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When John Agnew decided to stop just being another glass blower and joined with the Chambers brothers in 1843, he set into motion a series of glass houses that would remain in business for more than half a century. Although he split with the Chambers less than a decade later, he continued on with various partnerships and was eventually succeeded by his son. Although the main product was always window glass, at least two of the firms embossed their names on the bases of wax-sealer fruit jars.

Histories

Chambers & Agnew, Pittsburgh (ca. 1843-ca. 1852)

At the age of 14 (1833) John Agnew was apprenticed to William McCully, where he learned the glass trade (McKearin & McKearin 1941:604). Although sources disagree about both the opening and separation dates (see section on A. & D.H. Chambers for full discussion), John Agnew and the Chambers brothers began their business ca. 1843. The Chambers brothers started another glass house in 1843, then they separated from Agnew ca. 1852. Agnew continued making bottles at the old works, while the Chambers family kept the window glass factory (National Glass Budget 1909:11).

John Agnew & Co., Pittsburgh (ca. 1852-1868)

Creswick (1987:278) placed the date of the new business at 1855. Toulouse (1971:33) and McKearin and McKearin (1941:604) suggested that it began a year earlier; and an article in the National Glass Budget set the date at 1852. Hawkins (2009:15) agreed with the ca. 1852 beginning. According to both McKearin and McKearin (1941:604) and Creswick (1987:4, 278), the Agnew firm concentrated on making “druggists’ green glass and flint glassware” in two separate factories. Although Creswick (1987:4, 278) noted that Agnew’s son joined the firm in 1870, evidence from Hawkins (2009:16) indicates an entirely different company in operation beginning in 1868.
Containers and Marks

A&Co (ca. 1854-1868)

Knittle (1927:441) identified this mark as belonging to Agnew & Co. but included no dates or reasons for her choice. Toulouse (1971:33) dated the mark: “Questionably circa 1854 to 1866[,] Possibly 1876 to 1892 or later.” He felt that since the mark was embossed on two types of flasks, it could have been used as late as Agnew & Co. (1876-1892 or later). Jones (1966:15) also placed the mark with Agnew & Co. (again probably relying on Knittle) but dated it “1854-1866 - changed - again in 1876 - was still operating.” Griffenhagen and Bogard (1999:212), continued the trend, attributing the mark to Agnew & Co. (suggesting that A&Co was used on medicinal bottles) from 1876 to 1892, probably following Toulouse.

McKearin and Wilson (1987:646, 650-651) identified three flasks marked with “A&CO” as “attributed by Van Rensselaer to Adams & Co.” The only one they illustrated, we have identified as being made by Adams & Co. Hawkins (2009:4) also suggested that Adams & Co. used the A&Co mark on a “clasp-hands” flask and on other flasks (see the Adams & Co. section). Adams & Co. certainly made flasks embossed with the firm name and likely made the ones marked “A&Co.”

While Agnew & Wilcox apparently manufactured coffin flasks, we have found no record for any other flasks advertised by the Agnew firms until the Hulton (Pennsylvania) plant made some in 1884. It may also be significant that McKearin and Wilson (1987:155) only discussed John Agnew in light of his connection with Chambers & Agnew. Since the researchers focused on embossed flasks, it seems odd that they would not discuss any of the other Agnew firms – unless those glass houses did not make flasks.

Farnsworth & Walthall (2011:57, 381-386) discussed and illustrated Bennett Pieters & Co. and the firm’s Red Jacket Bitters. They noted a total of four bottles used by the firm that were embossed with the “A&Co” logo on the bases. In two cases, only the mark was embossed; the other two were embossed “A&Co No 4” and “A&Co No 5.” The logo was always in an arch in a concave center. These bottles were square in cross-section with tapered collar finishes and keyed bases, indicating a manufacture in a bottom-hinged mold.
One of the Red Jacket Bitters bottles was embossed “21 RIVER STREET” on one side. Bennet Pieters was listed at that address in 1864 but had moved to “31 & 33 MICHIGAN AVENUE” – the address embossed on another variation of the bottle – by 1866. The bottles with “No 4” and “No 5” on their bases had no address. The four bottles were almost certainly made between 1864 and 1868 (Farnsworth & Walthall 2011:381-386). Ring (1980:392-393) missed these variations, although she noted an ad for the River Street address. Farnsworth & Walthall (2011:57) attributed the mark to Adams & Co. It is unlikely that Agnew & Co. used the A&Co logo (see Discussion and Conclusions section).

