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1.—MR. MULLETT’S SECOND INNINGS

The Commonwealth Printing Works were organised by T. S. Harrison, who was trained at the establishment of Messrs. Waterloo, London. He was State Printer for seven years, but in 1925 he decided to retire, being, one supposes, unwilling to take over the responsibilities of the new printing works then preparing. This decision was the cause of considerable worry for the authorities. Australia had no long tradition of stamp printing, and had not yet been able to train up native born Australians for so responsible a post as that of State Printer. But there was in Melbourne a highly-skilled and experienced man, although he had also, unfortunately, just gone into well-earned retirement. This was Mr. A. J. Mullett, elderly but round and good-natured, who had recently been in charge of the State Printing Works of Victoria. He was approached and eventually consented to take charge, but only until a successor to Harrison could be obtained from the mother country. Thus it was that he commenced his second innings, and left his name on record for ever on the imprint blocks of Commonwealth stamps.

With regard to this 1½d. stamp, which was not, of course, the only one he printed, it has been customary to compare the printing unfavourably with that of John Ash who succeeded him. It is therefore only fair to say that every allowance must be made for the difficulties of changing from one building to another, the running-in of new machinery, and the disappearance (which has yet to be explained) of the 1½d. die, necessitating the engraving of a new die, and the preparing of plates in a hurry. At least, one supposes that there was a hurry, but it must be admitted that we could do with a little more information about what happened to the old 1½d. plates and die. Current explanations are far from satisfactory.

Mr. Mullett’s second innings commenced in October, 1926, and the new 1½d. stamps were put on sale on the 6th November, which was pretty slick work. Nor were his early prints really open to so much criticism. If one divides up a few hundreds of stamps according to the month of use, it will be found that the pale, woolly prints do not become frequent until about June, 1927, the month in which Mullett’s contract came to an end. John Ash had been State Printer for about nine months before his golden red shade became the rule at Post Offices. In other words, by no means all the “Mullett prints” were the work of Mullett, whose second innings was played through to the end in spite of many causes for discouragement.
2.—THE NEW DIES

For reasons which have yet to be explained Mullett had to make a new 1½d. die, and four new plates, for use with the yet untried multiple watermark paper. The die was cut locally and, although agreeably lighter in general appearance, and in most respects an amazingly accurate copy, it was defective in two particulars which make it easily identifiable. The numerals on the two sides were different in shape and, on the left particularly, were very much narrower than those of the old die. At the same time, the words “Three Half Pence” were very irregularly cut, the letters varying in thickness and form, but being usually smaller than those of the former die. The final E of PENCE is particularly ill drawn and it should be noted that its central bar often appears to be very short and even distorted on the prints. This is what is known as Die II, or Die IIIa. Its details are to be seen on any stamp from the four plates.

Die IIb seems to have arisen in the following fashion. The four plates having been made with a roller six impressions wide (see Section 3), there was no roller available for re-entering single impressions. This had therefore to be made by transfer from the original die. There was thus no new die, but a new transfer roller. As chance would have it the impression in relief on this roller differed somewhat from those obtained for the six-impression roller. It seems to have been the result of rather deeper and firmer pressure on the die, so that the relief was higher. One result of this was to produce in relief the whole of the middle bar of the last E of PENCE. When this new roller was used for the re-entries on plate four of its particular characters were at once apparent. Being applied to the plate with no more than normal pressure, it was yet able to sink further into it by virtue of its higher relief. THIS MEANT THAT THE UNCOLOURED BACKGROUND WAS INCREASED IN AREA AND THE PRINTING SURFACE DIMINISHED. It is from this fact that most of the differences between Die 2A and 2B upon which philatelists depend came into existence. Two of these differences are more reliable than others. The increased length of the middle bar of the E is at once apparent, and the white shading lines in front of the face, usually little more than fine threads, are enlarged until they may be as wide as the red shading lines which they separate. This particular form of the die is seen only in the three re-entries on Plate 4.

A third transfer roller—almost certainly a broad roller (see Section 8) was used for making the booklet plate. This gave impressions very similar to those of “Die 2B,” but the centre bar of the E is a little shorter and the general lightness somewhat less.

The conclusion is that Die 2 had only one form, but that it gave rise to three separate transfer rollers, varying according to the pressure employed in making them.
For those who are worried about the letter E and its varying middle bar, I attempt the following explanation. This letter was designed to print white, uncoloured, and therefore had to be cut into the steel of the original die. The die-cutter outlined the letter very nicely (he was a considerable artist, whoever he was), but he did not carry the middle bar quite deep enough—he sloped his burin (which I hope is the proper technical term) when finishing the centre bar. It follows that when this letter was transferred to the roller, it stood up with a badly sloping side. If this roller was lightly applied only a portion of the slope affected the plate, and the E appeared with a short middle bar (Die 2A), if it was applied with full force the E sunk into its full depth and the very widest part of its base took a part in the excavation (Die 2B). Anything in between the two produced the Booklet type, which might even be called Die 2C.

3.—THE GIANT ROLLER

There are many good things in philately. The joy of completion is not to be despised, a nicely centred £2 kangaroo looks well at the end of the set. The accumulation of cash value is pretty good, but the hunting down of elusive explanations, assisted by clues not easy to read, is better than either. A detective process of this sort has convinced me that this 1½d. value was printed from plates laid down with the assistance of a transfer roller of a quite exceptional character.

We know all about the 1d. plates of the same issue. They were made with the normal sort of roller, which laid down one impression at a time. This roller would be a disc of steel about one inch thick with the impression derived from the die on its rim. In the case of the 1½d. the roller seems to have been a cylindrical stick of steel about six inches long with six impressions side by side along its length. All six could thus be pressed into the plate at one operation and this would probably save time and trouble. This is the deduction one draws from the clues, but there may be considerable differences of opinion about it, and therefore the clues must be set out.

They are to be found in any printed sheet of this issue or, better still, in a complete set of four such sheets, one for each plate. They have in fact been verified for all plates.

There are, on the four plates, no less than eighty rows of six stamps, and the main clue is that every row is exactly like every other row in certain important respects, namely—

(1) The first and second stamps are placed appreciably lower than the others, and
(2) The third stamp is visibly higher than the second.
(3) The sixth stamp is higher than the fifth, in every row, but here the difference is not very marked.
(4) The first stamp in each row, and no other, sometimes shows
the recurrent wattle flaw which is described in section 29. This
has been checked on all sheets.

(5) The first and second rows show the variety in which the
A of HALF has lost its centre bar and looks like an inverted V. This
is shown in the illustration on Front Cover.

These constant differences could hardly have occurred if each
impression had been laid down separately and they seem to be
evidence of the use of a roller six impressions wide or, possibly, of
a mere block of steel six impressions wide, if it is conceivable that
one could make the necessary impressions without the use of an
actual roller, in fact, in the way in which a coin is struck by the
pressure of flat dies. If we now consider that the case is proved
up to this point we may ask ourselves what else we could look for
which might be evidence of a six-wide roller. It is clear that there
might be other flaws affecting perhaps only one plate and caused
by the temporary adherence to this long roller of some speck of
metal or perhaps to some defect developing in the roller itself.
Such flaws are to be found upon Plate IV and perhaps upon other
Plates. There is room here for careful investigation of whatever
material collectors may have available. The flaws on Plate IV are
illustrated and described in section 20.

This then is the case for the existence of a giant roller so far
as the writer has taken it. It will be found to be of considerable
importance when we consider various other problems which arise
in this issue.

4.—COMPARTMENT LINES

It will be remembered that the steel plate was prepared by
means of a transfer roller which stamped out the background, leav-
ing the design standing up at the level of the plate. It also left
standing up a considerable part of the gutters between the stamps.
These had therefore to be removed by gouging away before the
plate could be ready for printing from. It was not the whole of the
gutter area which remained for the strip of metal from which the
frame of the stamp was printed could only be defined by a recess on
each side of it and this outer recess naturally fell in the
gutter area. There remained therefore a well defined strip of sur-
face between the impressions and this had to be gouged away. In
the process of removal various things could and did happen, such as
accidental cutting of the frames. With these we are not concerned
at the moment, but only with the results which followed when this
gutter area was not properly cleaned. Small pieces, strips or points
of metal were often left when they should have been removed. These
did not, as a rule, come right up to the level of the plate, but any
extra pressure of the inking roller could easily leave ink upon them
and this very often printed off on the paper. The resulting printed
marks are called Compartment Lines in the excellent book on the
1d. value by the late D. M. Neil and, although the name is not
particularly descriptive, it can serve no purpose to change it now. These lines are constant in shape and position in relation to the margin of each stamp, although it is by no means always that the whole pattern of the line appears in any one printing. In most cases nothing is to be seen except perhaps a dot at one or two of the corners of the stamp. Occasionally quite long lines appear at the sides of the stamp, round the crown, etc. If every possible Compartment Line always printed, it would be easy to plate every one of the stamps of this issue. As it is, these lines are exceedingly useful in separating varieties which are otherwise much alike. There is room for enquiry as to how far these lines are disturbed by the process of re-entering impressions. In fact, it will be a very long time before the philatelic possibilities of this issue are exhausted.

It should perhaps be pointed out that similar Compartment Lines occur on the other values of this issue, but they vary certain particulars according to the precise technique of removal which the workmen brought to bear upon the metal in the gutters. Here again there is plenty of room for research.

