ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) Half Gallon Jars

By Barry L. Bernas

Opening Discussion

In the past, I’ve briefly written about several characteristics observed on the ANCHOR (in straight line above) MASON’S (arched above) PATENT (dot) front embossed pint, quart and half gallon size jars. Over the same period, I’ve expended more energy towards documenting what glass making companies did and possibly could have turned out this astonishingly complex series of home canning and commercial packing containers. In this article, I’d like to build further upon the former trend and make a thorough examination of the half gallon models within this grouping.

The ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) 64-ounce category to be discussed has two candidates. These are the older style or shoulder seal jars and the newer style or bead/top seal examples that have an annular bead around the finish. In the first instance, no eligible specimen has been reported. For the latter, there are only a few samples to compare. See Figure 1 for a picture of the subject for my study.

As a general rule, the quart capacity container in the bead/top seal group is the more prevalent edition encountered. Next is the pint version. The far less available model is the half gallon size. So for this expose, I will be using a representative sampling of only five vessels.

Methodology

In order to complete an in-depth look at the largest component of the ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) line, a standardized process is needed to match one jar against another. To accomplish this goal, a six step, self-developed approach is described in the following paragraphs.

Step one will provide a framework for determining any differences to the front body part (F) of the mold cavity. By comparing and contrasting embossing measurements and visual observations, I will end up with a means to differentiate one front body section from another. In turn, the end result will give me an idea of how many obverse body segments were used to manufacture the bead/top seal half gallon jars and thus, a way to identify new examples.

Here is how step one will unfold. In the word ANCHOR, the following salient aspects are to be addressed: whether or not the individual letters are roped; average height and width of the alphabetical characters; placement of the raised inscription ANCHOR above the bottom parting line; shape of the capital C; distances measured at predetermined locations between the letters NCHOR; whether the large O slants and finally, the size and style of the letter R.

For the subsequent raised word MASON’S, the average height of the capital letters will be calculated. Also, the shape of the S between the alphabetical characters A and O along with the shape of the S at the end will be examined for variations. In addition, the size and shape of the apostrophe will be addressed.

Turning to the last inscribed word PATENT, the average height of the letters in PATENT will be tabulated as well. In addition, the presence or absence of a dot after the T will be recorded along with its diameter.

The follow-on or second step of my methodology will inspect the reverse body half of the mold cavity (R). The main objective, matching that stated in step one, will be the pursued end for this section of the process as well.

During this segment, several sub-steps will be completed. In the first one, the presence of embossing, ghosting or the absence of either trait will be the main aspect to be documented. For two, the inscribed or erased symbol or wording will be identified, if present. If either is visible, a detailed description to include measurements can be expected to be recorded.

The tertiary piece will look for patches to the mold cavity or glass seepage patterns (P) along the lower side seams and bottom parting line intersections. When present, a description to include measurements will be undertaken. This step should provide complementing confirmation to the final results achieved in steps one and two.

An examination of the base (B) is the fourth element of my self-developed methodology. The data about its height, underneath design, valve mark outer diameter and any numbering/lettering embossed thereon will be recorded. The end result of this section of the process garners a way to differentiate and identify different base mold sections.

The penultimate stage focuses on the finish (FN). Here, its overall length; threaded area height; thread width and bead length, width and shape will be documented. The variances noted between finish types comprise the elements needed to identify the components of a standard or quasi-bead (mini) finish for subsequent discussion.

The last or analysis step has two parts to it. In the first, the accumulated data from the five previous parts will be initially compiled into a spread sheet format. Within it, each set of characteristics per step will be assembled into a group for separate designation. For example, the first grouping for sub-steps one through three in step one will be assigned the identifier – HGBSF1. This acronym breaks down to half gallon (HG), bead seal (BS)
and front mold cavity first example (F1). The next step one variation would be designated HGBSF2 and so forth in a one up F progression. For methodology steps two through five, the same initial grouping of data would be reflected as HGBSR1, HGBSP1, HGBSB1 and HGBSFN1. A different grouping identified in any of these steps in other models would carry a similar one up R, P, B or FN number progression.

