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GLOSSARY

chalice: vessel used to hold sacred wine during communion service, comprised of a bowl, stem and foot.

calyx: separate part between bowl and stem of chalice.

cruet: usually smaller version of a flagon, often used interchangeably with "flagon".

flagon: vessel from which sacred wine is poured into chalice during communion service.

knop: swelled, central part of the stem of the chalice.

paten: plate used to sacred bread during communion service.

pseudo-hallmark: mark used on American silver to supplement maker's mark; but, unlike its English and Continental counterpart, it has no official significance.
ABSTRACT

In 1851 New York City-silversmith Francis W. Cooper began making Gothic Revival communion plate for the New York Ecclesiological Society, a group of Episcopalian clergy and laymen modelled on the Ecclesiological Society in London. The stylistic qualities of Cooper's communion plate were guided by the New York Ecclesiological Society's aesthetic and theological goals. Until its dissolution in 1855, the Society marshalled the skills of Francis W. Cooper and other New York craftsmen to produce novel Gothic Revival communion plate for Episcopal churches in the eastern United States. Evidence from Cooper's communion objects and the Society's publications clarifies the relationship between Cooper and his patron, aspects of the manufacturing process and important design sources.

Modelling itself on the Ecclesiological Society in England, the New York Society supervised the production of inexpensive and more costly Gothic Revival communion plate on behalf of individual donors and churches, who were assured that it adhered to "correct" principles of ecclesiology because it was produced by the Society's craftsmen. William Butterfield, architect of the English Society, established
the criteria for "correct" Gothic Revival communion plate in the Anglican and Episcopal community by interpreting early sixteenth-century models. Rather than create facsimiles of English ecclesiological plate, Cooper and the New York Society rearranged Butterfield's seminal designs, incorporating a few stylistic anomalies. Despite these departures from English ecclesiological plate, Cooper's work for the New York Society adheres to tenants of ecclesiology in its over-all form. This consistency within the forms masks their disparate levels of ornamentation and Cooper's use of different construction techniques.

Cooper continued to manufacture communion plate for Episcopal churches for at least twenty years after the New York Ecclesiological Society's dissolution in 1855. With few exceptions, Cooper's later communion pieces are less elaborate compressions of his work for the New York Ecclesiological Society. This stylistic stasis and his work's influence on later nineteenth-century communion plate illustrates the conservativism of their patrons and the seminal influence of the New York Ecclesiological Society on American ecclesiastical silver.
Chapter I. ECCLESIOLOGY—THE ENGLISH MODEL AND THE “PROPER FORM OF CHALICES”

In 1851, New York City silversmith Francis W. Cooper began making Gothic Revival communion plate for the New York Ecclesiological Society, a group of Episcopalian clergy modelled on the Ecclesiological Society in London, whose leaders were likewise clergy within the Church of England. The stylistic qualities of Cooper’s communion plate were guided by New York Ecclesiological Society’s aesthetic and theological goals. Until its dissolution in 1855, the Society marshalled the skills of Francis W. Cooper and other New York craftsmen to produce novel Gothic Revival communion plate for Episcopal churches in the eastern United States. Cooper’s role as craftsman and the New York Ecclesiological Society’s role as his patron contextualizes the use of design sources and subsequent formal qualities of Cooper’s work.

One of the most influential forces of the ecclesiological movement was the Cambridge Camden Society, founded in 1839 to promote ecclesiology, which it defined as “. . . the study of Christian Art and Antiques, . . . [and] the recognition of
correct principles and arrangement, and decoration of churches. . . ." The Cambridge Camden Society (later renamed the Ecclesiological Society) and the New York Ecclesiological Society attempted to elevate religious ritual by making all aspects of the ecclesiastical environment aesthetically distinct from the secular world. Once determined, these "correct principles" were never radically revised in contrast to the eclecticism evident in contemporary secular decorative arts.¹

The New York Ecclesiological Society looked to its counterpart in the Church of England to provide designs for its Gothic Revival communion plate. It also emulated the English Ecclesiological Society in its promotion and distribution of Cooper's work. Both societies controlled the design and execution of Gothic Revival communion plate by offering their "correct" and "approved" versions of it made by their own silversmiths and sold at what they considered to be fair prices. According to the English Ecclesiological Society and its architect, William Butterfield, the "proper shape of chalices" and other communion forms related to their ritual function. Butterfield called on the Ecclesiological Society to engage a silversmith to make "chalices in the ancient form," like this gold chalice at Corpus Christi College, Oxford hallmarked 1507 (fig. 1). Published by the Society in 1847, the first volume of Instrumenta
Ecclesiastica included Butterfield's interpretations of pre-Reformation chalices (fig. 2). Butterfield's chalices were specifically designed for "the reverent performance of Communion," because the they had a shallow, hemispherical-shaped bowl with a gilt interior surface, a large knop that the communicant could easily grasp and a broad, hexagonally-divided base that stabilized the chalice as it sat on the altar.²

The ecclesiologists' deference toward "ancient" models went beyond the models' formal and functional qualities and to include a nineteenth-century perception of medieval craftsmen's superior skills. According to Butterfield, "those [silversmiths] who [had] not seen any specimens of the exquisite grace and finish of the workmanship of ancient goldsmiths [could] scarcely form an idea of [their work's] perfection." Utilizing the skills of London silversmiths John and James Keith, the Ecclesiological Society served rural Anglican parishes as "a depot to which they [could] come with confidence of obtaining good workmanship and correctness of design and decoration." Parishes interested in acquiring its Gothic Revival communion plate were cautioned not to allow a local silversmith to reproduce Butterfield's designs, because (according to the Society) other silversmiths lacked the experience and tools to follow "ancient" models.³
Ironically, the New York Ecclesiological Society dutifully followed the designs and marketing techniques of its parent organization while finding its own silversmith—Francis W. Cooper—to reproduce Butterfield’s designs. Throughout the four year period that Cooper made communion plate for the Society, he was supervised by the Reverend John Henry Hopkins, Jr., a member of its Executive Committee. Hopkins’s enthusiastic involvement in communion plate production is evident in the Society’s last publication, *Transactions of the New York Ecclesiological Society, 1855*. Hopkins, as the sole identified contributor to the publication and Cooper’s supervisor, most likely wrote the last chapter entitled, “The Altar Plate of Trinity Chapel in the City of New York,” which included a lengthy description and illustrations of Cooper’s most elaborate communion set (fig. 3, 4, 5). Past scholarship has taken its ornateness as representative of all of Cooper’s ecclesiastical silver. However, his work for the Society included simpler sets, designed to appeal to less affluent parishes who could afford the same style of communion plate but without the elaborate chasing and enamelling included in this set.4

The English Society took a disparaging view of Cooper’s work, although it knew of its American counterpart’s venture into communion plate production and sent Butterfield’s unpublished designs to New York. After the publication of lithographs
(fig. 4, 5) of Cooper’s footed paten and chalice from the Trinity Chapel set, the English Society patronizingly hoped for greater improvement. In its opinion “the execution [of these pieces was] coarse, and the style of art, in the figures and subjects, far from first-rate,” ironic criticism given that Henry P. Horlor, the enameller/engraver who was responsible for the “coarse execution” of the figurative ornament, had worked for the Ecclesiological Society before immigrating to New York. More likely, the set’s stylistic anomalies—such as its extensive gadrooning—set Cooper’s work apart from Butterfield’s designs for communion plate and consequently provoked the Ecclesiological Society’s criticism. While Butterfield’s “approved” designs provided the main blue print for Cooper’s communion plate, elements of Butterfield’s designs were freely combined with quotes from Pugin’s ecclesiastical metalwork designs.5

In 1851, when Cooper began making communion plate under Hopkins’s supervision, neither they nor the Society could have foreseen this operation’s growth over the next four years. Francis W. Cooper, under Hopkins’ supervision, produced thirty-five pieces in the first year. By the Society’s own estimation, two years later, “upwards of ten thousand dollars worth [of communion plate had] been prepared from designs and under the inspection of [Hopkins].” By the time of the Society’s last meeting 1855, while the elaborate
Trinity Chapel was being made, "over twenty thousand dollars worth of plate" had been commissioned from Cooper on behalf of American Episcopal parishes.  