Agnew & Wilcox, Pittsburgh (1868-1872)

John Agnew, his son, John C. Agnew, and Lemuel Wilcox operated the firm of Agnew & Wilcox outside the City of Pittsburgh at Carrick Borough. Agnew had built the factory in 1854 and operated it alone until his son and Wilcox joined him in 1868. The plant produced vials, bottles, and green glassware, particularly soda bottles and coffin-shaped flasks. In 1872, Wilcox left the firm, which was renamed John Agnew & Son (Hawkins 2009:20-21).

Containers and Marks

A&W (1868-1872)

Agnew & Wilcox used the A&W logo from 1868 to 1872. The mark is found embossed on the bases or heels of various bottle types including round medicines, coffin flasks (Figures 1 & 2), and blob-top soda bottles (Hawkins 2009:20-21). One round medicine bottle was made with a “key mold” base that left a half-circle mark (Figure 3). That type of mold was only used during the 1868-1872 period (Lindsey 2010) – validating the Agnew & Wilcox identification.
John Agnew & Son, Pittsburgh (1872-ca. 1878)

Once again, there are discrepancies on the transition dates. Toulouse (1971:33), following McKearin & McKearin (1941:604), placed the date for Agnew’s son in the business at 1866.¹ Creswick (1987:4, 278), citing the 1876 history of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, noted that the son joined in 1870. Both agree that the son became the sole owner in 1876. Hawkins (2009:16-17), however, dated the opening of the business at 1872 and noted that the operation had become Agnew & Co. by 1878. Agnew & Son was listed in the directory until 1877. Hawkins also noted that the firm was known as either Agnew & Son or J. Agnew & Son during this period. The plant operated two furnaces with 11 pots in 1876.

Containers and Marks

Knittle (1927:348) stated that

the Agnew clear-white and golden-amber perfume, bitters, patent-medicine, and similar bottles were of exceptionally good metal and design. Among the well-known patent-medicine containers of this make are the “Indian Queen” and “Ear of Corn,” each three quarters of a quart in capacity and golden amber in color.

As usual, Knittle did not enlighten us with her reasons for assigning these two bottles to the Agnews. Ring 1980:263; 340-341) showed no manufacturer’s mark for Indian Queen Bitters or on the National Bitters (ear-of-corn) bottle, although she did illustrate a triangular National Bitters bottle (not ear-of-corn) embossed with “A.C.” on the shoulder. If Agnew actually did make the two bitters bottles, the firm almost certainly did not use a logo on the containers.

¹ Although the issue remains unsettled, an 1876 source noted that the company was established as John Agnew & Sons in 1866 (Crockery and Glass Journal 1876:15).
Toulouse (1971:21-22) cited an “A” mark as being used by John Agnew & Son from 1854 to 1866. He stated, “Although the letter ‘A’ alone has been identified with Adams & Co. by Knittle, there is a groove-ring wax sealer identical with one marked in full ‘John Agnew & Son,’ with only the letter ‘A’ on the bottom” (Figure 4). The jar was also listed in his earlier book (Toulouse 1969:15-16).

Creswick (1987:1) showed this mark on a grooved-ring wax-sealer fruit jar but made no attribution to a manufacturer (Figure 5).

Hawkins (2009:17, 19-20) agreed with Toulouse and included a photograph of a fruit jar base embossed with both “JOHN AGNEW & SON” and an “A” in the center. He also showed a photo of an “A” on a rectangular medicine bottle (Figure 6). Although the fruit jar base was certainly made by John Agnew & Son, the “A” mark on the medicine bottle could have been used by any manufacturer of such items with an “A” in the firm name – including Adams & Co. or Agnew & Co. – or the “A” could even have been mold code.

A collection from the Tucson Urban Renewal project, included a colorless, pumpkinseed flask that was embossed on the base with the letter “A” (Figure 7). The quarter-pint flask was very similar to others that were embossed with A in a circle on their bases. The Circle-A was
likely the logo of the American Glass Works at Richmond, Virginia. The Tucson bottle was very similar in color, shape, and even a finial on the lower side of the base. This “A” mark was probably also used by American Glass.