For part two of step six, the final sets of statistical information gleaned from the initial part of this step will be next reviewed to form opinions about the bead/top seal half gallon segment of the embossed ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) series of jars.

There is an added benefit after the second portion of step six is completed. A means to succinctly reference the many traits found on other 64-ounce capacity containers within this line has been laid out. Hereafter, these can be used in discussions concerning these intriguing jars.

**Jar One**

Two examples (numbers 38 and 39) were considered for the first ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) embossed, bead seal half gallon jar to describe and label in this study. Each is clear in color, 9 7/16 inches tall (without the screw cap), has a 2 5/8 inches wide mouth with a smooth lip and weighs 27 ½ and 25 ¼-ounces (empty), respectively. A representative sample of the front embossing is shown in Figure 2.

**Figure 2**

Turnng to the word ANCHOR, all of the letters are unroped. Each English alphabet component is 11/16 inch in height except the character A which is ¾ inch tall. Thus, the average height for the capital letters making up ANCHOR on this initial front mold cavity is 11/16 inch. The width or thickness of the lines composing each written language symbol is 1/8 inch. In calculating the distance between the lower edge of any letter to the bottom parting line, I found a consistent measurement of 4 ¼ inches for both Jar One examples.

Figures 3 to 5 show the salient attributes on the front embossing which distinguish it from other types to follow. At least for the half gallon group, I’ve found that the C, O and R in ANCHOR; both Ss in MASON’S; shape and size of the apostrophe between the N and final S in MASON’S and the dot following the T in PATENT represent the best means to distinguish one front mold cavity from another.

**Figure 3**

On the far left side in Figure 3, the shape of the C in ANCHOR is significant. Its topmost component is nearly flat while the lower counterpart is curved. The differentiating aspect is the lower tail extends beyond the bounds of its upper mate. Jars 38 and 39 both show a similarly molded C.

Beside the C is the alphabetical character O. There is nothing unward about the shape of this letter other than it slants slightly to the left. Figure 2 shows this orientation nicely, especially when the vertical H and R are added to make the visual compari

Next to the O in Figure 3 is the last letter to examine in the word ANCHOR. The outer right-hand upper component of the R isn’t curved as would normally be expected. Rather, it is constructed with two straight lines instead of a single arched component. The top line is longer and angles outward while the other is shorter and is directed inward towards the top of the right leg. This unusual construction gives the top part of the R a five sided appearance vice being three straight lines accompanied by a curved segment. If you draw an imaginary horizontal line from the outer left side vertical line of the R across the top of the central bar to the outer limit of the two line intersection on the upper right, you find out that the width of this section of the R is 7/16 inch on both models.

Next, the right leg of the R is inspected. On this model in Figure 3, it is positioned downward in a slight curve but doesn’t extend beyond the outer limit of the unusual two lined right-hand outer upper segment above it. Between the bottom part of the R’s inner vertical left leg and the interior spot of the right leg directly opposite it is a distance of 5/16 inch on both jar specimens within this group.

Looking at the middle section of the front embossing shown in Figure 2, the two Ss in the arched word MASON’S and the apostrophe between the N and S will be my focus. Before moving to the Ss, the height of each letter in MASON’S is 11/16 inch except for the A and last S which are ¾ inch tall.

One would normally expect both Ss to be similarly constructed with a curved top and bottom section attached together by a curved or slanting interior connector line. In the case of the first S on the left in Figure 4, the bottom part and the connecting line meets these usual criteria. However, the top segment deviates from this presumption. The anticipated curved upper area is missing. In its place is a line that slants downward to the left. This construction gives the uppermost region on the first S a distorted appearance as seen in the picture. If the S is viewed as an
S hook, the top section looks like it was pulled open by too much weight being placed on the opposite end. Also, this character slants slightly to the left on both jar numbers 38 and 39.

The second S in Figure 4 has a more normal appearance with a rounded top and a somewhat flat bottom. Its slant to the right fits in with the arched orientation of the word MASON’S and is considered to be normal.

Looking at the apostrophe, it is 3/16 inch in length and has a semicircular front section followed by a tail that curves down and to the right.