Despite profligate growth in the amount of communion plate Cooper produced for the New York Ecclesiological Society, it never had enough resources to participate in an international exhibition like its English counterpart. In 1851, the English Society displayed fourteen communion objects in the Great Exhibition in London, which were later illustrated in the second volume of *Instrumenta Ecclesiastica* (fig. 6). Produced by its silversmiths, John and James Keith, from Butterfield's designs, the communion plate won a medal from the Royal Commissioners and "first and second prizes for best specimens of workmanship by the Goldsmiths' Company of London." About two years later, the New York Society displayed a communion set "at one of the large Broadway silversmiths, . . . [where it was]. . . pronounced to be one of the best and most beautiful ever seen." Unfortunately, the New York Society was "unable to have a set prepared for the exhibition at the Crystal Palace . . ." in New York that year, because its " . . . work-people [i.e. Cooper and their other craftsmen] . . . were poor, and so [was the Society], and no order was received which would admit the delay which would necessarily result from placing the vessels in the Exhibition."  

6
In 1855, after the dissolution of the New York Ecclesiological Society, F. W. Cooper continued to produce "communion plate of the most approved and varied patterns, in true ecclesiastical style" for Episcopal churches in until at least 1879. While seemingly free from the Society's control, Cooper's communion plate made in the years after 1855 showed little stylistic change. Cooper incorporated the same iconography onto the same basic forms with few changes to the proportions of his pre-1855 communion plate. However, many of these later pieces are distinguished by a lighter gauge of silver, simpler engraving, and often little or no enamelling. As less elaborate interpretations of the "true ecclesiastical style" set by the New York Ecclesiological Society, these communion objects served as less expensive, but equally appropriate, versions of Cooper's earlier sets. This stylistic stasis speaks to his patrons' conservativism and the lingering power of the New York Ecclesiological Society within the American Episcopal Church throughout the second half of the nineteenth century.⁸


8. After the last volume of the *New York Ecclesiologist* was published in December, 1853, the Society decided to publish annual volumes of *Transactions of the New York Ecclesiological Society*, which it succeeded in doing only for the year 1855. This final publication contains no information as to why the organization discontinued its quarterly meetings after April, 1855. New York Ecclesiological Society, *Transactions of the New York Ecclesiological Society, 1855*, (New York: Daniel Dana, 1857), p. 17. Stanton, pp. 159-161. Brown, pp. 74-79.
Chapter II. THE NEW YORK ECCLESIOLOGISTS AND FRANCIS W. COOPER, 1851-1855

In 1851, the New York Ecclesiological Society named the Reverend John Henry Hopkins, Jr. as “[superintendent] of all the Church Plate and work in metal, to be executed under the sanction of the Society.” Hopkins, a multi-faceted clergyman who designed communion plate, altar cloths and vestments, most likely provided the impetus for this enterprise and was a fitting supervisor for Cooper’s prodigious work.

Throughout this four-year period, the Society displayed examples of Cooper’s communion plate at its meetings and described his work in its publications, demonstrating that its was “proud of its tangible work.” As Cooper’s communion plate production increased, the Society described a concurrent improvement in Cooper’s skills. It attributed increasing demand for its communion plate in part to “the workmen employed [who had] reached a degree of skill which we think will enable them to give general satisfaction.” This growing confidence in its craftsmen reached its height in 1855 with the ambitious Trinity Chapel set (fig. 3).

Specifically why the Society began commissioning Cooper to
make communion plate, rather than continue to rely on the English Ecclesiastical Society to continue to provide American Episcopal churches with plate, is undocumented. At a quarterly meeting in 1849, the Society displayed a set of “English Ecclesiastical manufacture" made for St. Luke’s in New York City, praising “the workmanship of all [the] vessels [as] exceeding fine.” While pleased with English plate, American Episcopal churches may have had to wait for their orders to arrive, just as Hopkins complained of delays in receiving designs from the English Ecclesiastical Society. An importation tax on silverware of twenty to thirty percent in effect since 1842 would have added to the cost of even the simplest pieces ordered from the English Ecclesiastical Society. Regardless of its unstated motives, by producing communion plate like the English Ecclesiastical Society, the New York Society legitimized its own existence and disseminated ecclesiology throughout the growing Episcopal church.10

There are no known examples of Cooper’s ecclesiastical silver made before his association with the New York Ecclesiastical Society, although by 1851 he had been in business for about ten years. At the end of Cooper’s career in 1890, a shop fire destroyed not only his failing business but also documentary evidence that might have explained why the Society chose him to make their communion plate. Cooper’s
personal religious affiliation remains as obscure as his professional connection to this group of Episcopalian clergy.\textsuperscript{11}

Although other New York silver manufacturers made communion plate for Episcopal churches, none of them had the sanction of the New York Ecclesiological Society. A year before the Society began commissioning communion plate from Cooper, the rector of the Church of the Annunciation in New York City bought a pair of chalices and patens from the New York firm William Gale and Son (fig. 7). The Gale firm’s advertisement in the \textit{Churchman}, an Episcopal journal, merely states that they sold “silverware wholesale and retail,” while Cooper’s advertisement in the same journal describes his work as “communion plate of the most approved and varied patterns, in true ecclesiastical style” in the \textit{Churchman}. Cooper’s English counterpart, the London silversmith John Keith, similarly promoted himself as the “only manufacturer in London of Church Plate upon Ecclesiastical models.”\textsuperscript{12}

The silversmith Cooper and the clergyman Hopkins played distinct roles in the manufacture of this communion plate. Other craftsmen—the engraver, enameller, chaser, and case maker—contributed key elements to this novel style of communion plate. As the silversmith, Cooper worked in the style determined by Hopkins and approved by the Society.
Hopkins negotiated prices with the lay donor or the priest and coordinated a piece’s movement from shop to shop until completed. Cooper, the only one to mark the objects, was the most important craftsman in this chain of events. He made the forms, supplied at least a portion if not all of the materials and assembled a piece if it included enamelled sections. Without more documentary evidence, it is impossible to assign specific stylistic details in Cooper’s communion plate to his interpretation of the English ecclesiological designs or point to a paten’s gadrooning as a sign of Hopkins’ exclusive contribution. Like trying to count the number of angels that can dance on the head of a pin, discerning the patron’s and craftsmen’s contributions to the style of this communion plate is less fruitful than exploring how Cooper’s work manifested the Society’s authority over the visual environment in Episcopal churches. Specific communion objects documented the Society’s publications or in extant receipts describe Cooper and Hopkins’s erratic progress toward creating both elaborate and relatively simple communion plate in “true Ecclesiastical style.”