5.—JUBILEE LINES

These are seen as continuous lines of colour, or broken lines, surrounding the whole sheet. On the plate itself they are represented by printing surfaces standing up above the general level. They are called Jubilee Lines because they were first observed on the issue of stamps of Great Britain which commemorated the Jubilee of Queen Victoria in 1887. This is quite a long time ago, but no one since then has devised any alternative name, nor is one particularly needed. When the lines are broken up they are called "Co-extensive" which the dictionary defines as meaning "Extending over the same space, or time."

These lines are not just matters of ornament. They serve a definite purpose, and this is to prevent the stamp impressions themselves being first to take the impact of the inking roller and of the paper. The inking roller might possibly wear their edges and the paper give a clearer print if it is quite level where it touches the plate and is not bent over the lower impressions as it might be if there were no Jubilee Lines. It must be admitted that these reasons appear somewhat theoretical, but they are accepted by printers in many countries and they should know their business better than collectors.

The disposition of Jubilee Lines on the four plates of the 1d. value are shown on the next page. It will be noted that some of the lines are broken into short lengths. There is a reason for this. If there were a solid Jubilee Line all round the plates, without any break in it whatever, a cushion of air would be held between the paper and the plate in the printing, and this would lead to faulty impressions. This mistake was actually made in some of the early stamps of Egypt and had to be corrected.
These Jubilee Lines have their uses for the collector. In the case of this 1½d. value the plates are actually numbered by making small holes in the Jubilee Lines on the plates. These print as white dots, from one to four in number. There are also less obvious varieties which are very useful for plating purposes, e.g., there is a scratch on the line beneath 2.R.55 which makes it possible to recognise imprint blocks from plate II without any trouble at all. Neither in detail nor in position do these Jubilee Lines vary with the imprint, or printer, and they must therefore be actual parts of the plate and not lengths of what is known as printer’s rule.

There is one curious point about the Jubilee Lines as seen in the later issues printed in brown. Here the Jubilee Lines, the same old lines as before, are seen to be very much thinner than normal and, upon close inspection, its is seen that a thin strip has been taken off the continuous lines at the top and bottom of the four plates, but not from any other lines. This strip was removed from the side of the line nearest to the stamps, as may be discovered by noticing how much of the various constant flaws has been removed. It is not known why this was done, but it would certainly save a small amount of ink even if it served no better purpose. Corner blocks showing these thin lines are not uncommon, but appear to be confined to the later stages of the issues with C of A watermark.

6.—A PUZZLE

Nothing is more obvious and certain about this issue than the fact that the “Jubilee” lines are quite constant in their position and in all their little peculiarities. By means of them we are always able to ascribe to its proper place any corner block. At least, that is what I always thought until I came across a corner block which is now in my collection. This consists of four stamps and a wide margin. There is a continuous Jubilee line below and a broken one on the left-hand side. The block should, therefore, belong to Plate 1, but when one compares it with other blocks from this plate it is at once seen that the Jubilee lines are entirely different. Whereas the two broken lines on the left are cut askew in the normal plate they are cut level on this, and all the little irregularities which are quite constant on my other blocks are just as certainly absent on this special block of four. There is nothing more to be said about it except that it is a printing before the golden red stage, and that none of the individual stamps show any variation which looks as if it might be constant. I should be very glad to hear from anyone who has a similar block or can throw any light upon the matter.
7.—IMPRINTS

The imprint consists of the name of the printer and, below it, the words "Australian Note and Stamp Printer." It is to be found at the bottom of each sheet covering the space between the two panes and stretching far enough each way to come well below the corner stamp of each pane. There are certain variations in the wording and position of these imprints which are of interest to collectors and important from the point of view of research. For this reason it is necessary to have some scheme for describing the different forms of imprint, but first of all one needs a way of sorting out into groups the imprints from each of the four plates affected.

Some while ago a dealer sent me a lot of material which included perhaps thirty or forty of these imprints. It became essential to sort them into groups and I set out below the points which were found to be reliable for each plate—

(a) Plate I.—The corner stamp of the left-hand pane has a very distinct thickening of the shading lines over the right wattle. The section of Jubilee Lines below it is cut off diagonally and the top end of this cut is slightly to the left of the vertical level of the right frame of the stamp. All imprints from Plate I show these characteristics.

(b) Plate II.—The Jubilee Line beneath the corner stamp of the right-hand pane has an obvious, almost horizontal, scratch beneath the right-hand corner of the stamp.

(c) Plate III.—There is usually some deformity of the northeast corner of the last stamp of the left-hand pane. All my examples show this. It is due to a Compartment Line just above this corner. Traces of Compartment Lines are nearly always to be found down the right-hand side of the same stamp.

(d) Plate IV.—This is rather like Plate I, but the crown of the left-hand stamp is always deformed, usually sloping irregularly downwards to the left. The end of the Jubilee Line is cut off square and projects beyond the vertical level of the stamp.

We can now consider the various imprints from the different plates. It is proposed to describe these so that they can be distinguished from each other, but not, at this point, to say anything about their significance with regards to repairs, mutilation of plates, etc. The imprints are described in their order of appearance and include all those known to the writer, but there may well be others yet to be discovered. A difference between these imprints is quickly appreciated by noting the position of the letter "N" in John Ash, with reference to the letters beneath it. It may be directly over the "A" in AND, or even the "N" in AND, or mostly over the space between the two words NOTE AND. These are described respec-
tively as N/A, N/N and N/EA. It is now possible to describe the imprints quite shortly—

Plate I.
(1) Mullett imprint.
(2) Ash. N/A.

Plate II.
(1) Mullett.
(2) Ash. N/N.
(4) Ash. N/A. The letter J in John is entirely below the Jubilee Line.

Plate III.
(1) Mullett.
(2) Ash. N/N. John clear of Jubilee Line.
(3) Ash. N/A.
(4) N/N, but J is under Jubilee Line. Brown issues.

Plate IV.
(1) Mullett.
(2) Ash. N/N.

8.—THE BOOKLET

At first sight stamps from the booklet plates seem to be very similar in general appearance to those three re-entries on Plate IV which are usually said to exemplify Die IIb, i.e., the last E of PENCE has its three bars nearly equal and the shading lines in front of the face appear to be much wider and whiter than in the ordinary die. On closer examination of booklet sheets it appears that these characteristics are nowhere near so constant as one could desire. In very few cases are the white lines in front of the face wider than the red ones and the middle bar of the last E of THREE PENCE is quite often almost or quite as short as it is in the ordinary die. There can be little doubt that we are not actually dealing with a new die at all, but only with a slightly heavier application of the transfer roller than had previously been the case.

Since a roller was used which carried six impressions side by side, and each impression may have been taken from the old die by pressing more or less deeply than usual it is possible that there are minute differences sufficiently to identify the precise vertical row from which any stamp comes. I have made no attempt to do this, but it may be that someone whose time is less fully occupied would care to take a hand.
9.—THE BOOKLET PLATE

The material upon which the Booklet Plate may be studied is very much less than that available for the issues in sheet form since booklets were only issued in blocks of six and no complete sheet is likely to become available. We are told that the booklets were issued, or the plate prepared, in October, 1928, and that a sheet consisted of sixty impressions, having the three vertical columns on the right-hand side tete-beche in respect to the others. Also that on the issued stamps inverted watermarks naturally appeared over one half of the sheet. This is meagre fare for the philatelist, nor is it altogether borne out by a study of booklet sheets. It will be better to start de novo.

It will be found that many Booklet Sheets have distinguishing characteristics. In the first place they fall into two very distinct groups. In one of these the two stamps on the right-hand side of the little sheet of six impressions are placed on a distinctly higher level than the others. In the second group these two stamps are on a lower level than the others. From this it may be deduced that the plate makers used the same sort of roller that they had employed before, namely, one which had six impressions side by side. In this case three of them were inverted with regard to the others.

We can now go further and consider the size of the plate. Published information suggests that it consisted of only one pane of sixty stamps, in the usual ten rows of six stamps. If this had been the case we should find only six different miniature sheets with the right-hand pair of stamps higher than the others, and six other miniature sheets with the right-hand pair lower than the others. It is difficult to obtain all the different varieties of booklet sheets, but I have in my collection at least seven different sheets or parts of sheets in which the right-hand stamp is higher than the others. Since a single printing plate of only sixty impressions could provide only six different sheets of this sort one is forced to the conclusion that the printing plate was in fact one of the usual sort, that is, of the usual type having two panes of sixty each. In this case it ought to be possible to find twenty different booklet sheets, each identifiable by some small flaw on one or other of the six stamps. These flaws undoubtedly exist in large numbers and there is no reason to suppose that there would be any great difficulty in identifying them.
10.—THE ISSUES

The main divisions of this issue are those of the simplest catalogue (1) Small Multiple wmk. Red. Perf. 14 (2) The same, but perf. 13½ by 12½. (3) As the last but brown. (4) As the last but wmk. C of A.

This is the basis of all classifications, but the specialist will probably need something more elaborate, such as that on the next page. It will be noted that the question of shades is dealt with rather summarily. The truth is that colour, like beauty, exists in the eyes of the beholder. Most of us, but not all, can tell a red from a green. After that all is confusion because the human eye is so made that it varies in its sensitiveness to colour. An eye which is sensitive to purple will find little difficulty in picking out the famous rosine shade of the 1d. value. An eye to which most purples and violets are very much the same, and not particularly noticeable at that, will produce as rosine a great variety of reds and roses. The only solution is to keep at some suitable headquarters a range of named shades which can be regarded as standards. In the meantime the collector must please himself, or purchase from some dealer a series of the different shades he lists.

