri listing in that I have a horizontal imperforate pair of the 10 para on paper with the proper impressed "watermark". The 2 milliemmes I have in a corner block of six, imperforate; and the Byam collection contained an imperforate single of dimensions 25 mm. x 21 mm., used. I also have a horizontal imperforate pair used (genuine postal cancellation). It thus seems that both stamps should be listed in all catalogues. However, there

are also imperforate proofs in the issued colours of the 1888 issue. The shades are a little different from those usually seen on the perforated stamps, but so little that it might not be possible to make an unequivocal distinction. I know of the 5 milliemes, and the 1 and 2 piastres in this state, but not the 5 piastres (proofs are also known in other colours, but that is another subject).

Several values of the postage dues are listed imperforate in one direction. Scott lists the 10 para and 2 piastres of 1884, the 10 and 20 para of 1886, and the 5 piastres of 1888. Gibbons is more conservative, and lists only two: the 1 piastre of 1886 and the 2 milliemes of 1888, neither of which is listed by Scott! Zeheri lists the 10 para of 1884, all values of the 1886 issue, and the 2 milliemes, 1 and 5 piastres of 1888. Once again we have chaos among three highly reputed sources. I can confirm the 1 piastre of 1886 which I have in horizontal pairs, one mint, one postally used at Wasta. In each case only the row of perforations between the stamps is missing, the outer vertical perforations are present. I can also confirm the 1 piastre of 1888, which I have in a horizontal pair imperforate vertically (all rows), used at Port Said. In view of this evidence supporting Zeheri I am inclined to accept the entire Zeheri listing rather than Gibbons or Scott. Can anyone confirm the other controversial examples?

The 1879 Issue, printed by Thomas De la Rue and Company, is listed by Scott and Zeheri with imperforate varieties for the original seven values. (Actually, the original six values, but the two colours mauve and lilac-rose of the 10 para are included). They are stated to be proofs by Zeheri and priced only as a set, but Scott gives them issued status as "a" numbers. Gibbons does not list them at all. These varieties do exist, and their origin is disclosed by the De la Rue records, which state that "an impression from each of the six printing plates" were sent to Egypt on January 2nd, 1879. It has elsewhere been stated that there were actually only thirty examples of the imperforates prepared. Perhaps this is so, but the fact that the printing plates were for 240 stamps (four panes of sixty) argues against it. In any event, these imperforates are extraordinarily scarce. I have not seen, or heard of, multiples, but the Byam collection contained a set with sheet margins. Since these stamps were perforated with a comb machine, the spacing between lines of perforations is exact and constant, and an imperforate single can be accepted with confidence if the margins are half the width between stamps.

Imperforates do not appear on the scene again until the 1914 Issue, all values of which are known imperforate on unwatermarked and on watermarked paper. The former are unquestionably proofs, and are so listed by Zeheri. The watermarked imperforates, which are considerably scarcer, are probably also proofs, but Zeheri lists them with the issued varieties. Scott and Gibbons merely note the

existence of the imperforates by means of a footnote.

The 1921-22 Harrison printings on multiple crescent and star paper are also known imperforate (2 milliemes green, 3 milliemes, 5 milliemes carmine, 10 milliemes blue, 15 milliemes (both), 20 and 50 milliemes), but they are far scarcer than the relatively common 1914 issue. Zeheri lists them with the ordinary stamps but, strangely, Gibbons and Scott do not even afford them a footnote. Gibbons, however, lists two values as "imperforate between (pair)" (2 milliemes green and 5 milliemes lake), although neither Scott nor Zeheri lists such varieties. Their existence would be surprising, in view of the fact that these issues were perforated on a comb machine. (But see note at end of this article, Editor). It would behove the Circle to inquire with Messrs. Gibbons about the origin of their listing. I have never heard of examples.

The 1923 King Fuad series carries on the discrepancies among the catalogues. Gibbons lists only the 5 millieme imperforate and prices it as a pair, notwithstanding the fact that this issue too was perforated on a comb machine, which should allow imperforate singles to be recognised with certainty. Scott lists four values (5, 15 and 200 milliemes and £E1). Zeheri lists the 3, 5 and 200 milliemes and £E1, but omits the 15 milliemes. What is the poor collector to think? I have actually seen all the above except the 3 milliemes but suspect that all of them are of proof status. Zeheri distinguishes between imperforate proofs of the 5 millieme having the watermark upright or inverted, and issued stamps having the watermark sideways (as have the perforated stamps), but I do not know the authority on which this distinction is made.

