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Greetings

DR. GÉZA HOMONNAY

Let all the members of Mafitt be greeted on the occasion of the membership having elected me as their president at our last general assembly. This is a great honour for me also from the point of the list of the previous presidents, and I would like to seize the opportunity to introduce myself and my plans.

First of all I would like to express my thanks to our previous president, Gabor Visnyovszky, who acted as president for two full cycles after replacing Professor Istvan Lang. We all know that he has been a key figure in Mafitt ever since it has been founded; he has been working with a lot of energy and spent a lot of time in the organization and guidance of our association. Above the coming into existence of our four-yearly big events, the Mafitt:salons and world encounters, it is mainly due to his activity that Mafitt is a reputed association both in Hungary and abroad. We have numerous well reputed philatelist members, about half of whom live abroad and who together are an excellent representation of the front line of philatelists dealing with Hungarian philately.

Without the force of Mafitt to create a society the name of these philatelists would only be known in a much smaller circle. Our website contains the „Gallery”, acting like a Pantheon of Hungarian philately, which commemorates the activity of all those philatelists to whom we have so many to thank but who are regretfully not among us anymore. This is one of the principal goals of Mafitt, laid down also in the statutes as well – our organization filled in this role continuously and with good results. Gabor Visnyovszky has always given tremendous help to me personally in obtaining knowledge about stamps and philately. I am grateful and indebted to him also for this and can only wish him a lot of success in his post-Mafitt-presidency career.

About myself: I am 52 years old, originally an electrical engineer and have been leading my informatics company GAMAX Ltd. for more than twenty years now. I was an ardent shopper of unused Hungarian stamps in my teenage years, then – after a longer hiatus, like at many other collectors – renewed my activity some 15 years ago, and soon focused at the 1867 issue, which grew to a good exhibition collection. In the last years I began to collect worldwide postal history as well.

This publication, Philatelica, old but still new, is a continuation of the previous high-level periodical produced by the scientific working society of Mafitt, only published for a year after the establishment of Mafitt and dormant ever since. The new publication maintains both the original conception and the well-accepted format. We plan to produce two issues per year, but hopefully this number can increase. This depends mainly on the activity of our membership in contributing actively to the contents.
During the existence of Mafitt the members have always and continuously demanded this professional publication, but – mostly because of financial reasons – the presidium has been unable to publish it. This has happened despite the strong need for a publication that could help our philatelists to make their results, especially longer articles, appear in a high-level environment worth the elevated level of the research of these philatelists.

The new Philatelica will appear not only in print but also on our website, which will make it possible for our interested members to follow already the conforming process of the new issues (and comment the articles before their appearance in print). Its digital format and CD attachment will also enable huge-sized materials.

The periodical will not only act as a high-level philatelist newspaper containing articles and lectures, but also as the newsletter of Mafitt towards the members, with news concerning the organization and other interesting news concerning the Hungarian philately. Partly for the sake of our non-Hungarian members, but mainly to achieve an international recognition for the results of Hungarian philately we will produce the newspaper in two languages, Hungarian and English. As main contributors to the contents of our publication we count on the membership of Mafitt, but good contents will be accepted from non-members as well. Another topic where the members can help us is the translation – here the only criteria are high level and professionalism.

One of the basic rules of Mafitt is that new members should deliver an inaugural lecture, possibly within a year. This process practically ground to a halt a few years ago, most members admitted in the last few years have not delivered such a lecture yet. We would like to rectify the situation and publish these lectures or their shorter versions in our publication. We would also like to make it possible to access the contents of previous inaugural lectures, as these could not be made accessible due to the lack of a publication.

We would like to refresh our website more frequently and publish even more useful contents on it. Among others we put up all available assembly notes, plus we develop continuously the portrait gallery. We have some remaining material to be sold from our previous events; these can be viewed under the „Supply” menu item of the website. Even for outsiders the website can be interesting by giving an authentic picture about the events organized by Mafitt during the past two decades plus about the literature results of our members.

One regular program of Mafitt is the bi- yearly Austro-Hungarian Postal History Symposium, which was due this August. As the previous presidium could not prepare the event thoroughly enough, the new presidium negotiated a new date for the event with our Austrian friends, so it will be held on the weekend of 15 April 2012, probably at the original, for our goals nearly perfect venue, Pannonhalma.

One of my cherished dreams is to make the data and knowledge about Hungarian stamps worldwide available. As a good source we can think of the Monograph of Hungarian Stamps, being a superbly written, valuable work. Regretfully it has three big flaws: first, it is in Hungarian, second, it is nearly 60 years old, meaning it contains obsolete parts and third, because of the size limitations it does not contain enough pictures and in good enough quality.

Therefore I would like to start a leading project of Mafitt named „Internet Monograph”, which essentially would mean the preparation of a modernized version of the Monograph both in Hungarian and English only for the Internet, with a significantly expanded
picture material and the new philatelic discoveries of the past 60 years. This is a huge and highly responsible task, for which we will need all our knowledge. I would like to ask our members interested in this task to present themselves at our secretary or myself, as I would like to start the project by the end of the year.

Neither this biggest project, nor the other planned philatelic ones are possible without the active participation of our members. Therefore all the projects can be found on our website, where the would-be – participants can view the actual state and tasks of the projects.

Finally, I cannot pass by the forgery of the pre-stamp covers without a word – and related to this our connection to MABÉOSZ. During the last few years regretfully a kind of demarcation line sprung into existence between Mafitt and MABÉOSZ, the two main organizations of Hungarian philately. All this despite most of our members being members of MABÉOSZ as well and our belief is that it is right for persons having positions or tasks in both organizations.

In the middle of the last decade Mafitt decided to examine the origins and spreading of these forgeries and to name the responsible persons. Members of the presidium, but most of our entire president have done extensive research, and as a result quite a few facts have been revealed, and also the role of certain persons in the forgeries and in the spreading of the material internationally. All these have been summarized in a newsletter of Mafitt to its members on 5 April 2006, which, together with other documents of this case can still today be found on our website.

No clear-cut, convincing proofs about the intentional spreading of these forgeries have been obtained though. Therefore my opinion is that there’s no merit in dealing with this dead case anymore. And there’s also no merit in staying in a state of war with MABÉOSZ. This is why the presidium of both organizations issued a Declaration in June declaring that they deem this fairly old case as closed. My strong personal belief is that this was the right thing to do, mostly because all of us have a certain finite amount of energy which can be used for philately and this finite energy should be used for forward-going matters.

As there is an ongoing dispute about this matter outside of our organization, but some of our members are taking part in these, for us it was important to declare because of these members that from our point of view the case is closed and anybody disputing the matter outside of our organization is his or her personal business, not that of Mafitt: I myself would not like to continue any debate with strongly influenced, biased persons, who often make accusations not respecting sometimes even human dignity. And even more so as most of these persons, among them the leading figure, using militant party lingo are not our members.

I am confident that just because Mafitt issued some statements about the forgeries, we should not allow that it should be the forum of the disputes continued in sometimes repulsively rude tone by some persons regarding the operation of MABÉOSZ. With especial regard to the fact that some participants of this dispute transgress the basic behavioural norms and try to publicly enforce the removal and expulsion of certain persons, being proud of the fact that they do not accept the greeting and handshake of these persons. This is not the standard of Mafitt-members.

Our statutes declare the clear aim of the factual and scientific approach to the topics of Hungarian philately and the discussion of the disputed matters in a tone worthy of our knowledge – and it is indispensable that this stays so. Regarding the forgeries of the pre-
stamp covers it has been our obligation to collect and publish the revealable facts – and we still have scientific tasks before us in connection with the more as 500 letters collected by the Gervay Foundation – but we do not have either cause or grounds to act as back-seat driver in the name of the adversely affected parties. And it’s really none of our business to clarify the different opinions in another organization about the corollaries of the case. A scientific approach consists of the examination and analysis of facts and events; it does not consist of qualification of persons or judgment of their behaviour.

As part of our membership did not agree with this opinion, an extraordinary general assembly has been held just this November according to their wish with the sole aim of clarifying this matter. It has been a long and interesting debate, reaching the conclusion that the plurality of MAFIT membership agrees with the joint MAFITT-MABÉOSZ declaration and thereby with the strategic line adopted by the Presidium regarding this matter. (Actually it was interesting to see, that the two main problems of the members who called together this assembly, the notifying of the international philatelic community about this forgery and the researchability of the bought-up forged letters are both done deals.) This has been a reassuring vote for me so we can continue with our planned program.

To ensure the tranquillity of the creative atmosphere of Mafitt I would like to ensure everybody that this has been the last time I have dealt with this wayward theme and also in the name of the current presidium I would deem it as closed. I would like to resurrect the working mood of our members who may have been made unsure by these happenings and I hope they will once again rejoice upon participating in our community.

