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The Hamilton Glass Works opened in 1864 at Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, and made a general line of products that included druggists’ ware, target balls, fruit jars, and ink bottles. The firm reorganized in 1880 as the Hamilton Glass Co., absorbing the Burlington Glass Co. in 1885. Hamilton, in turn, became part of the Diamond Glass Co. in 1891, and Diamond closed the plant in 1898.

Histories

Hamilton Glass Works, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada (1864-1880)

John Winer, Lyman Moore, and George Rutherford were all druggists at Hamilton, Ontario. Winer and Moore established Winer, Moore & Co. – wholesale and retail drugs – in 1857. By 1862, Winer had taken on the retail establishment, and J. Winer & Co. had included Rutherford. The three decided to produce their own bottles and conscripted Nathan B. Gatchell, a former partner in the Lancaster Glass Works, Lancaster, New York. Gatchell, Moore, and Winer formed Gatchell, Moore & Co. and established the Hamilton Glass Works at Hamilton in 1864. George E. Tuckett & Co. (George E. Tuckett and John Billings) bought into the firm by 1865, although George Rutherford purchased the Tuckett share the following year – the operating firm then being called Rutherford & Co.

Although the full range of glass produced is currently unknown, the plant made druggists’ bottles, fruit jars, and ink bottles and was offering private molds (i.e., molds exclusively for a specific customer) by 1869. Rutherford & Co. continued as the operating company until the firm reorganized as the Hamilton Glass Co. in 1880 (King 1987:56-58; Toulouse 1971:242-243).
Containers and Marks

King (1987:60) illustrated fragments of five fruit jars, one ink bottle (Figure 1), and one target ball – embossed “RUTHERFORD & Co.” (Figure 2) – that were found on the Hamilton Glass Co. property in 1970 and 1971. It is apparent from the various sources (see below) that the Hamilton plants did not use a logo on most of their products, including druggists’ bottles; apparently only specific brands of fruit jars identify the firm.

THE GEM (1870s-ca. 1883)

Toulouse (1969:126-129) listed a jar embossed “THE GEM / RUTHERFORD & Co.” that he dated ca. 1873, when George Rutherford became president (Figures 3 & 4). The glass lid was embossed “RUTHERFORD & Co. (arch) / HAMILTON, ONT. (inverted arch).” A similar jar – “GEM / RUTHFORD & Co.” – he dated ca. 1885, giving no reason for the second date (Figure 5). According to King (57-58), however, Rutherford was one of the owners of Hamilton from the beginning (1864), but the operating firm became Rutherford & Co. in 1866. Roller (1983:133-134, 136) agreed with the Rutherford Gem as a product of Hamilton from ca. 1870s to 1880s and noted a total of seven variations.
Creswick (1987a:69-70) illustrated five variations of the Rutherford Gem, dating them all to the 1865-1895 period of Hamilton (Figure 6). King (1987:60) illustrated fragments of the Gem fruit jar that included the blowover section that was wetted off and ground down. These were found on the Hamilton property in 1970/1971 (Figure 7). See the sections on the Diamond and Dominion Glass Companies for more discussion about the Canadian “Gem” jars and the Hero Glass Works section for more about Gem jars made in the U.S. The Roller update (2011:210) noted that the “GEM” had a smaller mouth than “THE GEM” and that “THE GEM” had both large- and small-letter versions as well as one with no serifs that Jerry McCann suggested “appears to be an American made mold that had RUTHERFORD & Co added to it.” Lids for all of these were embossed “RUTHERFORD & Co HAMILTON, ONT.” A final variation was only embossed “THE GEM” and had a lid embossed “HAMILTON GLASS Co. HAMILTON ONT.” This suggests that the “Rutherford” jars and lids were made during the Hamilton Glass Works period, with similar jars made for a very short time after the change to Hamilton Glass Co.

**HAMILTON GLASS WORKS** (ca. 1864-1880)

Toulouse (1969:141) described a jar embossed “HAMILTON / GLASS WORKS” on the front and “CLAMP JAR / ½ GAL.” on the reverse (Figure 8). The lid was embossed “HAMILTON (arch) / GLASS WORKS (inverted arch)” and was held in place by a cast-iron yoke and thumb screw (Figure 9). Toulouse (1969:142) added a second variation embossed
“HAMILTON (slight arch) / No. 3 (horizontal) / GLASS WORKS (slight inverted arch)” on the front (Figure 10). He dated both variations ca. 1865-1873.

