WILLIAM BUELOW GOULD—CONVICT ARTIST IN VAN DIEMEN'S LAND

By

ISABELLA MEAD*

(With 1 Plate)

When I came first to the Launceston Museum I found very many paintings by a convict named Gould. Very soon visitors were asking me questions about him and I proceeded to read what had been written. It seemed very little. In fact, it amounted to the notes that had been put together by Mr. Henry Allport for an exhibition of Tasmanian art held in Hobart in 1931. These notes were published in the "Mercury" newspaper and then put together in pamphlet form. Every subsequent writer on Gould has used them.

When people said, however, "When was he born? When did he die? Was he married? Did he leave any family? Did he paint only in oil?" I had to reply, "I do not know." I am still not certain when he was born, but I know when he died.

When people asked, "Where did Gould live?", I said, vaguely, "Hobart". Then, one day, looking through some records in the Museum, I found that William Buelow Gould was before R. C. Gunn,† Magistrate, here in Launceston, for being drunk. So he wasn't only in Hobart. He was also in Launceston and, I found later, at Macquarie Harbour, at Port Arthur, at Bridgewater, and at Jericho.

Then—Was he married? Did he have a family? Yes. Did he paint only in oil? No, he used watercolour too, much more effectively than he did oil.

So I got together gradually some kind of picture of this early artist.

Of Gould's early life very little is still known. Actually his name was Holland, not Gould.

He was born in Liverpool. Who his parents were is not known, for births were not registered at Somerset House until 1837 and even then were not obligatory; but an entry in Gore's Liverpool Directory of 1805, which reads "Peter Holland, Drawing Master", is suggestive.

Was Peter Holland, drawing master, Gould's father? He was probably educated at a local grammar school for he could read and write, an accomplishment rare amongst convicts 150 years ago.

Further details are given in the diary of Robert Francis Martin, 1st Officer in the ship which brought William Buelow Gould to Van Diemen's Land. He writes of him:

"This poor wretch is another example of the baneful effects produced by gambling. He has been a pupil of Mulready's—his true name is Holland—his friends residing in Stafford are chinaware manufacturers.

He got into a gambling set in Liverpool, lost his money and to redeem it and being fond of play he got initiated and became a regular member of the set of sharpers.

In the course of his practices he came to London and was at one time intimate with the notorious Thurthill, the murderer, and all his gang.

He painted at times for Ackerman in the Strand and got transported for some petty theft which his vices and necessities drove him to commit."

In an attempt to verify this story which Gould told, a letter was written to the Royal Academy of Arts who were unable to illuminate the story at all. William Mulready, R.A., taught drawing throughout his life, but as far as is known, no list of his pupils exists. Ackerman came to London as a coach designer, opened a print shop, and published numerous illustrated books.

Dr. C. Craig has in his possession an oil painting which suggests very strongly the Ackerman influence.

Tradition says also that Gould worked at flower painting at Spodes. Spodes say that it is likely that Gould did have some of his early training with them and an examination of various native flowers which Gould did in Tasmania reminds one immediately of exquisite china. But Spodes say also that their records were few between 1770 and 1856; also, as they were not considered of historical value, they were destroyed.

It was Josiah Spode who, in England, perfected bone china about the year 1805. This china was more translucent than anything which had been produced previously and was very suitable for decoration. To Josiah Spode England owed the

---
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great reputation she obtained as being the only country manufacturing this beautifully decorated type of porcelain.

So here we have a man—educated, probably apprenticed to Spode, learning their exquisite brushwork and the use of colour. Then, learning from Muirhead, who taught drawing and exhibited at the Royal Academy, then working for Ackerman, who settled in the Strand and established art lithography in England. So Gould should have brought to Van Diemen’s Land a rich inheritance—all that he had learnt from Josiah Spode, the finest of china manufacturers, and from Rudolf Ackerman, the finest printer and art producer of his time.

Why did Gould come to Van Diemen’s Land?