It should not be our main aim to collect the data about forgeries produced in a small country town some 25-60 years ago, to find out who sold these to whom and who bought it back and when. Rather we should concentrate on our publication, on the overdue inaugural lectures, on the development of the Monograph and on the organization of philatelic events.

Let us look forward, not backward!

As a fruit of the renewed cooperation with MABÉOSZ, and together with the Stamp Museum we will try to find a solution for the long-standing problem of the non-existence of institutional expert examination of philatelic items. A solution could be the organization of the current official experts into an association or chamber.

In the spirit of these thoughts I wish for everybody a successful philatelic work and nice new items into the collection!

Photos about the general assembly of Mafitt in April with the new Presidency
**1922-1928. First International Air Routes and Airmail Postage Stamps Used**

DR. GYÖRGY LŐVEI

Compagnie Franco-Roumaine de Navigation Aérienne (CFRNA)\(^1\) was founded on 23 April 1920 in order to establish air connection between Paris and Warsaw on the one hand, and Paris and Bucharest on the other, via Prague. On 6 October 1920, Prague-Strasbourg-Paris-London route was launched; the intention was to extend it to Warsaw that same year. This extension was finally completed ‘only’ on 14 April 1921. On 14 August 1922, the route from Prague to Vienna was launched.

That same year routes to Bucharest and Istanbul were launched: on 22 September 1922 the first aircraft to Bucharest took off, while on 29 October 1922\(^2\)– to Istanbul. According to Romanian historical sources, aircrafts reached Bucharest via Budapest; nonetheless, Check and Hungarian sources remain silent on this issue. Until 1925, these planes did not (were not allowed to) carry mail to Budapest even if they stopped there. At the beginning, aircrafts flying from Vienna to Bucharest with a stopover in Budapest went also to Arad, because Yugoslavia did not let planes from Hungary enter its territory (Latham, item 106). Latham erroneously identified Budapest-Arad- Bucharest as a separate route.


15 May 1922: Belgrade; 28 June: Budapest-Arad-Bucharest and Budapest-Vienna; 21 September: Budapest-Belgrade-Bucharest; 15 October: Budapest-Bucharest-Istanbul; 7 November 1922: Budapest-Warsaw. These dates referred to flights; we do not know of any letters to be transported by these aircrafts!

Tálas listed the following dates:

04/05/1922: Budapest-Paris; from 28 June with rectangular pinkpostmark\(^3\)


---

\(^1\) From 1/1/1925 Compagnie Internationale de Navigation Aérienne (CIDNA), from 1933 Air France

\(^2\) There were 46 pieces of Prague-Vienna letters, while two letters were posted to Bucharest and two to Istanbul, which means that these flights were experimental. The Romanian piece of data, on the other hand, mentioned 17 September. Katalog Trojan: Ceskoslovenská Letecká Posta 36,37)

\(^3\) Berecz mentioned 1 May, stating also that the arrival date was 5 May. The question is when it took off, given the fact that the journey took one day.
Mail items transported by these flights survived until today.

For the sake of completeness, in the publication of Alföldi and Tálas (Alföldi-Tálas: Ungarische Luftpost 1896-1930 I. Teil [hereinafter: Tálas]) the data published by Latham were re-published again, with indication that mail items were missing.

Correct dates are the following based on Hungarian Official Journal:

23/6/1922–15/11 Strasbourg, Paris
21/7/1922– 15/11 Vienna
21/7/1922– postcards, non-insured samples could also be posted
22/8/1922–15/11 Prague-Warsaw, though only mail items destined to Warsaw could be posted.

Berecz presented a “First flight” letter from 1 May 1922, to Paris (its authenticity being rather dubious), which testified to the fact that its sender was a ‘prophet’: he covered the postage fee effective from 23/06/1922 (30 Kor). Besides this one, occasionally other letters with interesting postage have been turning up, with numerous postage stamps on them, fixed address label, and inscription Par Avion. The latter was provided for by certain provisions coming into effect later. The letters bearing this inscription were undoubtedly forged, since they do not bear postmarks upon arrival, which was unusual and unjustified at that time.

So far I have not come across any data on the flight bearing serial number 99 in the work of Latham, which flew between Budapest and Belgrade; 28/6/1922 Budapest-Arad-Bucharest correctly should be Vienna-(Budapest-Arad)-Bucharest: the aircraft did not carry mail to Budapest or Arad! (Sipos Józsefné: A légipostaszolgálat történetéből 1900-1944 in Bélyegmúzeumi Évkönyv, Közdok, 1988) also mentioned the abovementioned route in 1922. It was extended to Constantinople on 25 October).

A letter marked 15/d in the volume II of the Fischer Polish Stamp Catalogue 2010 was addressed to G. Gyula (Grósz Gyula) in Budapest. The date of acceptance to mail is not illegible, while the arrival Vienna Flugpost postmark can be read: 26/8/1922. This letter provides evidence to the fact that after 15/8/1922 aircrafts were running on the route Warsaw-Prague-Vienna-Budapest, occasionally, for technical reasons, mail was taken by air only to Vienna, and then transported to Budapest on railway.

In Hungary, the postal regulation of 23/6/1922 announced the launch of the route Budapest-Strasbourg-Paris. The regulation provided for the mail carried by these aircrafts and destined abroad to be postmarked at the post office No. 72 of Budapest. It had to be done by an airmail rectangular routing/indication pink color cancellation4. The vertical rectangular red postmark read: PAR AVION LÉGI PÓSTA. If the final destination was not accessible by air, the name of the location where the air journey ended was to be written on the line between the French and the Hungarian texts. The French word jusqu’à (to…/destination name) stood there. It meant that the mail item was taken to that destination by air, while the rest of the journey was done on railway, or ship.5 According to Latham, this hand cancellation was first applied on 17/7/1922. It was replaced by newer by-planes ones in May of 1924; there was a short period when both cancellations were used.

Postmark Budapest-Wien was first stamped on 2/5/1924, on the flight of MALÉRT that took place that day. Postmarks with earlier date (28 April) have also survived; in spite of this, it was

4 No air mail label was introduced in this time
5 Berecz, images 4-19 –4-34, the letter posted to Amsterdam was sent to Paris by air, and then transported by rail. (Victor G. Berecz, Jr.: The Pioneer Period of Hungarian Airmail, 1996.)
MALÉRT to open air traffic that year on 1 May 1924, and the by-plane cachet. Budapest-Wien was used for the first time on the MALÉRT opening flight. Other by-plane cachets cannot be connected to specific flights, notwithstanding their dates. (Postmarks used on Hungarian Philatelic Weeks were Budapest-Esztergom, Budapest-Szeged, Budapest-Győr, as well as those for the reverse direction).

In the volume I of the Monograph (pp. 628-9), only half a page was devoted to by-plane cachets. However, the Manual (Kézikönyv, Black book) deals with them in detail. Berecz was the one to present the period most painstakingly, while Tálas processed the topic in catalogue-like manner.

There are still many question marks as regards the use of these postmarks; some dates still need to be established more accurately.

On top of what was said above, I have not come across any postal provision which might have served basis for introduction of these by-plane cachets. There is only one comprehensive table devoted to this issue, in the book written by Berecz. Although the study carried out by István Tálas and László Alföldi processed the letters in their possession on the basis of their date and postmark color, there were no attempts to reveal when these by-plane cachets had come into use. Berecz indicated only years, while Tálas included precise dates.

Obviously, commemorative routing airmail postmarks applied in the three successive Hungarian Philatelic Week (Budapest-Szeged, Budapest-Esztergom, Budapest-Győr, 1924-1926) can be easily identified. On the other hand, there are no official data whatsoever on the introduction or use of the new type of routing air mail cancellations. However, we may safely say that on 1 May 1924 they came to replace earlier Par Avion/Légiposta hand stamps.

Parallel use of the two types was not exceptional in 1924. Berecz presented a letter from June of 1924 on which both types were used together. There is another letter from 1927, in my possession, which bears two different postmarks. We do not know of any reason justifying this simultaneous appearance of these two kinds of postmarks in 1927. (Berecz – pages 4-32, images 4-59)

The table on pages 4-31 of Berecz’s book includes minor inaccuracies; Tálas’s list is inaccurate just as well. This was the reason why I have supplemented the table with my own data and with those obtained from juxtaposing the two abovementioned sources. It does not mean that this new, integrated table below is the most accurate one; it only represents an attempt to demonstrate the difficulties of obtaining correct data.

