

they had handed down as *undoubtedly* the likeness of their brother ... no clue, to my mind, is more to be relied on, than well authenticated & substantiated tradition, coming down from *those who knew the man*.¹²⁰

What substance is there to this statement of “well authenticated & substantiated tradition”? The question is justified because the person most qualified to give an opinion on the silhouette, Henrietta’s own father, had nothing to say about it in his biography of Brock.¹²¹ Henrietta Tupper may have been right in saying that such a silhouette was passed on from one generation of her family to the next, but once again the evidence is lacking that this portrait is in fact of Isaac Brock. There are three reasons to doubt its authenticity: the uniform of the sitter, the star on his left side, and his age.

The officer is shown with a queue; its use, as already pointed out, was abolished in 1808.¹²² Thus, making allowance for the change to take effect, the silhouette was probably done no later than 1810. If this silhouette is a genuine portrait of Brock, it would have to have been done in Canada, since he had been in this country since mid-1806, after his premature return from Europe. There is no such record. Nor can the epaulet be dated with exactitude. The work of one of the experts on the subject, Major N.P. Dawnay, suggests the last years of the eighteenth century as a possible period.¹²³ The lacing of the collar, lapel, and loops points to the uniform of a guards officer worn around 1800, for the following directions appear applicable: “A standing Collar of Scarlet Cloth, ... laced round with ... narrow lace” complemented by “Button Holes on the Lappels looped with the same Lace, and the outer Side of the Lappels ... edged with the same.” What looks like equal spacing of the buttons in the silhouette is in conformity with the “10 Buttons on the Lappels set on at equal distances” as laid down for the uniforms of guards officers.¹²⁴ As a brigadier and major-general, Brock rated paired buttons on the front of his tunics, and that is exactly what his surviving general’s coatees show. They do not show either lacing of the kind seen in the silhouette.¹²⁵

The star on the left side of the sitter casts further doubt on the silhouette being a portrait of Brock. The star depicted is that of the Order of the Garter.¹²⁶ Brock was not appointed a Knight of the Garter. For the capture of Fort Detroit on 16 August 1812, he was appointed “an extra knight of the most honorable order of the bath”¹²⁷ on 10 October 1812, three days before he was killed in action.

120 FitzGibbon notebook, folios 159-64, Henrietta Tupper to Mary Agnes FitzGibbon, 27 May 1897; emphasis in the original.

121 Tupper, *Brock*, p. 349, has a note which says there was “no good likeness of the general.” The matter will be dealt with in the section on the pastels.

122 *Supra*, n. 109.

123 Dawnay, *The Distinction of Rank of Regimental Officers, 1684 to 1855*, plates 7 and 10, numbers 26 and 30 are examples of epaulets close to the one shown in the silhouette; the respective dates in the plates are 1796 and 1798.

124 Carman, “Regulations, 1802,” p. 204.

125 *Supra*, n. 64.

126 FitzGibbon notebook, folio 117 mistakenly identifies the star as that of “the bath.” Whether there is a suggestion of a regimental connection is not certain, but the Coldstream Guards have the Garter Star as their regimental device; on this point see Dawnay, *The Distinction of Rank of Regimental Officers, 1684 to 1855*, p. 28.

127 Tupper, *Brock*, p. 281, Earl Bathurst to Sir George Prevost, 10 October 1812.