Figure 5 shows the T and dot duo that comes at the end of PATENT on jars 38 and 39. Regardless of the specimen being referenced, each of the alphabetical characters in this word is 11/16 tall except the A which is ¾ inch high. On these examples, the outer diameter of the dot is 1/8 inch.

The in-depth examination of the front embossing in Figure 2 permits both Jar One examples to be placed in the first group of front mold cavities as HGBSF1. The items used to create this positioning were: 1) the distinctive shape of the C; 2) the slanting O; 3) the shape and width of the top section of the R along with restricted extension of its right lower leg; 4) the shape of the first S and its orientation; 5) the shape and size of apostrophe; 6) the shape of the second S; 7) the presence of a dot after the letter T; and finally, 8) the outer diameter of the dot. For each of the follow-on models, the same plus other criteria will be used to distinguish the first front mold cavity section model from another.

The reverse mold for Jar One has no embossing on it; however, it isn’t blank either. Both examples have ghosted letters that are approximately 13/16 inch in height. These spell out the former embossed phrase MASON PATENT which has been removed and displaced by a series of overlapping 3/16 inch in diameter circles. This mold shop process was known as “peening.” As you can see in Figure 6, the MASON is arched above PAT-ENT.

The uniqueness of the backside on jars 38 and 39 give them a reverse designation of HGBSR1. NOTE: I compared the circle positioning on both ghosting editions and found they were exactly the same. Thus, both jars were formed with the same reverse section.

The coming together of the front and reverse halves of the mold cavity and the base plate permit another means to set apart the HGBSF1 and/or HGBSR1 versions from subsequent counterparts. The back-to-back ninety degree intersections of the vertical side seam with the horizontal bottom parting line on opposite sides of Jar One models is a area that shows patches and seepage from non-tight joints. With the front embossing facing you, Figure 7 depicts the mold seam junctures on the left and right sections of jars 38 and 39.

On the left-hand diagram, there is gob of glass seepage in the relative shape shown. It is about 1/16 of an inch in elevation above the outer front surface on both jars within this group. Jar 39 doesn’t have any trace of leakage on reverse in the same drawing; however, jar 38 does show some along the bottom parting line. It is interesting to note that on the latter specimen, the top of the front side gob is more angular than the one drawn on the left in Figure 7. This observation coupled with the slight seepage of glass might indicate both sections of jar 38 were in use long after their mate was blown.

The right-hand depiction in Figure 7 reveals what seems to be a small tent shaped patch on both the front and reverse halves of the mold cavity. The lighter lines profile this feature. Between this trait, there is glass seepage along the vertical side seam that goes up about 5/8 inch from the bottom parting line. Strangely, the leaked glass symbol is more apparent to the touch on jar 39 vice 38 which goes against my earlier thought that these mold sections were more worn on jar 38.

The patterns outlined above and illustrated in Figure 7 drawings will be singularly grouped together as HGBSP1.

Next, the base on Jar One members will be examined. Each container has a cup bottom mold style which is ½ inch in length. Figure 8 has a drawing of this version.

On jars 38 and 39, the base has an initial 3/8 inch curved segment which begins at the bottom parting line and ends inward at the flat surface upon which either vessel rests. This flat surface is 9/16 inch wide. At its innermost point, a 5/16 inch segment starts a curved up and inward progression to a 2 5/16 inches circular and flat depression. In its center, there is a 7/8 inch in diameter valve mark. This example of an underneath section is identified as HGBSB1.

The last part to inspect is the Jar One finish. From the tip of its smooth
lip to the underside of the annular bead, the length on both examples is 7/8 inch. There are no side mold seams within the 9/16 inch long threaded region. On this part of the finish, there is a 1/8 inch wide, raised semicircular shaped screw thread. It starts just under the lip and winds its way around until merging into the top of the annular bead. I refer to this aspect as a continuous merging thread or CT-M. The bead on jars 38 and 39 is a standard one. In other words, it has a slightly slanted top that connects to a curved outer part which is joined with a slightly slanting inward bottom section. See Figure 9.