The beginning of the trouble was probably when he went to London, made the wrong friends, and got in with the notorious Thurtill. John Thurtill was tried for murder in 1823 and when he was arrested, the authorities arrested some of his associates they could find. At least three were tried and everyone in sight was examined. Perhaps Gould became frightened at this time and left London, going back to his friends in the pottery counties, hoping they would help him to find work. If they could not, they were too frightened to be associated with him after his life in London.

Unable to find work he found himself transported to Van Diemen’s Land, leaving behind him a wife and two children in Burslem.

Let us look at the portrait of William Buelow Gould which hangs in the Tasmanian Museum.*

This portrait shows him as quite a well-dressed man—about-town and was painted probably about 1815 when Gould was 45 or 46 years of age. Since we have in the archives an official description of him about this time, let us read it in conjunction with the portrait:

*In previous literature, especially Early Art in Tasmania (Henry Allport, 1981); The Story of Australian Art (William Moore, 1934); Origins of Art in Tasmania (Rosamond A. V. McCulloch, 1969), the man has been called William Barlow Gould, but all records show this to be a phonetical mistake.

**The mistake was never made by the Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, and Miss Ursula Hoff, National Gallery, Melbourne, in “Mennin,” Winter, 1951, No. 45, Vol. X, No. 2, uses the name William Buelow Gould in her notes on the Jubilee Exhibitions.

To the early inhabitants of Hobart Town, Van Diemen’s Land, however, it is very probable that names did not matter much and Barlow would be near enough. According to himself, neither Barlow nor Barlow Gould, nor even Gould was his true name, but Holland. But William Buelow Gould is the name used consistently by the authorities at the time and by Gould himself and throughout this paper.

and arms stolen one coat” The sentence was “seven years beyond the seas”.

He had a previous conviction for stealing “colours”, presumably painter’s colours. The charge for stealing the coat was felony and, unfortunately for Gould, this year, 1826, was the last year when petty larceny was felony.

Until he was due to leave England, Gould was detained in the hulks Dolphin and York. Here he stayed from November till the following August—nine months—when he was shipped to Van Diemen’s Land in the Asia 3. This was the second ship of this name to leave England for this country within a month. This Asia was shipwrecked, square sails on its three masts, and was of 523 tons, built Calcutta about 1811. She left Portsmouth on the 17th August, 1827, with 200 male convicts in the charge of Captain Boscawen. The Asia came again in 1841 and 1847. There were, altogether, three ships named Asia.

Gould was probably pleased when the actual day of sailing came. We do not know what his actual feelings were as he saw England for the last time.

The departure was witnessed by the Russian Squadron lying at anchor in the English Channel. The Russian Squadron was awaiting orders from the British Government to proceed to the Mediterranean to help England help the Greeks against Turkey in the Greek War of Liberation.

In ten days some of the convicts had become troublesome—sauiness being their chief misdemeanor. At the end of a fortnight the matter was more serious. A conspiracy was planned to take the ship, set the Captain and Officers adrift, and to sail for some part of South America. Reminiscent of Bligh, twenty years before. The plot justified the statement of the Portsmouth paper which wrote of the Asia’s departure—“200 worse characters never left the country”.

William Buelow Gould took no part in these intrigues. During the voyage out, Gould was evidently quite busy. He was entered on the ship’s papers as a portrait painter and the officers were having their likenesses taken by him. Officer Alsop was the first—sitting in full toga. But after four days Mr. Alsop was very dissatisfied with the result, especially when his friends quizzed him on the caricature. Then the purser Ellis, had his portrait painted. Two days later this was finished and judged by fellow officers to be a tolerably good one.

After this Gould began working at a portrait of the First Officer, Robert Francis Martin, but the motion of the ship became so strong that for nearly a week he was unable to proceed with it. Robert Francis Martin was not very happy about this portrait for, according to himself, it depicted him in one of his worst humours with a severe headache.