The 5 and 10 milliemes of the 1925 Geographical Congress set are listed in imperforate condition by Zeheri as issued stamps, but Gibbons and Scott ignore these varieties. They are quite likely of proof status. A similar situation exists with the 1926 Agricultural and Industrial Exhibition set, all values of which with the exception of the 10 milliemes are known imperforate.

(at this point it is proper to interject that I am concerned in this article with imperforate stamps on ordinary paper, and my remarks are not meant to apply to the "Royal" imperforate proofs on light card bearing the legend "cancelled". These, of course, exist for all issues from the aforementioned to the end of the Farouk regime, and are clearly proofs).

From 1925 on neither Gibbons nor Scott lists any imperforate varieties (barring the imperforate souvenir sheets), although such varieties exist. Zeheri lists a considerable number of the Farouk definitives in imperforate condition, on normal watermarked paper. They are by no means rare and turn up on the market regularly. They are presumably rejected by the general catalogues because of the

probability, if not the certainty, that they are proofs. However, the "brown centre" varieties of the 1929 Prince's Birthday set are also proofs, but Scott nevertheless lists them with the notation "Nos. 155a to 158a are trial color proofs"; and Gibbons lists them with the statement that they are from "special printings". It is not completely consistent, therefore, to omit imperforate stamps just because they are proofs, although there may be other justification.

Many of the commemorative stamps of the Farouk regime and on into the United Arab Republic period can be found imperforate; again only Zeheri lists them. Some of them may have originated from the Palace collection. I have been told that the more recent issues in imperforate condition are clandestine productions; it is perhaps significant that no prices are given in Zeheri for these later varieties. The watermarked paper for stamps is, of course, subject to strict accounting, but it is said that a small leeway is allowed because of small variations in the cut size of the sheets. When paper is supplied in large rolls it is, therefore, possible for a dishonest worker to accumulate slowly, a millimeter per printed sheet, enough leeway to allow an extra sheet or part sheet to be run off free of accounting. That this might be the case is, of course, speculative; but in any event these imperforates have been appearing on the market quietly and unannounced and there is no report that any of them was a true discovery in stocks available for sale over a Post Office counter. Some of the ordinary United Arab Republic issues also appear imperforate under the same conditions.

Finally, there are a few part-perforated modern issues. The large King Fuad Birthday stamp 50 piastres, and its subsequent issue with surcharge, is known imperforate at one marginal end. Most, if not all, of the examples are used. It should be noted that the unusual size of these stamps caused a special perforating problem, as shown by the varieties with two different gauges on the same side. These part-perforated varieties must surely be accepted as true errors, regularly issued.

Zeheri lists the 10 milliemes of 1953 as imperforate vertically, and the 1 and 2 milliemes of 1955 imperforate at right side only, while the 3 and 4 milliemes of 1958 are listed imperforate at left only. These varieties presumably come from the outer rows of sheets which had been placed incorrectly in the perforating machine, so that the final cut of the comb to produce the outermost line of perforations (and the cross rows in the sheet margin) did not take place. They are presumably quite proper varieties, rather than proofs, but I have not heard the story of their discovery. It would be most interesting to see the pair "imperforate between vertically" so as to know if all vertical rows of perforations are missing, or just the center one. Has anyone seen an example of this variety?

ADDENDUM:

At the 23rd January 1968 sale by Robson Lowe, London, lot 23 consisted of:
"1866, 2 piastre orange-yellow, imperforate vertically, fine, very slight trace of foxing.
With "BPA" Certificate 1956."

The vertical margins were ample and the maximum width appeared to be 21 mm. (measuring the photographic illustration in the catalogue). This stamp realised £14.10s. against an estimated £9.

These facts establish two important points. There is a strong market for part-perforated singles, and certificates can be obtained for them.

These points should be quite sufficient to warrant catalogue listing as singles.

(Peter A.S. Smith,
19 Feby. 1968).

EDITOR'S NOTE:

With reference to Peter Smith's suggestion (under the 1921-22 issues page 114) that it would be surprising to find the variety imperforate between pair in a sheet of stamps perforated on a comb machine, the following is relevant although not strictly "Egypt".

An "imperforate between" in the middle of a sheet of stamps, comb perforated, does exist; but I would suggest is probably a unique item. The 2d. dark brown QEII Great Britain is listed under "aa" (Gibbons) "imperf. between pair" on the strength of a quarter-sheet I showed to the catalogue Editor some years ago, before selling same to a British collector interested in such varieties.