It will be noted that Ash is credited with “Rose (various)” shades, whereas it is easy to assume that his characteristic golden-red was the only ink. As a matter of fact most of the Mullett shades may be found in the Ash period, although it is usually necessary to have the imprint to prove the point. Ash imprints in Mullett shades are not very uncommon.

That booklets and coils are deserving of definition as individual issues is a point upon which individuals may well differ, but, in this particular case, the booklet stamps have so different an appearance to others, and so many inverted watermarks, that they would in any case have needed separate mention. About the coils it is not so easy to make a good case, since so little is recorded about them.

The issue with the TWO PENCE overprint does not differ, except in that overprint, and in its historical significance, from any other issue of the same sheet, but it cannot very well be dismissed without any notice at all.

The inclusion of the thin Jubilee Line emission as a separate issue will be properly condemned by respectable collectors. Nevertheless, it is worth looking for the two imprint or plate number blocks required, but it will not be very easy to find them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date of Issue</th>
<th>Watermark</th>
<th>Shade</th>
<th>Perf.</th>
<th>Printer</th>
<th>Plates used</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.12.26</td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Deep rose Pale rose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mullett</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.1.27</td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Deep rose Pale rose</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Mullett</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7.27</td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Rose (various) Golden-red</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Rose (various) Golden-red</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oct. 28</td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Golden-red</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Booklets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Golden-red</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8.30</td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Golden-red</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>Sheets overprinted—TWO PENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.9.30</td>
<td>S.M.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Oct. 36</td>
<td>C of A</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>C of A</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>$13\frac{1}{2}$ by $12\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Thin Jubilee Lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.—THE THREE SHADES

It cannot be too often emphasised that shades, like beauty, are in the mind of the beholder and what is carmine—rose-pink to one collector will seem to be orange-red to another, will turn into yet a different shade beneath electric light and will suffer still another change under neon illumination. This does not mean that no one is able to distinguish shades. We can all do it, but we all differ in the names we use. The only solution to this is a standard collection of named shades. This can be obtained from a dealer, or can be made up for oneself. Since no two persons will readily agree about any but the simplest shades this making of a sort of reference collection is not for all of us and the writer, not being blessed with any great power of discrimination where colours are concerned, contents himself with three main shades of this issue and is content to leave the further elucidation of the subject to keener vision.

These three shades are deep-rose, light-rose and golden red. Deep-rose is the first to be met with, in the early Mullett prints, and is the same colour that one may encounter in the previous issue of the first die of this value. It is a pleasant colour although often somewhat spoilt by a tendency to dry-inking. The light rose-red comes a little later and here dry-inking is so constant a feature that it is quite difficult to obtain a series of good examples of this shade. Although it begins in the Mullett period, this shade, and to a less
extent, the deep rose may be found in the Ash printings also. The third shade, the golden red, is a remarkable product of the Ash period and begins to appear early in 1928, although a few copies may be found before this. As this is six months after the end of the Mullett contract it is evident how many of the rose shades must have been printed by Ash before he completed his invention or discovery of the golden-red. The latter is not easy to describe, but is fortunately very well known. It has a golden sheen when held up to the light which is quite characteristic and all the booklet sheets and, so far as I know, all overprinted sheets are in this shade.

12.—THE PAPER

The paper is a good white wove product, varying hardly at all in shade, but sometimes a little yellowish. On looking at the back of a stamp with fairly thick paper one may observe a diagonal diamond pattern of small dots covering the whole service of the paper. This is very usual in papers of this class and has no particular significance. Very often one meets with copies in which the grain of the paper seems to be horizontal instead of diagonal. A study of the multiple small crown paper on all issues might make it possible to prove that this variant occurred only at some particular period. Occasionally the colour of the stamp appears on the back to a slight degree, but this is unusual and there is no true aniline variety.

If a number of stamps be placed face downwards on some black surface they can easily be divided into three groups. In the first group are those in which the watermark is only just apparent and these would ordinarily be called thick paper varieties. In the last group are those in which the watermark is extremely obvious and so thin that the colour of the stamp makes it appear reddish. This is the thin paper variety. Some of this group, if placed on a black surface with their faces upwards, look so dirty and discoloured (from the black paper showing through) that their appearance is striking enough for collecting as a distinct variety. Between these two groups is an intermediate stage in which the watermark is plainly perceptible.

Rosenblum says that Wiggins Teape supplied the first paper and that this was a white wove of even texture, but that after March, 1928, the printers used paper from a new contractor. It may be that this latter paper was that of Wiggins Teape, and the former supplied by the "new contractor" who is not named.

13.—WATERMARK

The watermark is the well known small multiple type and is not liable to show any interesting varieties. It covers the whole paper and there are no margins with lines or crosses as in other issues. In fact, the inverted watermark is the only variety to look for. This is moderately common on the ordinary sheets, but is best
collected with a piece of selvedge attached so that it can be mounted on black paper, when the inverted watermark should be fairly obvious from the front. I have two blocks and a single in this condition. They are all from Plate III, all perforated 14, and all in pre-golden-red shade. The varying thicknesses of paper suggests that they do not come from the same sheet and they were certainly acquired from widely different sources. No doubt these facts are of high significance, but I am not quite sure what that significance may be.

The booklet stamps show as many copies with as without inverted watermark. This is natural enough since half these stamps were printed up-side-down. One cannot obtain much selvedge from booklet sheets, but there is enough to show the variety by mounting on black paper.

14.—PERFORATION

In the early years of this issue a machine was in use which perforated 14 all round. The perforations are sometimes rather rough, but are in the main well cut. The curious point about them is that they do not fit the stamp. There is always a surplus band of paper at the upper or lower end, or divided between the two. It is perhaps rather hard to blame this on the perforator as the fault really lies with the plate which left too wide an interval between the stamps. Later on a second machine was introduced (in December, 1926, Rosenblauem says) and this perforates $13\frac{1}{2} \times 12\frac{1}{2}$. The two machines were used side by side until February, 1928, the perf. 14 machine was discarded. Copies perforated $13\frac{1}{2} \times 12\frac{1}{2}$ may be met with after the middle of January, 1927. There are few major perforation varieties, but in this type of machine, perforating one row at a time, there is always a chance that a row may be missed and, if this happens to be the top or bottom row, the fact that perforations are missing may escape the checker. Such varieties are recorded. Double perfs may also occur and various irregular perfs. due to the crumpling or bending over of the paper. The sheet was fed into the machine either top or bottom first indifferently.

Major perforation varieties are rare, but, to make up for this, there is at least one common minor variety. This is the loss of a single pin, the pin next to the back of the “comy” between the fifth and sixth rows. If the machine is fed in bottom end first this error will occur at the bottom of the stamp and between the first and second vertical rows on the sheet. It is thus of some value for plating purposes, but, even for its own sake, the specialist may well care to secure some mint blocks from each position.

One frequently encounters stamps which are perforated with the letters O.S. or with the same letters with N.S.W. beneath them. These are official stamps, but were often on sale to the public and those perforated O.S. by itself are quite common. I know of no variety to this except a large block in my collection which has a doubly perforated O.S. through the selvedge of the lower margin. Many other varieties should be possible, but I have not encountered them, nor sought to. The N.S.W. stamps are, of course, for use in New South Wales, but the various types of these perforations cannot properly be discussed in terms of a single issue. Some firms used to perforate their initials through the stamps, and these are further mentioned on page 34.
15.—OFFICIAL STAMPS

Many stamps of this issue were perforated with the initials O.S. or O.S./N.S.W. and these seem to have been available to civilians as well as to Government offices. They may be found on Mullett as well as on Ash printings and are only too frequently encountered. Such peculiarities or varieties as there may be are being fully investigated elsewhere and no details about them would be in place in this essay.

16.—BOOKLETS

The Booklets as issued were rather flimsy affairs with a thin paper cover, three small sheets each of six stamps, and a very poor quality interleafing to prevent them sticking together. They were presumably prepared under the supervision of John Ash, but there is little information available. Much postal information is to be found on the front and back of each cover, as well as telephone charges, etc. On the front cover the price is stated as 2/3 for eighteen 1½d. stamps, so that no profit was made for putting them out in this particular format.

17.—THE "TWO PENCE" OVERPRINT

In July or August, 1930, following a change in the postal rates, there was a much increased demand for twopenny stamps while the use of penny halfpenny stamps was diminished. It was therefore decided to overprint the penny halfpenny red stamps with the words "TWO PENCE" in a rather shiny black ink. For this purpose sheets from all four plates were used, and there is nothing new to talk about except the overprint, and that really does not belong in any essay on the penny halfpenny value. It is sometimes said that a few sheets printed by Mullett were found to be in stock and were thus overprinted, but I do not know of any definite evidence to this effect.
18.—COILS

The writer cannot find any mention of the fact that this stamp was issued in the form of coils, but he has two stamps joined together, as they might be expected to be if coils had been made in the original way by sticking the top of one sheet to the bottom of another. This pair was sold to him as evidence of the use of coils and there seemed no particular reason to doubt it, except perhaps for the fact that the stamps themselves appear to be from different printings. Both are perforated by the second machine, i.e., 13½ x 12½. The writer has no other knowledge of coils than this and would be glad to have definite information.