Large Paten Made for the Church of the Annunciation

At the mid-point of the Society’s communion plate production
in 1853, a large paten was commissioned from the Society, which survives today with its receipt (fig. 8,9). This rare piece of documentation confirms Hopkins’s supervisory role and sheds light on some of the problems faced by Cooper and the New York Ecclesiological Society in the first few years of production. A note from Hopkins to the donor, W. H. Bell, explains that while the price for the paten, eighty-seven dollars, is higher than anticipated, “[his] silver-smith [was] out of pocket [five dollars] and . . . [would] never undertake another at the same price.” Cooper, whose signature appears in center of the receipt, provided the silver, constructed the body and finished the piece which entailed setting the enamelled center section and gilding the paten’s surface. These responsibilities consumed two-thirds of the paten’s price and contributed to Cooper’s pecuniary problem.

Fine silver, the highest grade of silver alloy, was used for the enamelled sections, while coin silver, which contains a higher percentage of copper, was used for the body of the paten. Fine silver had to be used for the enamelled sections because copper and other metals in the alloy cause cracks and discoloration of enamelled colors during firing. Unfortunately, the paten’s enamelled center was replaced at an unknown date by a three and a half inch dome in the center with unworn, yellow-colored gilding incongruous with the
gilding on the rest of the paten’s surface.\textsuperscript{13}

Cooper would have purchased silver from a precious-metal trading firm on Wall Street, like other New York silversmiths. Although he usually paid cash for “bullion on Wall Street,” Cooper had to have enough financial resources to purchase silver on credit or for cash. He may have purchased pre-processed silver, alloyed with copper in the form of “sheets, discs, wire [or] strips.” The ability to economically purchase silver was an important part of Cooper’s responsibility toward the commission. About two years after this paten was made, Cooper and his partner Richard Fisher advertised “the best quality of silver . . . on reasonable terms.”\textsuperscript{14}

While Cooper provided the raw materials in this instance, donors and parishes ordering his communion plate could also have recycled their old communion plate. Along with quality of workmanship, concern over how a manufacturer handled consecrated silver persisted throughout the century. Cooper’s trustworthiness was confirmed by the Society’s assurance to potential buyers that “the silver of the old sets will be carefully employed in the manufacture of the new, and deductions made in price according to its weight.” The English Ecclesiological Society likewise asserted that “every facility will be given for re-casting plate into more
suitable forms, care being taken to keep the metal unmixed with any that has not been already consecrated or used for holy purposes." Later in the century, New York ecclesiastical retailers J. and R. Lamb echoed the ecclesiologists' claims, stating in their catalog: "old consecrated silver carefully re-worked, and remaining silver returned in ingot."15

Henry P. Horlor, the Society's enameller and engraver, received thirty dollars for his now-defaced work on the paten. In 1852, the Society "discovered" Horlor soon after his arrival in New York City, and its description of Horlor's credentials reveals the Society's desire to both emulate and surpass the English Ecclesiological Society in communion plate production. While the New York Society had commissioned an enamelled piece at least a year earlier, it qualified its praise for this initial foray into enamelled ornament, describing the piece as "our first attempt in that line, and for a first attempt very successful." The results of this anonymous engraver and enameller were good enough for the Society to hope that it would continue to get commissions for enamelled pieces, "[allowing it] to repeat [its] experiments in this line on a larger scale." However, with its "discovery" of Horlor, who had "done most of the engraving and enamelling for the English Ecclesiological Society in London," the American ecclesiologists reasoned
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that with “a little further practice, . . . our plate will be second to none in the world.”

A letter from the donor to the rector of the church explaining that an unanticipated four-month delay had occurred seems to relate to Cooper’s inability to manufacture the piece for the original estimated price. Like other pieces he made for the New York Ecclesiological Society, the number of artisans involved in making this ornamental communion paten prolonged production time. Hopkins, as the member of the Society in charge of communion plate orders, contracted with each craftsman separately and ensured that “the work [passed] from hand to hand in various parts of the city.” With the exception of the enameller Horlor, the Society had “to instruct the workman in a style of work. . . .” new to American craftsmen.

Cooper’s Most Elaborate Work for the Society: The Grace Church and Trinity Chapel sets and related examples

The two most costly known communion sets made by Cooper under the New York Society’s supervision suggests a growing confidence in the skills of Cooper and other craftsmen. Unlike the well-documented paten Cooper made for the Church of the Annunciation, these two sets—one made in 1852 for
Grace Church in Brooklyn Heights and the other made in 1855 for Trinity Chapel in New York City—were publicized in the Society's journal. Both sets cost over one thousand dollars because of their size and the amount of enamelling, jewelling, engraving and chasing contained in the objects. Much of the enamelling, jewelling and chasing departs stylistically from Butterfield's designs. The Society and its craftsmen combined Butterfield's and Pugin's designs for communion plate and other metal work together with their own modifications, creating communion plate that was distinct from English ecclesiological plate, yet simultaneously derived from it.  

In 1852, the Society displayed a large set of communion plate of Cooper manufacture at a meeting of its Executive Committee. “The altar plate manufactured under the direction of the Society, for Grace Church, Brooklyn Heights. . . [consisted] of two chalices, one large paten for consecration, two smaller ones for distribution, one small plain one for superfluous bread, two flagons, one spoon, and one alms basin; all of which are put up in two oaken cases richly ironed in antique style.” While the two oak cases and spoon are no longer at Grace Church, the remaining nine pieces constitute the largest known set of communion plate manufactured by Cooper. As the Society's most elaborate set of communion plate up to that point, it bears comparison to
one of the Society's last sets made in 1855 for Trinity Chapel and consisting of two patens, two chalices, a large footed paten and alms bason (fig. 3). The later set's symmetrical configuration and uniform ornament as opposed to the Grace Church set's eclecticism implies that Hopkins' ability to coordinate the efforts of each craftsman improved over time. Also, by the 1855, Cooper was more familiar with Gothic Revival forms. Partly because of his new partner Richard Fisher, Cooper was experiencing a period of financial prosperity, which may have contributed to the later sets' uniformity.

In 1854 one year before the Trinity Chapel set was made, Cooper formed a partnership with Richard Fisher, a jeweler, at 131 Amity Street in New York City, which lasted until May 1, 1862. When Cooper and Fisher were advanced four hundred dollars to make the Trinity Chapel set, Cooper's business was in a better financial position to absorb unanticipated labor and material costs than several years earlier when he made the piecemeal Grace Church set and the Church of the Annunciation paten which left him "[five dollars] out of pocket." While the Grace Church set includes objects given anonymously and others identified with donors' names (as if sporadic fundraising was required during production), all the pieces in the Trinity Chapel set were given anonymously. While how much Cooper was paid for the
earlier set remains unknown, the Trinity Chapel set’s formal consistency reflects uniformity in its funding as well as Cooper’s stable financial situation.\textsuperscript{19}