---

6 Berecz uses this word
8 Oral statement of István Tálas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Year of Introduction</th>
<th>Rarity</th>
<th>(Earliest Occurrence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>B(lack)</td>
<td>1/5/1924</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Earliest Occurrence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6/5/1924</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6/5/1924</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zürich</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12/5/1924</td>
<td>5 (red, according to Tálas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/6/1924</td>
<td>5 (red, according to Tálas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4/9/1924</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14/10/1924</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucharest</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>?/11/1924</td>
<td>6 (Tálas: 26/9/1927)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19/9/1924</td>
<td>5 (Berecz: 1926)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6/9/1926</td>
<td>4 (Tálas: 26/9/1927)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>6 (Tálas: 26/9/1927)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21/4/1927</td>
<td>RRR</td>
<td>19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>26/9/1927</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(Berecz:1926)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danzig</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>29/9/1927</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Berecz does not know of it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>26/9/1927</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna (szept.27)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27/9/1927</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innsbruck</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27/9/1927</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breslau</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27/9/1927</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankfurt am Main</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27/9/1927</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27/9/1927</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurnberg</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27/9/1927</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>R(ed)</td>
<td>21/4/1925</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Berecz: 1927.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Research and evaluation done by Berecz, evaluation carried out by Tálas: the cheapest value, according to the date, was 100 CHF; it was accredited one point. The most expensive was 850 CHF; it was a letter with a red postmark from Paris and Zurich from 1924. In this sense, the evaluation based on 1 to 10 points was realistic. Trojan Catalogue listed the value of +800 Kcs, which seems low.

10 I quote data from the research done by Tálas. When data are missing, I indicate the data of Berecz: 1/5/1924 Vienna, 6/5/1924 Paris, Strasbourg, Warsaw, and Belgrade.

11 First flight of MALÉRT
12 First flight of CFRNA
13 First flight of CFRNA
14 In this case the légipósta/par avion hand stamp and the new one were used simultaneously.
15 This date was not very logical, since the flight Budapest–Paris always stopped over in Strasbourg.
16 Image 4-60 in the study of Berecz presented a front page without a postage stamp or date, which means that Tálas’s piece of data was erroneous.
17 Actual introduction probably took place as early as the second half of 1926: the letter is a part of Zoltán Koleszár’s collection.

18 Berecz presented a letter of the company Pewny A. (page 4-37, image 4-68), and reported that it was posted in 1926. Latham does not know of Cologne route.

19 On Felzmann Auction no. 117 a letter with the postage of 2,42 filler (item 243) turned up, which was posted in Graz to George Sobietzky. The word ‘Wien’ was replaced by ‘Graz’ on the routing hand stamp. The letter, its starting price being €1000, was not sold. It was a precious piece of the Green collection (Green was the leader of the Austrian Airmail Group in the USA).

20 Tálas knew of a letter destined to Graz, which was posted on 20 May 1924; we do not know, if it was transported to Graz via Vienna or not, due to the lack of a hand stamp or flight.

21 The hand stamp was used as a routing one too: it was applied to letters posted in Berlin and forwarded farther from Budapest.

22 According to Tálas, regular use: 28/4/1928

23 It was not a separate type. Berecz was the one to point it out because he considered its value to be base. In my opinion, it is rare because no one viewed it worth to collect, since it did not represent a new type. More accurate wording would be to say that Vienna and Paris hand stamps were the most frequent.

24 Neither Berecz, nor Tálas knew it, though Tálas published the image of the hand stamp. It included the word ‘Angora’.

25 Zoltán Koleszár’s collection includes by-plane cancellations from 1926-1928. The earliest is Budapest-Wien 17/10/1926; there are also Budapest-Paris.
Berlin R 27/05/1927 26
Dresden R 29/9/1927 8 27
Paris R 4/9/1924 9 (Berecz: 1927.)
Prague R 19/8/1927 9
Munich R 15/11/1924 10 (Berecz: 1926.)
Zürich R 26/9/1927 28, 29

The table does not include the only planned by-plane cachets: Budapest-Basel, Budapest-Budapest (!), Budapest-Krakow, Budapest-Lvov, and Budapest-Lausanne.

The revised table above allows drawing following general conclusions:

a)  
Vienna B 1/5/1924
Warsaw B 6/5/1924
Zürich B 12/5/1924
Paris B 06/05/1924
Belgrade B 04/06/1924
Strasbourg B 04/09/1924 30
Munich B 14/10/1924
Bucharest B ?/ 11/1924

Based on the dates above, 8 hand stamps were used in 1924.

b/ In 1926, by-plane cachets for Cologne and Prague were produced, since the direct route between Budapest and Prague had opened on 26/04/1926, and the route to Munich had been extended to Cologne (further two hand stamps).

c/ Between 25 and 28 September 1927, because the flights of Luft-Hansa AG had joined in, other biplane cachets were used; on 3-4 October it happened again, though this time the number of these bi-plane cachets was much smaller. Cachets with location names Krakow or Basel were not used at all; evidence proves that those with Innsbruck and Danzig were applied later too.

Danzig F 29/9/1927 - (unknown by Berecz) 31
Dresden F 26/9/1927 3
Innsbruck F 27/9/1927 3
Breslau F 27/9/1927 2
Frankfurt am Main F 27/9/1927 2
Leipzig F 27/9/1927 2
Nurnberg F 27/9/1927 2

As curiosity, I would like to mention that Tálas classified letters also on the basis of postage stamps, adding notes ‘Ikarusz’ or ‘Tural’. The second group usually included smaller denominations of the series of the year 1927, which featured the official falcon with the Crown. However, the fact is not mentioned that from 1 April 1927 (when the ‘Ikarusz’ postage stamps were withdrawn) until 31 August 1927, letters could be posted only with regular postage stamps, because ‘Tural’ airmail postage stamps were introduced only on 1 September 1927.

e) Neither did Tálas mention (nor was he interested in) combined postage Korona-Pengő-Fillér –similarly to the indifference

---

26 Felzmann Auction 128, item 57: starting price €100
27 Knowing the date, the evaluation seems exaggerated.
28 Neither Berecz, nor the Manual mentioned it.
29 Felzmann Auction 128, item 73
30 According to Berecz, 6/5/1924: Paris, Strasbourg, Warsaw, Belgrade
31 According to Tálas, regular use: 28/4/1928
reflected in the Hungarian Manual (Black Book). However, combined postage was acceptable between 26 March 1926 and 31 March 1927\(^{32}\). The value of the Ikarusz + pengô filler stamps is not yet calculated.

f) Berecz reported that by-planes cachets were used in 1927, on letters incoming from German: Mannheim/Budapest-Bucharest, Bonn-Budapest-Sofia and Munich-Budapest-Constantinople (Istanbul)\(^{33}\). In his view, CIDNA\(^{34}\) applied these by-plane cancellation when it took over mail from Luft-Hansa in Budapest, with the objective to forward it further.

g) Red by-planes cachets were not used before 1926 (therefore, they had not been used in 1924); the reason why they were introduced or used is unknown. Their use for urgent mail would have been logical; however, neither legal regulations, nor posted mail items provide evidence to this. Zoltán Koleszár’s red by-plane cachet, which comes from 1926 is the earliest one, is the only piece of evidence to substantiate the use of such hand stamps in 1926. Therefore, the year 1927 stated by Berecz is inaccurate. The year 1924 reported by Tálas was definitely an error, because then the earlier pink rectangular and the by-plane cachets were coexisting.

h) All in all twenty hand stamps were used, plus the modified one in Graz, which amounts to twenty-one hand stamps.

i) We should take into account that by-plane cachets were used excessively on airmail printed forms on 26 and 27 September 1927. The names of the recipients reveal that this use was driven by philatelic reasons. This explains why the value of these printed matters is much lower than that of regular letters. This was also the reason why Berecz thought that the letters postmarked by the by-plane cachet Budapest-Wien on 27 September 1927 were the cheapest, and should serve as reference point. I should note that I have never come across any letters posted to Vienna on that day; I have though seen postmarks on letters posted to other, more interesting destinations (for example, Prague was much more frequent). Some believe that these were first day of issue postmarks; the fact that the new filler-pengo airmail series was released on 1 September conflicts with this hypothesis.

Berecz mentioned, however, that it was then that the Post Office introduced the by-plane cachet Innsbruck, Breslau, Frankfurt am Main, Leipzig, and Nurnberg; these ones were then used for the first time. His extra point, as well as the +20% of Tálas referred exactly to this. Out of the newly introduced by-plane cachet, Tálas had only Danzig and Innsbruck on later ordinary letters. The later use is rare simply because the flying season ended in the middle of November, and did not start again before 1 April 1928. One month later the new air mail label was introduced, so the old by-plane cachets were already withdrawn.

j) The by-plane cachets were withdrawn not in 1927 but on 30/04/1928, when the new blue airmail labels were introduced in accordance with the provisions of the airmail conference held in The Hague. Interestingly enough, catalogues report that the by-plane cachets were used between 1924 and 1927. This piece of data was automatically and uncritically accepted. Typically of this approach, the Chech catalogue Trojan , as on its page 189, stated that these by-plane cachets were used between 1924 and 1927. Right below this piece of information, the photo of a letter with Budapest-Praha routing postmark with the date 6 April 1928 took place!