Roller (1983:148) also listed both variations as well as one embossed “HAMILTON / GLASS WORKS” on the body and “1 QUART” on the front heel (Figure 11). He noted that the Toulouse second variation could have a “1” or other numbers in the center. Roller dated all of the jars ca. 1860s, made, of course, by the Hamilton Glass Works. He also said that some of the lids were unembossed and that some finishes for both jar types were made for corks. He continued:

The cork-closure jars cannot be mistaken for the clamp-closure jars . . . they have a stopperwell finish, while the clamp-closure jars have a circular trough on the lip to hold a gasket (Figure 12).
Creswick (1987a:78-79) illustrated 12 variations of jars embossed HAMILTON GLASS WORKS – including No. 1-No. 4, cork and clamp finishes, and an error on the “CLAMP JAR” that says “OLAMP JAR” (Figures 13 & 14). She dated them all ca. 1866, and noted that they were made by the Hamilton Glass Works, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. Henny M. Guild applied for a patent for a “Preserve-Jar Fastening” on June 26, 1885. He received Patent No. 335,444 on February 2, 1886 (Figure 15). Creswick also noted that Guild received Patent No. 335,445 on the same day as his other jar patent (February 2, 1866) – for a wire handle for the jar. Guild applied for the patent on July 1 of the previous year – a week after he applied for the jar patent. We found no examples of the handle being used by Hamilton. King (1987:60) illustrated two examples of fruit jars embossed “HAMILTON / GLASS WORKS” that were found on the Hamilton property in 1970/1971 (Figure 16).

The Roller update (2011:229) added (from Jerry McCann) that the numbers on the jars indicated size: No. 1 = Imperial pint; No. 2 = quart; No. 3 = half-gallon; and No. 4 = Imperial half-
gallon and that these “are thought to be the oldest of Canadian made jars.” The lids were also embossed with the corresponding numbers (e.g., HAMILTON No. 1 GLASS WORKS). The jars embossed “1 QUART” or “½ GAL.” had lids embossed either “HAMILTON GLASS WORKS” or with no embossing (Figure 17). The update agreed that the jars were made in the 1860s.

A North American Glass photo showed an example unlisted in any of the sources. It was embossed “HAMILTON (arch) / N1 / GLASS WORKS (inverted arch)” – without the “o” in “No” (Figure 18). In addition, both Hamilton No. 3 jars and both Hamilton “1 Quart” jars in North American Glass photos have distinct horizontal shoulder seams – the kind made by three- or four-piece molds (e.g., see Figure 11). These were generally used earlier than two-piece molds, although how that fits into this situation is unclear.
The firm incorporated as the Hamilton Glass Co. on January 14, 1880. Rutherford was the president, with Moore as vice president and managing director and Brooks as manager of the plant. Although Winer was a director, he left the firm in the early 1880s. The company purchased the nearby Burlington Glass Co. in 1885, almost certainly to eliminate the competition. In so doing, it added flint (colorless) bottles to the inventory. The original plant made “green and coloured glass bottles, telegraph insulators, etc.” at one seven-pot furnace and one five-pot furnace in 1886 – working 150 men and boys. The Diamond Glass Co. absorbed Hamilton in 1891, but the plant apparently continued to function under its own name until Diamond shut down the factory in 1898 (King 1987:56-61; Toulouse 1971:242-443). The plant was still listed under the Hamilton name in 1897 and 1898, when it used 17 pots to make its products (National Glass Budget 1897:7; 1898:7).

Containers and Marks

As noted above, Hamilton apparently only used a few brand names on jars to indicate its products. We have found no logo that was generally used by the firm.