The annular bead is 1/4 inch in top to bottom length and 3/16 inch wide from the outer threaded region’s vertical side wall to its exterior tip. This style of finish carries the title of HGBSFN1.

In recapping Jar One, it has a front mold cavity (HGBSF1), a reverse mold section (HGBSR1), a patch or seepage distinction (HGBSP1), a base designation (HGBSB1) and a finish style (HGBSN1). As I unveil other ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) half gallon jars, each will be compared against this baseline.

**Jar Two**

Jar number 40 is the second sixty-four ounce example to review. This machine made container has a light sun-colored amethyst tinge. It is 9 7/16 inches tall (without the screw cap), has a 2 5/8 inches wide mouth with a smooth lip and weighs 25 ¾ ounces empty. Figure 10 shows its front embossing.

All of the unroped letters in the top word ANCHOR are 11/16 inch in height. Instead of being 1/8 inch thick as observed on HGBSF1, these alphabetical characters are narrower in width at 1/16 inch. The lower end of any letter is positioned 4 1/4 inches above the bottom parting line.

Looking at Figure 10, the first variance from Jar One is the distance between the C and H in ANCHOR. On the initial two specimens, this measurement was 1/4 (top) and 3/16 (bottom) inch at the respective positions noted. For jar number 40, it is a consistent 5/16 inch. If you look between Figures 2 and 10, the difference in letter spacing is readily apparent.

Figure 11 shows the C and R in the word ANCHOR. The left-hand character is formed differently than its mate in HGBSF1. The top segment is slightly slanted upward vice being flat as on Jar One. Its left side is straight while the bottom part is curved. Another differentiating factor is the alignment of the top and bottom tails. Each is positioned one above the other as opposed to the bottom one extending beyond the limit of the top one in the F1 style.

The O is molded with straight sides and curved top and bottom parts. Its orientation is vertical instead of slanting to the left as seen on jars 38 and 39. Figure 10 clearly shows this aspect, especially when the H and R are compared with it.

Before moving on to the R, I need to point out another difference between the front mold cavities on Jar One and Two. It is the distance between the outer right top and bottom tail on the C and the outer vertical left line of the H. On the former models, this measurement was 1/4 (top) and 3/16 (bottom) inch. For Jar Two, this calculation is 5/16 inch for each part.

On the right in Figure 11, the R in ANCHOR represents still another variation in style from F1. Its topmost segment has the traditional shape of three lines for the left, top and bottom piece with a curved fourth connector.

The lower right leg of this R varies as well. It curves down and outward with a toe at the end. In addition, the leg extends slightly beyond the outer limit of the curved topmost right section. Between the inside of the lower left line and curved interior right leg is a distance of ¼ inch. This makes this version a bit narrower at this point than the HGBSF1 version.

For the subsequent word MA-SON’S, each of the capital letters is 11/16 inch in height except for the A and both Ss which are ¾ inch tall. Thus, the average character elevation is somewhere between 11/16 and 3/4 of an inch.

Figure 12 shows the two Ss in MASON’S. The first one carries a rather symmetrical shape. In a comparison with the same feature on the left in Figure 4, this edition is more erect with much less of a slant to the left and is wider across the middle (7/16 vice 3/8 inch).

The second S has a comparable bottom and connector line segment to its first companion above with a slightly different profiled top region. In my opinion, it approximates the initial S for Jar Two in both size and shape.

Another point of difference is the length and design of the apostrophe. On jar 40, it is 1/8 inch long and has...
an ice cream cone motif. The top is curved while the bottom part is conical.

For the PATENT embossing, the alphabetical characters are the same size as those seen in HGBSF1. There is a dot after the T; however, it is only 1/16 inch in diameter, making it smaller than the F1 sample.

In my estimation, the front mold cavity for Jar Two is somewhat different from the initial model or F1. The variances I’ve noted are: 1) smaller width to the letters in ANCHOR; 2) increased distance between the C and H; 3) alternate shape of the C; 4) non-slant to the letter O; 5) shape of the top part of the R, toe on the bottom of its right extension and the leg’s boundary beyond the limit of the top curved segment; 6) noticeable increase to letter sizes in MASON’S (three are 11/16 and three are ¾ inch); 7) new shape to the first S, making it uniform, wider and straighter in orientation; 8) new apostrophe length and shape; and finally 9), a second diameter for the dot after the T in PATENT. To highlight these contrasting attributes, the obverse rendition for jar 40 will carry the designator HGBSF2.