---

\(^{32}\) Berecz presented even two letters: pages 4-29, letters 4-53, 54.

\(^{33}\) Berecz, pages 4-38, images 4-78

\(^{34}\) The new name of CFRNA from 1925 became CIDNA. The Hungarian Official Journal referred to the latter as Paris-Constantinople Airline.
k) Hungarian studies reported that 16 or 18 hand stamps were actually used (Monograph of Hungarian Postage Stamps, volume I, page 628; Manual of Hungarian Postage Stamps, page 234), stating also that they were withdrawn in 1927. These works also mentioned that hand stamps Budapest-Wien and Budapest-Dresden were used with red ink too. The Manual did not mention the Angora postmark at all, while Tálas presented the image of the postmark. In the meantime, a letter with the postmark including the word Angora turned up; it was sent from Budapest to Ankara, the capital of Turkey.  

l) Nevertheless, Hungarian publications did not take into account the table quoted on page 139 of Tálas’s book, who looked at postmarks also as regards their color. According to his categorization, red color was used for Belgrade, Berlin, Constantinople, Dresden, Innsbruck, Köln, Munich, Nurnberg, Paris, Warsaw, Vienna, and Zürich by-plane cachets. Prague was missing from the list. The list of the Manual was even more insufficient.

It is interesting, that on a letter posted on 25 March 1929 read as follows: Par avion jusqu’à ____________ (on the line, Marseille was written); it meant that at first the letter went from Budapest to Paris, and from there to Marseille by plane. We know for sure that the combined transportation from Budapest to New York via Marseille took ten days. Due to the inherent nature of postmarks, it is impossible to determine whether it was applied by a Hungarian or a French post, or by the airline company.

35 Angora postmark was included in Auction Profila 70 as item 6679.

36 It was interesting that Berecz deviated from this list, notwithstanding the fact that he was familiar with Tálas-Alföldi book.

The postage fee was paid in a special way: pengő-denomination airmail stamps were released only in 1930; due to this, the extra 2-pengő airmail fee was covered by 2 x 1 Pengő “narrow” Madonna definitive stamps, while the basic fee for foreign destination (40f), as well as the registration fee (50f) was covered by airmail stamps.

In 1950s, these by-planes cachets underwent an interesting change: the text and the image of the aircraft were removed from them, and they were used as special censorship hand cancellation for printed matters destined abroad or incoming from foreign countries.

In 1973, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the route Budapest-Zürich, the Hungarian Post Office had a new by-plane-memorial cachet with the date was produced (1973 Latham 858).

37 Gábor Visnyovszki published an article illustrated with postage stamp images in Philatelica, integrated volume 90/2 and 91/1, page 51-52.
Letters decorated with by-plane cachets are mentioned in catalogues issued in all countries; we do not know of any instance of routing cancellations being used at similarly high level in any other country.  

In the appendix to this article, I try to summarize the departure times of international flights, which might help collectors to better understand this field.

Appendix

Launch of International Routes First flights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1918</th>
<th>First Day</th>
<th>Airline</th>
<th>Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918.07.01</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Budapest-Vienna-Krakow-Lvov-Kiev</td>
<td>This route ceased to exist!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918.07.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 1922

28.06.1922. Hand stamp CFRNA Par Avion/Légipósta used on Budapest-Vienna-Strasbourg-Paris\(^{39}\) first flight

01.07.1922. Budapest-Vienna (regulation)

28.07.1922. Postcards may be sent! (Regulation)

22.08.1922. Budapest-Vienna-Prague-Warsaw (regulation)

15.11.1922. Airmail Flights Suspended

Year 1923

30.06.1923. MALÉRT Budapest-Vienna-Munich-Zürich

15.07.1923. Aero-Expressz Budapest-Vienna


16.06.1924. Budapest-Geneva – Munich, connection to:

MALÉRT + AERO-EXPRESS Munich -Frankfurt-Berlin

21.09.1924. AERO EXPRESS Budapest- Munich -Danzig

07.10.1924. Zeppelin Budapest-Paris -New York airship

20.04.1925. CIDNA Budapest-Vienna-Innsbruck-Zürich-Basel

01.07.1925 CIDNA Budapest-Vienna-Prague

16.04.1926. CIDNA Beograd-Budapest-Prague

---

\(^{38}\) In Czehoslovakia, Post Office Praha 1 occasionally used the red hand stamp *Letadlem z Prahy do/Par avion de Prague jusqu’à* .............. or 2-line bilingual hand stamp in 1927.

\(^{39}\) Aircrafts carried mail only to France (Strasbourg, Paris); from there it could be transported on land. To Vienna, mail was not carried on this route.
Despite almost two years’ worth of research, I was reluctant to start writing this article because I was still agonizing over unsolved problems. Since this topic is practically inexhaustible, by delaying it in order to come up with the ‘final’ solution, I would deprive those who collect Hungarian documentary revenue stamps an opportunity to link up with my results and to conduct additional research.

In order to put the open questions to rest, I would still need to examine many more stamps from their extended period of production in addition to the approximately 1500 examples on which I based this article. This is especially true of the 1869-72 and 1876-79 time periods from which, unfortunately, I was able to examine only a miniscule number of stamps.

My wish, which is not without foundation, is that this will present a significant opportunity for lovers of ‘fiscal philately.’ The popularity of revenue stamps amongst collectors has been growing contrary to that of postage stamps. Still, writings about postage stamps are accepted as a given. For this collecting specialty, such articles are sorely lacking.

It is easy for postage stamp collectors to tap into the publications prepared by many generations of philatelic researchers.

In the case of Hungarian philately, these publications include the seven-volume Magyar bélyegek monografiája (1965-1981), the 20-year run of the Philatelica (1971-1991), and the Magyar bélyegek kézikönyve that is popularly referred to as the ‘Black Book.’

It is fitting that with the re-emergence of the Philatelica, we take a short detour to make a historical connection with the past, evaluate the present, and look forward to the future.

The aforementioned list of publications is the crowning scientific achievement of a group of distinguished MABÉOSZ members. As the membership in MABÉOSZ ebbed, the publication efforts of this group decreased noticeably by the late 1980s. Some of their work was merged with the FIP exhibition organization division.

The Philatelica became a casualty of diminished financial resources by 1991. About this time, the Mafitt was organized to fill the void left in the area of organized research.

Unfortunately, the size of this group was two orders of magnitude smaller; and for two decades, it still could not resume the publication of Philatelica.

Luckily, we are living in changing times. Technical problems no longer impede us, and we can now proceed on the research path set by our predecessors.
The early issues of the Philatelica were filled with the publication of the sheet-reconstruction work of the 19th century envelope design krajczár issued conducted by Ferenc Orbán, Dr. Tivadar Petrovics, and László Pákozdi. It is fitting that, after a long hiatus, the restarted periodical should contain an article paralleling the research of the krajczár stamps with the revenue issues.

Personally, I would like to see additional articles on traditional philatelic subjects such as postal history and topical collecting in future issues. In this way, we should be able to restore the publication to its former illustrious level. Please keep in perspective as you read this first issue that support from every one of our members is necessary in order to accomplish this. Please consider how everyone can contribute to this effort in such ways authoring articles, lectoring research, and translating into foreign languages.

When I first read the Orbán-Petrovics articles on how to approach the sheet reconstruction research in the MABÉOSZ organization’s periodical called the Filatéliai Szemle in the 1970s, I was only in my 20s. Their approach from the short description was easy to comprehend and the results totally amazed me. The application of their methods proved to be more challenging. Still, the ordinary means available to those philatelists at the time allowed them to discover the specific sports that located each stamp in the sheet amidst the myriad of common printing flaws. Although I’ve been babying my collection of classical Hungarian revenue stamps for a long time, I dared not to think about how to apply these same techniques to it.

The world has changed a lot and, luckily, I finally matured up to this task. Between the years 2002 and 2007, I participated in the publication of a work on fiscal stamp issues. This gave me familiarity with a lot of background information. My career in information technology also evolved and it supported my efforts so that one no longer has to be a genius in philately in order to discover, to associate, and to validate small imperfections on stamps. During the 3rd Mafitt World Conference in 2004, complete sheets of previously unknown classical Hungarian revenue stamps became available for viewing. These gave me a solid basis for conducting research. Eventually, my collection grew and with the help of many unselfish fellow collectors I was able to have enough material to start the project of sheet reconstruction. Also, in November 2009, I was able to gain access to and scan the sample sheets printed on cardboard stock housed in the library of the Ministry of Finance. One of these sheets was a sheet of 1kr stamp shown in the illustration (600dpi scan) that is included in the data-filled disk (download from the website of Mafitt).