19.—ABOUT VARIETIES

This is, I hope, a suitable place to mention the use of such formulae as "3L.52." to identify a particular stamp. It is well known that in most or all of the Georgian surface printed issues there were four plates, each having two panes. If one names varieties according to the pane upon which they occur it is sometimes difficult (at least, to me) to remember which plate is in question. The alternative formula set out above is the shortest and most concise which has turned up. It names first of all the plate, then the pane, left or right, and finally the stamp. And now to other matters.

The slipshod, and sometimes deliberately dishonest, habit of calling every sort of variety a "re-touch" or even a "re-entry" has unhappily infected some philatelic writers as well as the baser sort of dealer. The habit is not confined to the English-speaking peoples, but is rife in Western Europe and may easily spread to the Pacific, from its eastern border. Now, the writer is not proposing to reform the world, but feels it desirable to say that when he uses the word "re-entry" herein, he really means that one impression has been erased and another substituted. Again, the word "re-touch" is, as far as possible to the infirmities of human nature, used only when the plate has been touched by an engraving tool after it had been finished and with the deliberate intention of effecting some alteration or repair. The long series of repairs to plates under the Ash regime involved more than retouching, for many white areas,
evidently caused by holes in the plate, were eliminated where re-touching could only have made them wider or deeper. They are, therefore, described hereafter as “repairs” and how exactly such excellent results were obtained the writer does not pretend to know. In some cases frame varieties are referred to particular positions, shown by charts on pages 22 and 53.

Nearly all the varieties described are uncoloured flaws and it has not been thought necessary to mention this over and over again. Even in some of the figures it has been necessary to represent white varieties by black lines (the writer being disinclined to do all the tracing necessary to reproduce their true appearance. For this he apologises, somewhat, but has no doubt that the reader will appreciate their intention without difficulty.)

Few varieties are as constant as one would like. Many are only present in one state of the plate; others are easily obscured by inking. The technicians employed by John Ash were extraordinarily clever in correcting errors, but they did not correct every error on each stamp at the same time; and, of course, they could not prevent fresh scratches and broken shading lines appearing. It follows that there is an enormous field for investigation as to the exact order in which the varieties on such stamps as 2.L.54, 59 and 60 actually appeared. The One Penny value is well enough as a subject for study, and its devotees may properly boast of the curious behaviour of its Die 2, and of the substituted cliches, but the four plates of the 1½d., Die 2, are in no way at all inferior in the scope and interest which they offer.

The subject of white re-entries (as I call them for convenience) is one of considerable perplexity. We are all so accustomed to consider that re-entry marks are necessarily those coloured markings which one finds when the line engraved process has been used that the idea of an uncoloured re-entry comes as something of a shock. Nevertheless these white re-entries exist, and are the only re-entries (by which I mean the only varieties deserving the name of re-entry) which occur on this issue. The recessed areas of the original die naturally appear in relief on the transfer roller. With this they are transferred to the printing plate, on which again these recessed areas correspond to the uncoloured background of the stamp as printed. If now an impression is erased, but not quite completely erased, the only traces which can remain are the deepest parts of the recessed areas, and these are never touched by the ink in the process of surface printing and can therefore only become apparent on the printed sheet if they are the cause of a colourless area where there should be colour. It must be admitted that the picture of these re-entries as we actually see them is frequently blurred and unsatisfactory, but the characters to be expected of a re-entry on this issue are nevertheless quite clear.
20.—PLATE FLAWS

It is natural enough that the operation of the roller should produce a certain number of flaws which occur more than once on the plate, and these have already been mentioned briefly. It is now time to describe them in a little more detail. On Plate 2 the left hand vertical column of stamps is apt to have a very thin left hand margin, while the right hand vertical column has what is sometimes called a “re-cut corner.” These two flaws seem to be due to the same operation of the roller, which must have pressed a little too deeply on the left and not deeply enough on the right. The effect of this would be that the left hand margin would have the background deeply recessed and the printing surface narrowed. The outer frames would, therefore, appear narrow, as in fact they do. On the other side of the pane one would naturally expect the opposite effect. Here the recessing would be too weak and the printing surfaces correspondingly broad, with the natural result that the corner would print very darkly and perhaps without the proper spacing between shading lines. This also is seen to happen. It has further to be noted that this type of error was not necessarily confined to the outer vertical rows. When the pressure of the roller was sufficiently exaggerated a second row might also show thin frames or thick corners, and these will be found to occur. It seems quite likely that Plate 2 was one of the first to be laid down, and Plate 4 the next, for both of these show signs of defective technique which seems to have been overcome when the other two plates were prepared.

On Plate 4 there were flaws of another kind (see below). On several stamps in the third vertical row of both panes there is a very slight break in the outer side of the second shading line above the back of the emu. This is such a flaw as might occur if a small piece of metal or grit adhered for a while to the roller. I have not sufficient material to be quite sure upon how many stamps it appears. In the fourth vertical row from the left a similar flaw sometimes occurs on this plate, but the break is in the next highest
shading line. The fact that these flaws occur on both panes suggests that the roller was moved from side to side, from one pane to another, and not straight up or down a single pane until that was finished, and then on to the next. The same lesson is taught by the small flaw, an upward projection from the right side of the white line outlining the left value tablet, which is shown on page 49. This flaw occurs on 1.L.14, and also on 1.R.14, and it is hardly possible that it should have this distribution unless the roller had been moved from one pane to another.

21.—SPLIT FRAMES

There are two sorts of abnormality which are found only on this 1½d. value and are absent on the 1d. value, for which the plates were prepared and printed from in much the same way, nor are they seen on any other values. The first of these is best called the Split Frame, for this is exactly what it appears to be. There are some thirty or forty examples of this divided between the four plates, and Plate 2 seems to have most them, although there are several whose position has yet to be identified. They appear as thin white cracks along the length of the frame line. Sometimes the crack opens out and leaves one of the internal projections of the frame separated from the rest by quite a wide area. The side frames are not often affected, and the top frame to the right of the crown has more splits than any other part.

The question naturally arises of how these splits, peculiar to this value, are caused. The fact that they can exist at all is perhaps due to something in the texture of the steel plate, the only plate in this series which was, so far as we know, made by A. J. Mullett. He was an elderly gentleman who had already retired and was with difficulty persuaded to assume the position of Commonwealth Printer for a short period until a younger printer could be obtained from the Mother Country. It is just possible that he was not equal to the supervision which the task of making this plate required. Although the presence of Split Frames may have been determined by some fault in the steel plate, their position suggests that they were actually caused by the pressure of the roller. The fact that so many are along the top border of the stamp may perhaps mean that the impressions were rolled in from this end, or perhaps from the other end. I do not know which of the two to select as most likely, but we may perhaps find in the position of these splits that the impressions were at least not rocked in from side to side.

Occasionally one meets with partly split frames due to slips of the tool in gouging out the gutters. These are usually much sharper in outline than true splits and they are not parallel with the line of the frame.

For the purpose of describing these splits, and for all other purposes of reference, it is desirable to have the stamp design divided up into numbered areas. The writer uses the plan shown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Split Breaks Frame</th>
<th>Slopes</th>
<th>Position in Frame</th>
<th>TABLE FOR IDENTIFYING SPLIT FRAME VARIETIES</th>
<th>IDENTIFYING MARKS</th>
<th>Stamp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Thinner and lower than No. 1</td>
<td>Cut in upper R. frame</td>
<td>2.R.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Splits all along top frame</td>
<td>2.R.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>NC of PENCE often joined</td>
<td>2.R.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To L. &amp; R.</td>
<td>Up to R.</td>
<td>Extreme tip of frame cut off</td>
<td>2.R.8</td>
<td>4.L.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To L. &amp; R.</td>
<td>Down to R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.E. corner cut off</td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To L. &amp; R.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>Splits all along top frame, = No. 4</td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>Split in Position 5 also</td>
<td>2.R.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thin frame to left of crown</td>
<td>4.R.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Splits all along top frame, = No. 4</td>
<td>4.R.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Break under L of HALF in first state</td>
<td>2.L.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.L.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.L.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To L. &amp; R.</td>
<td>Down to R.</td>
<td>Extreme tip only is cut off</td>
<td>2.R.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>Up to R.</td>
<td></td>
<td>As next but crown level</td>
<td>2.L.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>As last but crown slopes down to R.</td>
<td>3.L.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Usually a line outside N.W. corner in L. margin</td>
<td>2.L.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.L.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Splits all along top frame, = No. 4</td>
<td>2.R.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mark in margin at N.E. corner</td>
<td>1.R.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Split also in Position 2, = No. 14</td>
<td>2.R.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mark in margin at top left side</td>
<td>2.L.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Splits also in position 10</td>
<td>3.L.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.R.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Curved</td>
<td>Cut in bottom R. frame</td>
<td>1.L.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Curved</td>
<td>Splits also in positions 5 and 10, = No. 28</td>
<td>2.R.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Often a mark at N.E. corner</td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Deformed last E in PENCE</td>
<td>3.L.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.L.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Really a cut frame and not a split</td>
<td>3.R.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Angular</td>
<td>Splits also in positions 5 and 10, = No. 28</td>
<td>2.R.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>To left</td>
<td>Cut frame lines over emu's tail</td>
<td>4.L.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>To L. &amp; R.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Often fails to reach border of frame</td>
<td>2.L.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Dot before THREE</td>
<td>4.R.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.R.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>To L. &amp; R.</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Very wide. Bend in frame under PE of PENCE</td>
<td>1.L.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>To L.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.L.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>To R.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Cut in top frame near N.E. corner</td>
<td>3.R.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Above &amp; below</td>
<td>To right</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.R.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Above</td>
<td>To left</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.L.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
below. It has the advantage that one can easily remember the different areas each of which is an individual and distinct part of the design. The alternative is to divide the area by a regular grid. If this is done it is quite hard to remember how much of each distinct feature comes within a particular square of the grid. The writer tried this plan, but had to give it up in favour of that below.
22.—CUT FRAMES

These varieties are caused by part of the frame lines of stamps being cut away by the chisel, whose proper business was the gouging away of the surface plate in the gutter lines. If the chisel did not go far enough it was apt to leave some upstanding metal which could give rise to a compartment line. If it went too far the chisel removed a sliver from the frame. These cut frames are usually found on the side frames and for this there is a good reason. The vertical gutter spaces run uninterrupted from top to bottom of the plate. The chisel tapper would naturally be tempted by this fact and would now and again seek to cut out one long strip instead of doing the job stamp by stamp. Then Nemesis awaited him. One extra tap and the chisel slipped to one side and began to cut out a section of the frame. It was usually checked before much damage had been done and the sliver ended in a sudden cut outwards across the line of the frame. This is usually a clean cut, but on 1.L.35 there is a minute projection of metal pushed in front of the chisel as it was directed away from the frame again.