As was the case with jars 38 and 39, the reverse mold section for Jar Two doesn’t have any embossing on it. What is visible thereon is the ghosting illustrated in Figure 13.

These patterns are quite different from those observed in P1. As a result, I’ve assigned both the second one up number or HGBSP2.

Jar 40’s base is ½ inch long and of the cup bottom mold variety. Its measurements parallel those for Jar One. For the penultimate discussion area on Jar Two, the identifier for it’s underneath section is HGBSB1.

Not surprising, the finish construction on this example is the same as the initial model and is identified as HGBSFN1.

In reviewing Jar Two, it has another front mold cavity variety (HGBSF2), a second reverse mold section (HGBSR2), a new patch or seepage pattern (HGBSP2) but possesses an already cataloged base (HGBSB1) and finish style (HGBSFN1).

Jar Three

Number 37 is attached to Jar Three. This half gallon member of the ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) family is light sun-colored amethyst in tone. Its height is 9 7/16 inches again without the screw cap on it. The outer diameter of the smooth lipped mouth region is 2 9/16 inches. When weighed empty, it has a twenty-five and one-fourth ounce mass. Figure 15 has a picture of its front embossing.

The unroped letters in the word ANCHOR average 11/16 inch in height. Two of these alphabetical characters exceed this elevation limit. They are the A and C which are each ¾ inch tall. The width of the line on every written symbol matches that of Jar One at 1/8 inch. Another similarity (4 ¼ inches) is the distance from the nadir of any letter (except the right side of the N) to the bottom parting line.

The first embossing deviation to point out is the letter N. Notice the intersection of the middle slanted downward and right-hand vertical lines goes down below an imaginary line drawn to connect the bottom edges of the letters in ANCHOR. Figure 15 shows this anomaly which wasn’t present on the previous three jars.

It is interesting also to address the width of this character as well. On jar 37, it is 9/16 inch across the center. The Jar One and Jar Two widths were 5/8 and ½ inch, respectively.

Figure 16 contains a picture of the C and R. When I closely inspected the C, I formed the opinions that this C has a different shape, is more uniform in structure and is slightly narrower than the same character depicted in either F1 or F2. Measuring the inner distances between the inside of the left vertical line and the interior of the top and bottom ends of the segmented right side lines along
with the vertical separation limit between the ends of the C confirmed my visual observations.

A quick look at the O in ANCHOR reveals nothing unusual about it. A comparison of its orientation vis-à-vis the adjacent H and R indicates no slant at all, just like Jar Two.

The R has a similar top shape as witnessed in F1 (two lines vice a curved right-hand part); however, it is narrower at the outer (3/8 inch) and inner (1/4 inch) top limit measurements. Its counterpart had 7/16 and 5/16 inch tabulations, respectively across the same spot. A slimmer upper construction gives the internal pattern to the top segment a more squared vice pentagon appearance. Regardless of the letter style, the right leg on jar 37 is formed and positioned like its stouter F1 cousin.

The arched word MASON’S also has an average letter height between 11/16 and ½ inch. The M, O and N have the former elevation while the A and both Ss come in under the latter. These figures correspond with the same measurements on Jar Two.

Figure 17 has a close-up picture of both Ss. The initial one has a curved top and bottom segment which, in my estimation, gives in a somewhat uniform shape throughout its length. Besides this factor, there is a small straight line segment where the connector joins the top of the bottom piece which sets this character apart from either mate in HGBSF1 or HGBSF2.

I don’t believe there is anything particularly distinctive to bring up about the second S on the right in Figure 17.

Likewise, the 3/16 inch in length apostrophe carries the same shape as those seen on F1 jars.

An inspection of capital letters in PATENT points out no size differences between them and their associate characters on Jar One. There is a dot after the T. It is 1/8 inch in diameter which lines up nicely with the same trait on jars 38 and 39.

