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Holz, Clark & Taylor and its successor, Holz & Clark, were very short-lived glass houses, in Salem, New Jersey. Despite the short span of operation, they produced a series of jars that has apparently confused researchers for years. We hope this study will alleviate some of the confusion.

History

Holz, Clark & Taylor, Salem, New Jersey (1866-1867; 1867-1871)
Holz & Clark, Salem, New Jersey (1871-1872)

Born in Baden, Germany, William A. Holz was a butcher at Salem, New Jersey. Two brothers from Austria, Andrew E. Taylor, a merchant, and John Taylor, a cabinet maker, shared his dwelling according to the county census of 1860. By 1870, Andrew Taylor was living at another address, but Gilbert S. Clark had joined the Holz household. Although we have found no earlier information for Clark, Holz, Andrew Taylor, and Clark pooled their resources to form Holz, Clark & Taylor in early 1866. The plant was operational by September, probably in response to an increased demand for glassware after the close of the Civil War. The plant closed by mid-December, because the owners were unable to find customers for their wares. It is very likely that the high reputation of the Salem Glass Works, opened in 1863, crushed competition from Holz, Clark & Taylor (Marshall & McDonald n.d.).

1 Toulouse (1971:133) noted the founding of the company in 1862; Ridley refuted that, stating that 1862 marked the beginning of the Salem Glass Works, the initial plant in Salem. Holz, Taylor & Clark began in 1866. Pepper (1971:207) claimed 1863 as the beginning year. Toulouse (1971:133, 217) also claimed that Holz started the company and was later joined by Taylor and Clark.
Holz, Clark & Taylor reopened in April 1867. At some point during 1871, Andrew Taylor left the business, and the firm became known as the Holz & Clark Glass Factory. The company announced its closing on September 27, 1872. Holz moved to Chicago, and Clark relocated to Manhattan (Marshall & Mcdonald n.d.).

Toulouse (1971:135) stated that John Gayner leased the Broadway Glass Works from Holz, Clark & Taylor, a contention echoed by Pepper (1971:207). Marshall & McDonald, however, noted that Gayner did not lease or buy the Holz & Clark company as reported by Toulouse. The plants were at different locations. A local company, Prior & Lambert, purchased the former Holz & Clark plant at sheriff’s auction and used it as a warehouse until July 1879. John W. Gayner bought the building at that time and reopened it as the Gayner Glass Works (Marshall & McDonald n.d.; Toulouse 1971:217). Also see the section on the Gayner Glass Works.

Containers and Marks

According to a Holz, Clark & Taylor letterhead, the company made porter and ale bottles (apparently without manufacturer’s marks), although its main product was Mason jars in pint, quart, and half-gallon sizes.

**HOLZ CLARK & TAYLOR and SALEM JAR (1871-1872)**

Toulouse (1969:153) listed a jar with internal threads for a “glass-faced, metal screw stopper” that was embossed on the body with “HOLZ CLARK & TAYLOR (arch) / SALEM, N J (horizontal)” and “PAT / APPLIED / FOR” on the base. Toulouse (1971:134) noted that “the Holz, Clark & Taylor jar may have been made for a short time after the 1885 date of Gayner’s own plant, but he soon replaced it with more modern jars.” Creswick (1987:85) illustrated the jar and dated it ca. 1871-1880 (Figure 1). The stoppers for all these jars were the ones patented by Taylor and Hodgetts in 1871.

---

2 According to the Roller editors (2011:461), the factory was called the Broadway Glass Works – operated by Holz, Clark & Taylor.
The “HOLZ CLARK & TAYLOR” mark also appeared on similar jars that were embossed “THE / SALEM / JAR” on the reverse – still with “PATENT / APPLIED / FOR” on the base (Toulouse 1969:153). Roller (1983:326) listed this jar as made by the company between ca. 1871 and 1879 (Figures 2 & 3). Creswick (1987:188-189) illustrated the jar both with and without the “HOLZ CLARK & TAYLOR” mark (Figure 4). Roller (2011:461) treated all variations the same and dated them ca. 1871-1879. Ken Ridley (personal communication September 27, 2005) speculated that the Salem Jars with no manufacturer’s name on the reverse side were made during the Holz & Clark Glass Co. period (ca. 1871-1872).