These frame cuts are usually clean and obvious, being fairly deep, but in some cases it is hard to say whether there has been a cut or not. Plate 2 has often a thin frame on the left and this may look very much as if a long cut had been made.

The horizontal gutters are interrupted by the cross on the crown projecting from each stamp. For this reason the chiseller worked more carefully and there are few cuts in the top or bottom frames. There are, on the other hand, very many odd compartment lines and a certain number of accidental deformities of the crown. These affect the cross on top of it and references to the crown should be understood accordingly.

The major crown injuries are seen on 4.L.53 and 3.R.30, in both of which the right side of the cross is cut away. These are further mentioned in section 25 and it may suffice here to say that both were corrected. There is another stamp—too common to be other than from Plates 1 or 3—which has a less complete loss of the crown. It is apparently not an early stage of the cut on 3.R.30. On 3.L.30, there is a fine cut across the cross, the upper part appearing as a solid bar (page 23). This may be well due to a slip of the chisel. In 1.R.1 the cross is almost entirely missing and there is what is possibly a cut in the upper frame to the left of the crown (page 23). This was repaired later (page 23).

A third common result of the chisel unskilfully used is the cutting off of a corner of the design, and there are two other varieties which deserve mention here. The first is on 3.R.54 which shows a clean cut in the middle of the right frame, and this is nearly four millimetres long.

It is cut along the surface of the frame and does not involve its sides.
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Finally, there are those very strange frame splits which appear on 3.R.52, 2.L.52, and 3.R.43 (page 44). In these cases the upper part of the right frame is split like a log of wood, split down for quite a way. Is this a frame split due to the pressure of the roller, or is it the work of the chisel? On the whole, I do not doubt that it belongs in the first class, but it had to be mentioned here, There is apparently only one cut frame that failed, i.e., in which the sliver was not cut right out, but left as a sharp spicule projecting alongside the right frame. This is on 2.R.43 and is mentioned on page 42.

In the lists of varieties these frame cuts are described by the distance of the end or deepest part of the cut from the corner nearest its start. The direction of the chisel slip can therefore be deduced at once from the knowledge that it started from the top or bottom corner—and this helps quick indentification.

23.—SCRATCHES

There are many stamps in this issue which show flaws consisting of thin white lines of varying length. A number of these are illustrated. It is usual to describe some of them as "hair lines" and this is often an apt enough description from the objective point of view, but it is a description which has more than one philatelic meaning. Some hair lines are due to a hair or piece of thread on the paper and these are inconstant and of no great importance, others (although not in the case of this issue) are lines drawn on the plate to guide the placing of impressions, and better described as guide lines. So far as I know most of those here dealt with are due to actual damage to the plate by a scratch, but it is possible that some of them may be cracks and some may even be due to faulty impressions. A friend of mine has made some experiments to show the effect of so small a foreign body as a fragment of paper allowed to rest between two steel plates, of which one was hardened and the other soft. When the two were pressed together in the manner of a transfer roller on to a steel plate, the piece of paper made an obvious dent and would, in this issue, have caused a white patch.

There are many white patches, as well as scratch marks, to be seen in this issue, especially in the early prints, and they may have been produced in a number of ways. I would not pretend to say for certain what had happened in particular cases. It is perhaps better to lump them all together under some such phrase as "damaged plate flaws," but this is a matter in which each may choose a name for himself, or group them in his albums as he will.
24.—INKLESS SHADING LINES

The second variety peculiar to this plate is the variety which I have named for convenience "Inkless Shading Lines." As the name implies some of the shading lines which are part of the design of the stamp fail to print on so many copies (although not on all) that it is worth while looking for some definite cause for this abnormality. A good example occurs upon a stamp which will have to be mentioned again later. This is the 53rd stamp on the left pane of Plate IV. It is a stamp which occurs in three different states, having been twice re-entered before it was considered satisfactory. After the first re-entry there appeared a white area, devoid of coloured lines adjacent to the letters LIA of AUSTRALIA. This state of the stamp is rare and I have only had my own three copies upon which to form an opinion. One of these shows no sign of this white area while the other two show it very distinctly. What is much more interesting and important is that this white area survives a second re-entering of the whole impression. There can be little doubt that this really was a re-entry and not a repair because the first and second re-entries show differences in the lettering of three half-pence which no repairer is likely to have troubled to produce.

We have now to enquire what possible defect there could be which could survive the erasure and re-entering of an impression, and yet which was not present on the original plate. A definite answer is difficult. An area which fails to print must necessarily, in this issue, be a depression in the plate and since inkless shading lines are found only in certain situations on the stamps, and are particularly associated with two of the few re-entries, it is reasonable to suppose that these depressions on the plate were due to some unusual vigour in the application of the roller. That these inkless shading lines occur only in certain areas shows, I think, that they must have some very direct relation to the roller, i.e., certain areas in the roller were liable to bite deeper into the plate than others. The shading lines were still there, but slightly below the normal printing surface, but sometimes they didn't get inked and so printed only in part.

No answer has yet been given to the question of why this variety should be peculiar to this particular value. It can only, one supposes, be traced back to the special die which was cut by A. J. Mullett to replace an older die which was perhaps not handed over to him, or was maybe damaged during the transfer to new premises.
25.—THREE FAMOUS RE-ENTRIES

This section deals with the three re-entries which were made on Plate IV. All three were in what is called Die 2b, i.e., the shading lines in the front of the face are thinner and further apart than usual, and the central bar of the last “E” of “PENCE” is equal in length to the others.

The first of these re-entries is 4.R.27. The state of the plate before any re-entry was made seems not to have been recorded, but Mr. H. F. McNess has kindly sent me copies and these show a badly broken crown top. The appearance of this stamp after re-entry is characteristic enough. Almost the whole length of the left side, and very near to but outside the frame-line of the stamp, there is a coloured line which turns in rather sharply towards the stamp at its lower end. This line is often referred to as a double frame, or a doubling of the frame. This is a reasonably accurate description, but error creeps in when it is assumed that it is this doubling of the frame which constitutes the re-entry. As all re-entry marks left over from a previous impression on the plate must be white marks, this doubling of the frame can only be ordinary compartment line. The fact that 4.R.27 stamp has been re-entered is evident only from the Die IIb characteristics.

The next re-entry is 4.L.47. The first state of this stamp is well known and shows no abnormality of any importance. It is, of course, not very often seen because it can only be identified in a fairly large imprint block, and such blocks showing this particular state of the plate are far from common. In the single copy which I possess there are two notches in the lower margin underneath the letters “LF” of “HALF,” but these do not look as if they were necessarily constant and I have seen no report of any other copy before re-entry. This impression was twice re-entered. On the first occasion the resulting appearance showed the characteristics associated with Die IIb and certain other abnormalities. The most
prominent of these is an alteration in the shading lines on the left from just below the level of the 'roo's neck to the bottom of the stamp on that side. These appear to be blurred or even doubled. In many cases there is a considerable area behind the 'roo's back and to the left of the value tablet in which no shading lines at all appear. This absence of shading lines is an example of the "inkless shading lines" variety discussed in section 24. On other copies there is no sign of this variety, but the "H" of "HALF" is defective, and there is a compartment line along the left side, just as there is on 4.R.27. In this case, as in that, the compartment line may fail to print. This does not often happen on 4.R.27, but is usual on 4.L.27. It is difficult to get enough copies to put these different examples in a series, but it is at least possible that the earliest stages of the re-entry were those with the compartment line, that the new entry did not wear well, began to show white areas, and so had to be again re-entered.

The third state, that is, a second re-entry in the ordinary Die 2, cannot be detected except in a block. Here again I possess only a single copy and this does not seem to vary in any noteworthy fashion from the normal. This second re-entry was delayed for quite a while so that the first re-entry is not an uncommon stamp.

The last of the three famous re-entries is on 4.L.53, and this, like the last, was twice re-entered. We do not know why any of these re-entries were made since none of the three stamps showed before re-entering, any flaw so serious that it might seem to call for such action. There must, however, have been something wrong and it may be that the plate was damaged or rusted after it left the hands of Mr. Mullett, and before Mr. Ash began his series of repairs.