Still, my work still does not measure up to the results achieved by the great Orbán-Petrovics-Pákozdi trio, who worked up the positioning of the envelope-design krajczár stamps, either in the quantity of positions identified or the level of difficulty that they faced. In my case, the results also do not apply to the 2x100 subject printing plates. In the case of the 1kr stamp, the fine quality of engraving on the master die meant that regular re-engraving repairs were not required as was the case of the shallow engraved plated used for the envelope design postage stamps.

The pioneering nature of this writing is indisputable. This is the first attempt of its kind to discuss the identifying characteristics in the sheet of one value from the documentary revenue stamp series of the classical period. I would like to ask that my fellow collectors exercise restraint in criticizing this work. Rather, I would prefer constructive criticism given that the individual nature of this work had no previous research on which to rely.

---

40 See references 4, 5, and 6.

41 Az The first plate used to print the documentary revenue stamps contained 100 subjects.
I started to piece together the sheet reconstruction about two years ago using scanned sample sheets and accumulated stamps. Simply by happenstance, the 1kr value presented an excellent opportunity in solving the major problems. I showed my preliminary results at the MABÉOSZ ‘Sándor Visnya’ Traditional Collecting Section in early 2010. I repeated the showings in September 2010 at the IBK meeting held in Dabas and again at the HUNFILA 2011 stamp exhibition at Balatonfüred. My last exhibit included all of the discovered positional characteristics on the reconstructed 1kr sheet. This article represents the current status of my research as of July 2011.

I would like to acknowledge and express thanks to those who supported my work: manager of the Hungarian State Print and Mafitt member Dr. Erzsébet Novotny; Ministry of Finance librarian Mrs. József Földi; collector Ralph Ebner, who lives in Solingen, Germany; and collector Gyula Moys, who lives in Vác. My greatest thanks for the excellent translation of this complicated article into English belongs to Csaba Kőhalmi from Indianapolis.

**Introducing the 1 krajczár stamp**

The 1kr stamp is the most commonly encountered denomination from the 28-stamp series issued in 1868. (The 29th value was added to the series in 1870.) These stamps were produced using two printing techniques similar to the technology used to produce the Austrian documentary revenue stamps. The central part with its dominant appearance and richly detailed design features was printed using recessed engraving in black color. The underprinting on the rest of the stamps utilized typography.
The margins of the engraved design cover a small part of typographed printing that incorporates the veins of leaf used as a security feature.

The master plate for the first printing was prepared in early 1868 in Vienna because the Hungarian printers did not have the technical facilities necessary for stamp production. In 1889, with the need to print ever-increasing quantities of stamps, the transition to comb-perforating occurred and necessitated the construction of a second master plate. The work was done in Budapest. This second plate was used probably from 1889 to 1891. The indentifying marks listed here apply only to the stamps produced between 1868 and 1889 using the first master plate.

The initial printing of stamps issued on 20 June 1868 was so great that re-printings from Vienna in 1869 and 1870 were ordered only for the most commonly used denominations. Printing in Hungary started on 1 October 1870 using equipment and plates transferred from Vienna. The production was supervised by technicians trained in Vienna. Certain circumstances point to the fact that the first domestically produced stamp was the 1 krajcár value. During the 20-year life of these master plates, many production changes occurred resulting in the possible existence, at least mathematically, of 200 different varieties.

This large number of philatelic varieties of the 1kr stamp makes it possible to ascertain the progression of sheet position identifiers that resulted from the regular, annual production of printing plates. The one limiting factor in completing this study is the need for two to three times the quantity of 1500 1kr stamps that were available to date.

**Description of the stamp design**

Surprisingly, a detailed write-up of the designs from the first documentary revenue series has been lacking from philatelic literature. Since the discussion of the positional characteristics cannot be conducted without an accurate description of the stamp designs, this omission needs to be corrected.

Although trial prints exist, we do not know if there has even been one found for the 1kr value. Consequently, I can discuss the

---

42 The steel engraving dies for the stamps, prepared by the master engravers of the Staats- und Hofdruckerei of Vienna, were based on designs by J. Bayer, a Hungarian-descent artist also employed at the printing plant in Vienna. See PMB, p. 59 and Koczynski, p. 338. The engraver for the 1kr design was H. Büttemeier, whose name is usually misspelled ‘Büllemeir’ in Hungarian literature. See Koczynski, p. 341.

43 The 1kr stamps printed on thin parchment paper in Hungary starting in 1870 exist with four different underprinting. Initially, probably because of unfamiliarity with the use of the printing plates, two types of plates were used for the underprinting. These were not suitably matched with the size of the stamp and were intended for use on the smaller sized advertising revenue stamps. Soon thereafter, the use of these plates was discontinued.

44 Paper types and watermarks as well as perforation measurements changed frequently. After 1880, the color of the underprint changed from green to brown. The positioning of the watermarks creates additional differences.

45 The book, Pénzügyi bélyegek Magyarországon és a Habsburg Birodalomban (PBM, reference 3), appeared in 2007. In the handbook, my estimated quantity for the production of the green and brown stamps printed using plate no. 1 is 30 million. Ferenc Rend, in his writing contained in the Monográfia, stated that a contemporary recess-engraved plate could produce about 10,000 impressions of 100 stamps. This amounted to a quantity of one million stamps. In the 21 years between 1868:1889, therefore, 30 printing plates were needed to have been produced.

46 At the 1992 Mafitt Salon, I discovered the trial printings that were originally in the well-known collection dr. István Floderer. The trial prints of the 1 and 5 forint stamps were shown on the cover of the Okmánybélyeg circular in 1998. Soon thereafter, both of these along with the original designs of the Military Border Districts newspaper tax stamps migrated abroad.
design based only on a relatively early clear impression made in 1868.

The dominant feature of the designs is the value indicator ‘1 kr’ located in front of shading lines that get progressively thinner going from top to bottom. The curved text ‘EGY KRAJCZÁR’ is located above the numeral and is different than the location of such text of the other denominations of the series. The dual partial circle continues downwards symmetrically. The space between the panel for the numeral and the double circle is filled with decorative elements resembling the roofline of a house.

The Hungarian national crest occupies the space below the numeral. The crest is incorporated into a modified rectangular shield with chopped corners and is topped by the partially hidden royal mace and the Holy Crown with the cross on top leaning to the right.

The left side of the crest is divided into eight stripes, four of which are shaded with vertical lines. The dominant visible feature of the right side is a double-barred cross resting on a small crown atop three hills. The background is shaded with vertical lines.

Ribbon-like design elements surround the shield and connect it, design-wise, to the numeral panel and the surrounding double circle. Shading lines fill the lower portion of the ribbons. On stamps printed from somewhat worn plates, these lines tend to fade.

The four corners of the stamp design are filled with stylized vines resembling Arabian-style decorative elements.

In order to conduct a computer-aided analysis of the stamp design, I first created a 1200 dpi scan of the central image along the outer margin of double lines. This allowed the visualization of the approximate 1% change due to paper shrinkage. The horizontal dimension of every scanned picture was shorter than the vertical dimension. The original picture design was probably perfectly square, although the dimensions of the subject shown in Figure 4 are 20.9 x 21.2mm; and it is not square because the upper right corner shifts downwards and the lower left, inwards. In order to

47 The proper representation of the Holy Crown evolved only after the Compromise of 1867.
48 According to the rules of heraldry, this would be the right side of the crest. In philatelic writings, however, the convention used describes the stamp design is from the perspective of the spectator.
be able to compare each image accurately, I had to reformat them to be the same exact size. This operation resulted in reversing the changes due to the paper shrinkage.

The image in Figure 5 served as the 1000 x 1000 pixel standard image, sized as an exact 21mm square. Even though the differences are not visible in the printed medium, viewing the two images on a computer screen from the CD attachment will reveal the distortion from the original picture.

Half a century after the initial discovery, in his article Endre Szép proved that the repairs were made during the image duplication process on a 50-subject portion of the plate. Thus, the error occurred in two positions 2 and 52, the full sheet of 100. In his article, using the multiples from his collection, he also pointed out the positional characteristics that could be found in positions 1 and 51. Following this first announcement up until today, we still had only four sheets positions identified for the 29-stamp series out of a possible 2300 sheet positions!

In the next two decades, this periodical published the single column characteristics for three different denominations. These were for the 2kr value discovered by Endre Szép in 1991 and for the 30kr (in 2006) and the 1kr (in 2010) based on my discoveries. After seeing my sheet reconstruction exhibit in 2011, several collectors commented that they were aware of the characteristics found on the 5th and the 10th columns of the 1kr value, although they never considered promulgating their discovery.

In reality, the possibility of being able to start the sheet reconstruction existed back in the 1990s. The small number of collectors familiar with this area may have been a drawback and the main reason why it was not done. Even now, I am not aware of anyone who has attempted an approach similar to mine.