The New York Ecclesiastical Society explained that in the Grace Church set “the [all] vessels and cases [in the set] are different . . . [with] no duplicates ‘for symmetry.’” Their arrangement within the cases allowed one case of plate to be used “for an ordinary communion,” with the addition of the other case of plate for extraordinarily large communion celebrations. The proportions and ornament of the set’s corresponding forms, for example the two chalices (fig. 10, 11), are strikingly different. Despite the striking visual differences between the set’s three small patens, central sections of all three fit within the rims of both chalices, providing no clue as to the configuration of the set (fig. 12, 13). In comparing the two chalices, it is difficult to imagine that they were made as part of the same set. One of its two chalices, the set’s “crowning piece” and last one completed, was credited with being “the most costly and elaborate specimen of church plate yet manufactured in this country.” Three years later it served as the model for the pair of chalices in the Trinity Chapel set (fig. 10). The set’s other chalice (fig. 11) integrates formal and iconographical quotes from Pugin’s and Butterfield’s designs, which Cooper formulaically repeated in later chalices.\textsuperscript{20}
The iconography of the chalice's enamel and jewel ornament identify it with Grace Church and the celebration of Communion, replacing engraved legends memorials found on most of Cooper's communion plate (fig. 10). The member of Grace Church who gave the chalice was praised for his or her "true modesty which ever accompanies true liberality for the love of Christ. .. ." The anonymity of donor of this "crowning piece" of the Grace Church set prefigures the anonymous gift of the entire Trinity Chapel set which also are devoid of conventional engraved memorials identifying the presentation date, church or donor. Chalices in both sets incorporate symbolic references to the celebration of communion, rather than a literal engraved Biblical verse more commonly found on Cooper's communion plate. Hopkins and Cooper submerged textual references to the chalices' spiritual function and community into nonliterary chased, pierced, enamelled and jewelled ornament.21

Six enamelled and engraved sections of scenes of the Life of Christ are soldered together to form the foot of one of the Grace Church chalices (fig. 10). These scenes are placed on a dark blue ground, representing the Church Militant or the Christian church on Earth. Six alternating yellow and purple amethysts are set between engraved grape leaves on the collet (or upper portion of the foot), symbolizing both elements of the Eucharist (bread and wine). The bowl of the chalice
incorporates symbols “representing Christ risen, reigning in glory with his saints.” Framed between openings in the basket-shaped calyx engraved with six angels, the ascended figures of Christ and five saints are depicted among clouds on light blue opaque grounds which denotes their heavenly status. The horizontal band above these figures is engraved with sheathes of wheat punctuated by twelve red and white cornelians, mirroring the symbolic use of the collet’s engraved and jewelled ornament. A cross made of five jewels—garnet, ruby, amethyst, chrysolite and emerald—spells “grace” acrostically and is set prominently above the figure of Christ.\textsuperscript{22}

The footed paten made for Trinity Chapel replicates the Grace Church chalice’s hierarchical arrangement of enamelled color (fig. 5). The enamelled pieces medallions of the foot which show scenes from the Life of Christ have dark blue backgrounds, while the upper surface of the paten (which was “heavily gilded” at the time of its construction) contains scenes of Christ’s resurrection and ascension on light blue opaque grounds. The pierced trefoils on its base symbolize Trinity Parish and the engraved sections of the feet of both Trinity Chapel chalices depict Saints George, John and Paul, identifying the Parish’s other chapels (fig. 4, 14, 15). These “parochial peculiarities” mirror the cruciform arrangement of jewels found on the Grace Church chalice.\textsuperscript{23}
The heavily enamelled Grace Church chalice (fig. 10) and the Trinity Chapel chalices and footed paten (fig. 4, 5) incorporate elements from William Butterfield’s designs for communion plate (fig. 6). The enamelled panels and twisted cable moldings on the stems resemble the chalice on the far left of Butterfield’s design which has cable moldings applied to its stem. The panels between the twisted cable molding of the stem of the Grace Church chalice (fig. 10) contain enamelled cusped arches taken from the chalice on the far right Butterfield’s design contains similar arches on the faces of its stem (fig. 6). Teardrop-shaped openings in the calyxes of chalices from the Trinity Chapel and Grace Church sets vaguely resemble the circles that appear on the bowl of center chalice in Butterfield’s design. Christ’s “Triumphant Entry into Jerusalem, boldly and most effectively chased” on the Trinity Chapel alms bason is derived from Butterfield’s design for an alms bason shown on the far left of the plate.24

The chasing is in the Trinity Chapel set was attributed to a Mr. Segel, “an accomplished German artist in metal.” While the rims of the patens, alms bason and footed paten in this set are chased with gadrooning (fig. 3), only the large paten of the Grace Church set has a gadrooned rim (fig. 16). The narrative scene chased onto the Trinity Chapel alms bason is more complex than the non-figurative cross terminating in fleur-de-lies chased on to the Grace Church alms bason (fig. 
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17). While the calyxes of the Trinity Chapel chalices contain gadrooning and chased angel figures, the corresponding winged figures on the Grace Church chalice are engraved (fig. 4, 10). The prevalence of chased ornament in the later set reflects the Society’s confidence in the craftsman’s skills. Its praise of Mr. Segel parallels its excitement over its discovery of Horlor several years earlier. This addition of Mr. Segel to its cadre of skilled foreign-trained craftsmen affected the extent to which certain decorative techniques were exploited in its communion plate.25

In his description of the Trinity Chapel chalices, Hopkins emphasized that “no two of the twelve [chased angels are] alike,” implicitly assuring his contemporaries that the set retained asymmetry like the earlier Grace Church set, but that it was confined within the ornament of individual objects. The set’s internalized asymmetry manifested the object’s hand-work, which was called into question by the set’s superficial uniformity. Hopkins’s comment implies that the Mr. Segel had not used an engraved steel roller to mechanically shape these figures— anathema to the ideals of ecclesiology. While it is impossible to definitively determine the extent to which any of the craftsmen used hand or mechanized techniques, this perceived merit in hand-work applied to communion plate throughout the century. In the
1880s, J. and R. Lamb described their firm's "hand-made silver of churchly patterns . . . [which avoided] . . . the repetition of parts so common to factory-made work."26

Outward differences in the proportions and ornament of the two chalices made for Grace Church establish the set's asymmetry, which is also reflected in their marks and construction (fig. 10, 11). The foot of the enamelled and jewelled chalice is constructed of six enamelled pieces soldered together at their sides with quatrefoil-pierced base (fig. 18). In contrast, the enamelled crucifix panel of the other chalice is merely applied to one isolated section of the foot (fig. 11). The heavily enamelled chalice is the only piece in the set that Cooper used his mark "F.W.COOPER" in a reserve together with "MANUFACTURER", while the other chalice is more conventionally marked with Cooper's name beneath the base (fig. 18). The description of Cooper as the silversmith "who has manufactured [italics mine] the plate for the Society from the first," reflects the chalice's atypical mark.

The less elaborately enamelled chalice in the Grace Church set combines specific quotes from Butterfield's and Pugin's designs for chalices (fig. 11). The base's complicated footprint parallels the base from a Butterfield chalice design (see left-hand chalice of fig. 2), while the foot's centrally
placed crucifix and five sections engraved with flames mirrors the foot of the chalice on the far left of Butterfield's later designs for communion plate (fig. 6). This engraved flame and ray motif, which also appears the Trinity Chapel footed paten, carries throughout Cooper's ecclesiastical work (fig. 5). While the text that accompanies Butterfield's designs fails to articulate meaning of this iconography, Hopkins explained it to those "who [loved] to trace the progress of" ecclesiological communion plate in Transactions as "[representing] Christ as the source of both . . . light and heat . . . knowledge and love."