On 4.L.53 there is a variety in the first state which can be recognised, although it would not seem to demand re-entering. The right-hand side of the cross on the crown, above the level of the frame-line, is missing (page 52). It happens that there is a very similar break on 3.R.30 (page 52), and it may become important for the collector to distinguish them. I know of no way of doing this except when portions of compartment lines persist around the cross. On 4.L.53 one may sometimes see a short compartment line above and parallel to the top of the remaining part of the cross. To the right of this there may be a single dot above the shattered half, but whether this is truly a compartment line, or a remnant of the cross does not appear, nor does it really matter. In the case of 3.R.30 there is a single dot north-west of the left-hand corner of the remaining portion of the cross and no other compartment line in this area. In neither case are these compartment lines at all commonly seen.
The first re-entry of 4.L.53 has several irritating and conspicuous abnormalities. These are as follows: (a) There may be a compartment dot to the right of and slightly above the cross on the crown. This is of no particular importance. (b) The eighth shading line to the right of the crown, counting downwards, is either completely absent or represented by a few faint spots of colour. (c) The shading lines above the right-hand wattle are much thickened, but how this came about I should not like to say since it is no part of any normal re-entering process to make these lines thicker. (d) To the right of the letters “LIA” in “AUSTRALIA,” between them and the wattle, may be seen an inkless shading line flaw of various degrees. I possess only four copies of this stamp and it is present in each one. (e) The shading lines outside the lowest wattle flower and to a varying extent below it show the same sort of blurring or doubling which has been mentioned in the case of 4.L.47. (f) Above the head there is present a slight blurring of the shading lines there, and finally, (g) there may be, to a varying extent, a compartment line on the left-hand side.

This is a rare stamp and especially rare when perforated 13 1/2 x 12 1/4. I have a copy of this dated 3rd June, 1928, and the date is perhaps of sufficient interest to put on record although I have also the first re-entry on 4.L.47, apparently made at the same time, dated as early as 2/5/28. It would be of no use if I should pretend to understand how the various appearances set out above were produced by scrubbing out the first impression and making a new entry of the Die IIb type. I do not know how they were produced, but nevertheless it seems clear that a re-entry was made and must at least be described. The second re-entry, with the normal die, is an interesting stamp which admits of fairly easy identification. The inkless shading line variant often remains, there is apt to be a weakness of the shading lines to the left of the top large wattle on the left, and there is a constant defect in the first “E” of “PENCE.” The middle bar is short and is in part or wholly fused with the top bar (page 43). In every case there is at least sufficient fusion to prove the case if any other indication is present. It should be added as a further characteristic that the top right shading may also show a degree of inklessness on its outer side. My earliest date for this second re-entry is 13/8/28.
26.—A DOUBTFUL RE-ENTRY

The stamp in question is 4.L.54. In the early stage of this stamp, which is next to one of the well-known re-entries already mentioned, there are no signs of any re-entry marks. They do not appear until this neighbouring stamp is re-entered for the second time. There are then to be noted certain curious marks in the bottom left corner of 4.L.54. These are shown below. They are coloured marks and might be interpreted as evidence of a re-entry of the ordinary pattern, but are not the marks one expects from plates manufactured as was the case with this value. It is quite possible to harmonise them with the idea of a “white” re-entry if we suppose that the two entries were separated by a small space, one being rather higher up than the other. The space between them could have given rise to the marks seen, and the narrowing of the left frame in the second state would agree with this. Unfortunately for this view there is a minute notch to the left of the crown and this appears in both states so that the upper part of the impression cannot have been re-entered.

Exactly the same problem occurs in the case of 4.L.1. In this stamp there is a short white line joining the “A” of “AUSTRALIA” to the white oval below it, and this flaw does not disappear, but is rather increased after the re-entry, or repair. There is also a very obvious white flaw on the right-hand wattle, just below the outermost flower. In the second state this latter flaw has been very neatly removed, but there now appears a variety connected with the right-hand frame. This frame is thinned on its inner side, and has along that side, and close to it, a series of coloured dots, each of which is opposite the white space between two shading lines (page 47). The brain reels when trying to understand just how these appearances have come about. It may be observed in the case of this right
frame that the thinning does not appear suddenly. One can obtain stamps which show an immediate stage, having a few dots and a certain amount of wear of the frame. It would seem likely, therefore, that these so-called re-entries are traces of some previous impression, made in error when the plate was first laid down, and by no means deeply impressed, which have been allowed to appear as the plate become more worn—but even this explanation is not easy to justify.

There is a third stamp, 3.R.32, which may be another example of the same sort of thing. Its right-hand lower corner is illustrated in page 45, and this illustration will, I hope, be enough to arouse curiosity.

27.—A GOOD STORY SPOILT

This section deals with a single stamp—2.L.59, i.e., the last stamp but one, the left pane of Plate 2. Here is what a distinguished writer says about it—this is the “good story” —

The re-entry shows in the upper right corner, which shows a portion of the original impression as a diagonal coloured line running from the left hand ball of wattle up into the corner. Instead of the more obvious removal of the entire cliche and the dovetailing in of a fresh piece of steel, the extraordinary procedure was adopted of filling in the hole with lead and engraving the remainder of the design thereon. Naturally this wore rapidly, quickly producing a fresh void corner variety. Fresh lead was then added and the process repeated. It can be established by an examination of different stamps showing this variety, that the unusual procedure was adopted no fewer than five times before the final removal of the variety! It is possible to obtain a considerable series of these stamps showing different stages of wear in the different insertions, and for the specialist such a series is of very great interest.

When, in 1927, John Ash commenced the printing of these stamps, he very early removed this variety. A block of four impressions on steel was accurately fitted into an opening made by removing Nos. 53, 54, 59 and 60 from the particular pane. This substitution was, however, so well done that it cannot be demonstrated except by the disappearance of the variety.

When one reads that something “has been established” it is only natural for the modest reader to accept the statement. This is a reaction which must not be encouraged. It is better far to examine the evidence for oneself, and the evidence in this case goes to show that no “re-entry” could possibly produce a coloured mark, that is, the remains of a previous impression could only print as an uncleared mark. This matter is dealt with in another chapter and is only mentioned here because it at once impugns the general reputation of this story, which has far too long been credited.
The same is true of the end of the story, the statement that John Ash "very early" removed the "re-entry." Can this be true? It is apparently quite true that this removal of part of a plate did once take place in a plate of the One Penny value. So it could have happened again. The only difficulty seems to be that no one has ever seen a print from the repaired plate. Of the four impressions said to have been cut out, two at least, 2.L.59 and 2.L.60, have distinguishing marks which enable us to trace their presence whether or not the broken corner of 2.L.59 has been repaired. These marks are illustrated above. Now, there exist, and I have them in my collection, in front of me as I write, no less than three different Ash imprints on Plate 2. (See Section 7.) In all cases the distinguishing marks of 2.L.59 and 2.L.60 remain unaltered except for the corner repairs. It is abundantly obvious that if Ash cut out these impressions, he did not do it "very early" and it seems very doubtful whether he did it at all. Moreover, I have a copy of 2.L.60, used as late as 29th April, 1930, which helps the suggestion that no part of this plate was ever removed. Even on the sheets overprinted "Two Pence" the distinguishing marks of the very earliest prints still remain.
Having now discredited the beginning and end of this story, we are in a position to tackle the middle portion. This alleges that the printer, evidently Mullett, repaired this impression (2.L.59) no less than five times. This is said to be “established” by an examination of stamps showing this variety. It would, of course, be necessary to have dated copies for this purpose. In looking through 20,000 of this stamp I found only four copies in which the month and year were apparent in the postmark. This could hardly establish a sequence of five repairs. For such a purpose one would need to find at least three copies per stage, that is fifteen copies. Since some of these would be duplicates, we may suppose that not less than twenty copies would be the minimum needed. To obtain these at least 100,000 stamps would have to be searched. Even then it is more than doubtful whether a series convincing to the specialist could be produced. I have searched 10,000 without the slightest trace of more than one repair. It seems to me most likely that the whole story is an elaborate leg-pull worked off by some happy printer (or printer’s devil, perhaps) upon a too trusting philatelist.

28.—THE BACK OF THE STAMP

This heading is used to cover a number of minor varieties which are too interesting to omit altogether, but which are not universally accepted as suitable for the stamp album. The first of these is the occasional finding in any job lot of a stamp which has adhering to its back from one to four small strips of gummed paper, one at each corner. There seems no particular pattern for their position, and I put them aside without understanding their significance until one day I obtained the three bottom rows of a sheet which showed their significance. One of the stamps in the middle row was missing and its place had been taken by a stamp taken from another sheet. This had been very carefully fixed in position with four little strips of gum paper, rather thicker and stronger than the paper on which the stamps were printed. Whether this repair was effected by the printer of by some local Post Office is not at all clear, but the small strips of gummed paper were of uniform type and it therefore seems likely that it was not the work of a particular Post Office, but rather of the printer who might keep some special gummed paper handy for this purpose.

“Printed on the gummed side” or “over the gum” is a well-known sort of variety amongst stamps printed sheet by sheet and not from a roll. I have seen a single example of this error in the 1½d., Die 2, issue. It was perforated with the initials OS and was of a rather particularly deep red, over-inked character often seen in OS copies of this issue. The printing had just that lack of definition which comes from printing over gum. There was nothing at all about the specimen which was suspicious except that no trace at all of gum to be seen on either side, not even on the margins which had not been reached by the printing ink. Why this should have been the cause I do not know nor can I suggest how exactly
this variety happened to occur, but experts have passed it as a true “printed on the gummed side.”