**AGNEW & SON / PITTSBURGH PA (1872-1876)**

Creswick (1987:4) noted this mark around the outside edge of the base on a grooved-ring wax-sealer fruit jar that she dated ca. 1870-1876. Agnew & Son actually began in 1872. This variation appears in the section immediately below.

**JOHN AGNEW & SON PITTSBURGH, PA. (1872-1876)**

Toulouse (1971:40) noted a “JOHN AGNEW & Co. Pitts” mark that “appears as a circle on the bottom” of a fruit jar. However, that appears to have been a misprint from his earlier book (Toulouse 1969:15) where he noted the correct mark, JOHN AGNEW & SON PITTSBURGH PA. He noted that the company was in business from 1854 to 1866. Roller (1983:6) included the same mark, also on a grooved-ring wax-sealer jar and dated it as being made in the 1870s. He also noted a variation that included a star on the base.

Hawkins (2009:17) presented a base photo of one jar embossed “JOHN AGNEW & SON (arch) / PITTSBURGH, PA (inverted arch)” with a medium-sized “A” in the center that clearly shows that the resting point for the jar was on the embossing (see Figure 4). Except for the “A,” the embossing was on a Rickett’s-type plate around the circumference of the base, although the ring was not sloped or countersunk into the base like a typical Ricket’s mold.

![Figure 8 – John Agnew & Son fruit jars (Creswick 1987:4)](image)

---

2 More than two decades later, of course, the Circle-A logo was used by the Armstrong Glass Co.
Creswick (1987:4) also illustrated the jar in four variations (all on bases), dated ca. 1870-1876 (Figure 8). Leybourne (2001:5) added the jar photographed by Hawkins for a total of five variations:

1. AGNEW & SON PITTSBURGH
2. JOHN AGNEW & SON
3. JOHN AGNEW & SON PITTSBURGH PA
4. JOHN AGNEW & SON PITTSBURGH PA (with star in center)
5. JOHN AGNEW & SON PITTSBURGH PA (with “A” in center)

Roller (2011:20) showed examples of variations 1 and 4 in the above list.

Agnew & Co., Pittsburgh (1877-1893)

The firm was called Agnew & Co. by at least the end of 1877. At that point, the factory was “located in Baldwin township, near the village of Mount Oliver.” The plant made “prescription bottles exclusively, and have two furnaces, with eleven pots. One, with six pots, is in operation, employing eighteen blowers, and altogether about seventy men and boys.” (Crockery and Glass Journal 1877:20).

By 1878, the younger Agnew had dropped his father’s name. At that point, the firm had two factories at 153 First Ave., making flint bottles. The plants had two furnaces and worked a total of 11 pots (Crockery and Glass Journal 1876:15). The firm made “flint glass, vials and bottles” in 1879 at “six large double mouth patent pots” – the equivalent of eight normal pots (Brick, Pottery, and Glass Journal 1879:116). The factory claimed that it made virtually all types of bottles. Although the firm had opened a plant at Hulton, Pennsylvania earlier, it had closed the Pittsburgh operation by 1893 (Hawkins 2009:18).

\[3\]

McKearin & McKearin (1941:604) placed Agnew’s son in charge alone in 1876. Toulouse (1971:33) and Creswick (1987:4, 278) claimed the same date, almost certainly following the McKearins. A major problem with writing history is dealing with gaps. If the last listing for Agnew & Son was 1876, and the first for Agnew & Co. was 1878, which date do you choose?
Containers and Marks

AGNEW & CO. (1877-ca. 1894)

Toulouse (1969:16; 1971:40) illustrated a wax-sealer fruit jar with “‘AGNEW & CO.’ in a circle” on the base. He dated the jar at “circa 1876-82.” Roller (1983:6) also described the jar with the full wording and noted that it was made “c. 1880s-1890s by Agnew & Co. and the Agnew Co., Ltd., Pittsburgh and Hulton, Pa.”