Even though there aren’t huge dissimilarities to accentuate on this section of Jar Three, there are enough subtle differences to make it the third front or HGBSF3 in our discussion.

I used the subsequent characteristics to differentiate it from the obverse regions outlined for F1 and F2. The extension of the right-side bottom of the N stood out from earlier Ns. Also, the horizontal distance across the center was between the two other measurements for the same letters on Jar One and Jar Two. Finally, the thinner top section of the R completes the criteria listing.

For the reverse of Jar Three, another style or HGBSR3 is documented. On this surface, there are no embossed or ghosted words. It is completely blank.

When inspecting the side seams and bottom parting line intersections, I found no trace of any glass leaking out of the mold joints. As a result, the identifier of HGBSP3 is given to this model.

Figure 18 is a drawing of the base on Jar Three. Right off, you can see that in differs somewhat from the one diagrammed in Figure 8. The B1 version of this drawing was molded onto both Jars One and Two. This edition or B2 is a cup bottom mold type of base which is ½ inch in length. There is curved down and inward initial section but the 9/16 inch long flat surface that it joins on the first edition is missing. In its place is an approximate 1/8 of an inch wide flat surface. The substitution in this spot gives the initial circular region (measured from the outer limit of 1/8 inch wide surface) a 3 ¼ inches external diameter as opposed to the 2 13/16 inches on jars 38, 39 and 40. Likewise, the inner circular level at the bottom of the curved up and inward segment carries a 2 ½ inches interior diameter vice the 2 5/16 inches measurement observed on B1 and B2. Even though the valve mark has the same diameter (7/8 inches) as seen on the other ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) half gallon jars, the area on which it is embossed is concave vice being flat. Due to these formation differences, the base on Jar Three will carry the HGBSB2 identifier.

Except for the finish length (9/16 as opposed to 7/8 inch), this region on jar 37 has the same measurements as seen on Jar One and Jar Two. Therefore, the HGBSFN1 designator applies.

For Jar Three, a third front mold cavity has been documented (HGBSF3), a third reverse section was recorded (HGBSR3), a third patch/leakage pattern was brought to the surface (HGBSP3) and a new base design (HGBSB2) complemented a standard style of finish or HGBSFN1.

Jar Four

The last jar in my half gallon study is number 55. It is clear and 9 7/16 inches in height. Across the outer top of its smooth lip is a distance of 2 9/16 inches. When devoid of any contents, it weighs 25-ounces. Figure 19 shows the embossing on the front of it.

All of the unroped letters in ANCHOR are 5/8 inch tall except the A which has an 11/16 inch height. This fact makes the average height of the alphabetical characters in this word 5/8 inch which is 1/16 to 1/8 inch less than its compatriots discussed in previous sections. In addition, the width of the lines composing any letter in ANCHOR is 1/16 inch. A second dissimilarity is the distance from the bottom of any character in the initial embossed word and the bottom parting line. On the other four ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) embossed 64-ounce jars I’ve examine, this measurement was 4 ¼ inches. On number 55, it is 4 5/16 inches.

Turning first to the N, it is 9/16 inch in width which is the same measurement seen on Jar Three. However, the middle slanting and right vertical
line intersection doesn’t extend below an imaginary horizontal line drawn beneath each letter in ANCHOR.

The C can be seen in Figure 21. It has a curved upper right side section as seen in HGBSF2. Its right leg extends further beyond the limit witnessed on the same F2 front mold cavity. Also, there is no toe on the bottom. As I view it, its shape represents a fourth R style for the ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) half gallon series of jars.

The O in MASON’S is 11/16 inch. Only the A deviates with a ¾ inch height. The apostrophe between the N and S has the same length (1/8 inch) and shape (single scoop ice cream cone) as witnessed in its HGBSF2 cousin.

Looking closely at this last jar, it has a fourth observe (HGBSF4), an already seen R3 reverse, no patch/seepage pattern (P3), a previously identified B1 style of base and new finish (HGBSFN2).