Every now and again one finds a stamp with the name Tattersall printed on the back or, to be more precise, appearing on the back in violet typescript, but obviously not typed directly on to the stamp. It is in two lines “Tatter-” and “sall,” but the latter syllable has no constant relationship to “Tatter-” except that it is always below it. The appearance suggests that some young lady at a typewriter was asked to cut a stencil of “Tattersall,” many times repeated, and did so with her mind abroad on other matters. This stencil was then used to produce “Tattersall” in typescript characters printed over the gum. The ink used must have been of a particularly piercing character since it found its way through the gum and appears now on the back of these stamps, not always without missing a few letters, it must be admitted. There is a second type in a single line of small sans serif capitals. The four specimens in my collection suggests that this was produced by a rubber hand stamp entrusted to an exceedingly youthful office boy to whom it was a matter of complete indifference whether the imprint stood on its head, or its tail, or any other way.

29.—ODDS AND ENDS

One sometimes comes across stamps of this issue which are perforated with the device or initials of some private firm. The object of these is to prevent employees who might steal stamps from the office, exchanging them for cash at the Post Office. This sort of perforation is legalised in many countries and stamps so perforated are not regarded as damaged or cancelled. The only disability attaching to them is that they cannot be sold back to the Post Office. Nevertheless, they are seldom collected because the number of possible varieties is theoretically enormous, and these varieties are not due to the activities of the Post Office itself. Although all these things are true, the collector may think it worth while to put aside a short series illustrative of this practice, and if he accepts only cleanly perforated and well centred initials he will find that he must look through an extremely large number of these 1½d. stamps before he can fill an album page.

Amongst other odds and ends one may properly consider two minor varieties which appear with regrettable frequency on club sheets and the like. The first of these is the “HALF” variety, and this is occasioned by a band of colour cutting through the lower limb of the letter L in HALF. It is exceedingly common, especially in the brown issues, and very rarely at all convincing. No doubt there was some weakness in the original die which, together with over-inking, made the appearance of this variety possible, but the collector should hesitate to add it to his collection unless the break through the letter L is very clear and decisive.
A second flaw, of even less importance, is that which some people call a "splodge." This is a white mark which may occur in any part of the stamp, but has a distinct partiality for those areas which carry the most ink. The causation of splodges is not entirely clear. In some cases they appear to be due to some small thread whose impression is left in the middle of the splodge surrounded by a white area. In other cases, where the splodge is circular, it is quite possible that a minute bubble has prevented the plate, or the paper, from taking up the ink: In any case, these are merely inconstant printing errors, to be collected by those who wish to illustrate all stages of stamp manufacture, but not to be confused with the constant varieties due to faulty plates.

The recurrent wattle flaw is inconstant, but important. The centre of the largest wattle flowers is a white area with a few dots round the margin. This area is recessed on the plate. As it was impossible to make the bottom of the recess quite smooth and even it follows that various irregularities were left. If the inking roller carried more ink than usual or was rather too firmly applied it often happened that the bottom of this recess was inked, at least on the most prominent irregularities. Sometimes the recess was almost filled with ink. In the latter case the central area of the wattle as printed appears as a dark area instead of being white. If the inking has been less overdone the white central area may be dotted over with coloured marks. Usually only the larger flowers are affected and it is always the left side of the stamp which shows this variety. The variety is also confined to the first vertical row on each of the eight panes.

The inverted "V" variety is of much the same character as the recurrent wattle flaw. In this variety the cross bar of the letter "A" in the word HALF is obliterated by overinking. It may seem to be entirely absent or the ends may still be discernible. This is a printing variety of no great importance except that it occurs only on the first two vertical rows and may therefore assist in plating.

The illustration on Front Cover shows some of the above odds and ends (particularly the Inverted V, Half, and Wattle Flaws).
30.—LIST OF VARIETIES

1.L.3. Deformed cross on crown (Page 52).


1.L.5. Deformed cross on crown (Page 52).


1.L.21. Shallow frame cut on left, 11½ mm. from N.W. corner.

1.L.23. Frame cut lower right frame, 5 mm. from S.E. corner. Curved frame split in position five, often not seen. Shading lines are apt to appear thickened over right wattle.

1.L.30. Short curved projection to right of top of frame.

1.L.31. Scratch line through right wattle to top of emu's head (Page 50).

1.L.35. Frame cut, lower right, deep at both ends, 2½ and 3 mm. from S.E. corner.

1.L.42. White flaw through lower left frame and shading lines (Page 49). There is a diagonal compartment line downward from S.E. corner. This occurs on other stamps in the same vertical row. The white flaw was removed later.

1.L.50. Frame cut left side, 22½ mm. from S.W. corner.

1.L.57. Right frame shaved at top, with prolongation of top of top frame in a short curve over the shaved area.

1.L.58. Small square notch out of extreme S.E. corner.

1.R.1. Top frame very irregular and cross on crown represented by two low bumps of colour. Later repaired, but this still left the crown so flat that it is quite characteristic. (See Page 52 for both states.)

1.R.5. Frame cut in lower frame, 11 mm. from S.W. corner. End of cut under letters PE (Page 40).

1.R.8. Frame cut on left, 13 mm. from N.W. corner. This cut goes through to the brown issues, but is often obscured by inking.

1.R.13. Cut frame on left, 11½ mm. from S.W. corner. There is sometimes to be seen a small defect on the inner side of the right frame in position 6.

1.R.19. Large white flaw across outermost wattle leaf on left. This sometimes appears as three white dots separated from each other and this is probably an earlier stage. This flaw was corrected later (Page 48).

1.R.26. Cut right frame 5 mm. from top.

1.R.30. Cut right frame 22½ mm. from S.E. corner. Shaved top left frame. The frame cut disappears later (Page 50).

1.R.31. White tache, top right frame, sloping down and in. 1½ mm. long.
1.R.33. Cut in lower frame, vertical, 12½ mm. from S.E. corner.
1.R.39. Triangular notch left frame 5½ mm. from N.W. corner.
1.R.42. Split frame in position 5 (Page 52). This frequently appears to have developed into a diffuse oval flaw affecting both the frame and the shading lines below. It may be detected by the fact that a short compartment adheres to the top frame close up to the N.E. corner. Sometimes the resulting impression is indistinct, but the line can often be made out.
1.R.59. Shallow cut in left frame 16-16½ mm. from N.W. corner, the deep end of the cut sloping outwards. This tends to vanish in later printings, but can be discerned even on brown printings.
1.R.60. The top margin to the right of the crown is cut or dented down and there are often two or three coloured marks above the dent (Page 52). It occurs on all issues and no other variety resembles it.

2.L.3. The left side is much thinned, especially from 3½ to 5½ mm. from the N.E. corner. A similar thinning is seen on several stamps on this plate, especially in the first vertical column.
2.L.6. The left wattle has a leaf stretching out horizontally towards the kangaroo's ear. Under the tip of this leaf is a small break in a shading line.
2.L.17. Split frame in position 4, sloping in from left and slightly upwards (Page 52). This is exactly similar to a split on 4.L.40, but the latter has the top of the cross on crown sloping down to right.
2.L.18. Split in position 4. Level, coming in from right. The right frame is very irregular throughout.
2.L.19. Left frame irregularly thinned. Linear flaw to left of top wattle flower and behind kangaroo's head (Page 41). There may be a dot in position 22, and this sometimes breaks through the margin of the frame.
2.L.29. Split frame in position 5. Coming in from left (Page 52). Frame cut or thinning on upper half of right side.
2.L.42. Lower frame cut 9-9\(\frac{1}{2}\) mm. from S.E. corner, under letters N.C. (Page 40).

2.L.45. The wattle flower most to the right on the right wattle branch has two leaves between it and the margin. The upper one is cut into two by a vertical white line (Page 50).

2.L.47. Lower right part of stamp deformed (Page 38).

2.L.50. Split frame in position 4. Can sometimes be seen as coming in from the right (Page 52). Bottom frame broken by a sloping cut. The right hand end of the cut frame often shows as if it were pushed upwards. This break is corrected later, but the split frame remains.

2.L.51. There is a projection from the inner side of the left frame opposite the top of the lowest leaf of the left wattle
2.L.52. Split frame (Page 44).
2.L.53. White line to right of right value tablet is narrowed.
2.L.54. There are five flaws, but they are not all necessarily present at the same time. There is a diagonal linear mark through the shading opposite the forehead. This occurs late (Page 37). A vertical white line, often very faint, stretches downwards to the emu's back from just below the wattle stalk (Page 42). There is a break in the right frame just above the emu's tail. The large numeral in the left tablet is joined to the white line below it by a diagonal white line (Page 49). The shading lines of the S.W. corner usually print badly and appear blurred.

2.L.56. Outside the left value tablet there is a white comma-shaped mark. This was not repaired (Page 49).
2.L.59. There is a separate note about this on page 32.
2.L.60. There are a number of varieties on this stamp (Page 32). In front of the forehead there is a broken shading line which is later joined by a scoop out of the line below it resulting in an angular white mark (Page 32). This is the most easily detected flaw. The frame at the N.W. corner is cut off, but this was later repaired and the corner then appears normal or a little bulged upwards. The fourth shading line to the right of the corner of the eye is broken (Page 32). This does not always show and may have been repaired. There is a broken shading line immediately behind the emu’s head. This is absent in very early Mullet prints, but constant once it has appeared. Rarely enough one finds a break in the right frame a little above the emu’s tail.