Creswick (1987:3) illustrated a jar embossed “AGNEW & CO (arch) / {number} / PAT APL FOR / 1887 (all horizontal) / PITTSBURG (inverted arch)” on the base and noted four minor variations in wording along with numbers 1-6 and 9 also on the bases (Figure 9). The first three variations spelled PITTSBURG with no “H”, but the final one (accompanied by the “9”) used the PITTSBURGH spelling. She dated the jars “circa 1887.” Creswick’s four variations were all embossed AGNEW & CO (arch) / {number} followed by:

1. / PAT APL FOR / 1887 (all horizontal) / PITTSBURG (inverted arch)⁴
2. / PAT² APL FOR / 1887 (all horizontal) / PITTSBURG (inverted arch)
3. / PAT APL² FOR / 1887 (all horizontal) / PITTSBURG (inverted arch)
4. / PAT APL FOR / 1887 (all horizontal) / PITTSBURGH (inverted arch) [Note “H” in “PITTSBURGH”]

Numbers ranged from 1 through 6. A final variation included the numeral 9 and the “H” spelling of PITTSBURGH. All versions of the mark were found on grooved-ring wax-sealer fruit jars. There are problems with Creswick’s description that we have attempted to resolve here. Although she did not include any numbers on the first three variations, the number “6” appeared in her drawing of the first variation (listed as #1 above). She also did not include the patent information (PAT APL FOR) in the fourth variation (possibly due to poor embossing).

---

⁴ Some of these variations may have only been misreadings of poorly embossed bases.
These numerical mold codes have the potential as a dating source. Lockhart et al. (2011) hypothesized the use of sequential mold codes on export beer bottles. It seems likely that the same type of sequencing appeared on most if not all numbered molds. In this case, there may have been sequential molds from 1 to 9. Many of the bases shown in photos have completely illegible numbers. Those could be numbers 7 and 8.

Dating with mold codes should be applied with caution, however. For example, Agnew may have ordered molds numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4 initially. During slow times, No. 2 may have been used extensively, while the others sat on the shelf. When it wore out, it was replaced by No. 5. Since No. 5 was new, the blowers preferred it and used it as the primary mold until No. 5 wore out, when it was replaced by No. 6. Then business picked up, and all four molds were used again. Now, most jars made with No. 5 were older than most made by No. 2, 3, and 4. Despite this disclaimer, it is very likely that mold No. 9 was used much later than mold No. 1.

Roller (1997) quoted the *American Pottery & Glassware Reporter*, June 16, 1887 – almost certainly describing the Patent Applied For jar:

> Agnew & Co. . . . have a big demand for their improved standard fruit jar and are working steadily on them. They make the whole jar, including ring, in one piece and this effects [sic] a saving of time and labor. The fastening of the cap is a simple and effective device, involving no trouble whatever, and insuring [sic] perfect security for the contents. They have applied for a patent on their improvements.

Page 94 of the 1894 catalog of the Agnew Co., Ltd., also offered “Agnew’s Improved Standard Fruit Jar” made of flint glass in quart and half-gallon sizes. The catalog noted that “this jar is made of the same thickness of glass throughout, and will stand the heating and filling much better than the old style standard jar.” The photo in the catalog is clearly the jar with the 1887 patent application date. Roller (2011:19) illustrated an ad for the same jar from the February 26, 1896, edition of *China, Glass and Lamps*. Roller (1997) also listed continual advertisements for the Improved Standard jar throughout the period. The jar was almost certainly made by the Agnew firm from 1887 to the close of the Hulton plant in 1900.
Roller (2011:19) also explained that the older (1983) edition of the book was in error in stating that the “groove was formed by pressing down on the blowpipe while the glass was still hot.” The 2011 Roller editors noted that “there is every indication the mouth was molded by the mold, as the mold seam continues to the ground lip of the jar” (Figure 10). They further noted that the jar was made in a three-piece mold (dip mold with two hinged side molds to form the shoulder). The horizontal shoulder seam is clearly visible in Figure 11.

The Roller editors (2011:19) also called attention to the similarity between the Agnew jar and the “OK” jar (Figure 12). We have attributed the OK jar to the Aetna Glass Works (see the Aetna/Arsenal Glass Works section) due to the three-piece mold and tapered shoulder. Although there are similarities between these two jars, we continue to emphasize the similarity between the OK jar and other Aetna Glass Works Triumph and Union jars. However, the design relationship between the OK and the Agnew jars cannot be ignored and should be addressed by future research.