*In previous literature, especially Early Art in Tasmania (Henry Allport, 1981); The Story of Australian Art (William Moore, 1934); Origins of Art in Tasmania (Rosamond A. V. McCulloch, 1969), this man has been called William Barlow Gould, but all records show this to be a phonetical mistake.

The mistake was never made by the Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, and Miss Ursula Hoff, National Gallery, Melbourne, in “Mennin,” Winter, 1951, No. 45, Vol. X, No. 2, uses the name William Buelow Gould in her notes on the Jubilee Exhibitions.

To the early inhabitants of Hobart Town, Van Diemen’s Land, however, it is very probable that names did not matter much and Barlow would be near enough. According to himself, neither Barlow nor Barlow Gould, nor even Gould was his true name, but Holland. But William Buelow Gould is the name used consistently by the authorities at the time and by Gould himself and throughout this paper.

and arms stolen one coat” The sentence was “seven years beyond the seas”. The charge for stealing the coat was felony and, unfortunately for Gould, this year, 1826, was the last year when petty larceny was felony.

Until he was due to leave England, Gould was detained in the hulks Dolphin and York. Here he stayed from November till the following August—nine months—when he was shipped to Van Diemen’s Land in the Asia 3. This was the second ship of this name to leave England for this country within a month. This Asia was shipwrecked, square sails on its three masts, and was of 523 tons, built Calcutta about 1811. She left Portsmouth on the 17th August, 1827, with 200 male convicts in the charge of Captain Boscawen. The Asia came again in 1841 and 1847. There were, altogether, three ships named Asia.

Gould was probably pleased when the actual day of sailing came. We do not know what his actual feelings were as he saw England for the last time. But a general description of the departure has been given by the First Officer of the Asia 3, whose diary is still extant. He writes: “Some cast a tearful eye and melancholy look”, some “were too busy squabbling for rations that they did not seem to care”, and “others were lying in the sun talking in slang gibberish of their many adventures”.

The departure was witnessed by the Russian Squadron lying at anchor in the English Channel. The Russian Squadron was awaiting orders from the British Government to proceed to the Mediterranean to help England help the Greeks against Turkey in the Greek War of Liberation.

In ten days some of the convicts had become troublesome—sauiness being their chief misdemeanor. At the end of a fortnight the matter was more serious. A conspiracy was planned to take the ship, set the Captain and Officers adrift, and to sail for some part of South America. Reminiscent of Bligh, twenty years before. The plot justified the statement of the Portsmouth paper which wrote of the Asia’s departure—“200 worse characters never left the country”.

William Buelow Gould took no part in these intrigues. During the voyage out, Gould was evidently quite busy. He was entered on the ship’s papers as a portrait painter and the officers were having their likenesses taken by him. Officer Alsop was the first—sitting in full toga. But after four days Mr. Alsop was very dissatisfied with the result, especially when his friends quizzed him on the caricature. Then the purser Ellis, had his portrait painted. Two days later this was finished and judged by fellow officers to be a tolerably good one.

After this Gould began working at a portrait of the First Officer, Robert Francis Martin, but the motion of the ship became so strong that for nearly a week he was unable to proceed with it. Robert Francis Martin was not very happy about this portrait for, according to himself, it depicted him in one of his worst humours with a severe headache.
Gould then began what the men on board considered his best portrait, that of Captain Boscawen, the military captain in charge of the convicts.

Unfortunately, we do not know what has become of these portraits, but presumably some of these of the ship's officers would find their way back to England.

During the voyage, as well as painting portraits, Gould did flower studies and most of the officers agreed that he did his best work in this medium, and posterity has affirmed this.

A set of these flower studies was done for Dr. Fairfowl and one, a tulip, for the First Officer.

On his arrival in Hobart Town Gould had with him one drawing box, length 1 foot 1 inch, breadth 9 inches, depth 7 inches.

On Friday, the 7th December, 1827, after nearly four months at sea, the Asia 3 was nearing its journey's end and entered D'Entrecasteaux Channel. The run through the channel was delightful to those on board, with its picturesque bays and coves and high mountains in the background. Here and there was a cleared patch of land with the cottage or bark hut of a settler.