This extraordinary (and one would have thought impossible) variety presumably occurred as a result of two faults:

- 1) Due apparently to a stoppage of machinery the perforator struck twice on three rows of stamps. (This is not too uncommon judging from the number of "double" and "misplaced" perfs. one sees.
- 2) Two of the stamps in the centre of the sheet became separated from the remainder (as a result of the "double" perforation) on three sides. These two stamps then together became folded backwards (or forwards?) in such a manner as to miss the next strike of the perforator (comb), between them and the row above. Result:

vertical pair imperforate between, in the middle of the sheet!

This particular item should be classified, in my opinion, as an "oddity" rather than a variety in the true philatelic sense. Nevertheless, of extreme interest, and especially in relation to Peter Smith's article.

(Editor: Feby. 1968).

-----oOo-----
---o---

MARKET NOTES

by P.E. Whetter (ESC No. 133).

It has been suggested that we should re-introduce the articles "Market Notes" that were a popular feature some years ago. We might be able to increase their usefulness by including particulars of forthcoming auctions of Egyptian material both in this country and abroad and also give a resumé of the ruling prices in the main international centres. If members will keep me advised of forthcoming sales, prices realised, etc., particulars will be given where appropriate in later articles.

The most important recent sale was Robson Lowe's Afro-Asian sale on the 23rd January 1968 in which 309 lots of Egypt fetched a total of £7251.15s.0d.. From such a wealth of material it is only possible to select a small fraction for special mention.

In the first issue a used strip of four of the 10 para realised £18.10s., and an unused copy perforated $12\frac{1}{2}$ x 15 - £35. A fine mint marginal block of four of the 1 piastre went for £40, and a mint pair imperforate between and at left fetched £30. A mint strip of three of the 2 piastres perforated $12\frac{1}{2}$ x 13 compound realised £44. A bisect of the 2 piastres on cover from Cairo £77.10s.-d.

Spirited bidding for a block of four of the 1867 5 para with the usual keyhole Suez/Cassa postmark rather surprisingly took the price up to £32 against a valuation of £8. A used copy of the 20 para with "cartwheel" flaw fetched £8, and the broken obelisk on the 1 piastre (mint) went for £15.

No less than £46 was paid for the 1874-75 1 piastre pair imperforate between (used), and £52 for a mint block of four of the $2\frac{1}{2}$ piastres value with one cliché inverted.

There was keen competition for the 1879 10 para on 2 piastres mint tête-bêche pair which finally found a home at £165.

Among the 1922 Crown overprint errors offered the 1 millieme inverted overprint in a mint block of four reached the modest figure of £22, a similar block of the 20 milliemes £26, and a single copy of the 50 milliemes £40. A used example of the 50 millieme error only gained £28.

The highlight of the 1923 issue was a complete mint sheet of the £E1 value which fetched £270. A fine mint marginal pair of the 200 milliemes imperforate fetched £65.

Three Port Fouad sets, with slight faults, fetched £75 mint (2 lots, same price) and £70 used. The 1929 Prince's Birthday set in "wrong" colours was sold for £26, and the same in mint marginal blocks £125.

Complete sheets of the 1932 surcharges went for £25 (50 milliemes) and £400 (100 milliemes). The 1934 U.P.U. set in mint control blocks of four secured the comparatively modest price of £135, and a control block of the £E1 Birthday stamp £44. The Scout Jamboree miniature sheets perforated and imperforate secured £57.10s. the pair.

Among the officials a mint copy of the 1922-23 5 milliemes with double overprint fetched £18, presumably a bargain as a similar copy offered a week later at Harmer's reached £28.

A recent letter from Peter Smith includes some comments on the prices realised in the above sale which are worthy of note. He wonders (as indeed did many of us who were at the sale) if the prices attained reflect a resurgence in market value of good Egypt, or whether it was the result of fortuitous competition between Italians. At any rate, he suggests, after that we should all consider increasing our insurance cover on our collections!

(Editor).

-----oOo-----
--o--

Back Numbers of "L.O.P.":

P.E. Whetter (ESC No.133).

I am anxious to obtain the following back numbers of "L'Orient Philatelique":-

1 to 24 inclusive, 29, 31, 32, 49 and 94.

I have duplicates of the following for disposal:-

27, 44, 46, 47, 51 to 56, 58 to 61, 76, 79, 81 to 93.

If any members have any other duplicates for disposal, or particular wants, and care to let me know (or the Secretary) I will try to put the 'buyers' and 'sellers' in touch with each other.

-----oOo-----