**Stoppers**

Toulouse (1969:153) discussed the internal-threaded stopper and suggested that it was made to the Taylor and Hodgetts 1871 patent (see below). Roller (2011:461) listed two types of internal-thread stoppers associated with these jars. One was embossed “Wm GRANGE & SON 711 N 2ND ST PHILA” – but Jerry McCann cautioned that there was no evidence that the stopper was original to the jar (Figure 5). Photos from North American Glass, however, frequently paired the Grange stopper with Salem and Salem-plus-
Holz-Clark-&-Taylor markings. Other stoppers had no embossing, although both variations were obviously the same style (Figure 6).

Creswick (1987:188-189), too, identified the Taylor & Hodgetts 1871 patent as being the one for the stopper. She also mentioned Wm. Grange & Son in connection with the Salem jar (without the Holz, Clark & Taylor name). She noted that the firm was listed in the Philadelphia city directories from 1845 to 1885 as a china store and that there must have been some connection between Wm. Grange & Son and Holz, Clark & Taylor. A ceramic jar made for Wm. Grange & Son identified the firm as “Queensware Dealers” (earthenware ceramics) and showed that they preferred to have the firm name on items (Figure 7). The firm was obviously a retail outlet and likely a jobber in tableware.

**Taylor & Hodgetts 1871 Patent**

William Taylor and Charles Hodgetts received Patent No. 117,236 on July 18, 1871, for an “Improvement in Caps for Preserve-Jars” and assigned the rights to Louis R. Boyd (Toulouse 1971:134). Unfortunately, the patent document failed to list the date that Taylor and Hodgetts applied for the patent (Figure 8). The story, however, is much more involved. William Taylor and Charles Hodgetts originally applied for a patent for this same stopper on March 26 1856. The patent was rejected on April 16, 1856, and withdrawn April 22 of that year. There was conflicting testimony in an 1886 lawsuit –
Consolidated Fruit Jar v. Bellaire Stamping Co. – as to whether Taylor & Hodgetts, tinsmiths from 1855 to the death of Taylor in April 1874, ever actually made any of the stoppers. They may have manufactured some of these closures in 1855 and 1856, but – as previously noted – that is unclear (West Publishing Co. 1886:377-379). In any event, the ones they made would have been of metal instead of glass.

Meanwhile, Lewis R Boyd received Patent No 88,439 on March 30, 1869, “for substantially the same invention.” On January 7, 1871, however, S.D. Cozzens, Boyd’s attorney, filed to renew the Taylor and Hodgetts patent – without their authority. Boyd purchased the rights from Taylor and Hodgetts in June 1871, Cozzens received the authority to reapply, and Taylor and Hodgetts received the patent (assigned to Boyd) in July 1871 – as noted above (West Publishing Co. 1886:377).

Despite the wording of the courts, the Boyd patent was for a glass “cap or plate” held by a crimp to the top of a metal screw lid. The original Taylor and Hodgets patent included a metal covering for their glass closure, but that was deleted from the 1871 patent. It is thus clear that the Salem jar was made to the Taylor and Hodgetts patent. Boyd probably only purchased the patent to protect his glass insert and metal cap design – rather than the shape of the closure. Roller (2011:349, 351, 353), for example, noted the patent in Mason jar contexts with Boyd caps. Even though Marshall & McDonald (n.d.) suggested ca. 1870 as a possible date for the earliest jars – based on the “PAT / APPLIED / FOR” basal embossing – the jars were probably not made prior to the June 1871 renewal application.