At six o'clock that Friday night they anchored near Battery Point.

Mr. O'Farrel, the Naval Officer, was first on board for reports. Mr. Rollo O'Farrell is, I think, an interesting character. He had been appointed Naval Officer by Earl Bathurst in 1825. Governor Arthur said he was ignorant of business of every kind and Rollo O'Farrell, who sounds an Irish adventurer, said he had come to Hobart Town expecting to run down smugglers, not to do an office job. However, he appears to have been very attentive to duty on this day.

At 5 a.m. the next morning, Mr. Kelly, the Harbourmaster, came on board. Then Captain Montague, Deputy Colonial Secretary, and Mr. Lakeland, Principal Superintendent of convicts, mustered the prisoners and inquired as to their receiving good treatment and full rations during the voyage. There were no complaints and the appearance of the convicts was very much praised by the colonial officers. The Historical Records say: "198 prisoners in a clean and healthy condition were disembarked".

This embarkation took from Monday to Thursday.

These convicts were found to be a very valuable set, most of them being from farm labouring—men much wanted in the colony. This is interesting when compared with the English report that "200 worse characters never left the country".

Of these 200 prisoners who embarked, 198 landed safely at Hobart Town after a trip of nearly four months, during which time there had been mutiny and very high seas. Of these 198 convicts, 171 were assigned to the service of settlers, 23 were employed to the public works, and four were invalids. Gould was to be employed on public works.

The official account of the arrival of the ship says: "The surgeon superintendent, Mr. Fairfowl, and the Master, Mr. Ager, appear to have paid every attention to their respective duties" and the Governor, Sir George Arthur, paid them some high compliments on the health and cleanliness of the men.

Although Gould's conduct was exemplary on the voyage (his report reads "Conduct again good"), it appears that his crime merited employment on public works and not assignment, so, after being paid his 6s. 10d. which had been retained for him during the voyage by Surgeon-Lieutenant Fairfowl, he was sent to the Brickfields.

This is a different occupation to that of painting, but there is a connection, and here again it seems to have been understood that Gould had had previous experience in potteries.

Within a few weeks of his arrival we find that the Colonial Engineer, John Lee Archer, is asking for permission for William Gould (No. 521 of Asia 3) and another convict to sleep at the Brickfields Hut so as to attend the "pottery oven occasionally at night". This request was submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor who ascertained that, up till 28th January, 1828, that is for six weeks after his disembarkation, Gould "hath not any offence recorded against him".

Two days later however, on the 30 January, the Principal Superintendent was obliged to note on the Certificate of Gould's good conduct that Gould was now in the Chain Gang charged with being drunk and that "he is a useful man to the Engineer in the new pottery, but I conceive he is a man of very bad character".

The particular offence that brought forth this statement was that on the 21st January he was in a public house called "The Jolly Sailor", then situated in Goulburn Street, Hobart Town, in a state of intoxication after 9 o'clock on a Saturday night (perhaps spending his 6s. 10d.) and the penalty was 14 days with the Chain Gang.

It would appear that Gould had become an habitual drinker and during the next few years we find that he is continually before the authorities. His subsequent dossier states that on—

17th June, 1828, he is committed for stealing a silver watch, the property of Maria Sargent. Pleaded guilty.

24th June, 1828, he is convicted for the above offence. Sentence, 7 years, to be served concurrently with his present sentence.

20th June, 1829, while employed on public works he is tried for passing a forged note of the Derwent Bank and subsequently destroying it to avoid detection. Sentence, 3 years to Macquarie Harbour.

At this time the brig Cyrus was employed in taking convicts to Macquarie Harbour. It was in her that Gould sailed on the 28th July, 1829, and became one of the figures in a world-known piracy.