Summary
My self-developed methodology for the study and categorization of the bead seal half gallon ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot/non-dotted) jars has yielded the following basic information. At least four (4) front and three (3) back mold cavities have been identified. Aiding in this determination was the three (3) patch and/or glass seepage patterns noted. Finally,
two (2) cup bottom mold base configurations and two (2) finish styles were recorded.

**Further Observations and Comments**

The sun-colored amethyst tone seen on Jars Two and Three could be an indicator of when these particular half gallon jars were produced. Here is what Dick Roller had to add to my supposition.

“Generally, only those jars that were made prior to the first World War will turn to an amethyst color. Prior to that time, glassmakers added a decolorizing agent, manganese dioxide, to their batch materials in order to prevent the common aqua (green) bottle glass. Due to the German blockade of the Atlantic, the supply of manganese dioxide (which came from Russia) dried up. Glassmakers turned to a new decolorizer – selenium. Selenium jars will not turn amethyst color. After the war, very few (if any) glassmakers went back to using manganese dioxide.”

Thus, between the introduction of the bead seal around 1910 and the entry of the United States into World War I in 1917 or earlier, these two jars were probably manufactured.

The relatively similar weight for jars 39, 40, 37 and 55 suggest a flow and feed device (gob feeder) may have been attached to the machine which blew these jars. In his book, *Chapters on Machinery and Labor*, George E. Barnett stated the following.

“…As early as 1903, (Homer) Brooke devised a machine descriptively known as the ‘flowing device.’ There were technical difficulties to be overcome, however, and only a small part of the total production of bottles was made by flow and feed devices until about 1917. By that time, a number of different types of these devices were being marketed…”

If a gob feeder was used to make these four jars, the hypothetical production timeframe corresponds to the general 1912-1917 era.

The side mold seams begin directly after the bead indicating a one-piece neck ring was used to make this finish. Apparently, there was a need to have a seamless threaded area for this jar, indicating a potential use other than or beyond home canning. Probably, these half gallons were packer jars by design. The CT-M on each adds more credence to my opinion.

For many years, I’ve thought about and experimented with several means to definitively analyze the various jar parts for members of the ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) series of jars. The methodology that I finally settled on and used in this article is admittedly complex and quite possibly, cumbersome to some who don’t like to delve into the minutiae. Regrettably, I haven’t been able to come up with a simpler way to achieve the same results. If you have any suggestions to simplify or rearrange this study, please don’t hesitate to contact me to discuss it. For sans a new path, I’ll be applying the same process to pint and quart, shoulder and bead/top/side seal models in later articles. BLB

---


3. Jar 54 Where are You?, Barry L. Bernas, Bottles and Extras, Summer 2006, pg. 20. See this article for more information.

4. For this comparative study, five jars were selected from my collection.

5. There are deviations from this rule of thumb which will be explained more fully in separate articles about the pint and quart series of ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT (dot) embossed jars.

6. This same basic methodology with some added steps will be used for the study of pint and quart examples.

7. Fruit Jar Newsletter, Dick Roller, December 1988, pg. 447. Mr. Roller coined the term quasi or mini bead in this reference.

8. Fruit Jar Newsletter, November 1995, pg. 796. Dick Roller explained this method of embossing obliteration as follows. “...A longtime Ball employee kindly wrote to tell me that the ‘peening’ process was used to remove letters cut into molds, and still is used to repair mold cavity edges which have been damaged during production. The process consists of pushing the malleable iron back into the cavity by repeated hammer blows on a blunt-tipped chisel. The small circles we see on jars are the result of marks left by the end of the round chisel on the mold surface – the ‘ghosts.’ The term ‘peening’ has been used in the glass industry for years, and was not coined by a jar collector.”

9. The odd thing about the initial reverse mold cavity (HGBSR1) is that there aren’t any jars listed in either Red Book or The Standard Fruit Jar Reference that show this MASON arched above PATENT embossing. Clearly, a mold section with this embossing was made (probably with a shoulder seal finish) and later modified by deleting the raised markings and most likely redoing the finish to a bead seal. The absence of an example of an embossed jar with this specific embossing style is difficult to understand let alone explain with any certainty.