Christ's knowledge is represented by rays formed from straight three lines, referring to the Doctrine of the Trinity. Between these rays, flames represent Christ's love which is "consequent upon . . . knowledge of His truth; and therefore they spring from behind the rays of light." These flames, engraved with a longer central line flanked by three lines, "set forth the seven-fold gifts of the Spirit."27

The knops of both Grace Church chalices are chased and engraved with grape leaves which frame six enamelled bosses (fig. 10, 11). This organic chasing and engraving contrasts with the architectural knops designed by Butterfield (fig. 2, 6), pointing to the influence of Pugin's Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume which includes a chalice drawn with a similar knop and chased bands on both sections
of the stem (fig. 19). Like the earlier Grace Church chalice (fig. 11), Pugin’s design includes a calyx of pointed grape leaves. While the character and proportions of the individual grape leaves on Cooper’s chalice relate to the bowl of the chalice on the far right in Butterfield’s design (fig. 6), the shape of Cooper’s calyx is derived from Pugin’s design for a chalice (fig. 19). While the set’s other chalice received more attention from the New York Ecclesiological Society at the time of the set’s completion (fig. 10), the earlier chalice’s amalgamation of design sources had a longer-lasting effect on Cooper’s later work (fig. 11).

The same Pugin drawing was the design source for a pair of chalices made by Cooper and Fisher presented to St. Andrew’s Church in Baltimore, Maryland on Easter 1855 (fig. 20). The grape-leaf knops, calyxes and chased bands on the stems of the St. Andrew’s chalices relate to a Pugin’s design and the earlier Grace Church chalice (fig. 11, 19). While there is no record of the *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume* in the New York Ecclesiological Society’s library, the row of engraved arches on their bases and ringed quatrefoil bosses in the knops confirm Pugin’s design as the stylistic source for this pair of chalices, suggesting that Hopkins or another member of the Society saw (if not owned) this publication. While the bosses and calyx of the Grace
Church chalice were enamelled, the corresponding elements of
the St. Andrew's Church pair were rendered in less-costly
pierced, stippled and engraved ornament. Like their
predecessors in the Grace Church and Trinity Chapel sets, the
St. Andrew's chalices are held together by cable about an
eighth of an inch in diameter, which is soldered to the
underside of the bowl and extends through the hollow stem
emerging beneath the foot, where it is bolted in place.28

Cooper made two flagons for the Grace Church set which, like
the set's two chalices, bear little resemblance to each other
(fig. 21, 22). These two flagons were models for other
flagons that Cooper made under the supervision of the New
York Ecclesiological Society and continued to make after the
Society's dissolution. The chased gadrooning and lobes of
one flagon contrast with the other flagon's plainer surface
interrupted only by applied and chased plain moldings.
Despite these differences in chased ornament, the engraved
ornament found on both flagons is similar, with engraved
scrolls on the spout, vertically arranged sprays of flowers
on the neck, and a grape-vine band at a point where the
handle attaches. Below this point, both flagons are engraved
with a legend with hatched background beginning with a
circumscribed cross.

Close analysis of the flagons' engraving and handle
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construction reveal incongruities, implying that the two flagons were made by different hands. The tapering handles on both flagons are engraved with scrolls similar to those that appear on their spouts and are annulated with plain molding. The molding is chased on the gadrooned flagon and continues beyond the hinge to the point where the handle is soldered onto the neck (fig. 21), while the applied molding on the other flagon's handle terminates at the hinge (fig. 22). Differences in the execution of the engraved floral sprays confirms the evidence of different hands at work on these pieces. On the gadrooned flagon (fig. 21), the pairs of leaves above each blossom grows from a single-branched stem. This contrasts with the longer stems and more molded petals engraved onto the neck of the other flagon (fig. 22, 23). Despite this material evidence of the work of more than one engraver, it is impossible distinguish Horlor's work from any number of unidentified engravers who contributed to this large set without further documentary evidence.

Differences in their construction and engraving parallel their inconsistent marks. One flagon is unmarked (fig. 22), while the gadrooned flagon is marked "F. W. Cooper" in a reserve with three pseudo-hallmarks (fig. 24). The only known ecclesiastical piece which Cooper struck with pseudo-hallmarks, this flagon's marks imitate those of John and James Keith, the London silversmiths who manufactured Gothic
Revival communion plate for the English ecclesiologists. The Keiths marked their work with a passant lion for the sterling silver standard, a letter for the date the object was hallmarked, a profile of Queen Victoria to show that excise duty had been paid on it, their initials, “I. J. K.” or “I. K.” and a leopard head to denote London (where it was assayed). While more work needs to be done on nineteenth-century pseudo-hallmarks, by choosing this particular style and configuration of pseudo-hallmarks to supplement his own maker’s mark Cooper associated his ecclesiastical work with Keith’s communion plate of Butterfield’s design, which was being imported through the English Ecclesiological Society as early as 1849.29

Unlike the set’s chalices, its flagons adhere more closely to Butterfield’s flagon designs which call for scrolled decoration on the spouts and handles, plain moldings, bands of narrow “windows”, flowering vines and grape vine motifs (fig. 25). While the narrower proportions of Cooper’s gadrooned flagon (fig. 21) resemble Butterfield’s later flagon designs (fig. 6), sources for the flagon’s chased gadrooning and lobes are not as clear. Cooper or Hopkins may have grafted the lobes that appear of the foot of an altar candlestick designed by Butterfield, which may originate from Pugin’s designs for the same form (fig. 26, 27). About a decade after this set was completed, Cooper incorporated
inverted lobes into the foot of a silver plated Masonic pitcher, demonstrating his penchant for dramatic chasing (fig. 28). In 1871, the American Episcopal Church presented an alms basin to St. Paul’s Cathedral in London. Hopkins was credited with designing this elaborate basin which incorporates heavy chased gadrooning around the rim (fig. 29). Despite Cooper’s and Hopkins’s inconclusive roles as designers, Pugin’s designs for flagons in Designs for Gold and Silversmiths (1836) are clearly not a major influence on Cooper’s flagon (fig. 30). The shapes of his flagons are more articulated and their proportions are smaller than Cooper’s flagons. Regardless of the impetus behind the gadrooning and lobes on Cooper’s communion plate, their prevalence in American ecclesiological communion plate distinguishes it from English antecedents.30

The Grace Church gadrooned flagon relates to two other flagons that Cooper during this period (fig. 21). One flagon, presented in 1853 to the Church of the Annunciation seven weeks after the large paten, differed only in its gilt exterior and broader proportions (fig. 31, 32). Another flagon, presented to St. John’s Church in New York City in 1856 (ill. 47), recalls the chased lobes and gadrooning from the Grace Church and Church of the Annunciation flagons. Its lid, similar in shape and construction to that of the Grace Church flagon, is also capped with an enamelled cross like
its predecessor (fig. 21). Like both Grace Church flagons (fig. 21, 22), the engraved ornament is used formulaically within the structure of the flagon. An engraved grape vine encircles the body at the point where the handle attaches; engraved scrolls ornament its spout; and, an engraved legend begins at the center of its belly to the immediate right of an engraved cross below the handle. Its scrolled tapering handle with forked tail resembles the unadrooned Grace Church flagon (fig. 22) and is likewise engraved with a scrolled vine between molded edges.31

Just as the design of the flagons and chalices in the Grace Church set is reflected in later versions of these forms, Cooper’s large footed paten in the Trinity Chapel set created a precedent which was followed in a later, less ornate, version. According to Hopkins, the footed paten form was unique to American ecclesiological communion plate. Just as Butterfield attributed his criteria for the “proper” shape of a chalice to its ritual function, Hopkins explained this innovative form in terms of its role in communion service. Like the large paten in the Grace Church set (fig. 16), the Trinity Chapel footed paten was made for consecration (fig. 5). However, the footed paten is elevated so that “it would [not] appear to the congregation to be an insignificant vessel, as compared with the chalice or flagon,” ensuring that both elements of communion—the bread and wine—received
“equal honor”. Described as “a deviation from ancient examples, and being without any authority,” Hopkins conceded that “it [would] probably be condemned by strict ecclesiologists.”

