

486 EDWILL REVISITED

Eric Tankesley-Clarke



In the September, 2010, issue of the *Heisey Newsletter*, Walter published his own and other observations on the 486 Edwill pattern and illustrated a few of the pertinent pieces. That article got me thinking. (You may all groan at this point. I'll wait.) It reminded me of a piece that I can add to the list of extant Edwill items, and that is the half-gallon jug. I especially prize this piece, not just because it represents a hard-to-find pattern, but because I relish the sleek elegance of the contours. It is one piece I can hardly keep from caressing when I go by it, so I usually don't (keep from it) and do (caress it). Going back to the August, 2007, issue of the *Newsletter* that Walter pointed out, there is an illustration from Catalog 100 of the 485 Dunham jug (in the 3-pint size). The Dunham jug has the same graceful shape. The much-felt-up jug I have differs from the Dunham illustration only in having a low foot. It appears that the Edwill and Dunham nappies differ in exactly the same way, since we have the price

list and catalog illustrations to compare, so there's little doubt of the jug's pattern. At any rate, here are photos of the half-gallon 486 Edwill jug and a detail of its base. (I was careful to wipe the fingerprints off before taking the pictures.)

So, does the jug's appearance do anything to confirm the identities of the 8068 Shamel covered butter and Vogel's 7050 spoon? Not exactly; at best, it adds circumstantial evidence. Unlike the jugs and the nappies, both the butter and the spoon have shapes that differ from the corresponding Dunham pieces. What strikes me about the Vogel spoon is that its contours and foot echo, if not exactly imitate, the jug's shape—hardly confirmation, yet one step closer. But what about those lines at the base? Those apparent facets or flutes would be an odd bit of detailing not seen, as far as I know, in any comparable Heisey low foot. My guess is that either (a) the lines are intended to be shadow lines to emphasize the foot or (b) Vogel was showing reflections and refractions of the star bottom. I think (b) is more likely, and here is why. I was comparing the 397 Colonial Cupped Scallop covered sugar and spoon with Vogel's piece. I got them out because, besides having a similar sensuous silhouette that begs to be held (and I was tired of listening to their begging), they are just a few years older than 486 and have the same low foot that we see in the 486 jug and in the Vogel drawing of the 7050 spoon. When viewed from the side, straight on at foot level, each of these 397 pieces shows exactly the same lines in the foot that Vogel drew, and the illusion is due to the star on the bottom; the foot itself is smoothly rounded. (Looking at the 397 sugar and spoon makes me wonder whether the molds for these short-lived items might have been reworked for 486 Edwill. However, the 397 butter cover is too different for that treatment.) The 486 jug displays the illusion, too. I vote for Walter's first explanation, that the Vogel illustration is not true to the original piece, because of the apparent (but not real) lines derived from the star bottom. If the Vogel piece's foot has no flutes or lines, then it is exactly the same sort of foot that the jug has and is almost certainly 486. It makes perfect sense that the butter, footed the same way, should have softened lines to complement the spoon, which the rounded knop achieves. While I'm guessing, I'll guess that there

are more 486 Edwill pieces afoot in collections now, just unrecognized.

Vital Statistics

486 Edwill jug, ½-gal.: Height (to lowest point on rim), 6¼"; height (to highest point on rim), 7⅝"; diameter of foot, 5¼". Star bottom, fire-polished. Marked.

*Some patterns don't beg, but pieces of Ed-will.
Can someone point me to them just so I can feel
them? Point at heisey@embarqmail.com.*