We have not discovered any relationship between William Taylor (the inventor) and Andrew Taylor (of Holz, Clark & Taylor) nor any connection between either Taylor or Hodgetts and the firm of Holz, Clark & Taylor. Since Taylor and Hodgetts assigned their patent to Lewis R. Boyd, the story is even more involved – although we have also not discovered a connection between Boyd and the firm. It may be as simple as Holz, Clark and Taylor making the jars with a per-jar royalty going to Boyd, or they may have purchased the closures from Boyd.
Marshall and McDonald (n.d.) provided a probable chronology for the jars, correcting the earlier Toulouse and Roller dates (Table 1). They originally suggested ca. 1870 for the jar with no “SALEM” embossing, but we have adjusted that to 1871 based on the above discussion.

Table 1 – Holz, Clark & Taylor Jar Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jar Embossing</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOLZ CLARK &amp; TAYLOR</td>
<td>Holz, Clark &amp; Taylor</td>
<td>ca. 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLZ CLARK &amp; TAYLOR / THE SALEM JAR</td>
<td>Holz, Clark &amp; Taylor</td>
<td>ca. 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE / SALEM / JAR</td>
<td>Holz &amp; Clark</td>
<td>ca. 1871-1872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE / SALEM JAR (2 lines)</td>
<td>Gayner Glass Works</td>
<td>ca. 1879-1880+*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* We have not discovered an example of this jar in any other source.

**HC&T** (late 1870s)

Toulouse (1969) and Creswick (1987) missed this mark, although Roller (1983:238; 2011:359) noted that these jars may have mold identifier numerals between MASON’S and PATENT. He dated the jars to the late 1870s. They are found on jars embossed “MASON’S (arch) / PATENT / NOV. 26TH / 1854 (all horizontal). Antique Bottles.net provide a photo (Figure 10).

**Discussion and Conclusions**

Although the date ranges for the jars are probably accurate, some mysteries remain. First, we must wonder why all of the bases for three generations of jars were still embossed “PAT / APPLIED / FOR.” Of course, those three generations only encompassed a two-year period, so the baseplates from the original molds may never have been altered. It seems virtually certain that the words “THE / SALEM / JAR” were added to the original Holz, Clark & Taylor molds, but none of the sources mentioned ghosting on the Salem Jars without the Holz, Clark & Taylor designation. If that were the third generation in the series (which seems likely), there should have been some trace of the old markings – assuming, of course, that the same molds were used a third time. Since every example of the Salem Jar we can find still has the Pat
Applied For baseplate, it seems likely that the jars were still made in the same molds. Is it possible that no one has looked for ghosting on the reverse sides? If there is no evidence of peening or other removal processes, the mold shop must have been very good.

The two-year life span of these jars is further supported by their rarity. McCann (2016:301-302) valued the jars in the $1,500-2,000 range, noting that they were “not available.” Leybourne (2014:200, 408) valued the Salem jars at “$1,250 & Up,” with the ones embossed only “HOLZ CLARK & TAYLOR” slightly higher.

Although Marshall and McDonald listed a jar embossed “THE / SALEM JAR” in two lines, we have been unable to find an example or even a reference to the jar. In our study of the Gayner Glass Works, we did not discover a Salem Jar made by the firm.

William Grange & Son is also worth discussing. Although Creswick noted that the firm was located in Philadelphia, none of the sources understood the connection between Grange, William Boyd (the owner of the patent), and Holz, Clark & Taylor. It seems obvious that William Grange & Son carried the jars as part of their inventory; otherwise, they would not have had the firm name embossed on the stopper top. Ordering the jars from Holz, Clark & Taylor for their own use is probably the simplest answer to the connection question. The relationship between William Boyd and Holz, Clark & Taylor, however, is not as clear cut – although the glass house may simply have leased the rights from Boyd or bought the lids from him.

Although their life was brief, the jars had an interesting history and mystery. They are a good example of a developmental sequence, and they deserve their place in the historic record.
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