The New York Ecclesiologists turned to the “approved” chalice form to create this salver-like paten (fig. 5). The stem’s narrowly-pierced hexagonal core with detached twisted cable moldings and large pierced knop with protruding bosses resemble the stems of the set’s chalices (fig. 4). The paten’s foot is divided into six sections at the top where it meets the stem and is supported by a base resembling the pierced bases of the chalices with an applied twisted cable molding. Because gilt surfaces were usually reserved for the part of the form that contacted the communion bread or wine, the paten’s foot or stand did not require gilding in contrast to the top “which [was] heavily gilded all over.”

Cooper used the same formula when he produced a simplified versions of this form for St. John’s Church in New York City, presented in 1856 in memory of Bishop Wainwright (fig. 33). Without the liberal use of figurative enamelled and engraved ornament, the St. John’s footed paten more clearly illustrates Hopkins’s explanation of this form as a platform elevating the communion host to the same literal and spiritual level as the wine contained in the chalice. The
upper portion resembles the large paten that Cooper made for the Grace Church set; it is engraved with a Lamb with Banner surrounded by six grape leaves in a cinquefoil frame in the center and has a similarly engraved and gadrooned rim (fig. 16). Traces of gilding remaining in the gadrooning correspond to remnants of gilding on the upper surface of the Trinity footed paten. While not embellished with enamelled and gilt medallions like the Trinity piece, the St. John’s footed paten shares specific engraved elements with its predecessor. The engraved legend around the rim of the St. John’s footed paten begins with Jesus’ initials, “IHC” engraved over a “cross botonné” on a cross-hatched ground; a similarly complex element marks the beginning of the legend engraved on the Trinity footed paten (fig. 5, 33).

The foot of the St. John’s footed paten follows the pattern established by the Trinity Chapel piece, but in a more restrained tone. The knop is chased and its bosses engraved with four-petal blossoms, which derive from Butterfield’s designs for chalices (see knop of left-hand chalice in fig. 2). These bosses are simplified versions of the chased and pierced bosses found on the knops of the Trinity Chapel chalices (fig. 4). Like the Trinity Chapel footed paten, sun imagery is engraved on the foot below the knop. However, as the foot spreads out to the base its edge is decorated only with an engraved legend, without the Old Testament scenes and
enamelled medallions depicting the Life of Christ which appear on the Trinity Chapel paten. The quatrefoil-pierced base of the St. John’s footed paten resembles the pierced bases of the Trinity Chapel chalices; but, pierced triangles between each quatrefoil were omitted from the later St. John’s footed paten.

Cooper’s less elaborate work for the Society: St. Peter’s Church set

Not all of Cooper’s work for the Society aspired to be costly and elaborate like the Grace Church and Trinity Chapel sets. From the start of its supervision of Cooper’s ecclesiastical work, the Society sought to “[furnish] church plate of correct form and material, appropriate ornaments, and more reasonable prices than can be procured elsewhere.” Like the English Ecclesiological Society, the New York Society wanted to impress Episcopal parishes with both the “beauty and cheapness" of its communion plate. To that end, in 1851, Cooper made a set consisting of a chalice, paten, flagon and spoon for St. Peter’s in Morristown, New Jersey (fig. 34). The Society published a letter from the rector of St. Peter’s praising the set’s “beauty and propriety [which] could not in any other way have been obtained for the same expenditure.” The rector called on the Society to “multiply and scatter
them throughout the country . . . [as] the happiest [illustrations] of the principles of the Society." For the Society's readership, the rector's enthusiasm for the set's simplicity demonstrated the universal appeal and accessibility of the Cooper's communion plate within the American Episcopal Church.35

One of the English Ecclesiological Society's main selling points was that its communion plate was less expensive than incorrectly interpreted Gothic communion plate. The Society claimed that the cost of a "really good set of [its Keith-manufactured] plate . . . [of] average value," was less than cheapest set made by Mr. Thomas West. West's more expensive flagon was derided as being "most ugly and secular in shape: suggestive of any purpose rather than the sacred one it serves." The Society claimed that its silversmiths, John and James Keith, could use less material more skillfully than "unapproved" craftsmen, such as Mr. West, who could only increase the value of their communion plate "by putting more metal into it, thus increasing its size and weight." "Like true barbarians, they [could] only be magnificent by being clumsy."36

The St. Peter's set is comparable to the Society's "cheapest set", "consisting of Chalice, Paten, Flagon (one pint), Alms Bason and Spoon," cost one hundred dollars, without
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"enrichments" such as "engraving, chasing, gilding, and enamelling and jewels." Although no known receipt survives, the St. Peter's set probably cost around one hundred dollars because of its similar configuration and sparse engraving and molding. Unlike its English counterpart, the New York Society never discussed unsanctioned American communion plate in its publications. Perhaps because access to "ancient" Gothic models would have been limited or non-existent, there were no counterparts to the audacious Mr. West in New York or other American cities producing "ugly and secular" versions of Gothic Revival communion plate.37

For the St. Peter's Church set (fig. 34), Cooper followed Butterfield's designs more closely than he did in his later, more elaborate Grace Church and Trinity Chapel sets. The St. Peter's paten corresponds directly to Butterfield's paten design (in the upper left corner of the plate) and is an engraved, unenamelled predecessor to one of the patens in the Grace Church set (fig. 2, 35, 12). Like Butterfield's design, the bottom of the paten is filled in with a head of Christ surrounded by sun imagery. The plain applied molding on the chalice's bowl, which annulates an engraved legend, reflects the left-hand chalice in Butterfield's design (fig. 2). The chalice's stepped collet between its hexagonal domed foot engraved with a stylized Gothic "IHC" and hexagonal stepped base combine characteristics found in the feet of
both Butterfield’s chalice designs (fig. 2). While the knop has been replaced, the pierced hexagonal stem is original. It is connected to the foot by soldered flanges, instead of the more substantial cable-and-bolt construction that Cooper used for other chalices this period.\(^3^8\)