Toulouse (1969:16) also found what he thought might be a solution. He noted that “a similar wax sealer [to the Agnew & Co. jar] was patented Sept. 18, 1860.” Unfortunately, he did not list the patent in his patent section. The only jar-related patent we could find for that date was Patent No. 30,036, issued to R. Hemingray for

---

5 The information originally came from Toulouse (1969:16).
a “Mold for Glass Jars.” The jar in the drawing is superficially similar to the Agnew jars, but the device was a hinged, two-piece mold with a ring mold to make the finish (Figure 13). Toulouse was in error; this was not related to the Agnew jar.

We differ in opinion from the Roller (2011:19) description in one small particular. The patent applied for section of the base is noted as “PAT\textsuperscript{D} APL\textsuperscript{D} FOR.” The central base embossing (including the patent part) is indistinct in all photos we have seen. However the superscript “\textsuperscript{D}” in “APL\textsuperscript{D}” is visible in the photos (Figure 14). The “\textsuperscript{D}” in “PAT\textsuperscript{D}” is not visible, and we consider it unlikely. The “PAT\textsuperscript{D}” abbreviation usually indicates the word “PATENTED” – while the word in “PATENT APPLIED FOR” lacks the “ED” making the word past tense. Of course, it is possible that “PAT\textsuperscript{D}” was an engraver’s error.

The Pittsburg/Pittsburgh spelling is intriguing as is the story behind it. According to Hawkins (personal communication, 2006):

The “h” in Pittsburgh has a great history. Pittsburgh and many other Pennsylvania towns originally had the “h.” On December 23, 1891 the “h” was dropped from all towns by a mandate from the U.S. Board of Geographic Names in order to standardize spellings. After 20 years of work, the people of Pittsburgh were able to get the “h” officially back on July 11, 1911.

However, Hawkins also noted that some early bottles were made without the “h” spelling. He added, “I personally believe that sometimes the ‘h’ was left off to save money.”
Agnew Co., Ltd., Hulton, Pennsylvania (1880-1893)

Agnew & Co., now a limited company, opened a new plant (the Oakmont Glass Works) ca. 12 miles up the Allegheny River at Hulton, Pennsylvania (earlier known as Hulton Station) in mid-April 1880. The plant made wines, brandies, flasks and prescription bottles in flint glass only by 1884. Although the factory was auctioned to H.T. Wallace on August 20, 1885, Agnew continued to direct the operation. By 1893, the company closed down the Pittsburgh offices and relocated everything to Hulton. In December, the firm name became the Agnew Co. (*Crockery & Glass Journal* 1884:12; Hawkins 2009:18-19).

The Agnew Co., Ltd., Hulton, Pennsylvania, produced a catalog in 1894 (Editors of the *Pyne Press* 1972:71-101). Roller (1983:6) also illustrated an ad that indicated that “Ltd.” remained in advertisements until at least 1894, although the company had changed its name in December of the previous year.

The Agnew Co., Ltd., Hulton, Pennsylvania (1893-1900)

With a new incorporation, the company became the Agnew Co. in December 1893, even though the 1894 catalog was published using the Agnew & Co., Ltd., name. In 1897, the plant had “one furnace, 11-pots in operation on flint prescriptions, flasks, brandies, beer bottles, milk bottles, pickle ware, etc.” (Figure 15). By 1898, the number of pots had increased to 12. The factory was sold at auction on June 2, 1900. After that, the plant may have been idle until it was operated briefly by the Oakmont Glass Co. in 1903 (Hawksins 2009:19; *National Glass Budget* 1897a:4; 1897b:7; 1898:7). There is no evidence that either Hulton plant used any form of logo on glass products. See Table 1 for a summary of the Agnew firms.

Figure 15 – Sample of flasks from the 1894 Hulton catalog (Pyne Press 1972:75-76)
Table 1 – The Agnew Companies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chambers &amp; Agnew, Pittsburgh</td>
<td>ca. 1843-ca. 1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Agnew &amp; Co., Pittsburgh</td>
<td>ca. 1852-1868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnew &amp; Wilcox, Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1868-1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Agnew &amp; Son, Pittsburgh</td>
<td>1872-ca. 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnew &amp; Co., Pittsburgh</td>
<td>ca. 1878-1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnew Co., Ltd., Hulton, PA</td>
<td>1880-1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Agnew Co., Ltd., Hulton, PA</td>
<td>1893-1900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion and Conclusions

It is pretty certain that most of the products made in Agnew family glass houses were not marked with any company identification. With the exception of Agnew & Wilcox, there is no conclusive evidence that any of the Agnew firms used a mark for any containers except wax-sealer fruit jars embossed with the entire company name. The discussion below is in alphabetical order rather than the order listed in the text above.