2.R.2. A prominent white spot on the head. (Page 32). This was later repaired.

2.R.3. The top right corner, above the wattle, is much more deeply printed than usual. This is the appearance often erroneously described as a recut! a description correct enough for an ordinary line-engraved plate, but here mis-applied to a fault caused by insufficient recessing of the background, leaving a much too large superficial printing surface. The top line of shading often fuses with the corner frame. This is a fairly common type of variety, but this particular example can be safely identified by the presence of a small, flat projection from the top frame, 1-2 mm. to the right of the cross on the crown (Page 52). The lower right corner is usually rounded. There is a second state of this stamp with the flaws corrected.

2.R.8. Split frame in position 2, taking off the point. This is corrected later (Page 52).

2.R. 28. A horizontal 1½ mm. flaw, "a gash in the neck" (Page 37). In late stages it is associated with a weakening of the right end of the second shading line up from the bottom of the oval. The gash was repaired later.

2.R. 29. A downward and inward break through four shading lines to the right side of the stalk of the right wattle (Page 50).

2.R. 31. Vertical linear flaw above emu (see below).

2.R. 32. Straight split in position 5; curved split in position 10 and angular split lower down. All repaired later.

2.R. 34. This stamp has a well marked break in the N.E. corner (Page 39), and is sometimes confused with 2.L.59. The break is usually seen on pre-golden red prints and was probably corrected later. This stamp is easily identified by a downward projection from the E of POSTAGE (Page 45).

2.R. 35. Split frame coming in from right in position 1. The letters NC in PENCE are often joined by a slowly developing flaw between the letters.

2.R. 43. A white flaw under the head, actually a break in the ninth shading line upward from bottom of oval (Page 37). There is also a split frame in position 21, but this does not take the usual form, but shows as a projecting splinter outside the frame.

2.R.52. Linear flaw, vertical, under emu’s tail. Corrected later (Page 42).

2.R.55. Split frame in position 5, coming in from left (Page 52). A short split from the right is also seen on early copies (Page 52).

2.R.56. The letter “C” is sometimes converted into an “O” and, at a further stage, fused with the “E” following (see below).

2.R.57. White diagonal flaw between wattle flower and leaf on left (Page 48).

2.R.58. Cut frame on right 4¼ mm. from N.E. corner. Paint frame split coming in from left in position 1 (Page 52). The cut frame is corrected later.

3.L.2. In position 10 there is a small white tache just below where the frame narrows most.


3.L.6. Small notch near crown on the right. Left frame becomes thinner below level of kangaroos shoulder and coloured dot by left frame rather above this point. Over the emu’s back is a white flaw caused by a break in four shading lines (Page 42). This flaw is early removed, but the other distinguishing marks remain.
3.L.7. A break in from one to three shading lines between the nearest wattle flower and the white oval above the letter U of AUSTRALIA. This was corrected later (Page 48).
3.L.11. A break in the outer part of the sixth shading line counting upwards beneath the neck.
3.L.14. The right-hand serif of the top of the L of AUSTRALIA is apt to be blurred, enlarged and indefinite (Page 45). The bottom frame is thinned under the HA of HALF (Page 40).
3.L.19. Shallow notches at each end of bottom frame line.
3.L.56. Right frame cut 13 mm. from N.E. corner.
3.L.60. Break in lower frame.
3.R.5. Top right corner of cross on crown is missing and NW corner is rounded.

3.R.8. Left frame cut nearly 25½ mm. from S.W. corner.
3.R.11. Two vertical white lines through lowest leaf of left wattle. Many stages of this flaw can be found.
3.R.16. Split frame coming in from right in position 12. There is often a small sloping cut in under side of upper frame 3½ mm. from the N.W. corner.
3.R.23. Flaw in right frame, etc. (Page 45).
3.R.30. The right half of the cross on the crown is broken away (Page 52). This is not so on the earliest prints and was corrected by Ash so that three states can be collected. An identifying mark is a small coloured dash, sloping up to the right, below the lower margin and 4½ mm. from S.W. corner. A similar dash may sometimes be seen on 3.R. 29, but it is slightly more to the right.
3.R.33. Vertical white line, breaking nine shading lines, downward from the tip of the lowest leaf on the outer side of the stalk of the right wattle (Page 50).
3.R.36. Small white mark, 1 mm. wide, above and to left of THREE, close to line below POSTAGE.
3.R.45. A small dot adheres to right frame \(rac{3}{4}\) mm. from N.E. corner.
3.R.50. A dot between letters A and L of HALF, or the letters may be joined by a short line.

3.R.51. Break through upper frame \(rac{3}{4}\) mm. from N.E. corner (Page 52). Slight pointed projection from upper frame 7 mm. from N.E. corner.
3.R.54. White line running up and down in right frame. Probably a cut rather than a split. Does not occur on earliest prints and was corrected by John Ash.
3.R.55. Frame cut on right \(9\frac{1}{2}\) mm. from N.E. corner.
3.R.59. Break in right frame below position 10. The lower end of the broken frame is bent slightly outwards although without losing contact with the upper end. This does not appear on the earliest prints and was later corrected by Ash.
3.R.60. Broken shading line to right of crown. This was later corrected.
4.L.1. This is the subject of a special note on pages 30 and 47.
4.L.2. Left frame cut 11\(\frac{3}{4}\) mm. from N.W. corner.
4.L.25. The bunch of leaves on the left wattle stalk is joined by a coloured line to the left frame.
4.L.26. Left frame cut 17\(\frac{1}{4}\) mm. from S.W. corner. Corrected later.
4.L.27. Short white line under N of PENCE.

4.L.28. Elongated triangular coloured flaw opposite 'roo's waist, close upon white line. Frame split in position 10. Two short white lines cutting shading line under 'roo's tail. Similar lines above emu's tail. There is another stamp (or is it the same?) which has the frame split and the flaw above emu's tail, but not the other flaws. It has also a frame split in position 4. Here is opportunity for investigation by anyone with access to blocks.
TWO STATES OF 4.L.I.

FIRST STATE

SECOND STATE
4.L.32. Frame split in position 22.
4.L.45. In a block I have this stamp with inkless shading line flaw at S.W. corner and widening of left frame of left value tablet. It needs a few more copies to establish the frequency of this variety.
4.L.47. This is the subject of a special note on page 27.
4.L.51. Frame split involving extreme tip of triangle in position 2 (Page 52). Broken frame on left opposite top of lowest wattle. Linear flaw vertical above emu (Page 41). My dozen or so copies of the first state all show the plate four flaw above the emu (see page 20). In a second state the broken frame is repaired, and in a still later state the linear flaw has vanished. This is another stamp worth more study.
4.L.52. Inkless shading line flaw in S.E. corner, widening the white line inside the frame.


4.L.60. Crown deformed (Page 52). White mark in nape of neck (Page 37). Sometimes a break in right frame. Above and to the right of the N.E. corner are two short parallel horizontal lines. It is often possible to see something of at least one of these, and this is then a useful mark of identity. The mark on the neck and the broken frame were corrected later.
4.R.24. Large white dot close to left of THREE. Frame split, seldom well seen, in position 24. Often a dot under a lower frame 4½ mm. from S.W. corner. The dot (Page 43) disappears later.
4.R.27. The subject of a special note on page 27.
4.R.33. Small niche in right frame ¼ mm. from N.E. corner.
4.R.48. Frame cut on left 2½ mm. from S.W. corner. Top right corner blunted.
4.R.49. Two flaws on head (Page 37).
4.R.55. White tache joins S and T of Postage (Page 46). Diagonal downward white line, from left to right, through left numeral corner (Page 49). Letter H in HALF with deformed central bar (Page 50). Small white mark on head above nape of neck. This stamp was repaired more than once and finally became normal.

4.R.58. There is a notch 1 mm. to the left of the cross on the crown (as there is on various other stamps), but the point of interest about this stamp is that it shows a much lighter appearance of the upper part of the stamp—as if the roller had pressed rather too heavily here.

4.R.60. A short sharp nick 5 mm. from the N.W. corner.
A TABLE FOR IDENTIFYING CUT FRAMES, based upon the distance in millimetres between the deepest end of the cut and the corner named.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frame</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Corner</th>
<th>Stamp</th>
<th>Additional Identifying Marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>2 ¹⁄₂ and 9</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1.L.35</td>
<td>Cut terminates sharply at each end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>4 ³⁄₄</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>2.R.58</td>
<td>Often a split left top frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1.L.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1.R.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1.R.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>9 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3.R.59</td>
<td>A broken frame, not a cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>9 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3.R.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1.L.4</td>
<td>Broken shading line to right of crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1.R.5</td>
<td>A bottom frame line cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>11 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1.R.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>11 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1.L.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>12 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>4.L.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>12 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3.L.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3.L.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1.R.8</td>
<td>Flaw over emu's back in first state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>16-16 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>1.R.59</td>
<td>Deep end of cut slopes downwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>17 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>4.L.26</td>
<td>Frame bumped too close to wattle leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>22 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>1.L.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>22 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>1.R.30</td>
<td>Top left frame shaved for 2 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>25 ¹⁄₂</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>3.R.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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