The St. Peter’s flagon derives from Butterfield’s simplest flagon design, appearing as flagon number three in the lower left corner of plate 56 of *Instrumenta Ecclesiastica* (fig. 25, 35). Without a handle or extensive engraving, Cooper’s flagon was less costly than the more complex flagons made for Grace Church. A Biblical verse in the vernacular, “I am the vine ye are the branch,” is engraved around the belly of the form, contrasting with the Latin verse which appears on Butterfield’s flagon. The pruned grapevine motif within the legend relates to a Biblical description of God as a vinedresser. Adding “authority” to Cooper’s flagon, the vine motif and hatched background correspond to an engraved legend around the rim of an “ancient” paten included in *Instrumenta Ecclesiastica* (fig. 36). While the rector of St. Peter’s Church did not overtly state in his letter to the Society that he was pleased with the English legends chosen for the set, his general praise for the communion set indicates that legends in English, not Latin, were considered “appropriate” and “correct” for American Gothic Revival communion plate in the Episcopal Church.\(^3^9\)
The set's spoon is a rarity. Many of Cooper's communion spoons have become disassociated from their sets because they have fallen into disuse and are rarely marked. During communion service the spoon remained away from the altar on the credence table, where it was used for "removing any impurity from [water and wine mixture in] the chalice." The spoon's elliptical pierced bowl facilitated this function. The spoon's tubular stem terminates in a cross botonné engraved on the reverse side of the spoon, indicating that it was meant to "rest on the credence [table]" with its reverse side facing up. Pugin's designs for spoons, like his designs for flagons, had no perceivable influence on Cooper's spoon for St. Peter's (fig. 37). Beyond their formal differences, Pugin's spoons were designed with unpierced bowls, suggesting that they performed a different function. Although no spoon designs were included in *Instrumenta Ecclesiastica*, Cooper's spoons were influenced by ecclesiastical flatware manufactured by London silversmith John Keith under the English Ecclesiological Society's approval, such as a spoon and knife dating from 1855 in St. Mark's Church in Philadelphia (fig. 38).40
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ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO


11. Cooper was buried in a non-denominational cemetery after his death at age 87 on May 6, 1898. His funeral was held in his house and neither he nor any member of his immediate family were baptized or buried in Trinity Parish. (Brooklyn Death Certificate 7157 on microfilm at the Municipal Archives of New York.) The World (Brooklyn Edition), May 8, 1898, p. 10. Cooper is not listed in the 1850 New York County Census of Manufacturers, and the Dun and Bradstreet credit reports discuss his business only after he takes on a partner, Richard Fisher, in 1854. Dun and Bradstreet Report, vol. 318, p. 373, 1855.


19. In 1856, Cooper and Fisher were described as “doing well and in very good credit regarded by the trade as reliable for their [accounts]” in part because of Fisher’s involvement as the “principal monied man being [worth] $30 to $40 thousand dollars.” Unfortunately, Cooper was not included in the 1850 Census of Manufacturers, but, by 1860, Cooper and Fisher produced an estimated thirty thousand dollars worth of secular and ecclesiastical silver per year, placing them eighth in the top sixteen grossing silver manufacturers included in the 1860 Census of Manufacturers for New York City. Fisher left New York City and the partnership in 1862. Dun and Bradstreet Report, vol. 322, p. 373, 1858, and vol. 318, p. 373, 1856. Trow’s New York City Directory. (New York: John F. Trow, 1854), p. 161. Cooper lived with his family, three boarders and a servant in the same building that housed the Cooper and Fisher shop in June, 1855. While he did not own any land at the time, he was prosperous enough to house his family of seven and two silversmiths who were probably journeymen in his shop. One twenty-eight-year-old silversmith, B. Husan, was native to New Orleans and had lived in New York since 1843; the other craftsman, George Chandler, was an eighteen-year-old native of New York City. Population Census of the Inhabitants in the Fourth District of the Fourth Election District of the Fifteenth Ward of the City and the County of New York Taken ... on the Fifth Day of June 1855 in the Surrogate County Court’s Office, New York, New York. Cooper and Fisher employed fifteen workers on average and owned fifteen thousand dollars worth of silver in stock by 1860. Unfortunately, the company’s power source—hand, steam or horse—was unrecorded. 1860 Eighth United States Census of Manufacturers and Products of Industry New York, Fifteenth Ward, Second District, page 1.


21. New York Ecclesiological Society, New York Ecclesiologist, vol. IV, loc. cit. No documentary evidence speaks to why Cooper’s most elaborate work was given anonymously. Both sets were made for new churches: perhaps the donor’s anonymity emphasized the congregation’s cooperative effort in getting a new edifice built. Although Richard Upjohn designed both buildings, his personal and business papers in the New York Public Library do not reveal any evidence that he ever designed communion plate. Grace Church was built in 1847; Trinity Chapel was built in 1855. Elliot Willensky and Norval White, AIA Guide to New York City, third edition, (New York: Harcourt Brace Tovanovich, Publ., 1988), pp. 576-577.


25. *Transactions*, p. 85, 89-90. "Mr. Segel" may have been William J. Seely, a chaser at 102 Nassau Street. However, the chaser may have in fact been named "Segel", but was unrecorded in any city directories. David B. Warren, et al., *Marks of Achievement. Four Centuries of American Presentation Silver*, (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1987), pp. 84-85, 189.


30. Victorian Church Art, (London: Victoria Albert Museum, 1971), p. 25. Metropolitan Museum of Art, Nineteenth-Century America: Furniture and Other Decorative Arts, (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1970), plate 96 catalog entry suggests that continental influence may explain these features. Given the influence of Butterfield on Cooper’s work for the New York Ecclesiological Society, it is more likely that these lobes were inspired by Butterfield’s candlestick designs. However, this is an interesting suggestion given that the New York Ecclesiological Society purchased a volume entitled, Webb’s Continental Ecclesiology, for its library before this flagon was produced. “Presents to the Society from May, 1848, to May 1851” bound in General Theological Seminary Library’s copy of Transactions, p. 42.


32. Transactions, pp. 86-87.


37. For example, chalice and paten cost between forty-two and one hundred dollars; a flagon between eighty and one hundred dollars, etc. Cases ranged in price from seven and a half to thirty dollars, depending on whether they were made from black walnut or more expensive oak with decorative "ironwork". New York Ecclesiologist, New York Ecclesiologist, vol. IV, pp. 4-5.


39. John 15:5 “I am the vine you are the branches." Also in John 15:1-2, “I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinedresser. Every branch of mine that bears no fruit, he takes away, and every that does bear fruit he prunes, that it may bear more fruit.”

Chapter III: COOPER'S ECCLESIASTICAL WORK AFTER THE NEW YORK ECCLESIOLOGICAL SOCIETY, 1855-1879

The New York Ecclesiological Society's influence continued to resonate in Cooper's communion plate long after the organization's dissolution in 1855. For the following four years, Cooper and Fisher drew upon their former patron's power by advertizing "communion plate, of the most approved and varied patterns in true Ecclesiastical style. . . ." After Fisher withdrew from their partnership in 1862, Cooper continued independently making communion plate for at least the following fifteen years. Some of his later work maintained the ornateness established in the Grace Church and Trinity Chapel sets, such as a flagon presented to St. Barnabas in Irvington, New York in 1867 (fig. 39), reflecting Cooper's contemporary advertisement for communion plate "[enriched] with engraving, gilding, chasing, enamel, and jewels. . . ." However, most of Cooper's later work continued in the relatively simple vein established in the set made for St. Peter's in 1851 (fig. 34).41