A

Although this mark is enigmatic, we have found no attribution for this single letter except to Adams & Co. (1861-1891) or perhaps one of the Agnew companies, probably John Agnew & Son (1872-1876). The mark has only been reported in the literature on grooved-ring, wax-sealer fruit jars (one also embossed John Agnew & Co.), at least one colorless medicinal bottle, and at least one pumpkinseed flask. Of these, one jar was certainly made by an Agnew factory, the flask was very likely manufactured by the American Glass Works at Richmond, Virginia (see that section), and the medicinal bottle manufacturer is unknown. The other wax-sealer jars are discussed further in the John Agnew & Son section below. The single “A” is not a common mark.6

6 This research supersedes the “A” attribution suggested in the Adams & Co. section.
Most sources attribute the “A&Co” mark on flasks to Adams & Co., and that is probably correct. With the exception of coffin flasks made by Agnew & Wilcox, the next flasks known to have been made an Agnew firm was the 1884 listing at the Hulton plant.

Knittle (1927:441), Toulouse (1971:33), and Jones (1966:15) all identified the mark as belonging to Agnew, but the later two just followed Knittle. Toulouse, at least, was cautious. All three researchers, however, are noted for guessing in their attributions of marks (e.g., Lockhart 2004). Griffenhagen and Bogard (1999:212) just copied the earlier sources. All this suggests that only Knittle actually identified Agnew as the user of the A&Co logo.

Although now almost 26 years old, McKearin and Wilson (1987:646, 650-651) remains one of the best sources for information on flasks. It is notable that they did not even consider Agnew & Co. as a possibility. Farnsworth & Walthall (2011:57) also came to the conclusion that Adams & Co. was the user of the mark. We therefore suggest that Adams & Co. was the only user of the “A&Co” logo.

The discovery of “A&W” embossed on a few bases and heels is apparently a recent discovery. We have only found the logo in Hawkins (2009:20-21). Since the containers appear to have been made in Pittsburgh, the Hawkins identification of Agnew & Wilcox (1868-1872) is almost certainly correct.

Two later marks are solidly identified. Both “AGNEW & SON” and “JOHN AGNEW & SON” were used on wax-sealer fruit jars sometime during the 1872-1878 period. Since these used the exact firm name, the user is in no doubt. Agnew & Co. also made a very different fruit jar beginning in 1887 (see next entry). It seems odd that the firm would take an almost ten year hiatus from fruit jar production. Assuming that the firm did manufacture fruit jars during the period, there are three possible explanations – all of which may have been correct at some point during the sequence.
First, Agnew & Co. may have continued to use the AGNEW & SON and JOHN AGNEW & SON molds until they wore out – without changing the name on the base. Second, the firm may have used molds with no company identification. Finally, the wax-sealer jars embossed only with the letter “A” may have been made during all or part of this period. It is highly likely that the plant used the old molds until they wore out, then elected one of the other two options.

AGNEW & CO.

The wax-sealer jars embossed “AGNEW & CO.” were the most solidly documented marked containers offered by any of the Agnew firms. The jars were advertised by the Pittsburgh plant in 1887 and continued to be listed by both Pittsburgh and Hulton factories until at least 1896. They were probably made until the plant closed in 1900.

The “PAT APP” FOR on the base requires some speculation. None of the sources listed a patent for these jars, our search has produced no results, and the Toulouse suggestion was clearly in error. It is highly likely that Agnew applied for a patent and was eventually rejected. The patent process can take years. We have recorded instances where a patent was finally issued almost a decade after the application. It is thus well within the realm of possibility that the Agnew application remained in limbo until at least 1896, and the factory continued the “PAT APP” FOR” embossing to discourage other glass houses from copying the jar. As far as we can determine, the patent office kept no records of rejected applications – or none have survived from the 19th century.
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