**Events leading up to the sheet reconstruction of the documentary revenue stamps**

Collectors of the documentary revenue stamps held the belief for a long time that, because of the precise copper-plate engraving printing technology utilized in producing these stamps, identifiable sheet position characteristics do not exist. In the first edition of the OKMANYBÉLYEG (1991/1. pp. 8-16), Endre Szép wrote that the ‘three bars’ error of the 12kr stamp was discovered only in the 1930s, more than 60 years after these stamps were issued. This error was caused by repairs done during the assembly of the master plate.

**Bottlenecks in the sheet reconstruction of the 1kr documentary revenue stamp and how they were overcome**

One of the prerequisites for starting the research for a sheet reconstruction project, in addition to having perhaps several thousand stamps on hand, is the availability of large multiples. While this is not absolutely necessary, it definitely helps to get the project off the ground floor. A full sheet of stamps would also serve as a good way of double checking the results.
For quite some time, the lack of large multiples of the documentary revenue stamps seemed like an insurmountable obstacle for me. Multiples of revenue stamps are much more scarce than those of postage stamps. As we know from experience, revenue stamps, even when several copies of the same value were required for payment, were attached individually.

Signs point to the fact that documentary revenue stamp sheets were not kept intact by the users, who tended to separate them into strips. It was more convenient this way than to store with full sheets, the size of which was twice that of the postage stamps. Most likely, such strips were held together with paper clips, and the necessary stamps were removed one at a time.

I have concrete evidence of the existence of such unused strips of the ½kr, the 1kr, and the 2kr stamps. I am using one such strip of the 1kr stamps as a part of my sheet reconstruction.

Naturally, the unused strips are curiosities and are hard to find. We cannot bank on the availability of enough examples to support the sheet reconstruction. The vast majority if the classical revenue stamps are singles. Their existence in pairs is rare; larger multiples are even harder to find.

Still, it is a help to us that documentary revenue stamps came in more varieties that their contemporary postage stamps. The basic material for the sheet reconstruction can be acquired from bundles of 100 usually available on the philatelic market. From these bundles, even though the availability is not as great as is the case with postage stamps, we can find useable copies originating from the same sheet. This helps to support the reassembly of larger multiples.

Figure 6 shows an example of how two stamps can be matched as a pair using the partial cancelation, the complimentary perforations, the correct positioning of the watermark, and the color match of the underprint as guides.

Figure 7. 1873 issue KRAJCZÁR watermarked stamps originating from the same sheet with 34 positions identified.
In September 2009 I came across the first opportunity to assemble a larger multiple suitable for comparison with the sample sheet.

Figure 8. 1881 issue ‘kr’ watermarked stamps from the same sheet. The 66-stamp multiple is illuminated from the back to show the watermarks.

### Statistics of the analyzed samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brown</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1562</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1.*

The columns of the table correspond to the columns of a sheet of stamps; the rows, to the rows in the sheet. The fields marked with a white background indicate the identification of at least 12 examples satisfying the average distribution requirement (a statistical term). The orange-shaded fields show positions that presented a problem with identification because the quantity of samples was below the average distribution. The row labeled OK shows the total quantity of stamps that have been identified by location in each column. The next three rows below show the quantity of the samples by columns, but not necessarily identifiable by position, from three different time periods (this number involves 20% of the total). The last row shows the total quantities. The meaning of the rightmost numbers shown in red is 1) of the 1562 stamps, 1252 were identifiable by position, 2) 170 pieces from the first printing in 1868 (32% of the total quantity) and 61 pieces (15%) of the green underprint 1873 watermarked issue as well as 80
pieces (13%) of the 1880 issue with brown underprint were identifiable only by column.

The statistical analysis shows that the chances of identifying stamps by sheet position from the initial printing are poor. The explanation for this lies in the fact that the positional characteristics did not originate from the master plate but were the results of the fabrication of the printing plates.

Statistics also show that the most problematic areas of the sheet reconstruction are in positions 61 and 91 (indicated in red) from the first column. Certain other positions from which I could not find a singular characteristic even from printing plates made late in the period, may become more readily identifiable with the aid of reconstructed multiples. These positions are in the second column and throughout the right half of the sheet (positions highlighted in orange). Nevertheless, in addition to the sample sheet, we have at least four examples for each position.

**Column types**

The engraved Francis Joseph postage stamp issues of 1871 are closest in timeframe to the 1868 documentary revenue stamps. Gyula Madarász based his study of the 1871 engraved issue on earlier research and provided us with an exact description of the assembly of the master plate. This process was based on methods learned from the Viennese State Printing Office, the same organization that constructed the master plates for the revenue stamps three years earlier. It is not surprising that the characteristics of the master plate for the 1kr revenue stamp closely resemble those of the plates for the engraved postage stamps.

The original engraving in the case of the postage stamps was a steel die that did not incorporate a numeral of value. This master engraving was then duplicated using a Galvan plastic process. The six different numerals of value were then engraved into these creating the new primary dies for each denomination. The new dies were probably used to make trial prints for the sake of quality control. Then new dies were quite possibly re-engraved to correct problems revealed by the trial prints before they were used to create the 100-subject master plate. In the case of the documentary revenue stamps, there was no need to add the numeral of value to the original die because it was part of the design. The subsequent steps in making the plate were the same as with the postage stamps.

The dot located in the white space surrounding the main design is a characteristic of Galvan plastic duplication (and proves that the first copy was not created by transferring the design from a steel die to a copper plate). This spot is visible on all stamps despite the many variations of printing quality.

From its characteristic, it is obvious that it was not a part of the original engraving. Still indirectly it originated from it during the duplication. Consequently, because of its origin, it can be treated as a pseudo-engraving mark.

The sequence of assembly for the first horizontal strip of 10 is easiest to decipher because it contains flaws that appeared during the fabrication process revealing how it was put together. The column-types resulting from the flaws that occurred in the strip of 10 are repeated in the rows underneath and provide an excellent starting point for the sheet reconstruction. The type characteristics are marked with capital letters in the columns that are labeled with Roman numerals.

---

Description of the column identifiers

A (Columns I-VI): The fifth, mostly broken line, counting from the top of the 1 to the left of the slant ends in a faintly decipherable dot.

B (Columns II-VII): a) break in the second R of the word KRAJCZÁR
b) dot on the outer arc (not always visible)

C (Columns III-VIII): a) small line to the left of and between the 5th and 6th double lines counting from the bottom (also found on columns V, X)
b) dot to the left of the 4th double line counting from the bottom
c) dot between the letters k and r of ‘kr’ next to the ‘r’

d (Column IV.): all other column identifiers are missing (this columns shows only the paired and sheet position characteristics)

E (Columns V-X): a) shading lines in the outer left arc are missing (column V)
b) thick dot at the end of the ribbon to the left of the shield
c) shading lines show repairs along the outer left arc (column X)

F (Column VI): a) dot in the middle of the double arc on the left side
b) dot to the right of the first R in KRAJCZÁR

g (Column IX): dot above the K in KRAJCZÁR

By observing the repeating column types, we can draw conclusions about the duplicating process. The characteristics found on the leftmost five stamps in the strip of ten are repeated without exception on the right half of the sheet along with the addition of the marks for type F and G. This means that the strip of five for the right side was created by duplicating the five images from the left side. It is highly unlikely that the process occurred the opposite way to this. The three characteristics of the F and G types, including the very strong Fa mark, would have, most likely, disappeared during duplication. During the galvanic method of copying, some minor marks occasionally disappear; but the disappearance of several observable marks that are quite far from each other and are prominent is highly implausible. So, we can turn our attention to the assembly of the primary five images on the left side. Figure 11 shows the central portion of the first five columns from the sample sheet and a reconstructed set of four rows. The marks are plainly visible when the image is opened from the CD and the figure is viewed on the computer screen. In print format, these marks are seldom visible to the naked eye, so
I’m showing the enlarged type characteristics between the two strips of stamps.

For postage stamps, a primary die, suitable for printing single images, was created by thickening the back with lead used for making printing type. This was then copied four times and soldered together with the primary die, creating the first strip of five. This is not exactly what happened in the case of the 1kr revenue stamp, otherwise the Cc double column mark could not have shown up in two places. Only the type V stamp image could have been copied from the type III while keeping the Ca mark but not the Cb. Thus, the new ‘E’ type marks came into existence. In an opposite scenario, we can hypothesize that the ‘E’ flaw was repaired on the duplicate copy but not on the original and it was not discovered during the secondary duplication, a situation that is unlikely. This mark is very prominent. It can be seen easily with the naked eye. On top of that, it occurs frequently since it can be found on every five stamps. Some collectors were clued in on it even before it was mentioned in the literature.