Objects marked "COOPER & FISHER" "131 AMITY St. N.Y." can be dated to between 1854 and 1862; however, without further
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documentation, it is impossible to determine which objects were made independently and which were made under the supervision of the New York Ecclesiology Society. John Henry Hopkins, as a designer and clergyman, may have continued to take an interest in Cooper’s work after 1855. (Until 1862, Hopkins was part-owner of the Church Journal in which both Cooper and Horlor advertised.) Despite this dating problem, a large paten made for St. Peter’s illustrates the formal continuity of Cooper’s work (fig. 40). Its diameter, gadrooned rim, engraved grape leaves and Lamb with Banner in a cinquefoil frame associate it with similar patens made for Grace Church (fig. 16), the Church of the Annunciation (fig. 9) and St. John’s Church (fig. 33). Whether made under Hopkins’s supervision or commissioned directly by St. Peter’s, the rector liked the earlier communion set commissioned through the New York Ecclesiological Society enough to order a large paten from Cooper and Fisher three to nine years later. Episcopal preference for Cooper’s communion plate continued beyond his partnership with Fisher well into the 1870s. At the beginning of the twentieth century, more than a fourth of Trinity Parish’s forty-two communion objects were produced by Cooper between 1862 and 1879.42

Most of Cooper’s later work is typical of a set presented in 1871 to St. Chrysostom’s Chapel of Trinity Parish in New York.
Like the earlier St. Peter’s set it is comprised of a flagon, chalice, paten and spoon, and all of the vessels maintain the simple profile and isolated engraving found in the earlier set (fig. 34). During this period, Cooper compressed key elements of “proper” and “correct” communion plate into simplified forms made from cheaper, lighter-gauged silver. While Cooper pared-down the more costly aspects of his communion plate, he appears to have never substituted silverplate for solid silver, which was in keeping with the Ecclesiological Society’s description of silverplate as “a miserable and hypocritical substitute for genuine silver.” Only in the late 1870s did Cooper modify some of the stylistic formulas established in his earlier work for the New York Ecclesiology Society.43

The chalice in the St. Chrysostom’s set and another chalice made circa 1870 for the Church of the Mediator in Edgewater, New Jersey, (which survives in its original case) maintain the same profile and gilded interior as Cooper’s earlier chalices (fig. 42). In these later pieces, Cooper efficiently used the same draw of wire for the applied moldings as he used for the base rims. A false calyx of six grape leaves engraved onto the bowl of the chalice on the right is a simplified version of the applied and enamelled grape-leaf calyx of one of the Grace Church chalices (fig. 11) and the engraved calyx of the pair of chalices made for
St. Andrew’s (fig. 20). The stems of both chalices are still hexagonal but their faces are left plain. Like the earlier St. Peter’s chalice (fig. 34) the stems are soldered to their feet without a reinforcing cable and bolt. Cooper abbreviated the knops, made from spun or stamped-up halves, leaving visible horizontal solder seams because they are devoid of the camouflaging chased and pierced ornament found on the knops of Cooper’s earlier chalices. Low-profile bosses on each knop are merely engraved with blossoms or quatrefoils, instead of the chasing, piercing and enamelling employed on earlier bosses. Engraved sun imagery surrounding the letters “IHS” at the center of both patens provide a condensed, simplified version of the engraved and enamelled iconography incorporated into the earlier St. Peter’s and Grace Church patens (fig. 12, 35, 43).44

Cooper used the same formula for a portable communion set, literally and figuratively compressing key aspects of form and ornament to make a miniaturized version of a communion set in “true ecclesiastical style.” Presented to St. Ambrose in New York City in 1868, the set includes a chalice three inches high and a paten nearly three inches in diameter (fig. 44). Like Cooper’s full-size chalices, the interior of its hemispherical bowl is gilt, an unchased knop divides the stem and the foot’s engraved sun imagery hexagonally divides its surface while its footprint is circular. Cooper utilized a
tube of silver for the chalice’s stem similar to the tube of silver that he used for the spoon’s handle in the St. Peter’s set (fig. 34). The paten is spun or stamped with a rolled edge and engraved with a legend around the rim and “IHS” inscribed with rays at the center, like Cooper’s larger contemporary patens. In its original case about three inches high and four inches in depth, the set is a precursor to later “pocket sets” sold by J. and R. Lamb (fig. 45).

The flagon photographed in the St. Chrystom’s set and a contemporary flagon made for the now-defunct St. Paul’s Church in Newark, New Jersey, are streamlined versions of Cooper’s earlier, more ornate flagons (fig. 46). The thumbpiece on the St. Paul’s flagon has disappeared, replaced by a large cross-shaped finial above its lid. Like the chalices knops discussed above, its lid is an unchased version of the lobed lids of the Grace Church and St. Barnabas flagons (fig. 21, 39). Its foot is engraved with the same sun imagery as Cooper’s contemporary chalices; and, the engraved arch motif on its base relates to the bases of the St. Andrew’s chalices and Pugin’s drawing of a chalice (fig. 19, 20). The St. Paul’s flagon has a gilt interior like all of Cooper’s known flagons because, like the chalice bowls, this surface contacts wine during the communion service.45
A photograph of a group of communion objects dated between 1873 and 1879 illustrates the last known examples of Cooper's ecclesiastical silver (fig. 47). Held by St. Augustine's Chapel of Trinity Parish in New York, the objects in this fading image show that Cooper's work began moving away from ecclesiological tenants by the mid-1870s. A paten in "sweep form", placed upright behind the central chalice has an evenly concave surface which differs from Butterfield's paten designs (fig. 2) and the Cooper-made paten to the right of it in the photograph (also dated 1874) in which the paten's central depression fits within the bowl of an accompanying chalice. An unidentified cruet to the right of the central chalice relates to a pair of undated cruets made by Cooper (fig. 48). The pair's proportions and central medallions with molded bands relate to two unmarked glass cruets with silver mounts dating from 1879 owned by Trinity Church (fig. 49). The flagon on the far left of the photograph, with its tubular neck and domed lid, anticipates the shape of a flagon sold by J. and R. Lamb around 1885 (lower left corner fig. 50). Cooper's departure from the baluster form over thirty years after the Ecclesiological Society sanctioned this flagon shape (fig. 25) is a telling caveat to the array of flagon forms offered later by J. and R. Lamb.46

Despite these later modifications, Cooper's work never drastically compromised the tenets of ecclesiological
communion plate established by Butterfield and the London Ecclesiological Society in the mid-1840s. His status as the exclusive silversmith of the New York Ecclesiological Society had given him access to "approved" English designs and American Episcopal parishes in need of communion plate. Cooper continued to benefit from this status long after the organization's existence. By the 1880s and 1890s, the formal qualities of Cooper's communion plate were manifested in Gorham and Tiffany ecclesiastical silver. In an early twentieth-century photograph of Trinity Chapel's communion silver, Cooper's chalice (on the far right) made around 1870 does not look out of place with the two Tiffany chalices in the center dating from the 1890s (fig. 51). While Cooper's influence on nineteenth-century American communion plate is beyond the scope of this query, the stylistic stasis of Cooper's work and nineteenth-century Gothic Revival communion plate in general attests to the power of the transatlantic ecclesiological establishment and its proprietary control over the interpretation of British pre-Reformation ecclesiastical silver.47
ENDNOTES FOR CHAPTER THREE


44. “IHS” inscribed in a sun is associated with St. Bernardino of Siena (fifteenth century). This iconography does not appear in Butterfield’s published designs in Instrumenta Ecclesiastica. Cooper may have used a continental design source or a Pugin design. George Ferguson, Signs and Symbols of Christian Art, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 109, 150.
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