CROWN (ca. 1880s)

King (1987:60) reproduced drawings by Jack Kingdon of what he called the “no dot” crown fruit jar as one that was found on the Hamilton property in 1970-1971 (Figures 19 & 20). This was most likely the first of all the Crown jars that eventually became the standard for the Diamond and Dominion Glass Companies. These were probably made in the early 1880s. By some point after 1883, the North American Glass Co. (later to become Diamond Glass) took over the brand, possibly sold by

1 For more information about the Burlington Glass Co., see the section on the Belleville Glass Co.
Hamilton (see the section on Diamond Glass Co. – Canada – for much more on Crown jars. The Roller update (2011:148) added that some glass lids found on Crown jars were embossed “HAMILTON GLASS CO HAMILTON ONT” – although the editors did not specify which variations had the Hamilton lids.

This identification needs to be qualified. The presence of specific fragments on any site is not conclusive evidence that the bottles or jars were made there. Glass houses used culet (broken glass) to feed new pots or batch changes. They used such glass from other firms as well as their own. Thus, these fragments could have been made by any other factory at Hamilton or even farther away. However, the greater the number of fragments, the more likely that the jar or bottle was used at the factory on that site. Unfortunately, King did not report the quantities of any of the fragments discussed here.

We should also note that factory breakage was often not cleaned up well and remained at the site when the factories closed. If the debris showed signs of imperfections or partial processing – such as the blowover shown in Figure 7 – then they are conclusive evidence that the products were manufactured in situ. Factory breakage is more difficult to ascertain, but it, too, indicates production at the site. Unfortunately, it is difficult to discern the correct categories for the Crown or Darling fragments.

Toulouse (1969:76-81) described 22 variations of crown jars, all marked with the word “CROWN” and illustrations of a crown. Roller (1983:95-96) dated Crown jars from ca 1867 to the 1920s and listed the Burlington Glass Works, Diamond Glass Co., Diamond Flint Glass Co., Dominion Glass Co., Hamilton Glass Works, and North American Glass Co., all Canadian companies, as makers. Creswick (1987a:36-37) listed and illustrated 14 variations of the Crown jars and also named a variety of makers. Unlike the others, she dated the jars from ca. 1867 to ca. 1967. In her second volume, Creswick (1987b:38-40) illustrated and listed a total of 21 variations of the Crown. Some of these, of course, were included in her initial volume. See the Diamond and Dominion Glass Co. sections for more information.
THE DARLING (ca. 1880-1889)

Toulouse (1969:88-89) described “THE DARLING” and “THE DARLING / IMPERIAL” but did not know the maker (Figures 21 & 22). Roller (1983:101) noted that the ADM monogram embossed above “THE DARLING” identified “Adam Darling, Montreal,” a Quebec jobber, as the seller of the jars. He, too, added the variation with “IMPERIAL” below “DARLING” but did not identify the maker for either jar. Creswick (1987a:42) identified both “THE DARLING” and “THE DARLING / IMPERIAL” as being made by Hamilton during the ca. 1880-1885 period (Figure 23).

King (1987:60) illustrated fragments of the Darling fruit jar that were found on the Hamilton property in 1970/1971 (Figure 24). As discussed above, this is our only connection between this jar and the Hamilton Glass Co. Although this is the best evidence we have, it is not conclusive. The Roller update (2011:159) added that the ADM monogram could have either double or single lines and that the pints all had narrow mouths. The editors also maintained that the maker was uncertain. King’s report of fragments found at the factory site, although not totally conclusive, strongly suggests that the Hamilton Glass Co. (or Works) was the manufacturer. Creswick did not explain her reasons for the 1880s date range, but we have tentatively agreed and placed the jars during the “Co.” period.
SAFETY VALVE – HG monogram in a triangle

Toulouse (1969:270-271) discussed four variations of the Safety Valve jars. He incorrectly assigned the jars to the Hamilton plant of the Diamond Glass Co., Diamond Flint Glass Co., and the Dominion Glass Co. from ca. 1895 to ca. 1930. Roller (1983:314-315) conclusively demonstrated (including illustrating a 1904 ad) that these jars were made exclusively by the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. (see the Hazel-Atlas section for a discussion).

Discussion and Conclusions

Like many of the early firms, the Hamilton Glass Works and its successor seem to have left their products generally unmarked by any identifying logo. We have only found jars that were indicative of the two firms, and those are described above.
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