The question could arise that if the disappearance of the significant identifying characteristics can be excluded for all practical purposes, why wasn’t the very strong Cc mark from column III transferred to column V? It is possible that this obvious flaw was discovered during the duplication on the positive image\(^{50}\) and it was smoothed out. The ‘E’ mark then originated during the second step of the copying process and there was no opportunity to correct it after it was discovered. Even if had been discovered, it was so widespread that there was no time left to attempt repairs.

By going backwards in the search for the solution of the sequence of duplication, we can determined from the column III image that it was the original die because its marks would have been transferred to the other stamp images. If we are looking for the stamp image with the fewest flaws, then we have to choose column IV. The designator ‘d’ (lower case letter in parentheses) indicates that this column has no identifiable common characteristics. It can also be surmised that this column’s type is characterized by the lack of all other column characteristics. Theoretically, column I could also come into consideration because the type ‘A’ mark is such a miniscule dot that it could easily disappear when duplicated. The fact that during the duplication of the strip of 5 this dot did not disappear negates this possibility. On the contrary, this mark along with the type ‘F’ column characteristics can be found together in column VI. Of the two possibilities, the more likely one is that primary die was soldered into place for column IV.

\(^{50}\) The duplication consisted of two steps because in the first step, a positive ‘patrica’ image was created that could not be soldered to the recessed ‘matrica’ negative image. The ‘matricas’ were used to create working dies that were used to make the trial prints essential to maintaining image quality.
Column I, in showing very few deviations from column IV, obviously originated from it. In other words, two copies were made from the primary die, and these were placed into columns I and III. Following the first duplication, the intent was to preserve the integrity of the primary die. Therefore, the first generation copies were duplicated in order to fill the remaining positions in the strip of five. As a result, columns III and V share the common Ca mark. Most likely, the serious damage to the letter ‘R’ occurred during the duplication of the column I image. In conclusion, I am illustrating the most probable sequence of duplicating used to create the strip of ten.

In Figure 12, the re-engraving repair of the last image appears in the 10th column. This repair differentiates this column from the column type ‘E’ found in the fifth position. Since the repairs were performed not on the strip of ten but on the interim plate of 50, their description will be discussed later as part of the review of the characteristics of the plate of 50.

Paired indentifying characteristics
The paired identifying characteristics were created during the duplication the 50-subject plate. They are repeated five stamps apart on the upper and lower half-sheets and occur on two stamps in a full sheet. An interesting attribute of the plate, as shown in Figure 13, is that very few such characteristic appear in the last row.

In Figure 12, the re-engraving repair of the last image appears in the 10th column. This repair differentiates this column from the column type ‘E’ found in the fifth position. Since the repairs were performed not on the strip of ten but on the interim plate of 50, their description will be discussed later as part of the review of the characteristics of the plate of 50.

51 Note that despite the gravity of the break, the continuous wear on the plates makes it harder to identify. Even in questionable cases, the joining of the lines in the letter R makes it appear that ‘something is not in order.’ In such instances, identifying the Bb characteristic helps to determine the accurate column type.

52 The similarities in the first two rows of 10 led me to believe that they were the results of re-engraving repairs. A closer scrutiny negated this.
characteristics that are least visible on this row, would have disappeared during the duplication.

I’m continuing with the discussion of the characteristics of the re-engraving repairs from column X that were not on the plate during the duplicating process. The format of these repairs indicates that the shading lines in the white field surrounding the left side of the stamp image were considered too faint after the trial printings were examined. Therefore, the lines were re-engraved on the five images along the right side of the plate.

The repairs did not succeed in achieving uniform depth of the engraving lines. Later printings reveal the differences which indicate that the re-engraving repairs had to have been done not on the strip of ten but on the half plate of 50.

As we can see, the re-engraving repairs on the two halves of the sheet represent paired characteristics. This makes possible the separation of the stamps with the type ‘E’ mark into positions from columns V and X. On stamps from column V, this field is empty. The shading lines may show up uniformly but faintly on early printings and disappear entirely on later printings.

These differences can be studied from Figure 14b. This illustration shows a partially reconstructed block of 36 from an early printing. The stamps on the left side of the block are from column V, while the ones on the left are from column X.

The construction technique used for the plate of the half sheet explains the peculiarity of the Cc mark from column III. In the top row it appears very faintly; and, depending on the printing

---

53 For a long period of time, using a block of 20 as a reference, I assumed that the re-engraving repairs of the first, the second, and the third rows were the results of the plate assembly. A more accurate comparison revealed that the re-engraved lines were created separately.
pressure, it disappears entirely. Under these circumstances, the sheet position can be identified from the other two column characteristics as well as from the positional paired characteristics. A unintentional, shortened period of galvanization may have contributed to the weaker transfer of the characteristics during duplication.

It is likely that the prime die was used in position 4 of the last row in the half plate of 50. But, is it possible that positions 44 and 94 from each half of the plate contain an earlier die? This question was answered because of a pure coincidence. In Figure 15, I can show three vertical strips from the 1868 issue that are unused originals and are not reconstructed.

On two of these strips, the paired characteristic mark in position 24-74 exists; on the third, it is missing from position 74. These strips that are identified by letters on the larger sheet view can be examined in detail from the file on the CD. The red circles in Figure 15 indicate the location of the ‘Z’ shaped die break on the stamps. It resembles ‘Zorro’s fencing mark. The question marks point to the positions in which the mark is missing. The other paired characteristics from positions 24-74 are also circled and confirm that these originated from the same position on the half plate of 50.

The puzzling question to be answered regarding this is how the paired characteristic could have disappeared from one half of the sheet? Especially permanently! On stamps produced in Hungary after 1870, the mark shows up only in position 24. This is confirmed by the stamps from the 1878 and 1880 printings shown in the figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pozíció:</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1868f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878m</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Various multiples showing sheet positions 4 through 74 with the two differing versions of the incidence of the ‘z’ characteristic.

Figure 16. The ‘Zorro’ mark from position 24. It is also found on position 74 in earlier printings.
It is obvious from the first two full strips and the third, partial one, that the printing of stamps in Vienna was accomplished using two different plates in order to facilitate the production. The process of making these plates was as follows. More than one copy was made from the first half plate of 50 subjects. At first, the ‘Zorro’ mark did not appear on the plate. It probably originated when the second copy was made. The second was soldered together with the first to produce the 100-subject master plate. This was not intended to be used to print stamps. Normally, the work schedule would have allowed enough time to produce a 100-subject positive plate (‘patrica’) which could then be used later to make working plates using galvanic duplication. In the interest of hurrying up the production, the 50-subject positive plate was used to make two copies, each of which included the ‘Zorro’ mark. These were then assembled for the purpose of starting production.

The upper two strips of stamps originated from the first plate used for printing, and this plate was not a duplicate of the master plate but an interim plate produced from the 50-subject positive (‘patrica’) plate. The missing ‘Zorro’ mark for the other plates points to the fact that the lower half plate represents the earlier situation. This leads us to revisit the writings about the assembly of the strips of five and of ten. Given what we know, this situation points to the fact that original master die was incorporated in position 94 of the master plate.\(^{54}\)

Unfortunately, the sheet reconstructions labeled ‘f’ and ‘g’ do not include the last row where this stamp would be present. Still, the stamp from position 44 should be very similar because its source was the same on the 50-subject plate. The stamps from these positions, therefore, would approximate the original image most closely.

On sheets produced later, naturally from 100-subject master plates, we find this stamp significantly re-engraved. In the course of assembling the master plate, the images in positions 94 and 95 were altered by deepening the curved lines behind the letters ‘kr’. Most likely, the area was found to be too light when inspecting the first trial sheet printed. It would have been better to leave it be. The subsequent results indicate that as the plate was used, the original lines became faint and indecipherable. The improvements lost their intent and the lines became more prominent as can be observed on the two middle stamps shown in Figure 17.

---

\(^{54}\) I reached this conclusion a year and a half after summarizing my writings for this article. In my earlier presentations, I assumed that sheet position 54 was an original mark from the master die. I marked this off as an unsolved problem and used it only as a working hypothesis.
The first column of the master plate also contains two repairs. The slanted cross atop the crown in positions 21 and 71 became damaged during the duplication. The area was repaired on the master plate. Of the two places, the repair of the cross in position 21 was more successful; although, on clearer printing, the base of the cross is noticeable shorter and deviated from that of the other stamps.

In position 71, the cross was coarsely re-engraved, its base became shorter and ‘slipped down’ into the round part of the crown.

The individual position characteristics are the result of the duplication of the printing plates. If these occur on the transfer plate from which the printing plate is reproduced, then the characteristics can be found; however, it is possible that they disappear after a period of time. Such characteristics that turn up later are referred to as sheet position group characteristics that appear only a particular group of printing plates.

In the current state of my research, I have differentiated, using a ‘+’ sign, between the group characteristics that are identifiable by position and the characteristics that I found on the stamps issued in 1868, assuming that these originated from the master plate. In order to finalize this work, one would need more than the 12 copies that have been located by sheet position. Additional group characteristics need to be identified, given that the total number of printing plates was around 30.