10. The presence of patches and glass seepage suggests older front and reverse cavities, ones that have seen much previous usage, were joined to form this jar mold.

11. This distance corresponds to the bottom segment of the tail in C extending beyond its mate at the top.

(arched) embossed, ground or smooth lip, shoulder seal jar as SFJR 742. Dick Roller provided the following amplifying information about it. “These jars were made for many years, and may be found in numerous combinations of color, letter size and style, and lip finish. They were made (ca. 1890s-1910s) by a great many small glasshouses that produced ‘Mason’ jars during the period when some jars were still being made by hand, while others were being made on early semi-automatic glassblowing machines. Because of the large number of producers and the lack of information embossed on the jars, it is difficult to attribute these jars to any given glass house.”

13Jars of the ANCHOR MASON’S PATENT Series, Barry L. Bernas, The Guide To Collecting Fruit Jars Fruit Jar Annual Volume 11 – 2006, Jerome J. McCann, 5003 W. Berwyn Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60630-1501, pg. 13. In this article, I stated the quasi or mini bead had been previously found only on a threaded pint and unthreaded quart. At that time, my statement was correct but now a half gallon needs to be added to this mix as well.

14Fruit Jar Newsletter, April 1992, pg. 617.

15Chapters on Machinery and Labor, George E. Barnett, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale and Evansville, Indiana, 1926, pgs. 109-110. Mr. Barnett appended a footnote on the above page 109 which stated “In 1912, the Hazel-Atlas Glass Company was using a pouring device which produced certain classes of jars satisfactorily.” This information came from the 1912 Proceedings of the Glass Bottle Blowers Association. He also added “…bottles produced (by this device) are more uniform in weight and content than those made by the most skilled operators of semi-automatic machines.”

Barry L. Bernas
239 Ridge Avenue
Gettysburg, PA 17325
(717) 338-9539
BarryB6110@aol.com

HELP/ASSISTANCE NEEDED!!

History of Antique Bottle Collecting in the United States
State-by-state survey by Bill Baab, Southern Region editor
Federation of Historical Bottle Collectors.
2352 Devere Street
Augusta, GA 30904-5202
(706) 736-8097
riverswamper@comcast.net

Dear Fellow Collector(s):

I have embarked on an ambitious project: Compiling a state-by-state history of bottle collecting in the U.S. I need your assistance. I feel it needs to be put into print before names, events and dates slowly slip into time, to be forgotten. Below is a list of things to be addressed. Don’t hesitate to add anything else on your own. Don’t worry about length. Once the survey has been completed, each state’s story will be told in Bottles & Extras, one state at a time.

The following needs to be written in story form, starting with the earliest happening and winding up with the latest. If you feel uncomfortable about writing, just include as many facts, places, people and dates as possible. I am a retired journalist and can put it into story form. Be sure to sign your name and include mailing and e-mailing addresses and telephone numbers. If I have any questions, I’ll contact you. Once I get through editing your report, I’ll e-mail it to you to be checked for errors or omissions before publishing it in Bottles and Extras. Accuracy in everything is a must.

1. During what year did bottle collecting start in your state? In what areas, cities or towns did it first start? Who was (were) credited with getting the hobby started? Did any one thing or event or find lure them into the hobby before it became statewide? You may include yourself if you were one of the key people in the early days of collecting.

2. Are there any photographs of digs or individuals and collections available from the early days? If so, please have as many identified as to who’s in them, where photo was taken and when.

3. These state-by-state stories will be published under the byline(s) of those compiling the data. I also am interested in hearing how the compiler(s) got started in the hobby.

4. During the early digs, what were some of the prized bottles being found? Anything unusual dug? (One of my club members dug a Prince Albert tobacco tin with a $5 gold piece inside!) Finds also can include pottery, since many of us branched out into antique and contemporary ceramics after having started in bottles.

5. This is not the history of the Federation, but an individual’s or a club’s affiliation can be included.

6. Anyone have wild adventures during their pursuit of bottles? If so, please describe to the fullest just what happened, to whom, when (dates) and where.