Sheet position identifiers

The subsequent figures collectively illustrate the characteristics found in the individual columns. The numbers along the top of the figures show the paired positions; the numbers along the bottom show the individual positions. Inasmuch as the upper, paired characteristics were created during the assembly of the master plate, these can be found on every single stamp from the indicated position and are missing only from stamps printed under unusual circumstance resulting in impaired print quality.
Column III. (Type C)
Column VII. (Type B)

Column VIII. (C)
Column IX. (Type G)

Column X.oszlop (Type E)
Lessons learned

I started the work by spreading a large quantity (80 to 100) to stamps on my worktable and then sorting first by column types, then by individual columns. Most of the characteristics are visible under minimal magnification, provided that the ambient lighting is good. The use of a 10x magnifier is required to observe the more minute characteristics. A 200x digital microscopic magnifier can be of enormous help, especially since it can be used to register an image right away.

It is practical to start the sorting with columns E and C because their characteristics are visible to the naked eye. By eliminating these from the pile, column B can be sorted out with the aid of a magnifier. As the pile of stamps diminishes, it becomes an easier task to progress to finding columns F and A. The stamps that have not been identified may present a large group, but there is no need to worry. In the end, about 10 to 20% of the stamps remain unidentifiable independent of the period of production. Types B, C, and E occur in two different columns. These can by sorted by column using the individual sheet position characteristics. After this, using the figures that collectively show the characteristics for each column, examples can be identified by sheet position.

It is highly possible that during this sorting we can concretely identify stamps by their identical cancellations to have originated from the same sheet and thus making possible the restoration of small or large multiples.

In order to promote the continuation of the research work and make it less of a burden to other collectors, there is attaching a digital disk that contains accurate scans of multiples and stamps identified by sheet position along with their characteristics as a hard copy reference.
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The life of Andor Bér /1909-2010/  

JENŐ SZABÓ

Andor Bér was born on the 18th of October 1909 in Basaharc. He finished his studies at the Institute of Economics and Accounting. His interest towards art history has led him, among others, to the deeper studies of stamps and the Italian language. It hasn’t been by chance therefore that he turned towards industrial form design. Rising gradually in the hierarchy he reached pension as the director of the Industrial Form Design Institute. Even his office has been connected to stamps, as the stamp designer Laszlo Dudás has also been among his colleagues.
He pursued his hobby from 1938 on in the Hungaria Stamp Collector Circuit. After the war and the liquidation of civil societies he became member of the stamp collector circuit of the II. district of Budapest, of which he first became secretary, then, in the sixties, President. He retained this position for a very long period, he became president emeritus only in the last few years of his life.

He was chosen as member of the board of MABÉOSZ in 1962. He has been an active participant of the Scientific Panel, later as secretary and finally as president. At the foundation of the MABÉOSZ sections the Panel has been transformed into the Postal History Section, of which he became the President. He has been a founding member of the Hungarian Scientific Philatelic Association (MAFIT) in 1989, in which he acted as cashier and board member for several years. In 1995 he became an Honorary Member of MABÉOSZ.

Apart from Hungarian associations the now internationally known collector, exhibitor and specialist also became member of dignified international philatelic societies: he has been a member of the Royal Philatelic Society, the Hungarian Philatelic Society of Great Britain and the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Ungarn. He represented Hungary in the Postal History Section of the FIP for a long period.

His collection of high intellectual and financial value has won national and international awards. His first result has been the bronze medal of the 1956 Tel-Aviv Exhibition, which has been followed by FIP Gold Medals, among them at the Stockholmia in 1986, the Finlandia in 1988, the Philexfrance in 1989, the Stamp World in 1990 and the Eurofilex in 1992.

The 18th of October has been an illustrious day both in the life of Andor Ber and the Stamp Museum: he donated his most valued treasures, the Papal States pre-stamp and postal history collection plus the Hungarian pre-stamp covers collection to the Museum. His generosity is recognized by his picture placed on the Wall of Donators.

The Mihaly Gervay Award and the Award for Post, both received on this occasion, has been the crowning of the numerous recognitions of his substantial life path. He himself has founded a challenge award together with MAFITT, which is assigned each year since 2001.

For the reason of his authority and numerous articles he has been invited to the editorial board of the Filatéliás Szemle. The journal had a number of his articles appear, and he has also been an author of Filatelica. The Chechoslovakian Filatelié published his article about the postal history of Slovakia and he held several lectures in Slovakia as well. His work about the history of the Hungarian Post from the beginning to 1850 appeared in the II Nuovo Corriere Filatelico. He is a co-author of the Stamplexicon and the Handbook on the Pre-stamp frankings and cancellations of the Hungarian Post. He wrote a book about the postal history of Budapest as well.

Andor Ber, during his long life, let it be his relation to the material world or to the human societies, gave a lot both to his contemporaries and succeeding generations. His life and work should serve as an example for all of us!
Repertory for writings of Andor Bér

ANDRÁS DABÓCZY

1 Bélyeg előtti levelek FSz 1971/2 17.
2 A bélyegelőtti levelek postajelzései és viteldíjrendszer Philatelic 1971/2 1.
3 Tudományos munkaközösség FSz 1973/2 21.
4 Magyar gyűjtők nemzetközi kiállításokon FSz 1974/1 5.
5 Koleralevelek FSz 1975/7 10.
6 Bélyeg napi kiállítás FSz 1976/7 28.
8 A Bélyegmúzeumban FSz 1977/9 33.
9 Szorgalomlevél FSz 1978/4 14.
10 Bélyegelőtti levelek kezelési jelzései FSz 1978/7 12.
12 Vitassuk meg: Lehet 10 keret? FSz 1979/4 3.
13 A budai kisposta FSz 1979/5 7.
14 Külön-külön igazgatandó (vita) FSz 1979/10 8.
15 Postakezelési jelzések kialakulása M.orsz-on (kutatás) FSz 1981/4 15.
16 Budapest rövid postatörténete 1867-ig FSz 1984/4 13.
17 A magyar kocsiposta kezdete FSz 1984/11 16.
18 Postatörténeti kiállítás FSz 1985/7 9.
19 Modern bélyegek gyűjtése hagyományos módon FSz 1986/12 21.
20 A magyar posta bélyegelőtt bérmentesítéseinek és bélyegzőinek kézikönyve (Bér-Makkai-Surányi) Téka 1986
21 Dolgozzuk fel Magyarország legújabbkori postatörténetét FSz 1987/5 9.
22 Kiállítani! Kiállítani! FSz 1987/9 5.
23 Egy megszünt állam FSz 1987/12 21.
24 Bélyeglexikon (Bér-Fogarasi-Gazda-Surányi) Gondolat 1988

26 Postatörténeti jelzések kialakulása M.orsz-on (kutatás) FSz 1989/11 17.
27 A bélyegelőtti levelek gyűjtése FSz 1989/12 13.
29 A bélyegelőtti levelek kormányzott postatörvénye FSz 1992/6 15.
30 Merre tart a filatélia? FSz 1992/12 18.
31 Kiütteresés? Bv-FSz 1993/10 7.
34 A harmadik infláció gyűjtése FSz 1996/6 9.
35 A bélyegelőtti levelek gyűjtése Bv-FSz 1996/9 17.
36 A postatörténeti és a hagyományos gyűjtési módszer FSz 1996/12 16.
37 Egy kis történelem Bv-FSz 1997/11 8.
38 Postatörténeti kiállítás [felhívás] Bv-FSz 1997/12 16.
39 Budapest rövid postatörténete a kezdeteig Bv-FSz 1998/10 20.
40 Budapest rövid postatörténete a kezdeteig Bv-FSz 1998/11 25.
41 Kiállítási tanulságok Bv-FSz 1998/12 11.
43 Gondolatok az ünnepi közgyűlés apropóján Bv-FSz 2002/8 8.
44 Bélyeg előtti levelek gyűjtése Bv-FSz 2003/1 6.
45 Koleralevelek Bv-FSz 2003/2 11.
46 Óbuda, Buda és Pest postatörténete 1850-ig Bv-FSz 2003/8 10.
47 II.Rákóczi Ferenc postái (1.) Bv-FSz 2006/11 15.
48 II.Rákóczi Ferenc postái (2.) Bv-FSz 2006/12 8.
49 A magyarországi hírvivés és a postaszolgálat kialakulása (I.) Bv-FSz 2007/3 16.
50 A magyarországi hírvivés és a postaszolgálat kialakulása (II.) Bv-FSz 2007/4 23.
51 A magyarországi hírvivés és a postaszolgálat kialakulása (III.) Bv-FSz 2007/5 22.

Abbreviations: FSz = Filatéliai Szemle, Bv-FSz = Bélyegvilág- Filatéliai Szemle
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