The trip was unfortunate from the beginning. The ship was detained eight days at Recherche Bay. On the ninth day she drove from her anchors and put back to refit at Hobart Town. She then returned to Recherche Bay to pick up her anchors and was again weather bound. During this time a conspiracy was planned. Here we are only concerned with Gould's part in it.
There were 31 convicts on board, all in double iron. Fourteen of these did not join the mutineers and were put ashore, together with the captain, crew and the officers in charge of the convicts.

In organised attempts to obtain help, one party of five, including Gould, set off for the Huon River. They were later picked up in a state of exhaustion by a search party when they were twelve miles from its mouth.

Back in Hobart Town, five weeks later, on the 4th September, 1829, these five prisoners presented a memorial to Governor George Arthur praying him to "look into our case and be pleased to grant what indulgences your Excellency may think best".

The specific report on Gould says, "This man was particularly quiet and orderly", Governor Arthur said, the 7th October, 1829: "I have considered in council the cases of the prisoners who, being ordered to be moved to Macquarie Harbour by the Cyprus were put ashore when the vessel was seized by the convicts, and looking to the importance of holding out encouragement to good conduct in the prisoners under such circumstances of temptation as this mutiny . . . will approve of their being disposed of in the following manner".

Most were to be assigned, including Gould.

Gould's assignment was to Dr. Scott, of Boa Vista. Dr. James Scott, a surgeon in the Royal Navy, was appointed as Colonial Surgeon to the settlements on the Derwent in January, 1821. In June of the same year he was married at St. David's Church by the Rev. Robert Knopwood to Lucy Margaretta, the only child of Lieutenant-Governor Davey.

It would appear that Gould was favoured in this assignment to such a prominent citizen in Hobart Town, but habitual drunkenness and the inevitable absence from work did not earn for him his master's approbation. In May, he was sent back to the Barracks.

Successive admonitions and reprimands on the part of Dr. Scott bore no fruit and Gould soon found himself in cells on bread and water, being lashed, at the treadmill, doing hard labour, and in the hulk chain gang.

There is a monotony about the offences—drunkenness, drunkenness, and being out after hours, drunkenness on Saturday and Sunday, absent without leave, absent without leave and going on the Derwent River without proper authority, absent without leave and found in the street in the company of a female servant—for this he was to be confined in the Prisoners' Barracks for three months.

Time and again he was returned to Dr. Scott, but hardly a month goes by during the two years that he is with Dr. Scott but he is before the Magistrate.

Gould's continual drunkenness and the resultant bad behaviour became too much for the Authorities and on the 7th September, 1832, three years after his first trip, he sailed, by order of His Excellency Governor Arthur, for the second time to Macquarie Harbour.

At Macquarie Harbour where, officially, Gould appears to have been the servant of Dr. de Little, he was employed mostly at drawing. We are fortunate that he was for, apart from the artistic quality of his work, he has given us a very clear photographic picture of how Macquarie Harbour looked at this time.

In the "Penal Settlements of Van Diemen's Land, Macquarie Harbour, Maria Island, and Tasman's Peninsula" by Thomas James Lempriere, reprinted by the Royal Society of Tasmania (Northern Branch) 1954, p. 13, is found a detailed and interesting account of the work of Captain Butler, Commandant, 1825-9.

Lempriere tells us that Captain Butler left nothing to his successors to perform and it is interesting to compare his description of the Settlement with detailed watercolours by Gould, the originals of which are held by the Mitchell Library.

These watercolours came to the Mitchell Library with the G. A. Robinson Collection. They are clear in colour and detail and the drawing is exact in the then topographical style.

Here I would like to refer to two other sketches by Gould which also came back to Australia as part of the G. A. Robinson Collection. One is of "Tower", signed W. B. Gould Del., and the other is of a group of six aborigines. In both of these sketches the aborigines are wrapped in white shrouds.

G. A. Robinson, Concellor of the Aborigines, was at Macquarie Harbour early in 1833 and appears to have called there several times during that year. Commandant Baylee was, however, so busy closing down the settlement that he appears to have had little time to report fully on Robinson's movements. Robinson was, at this time, gathering in the aborigines prior to their removal to Flinders Island.

On the 20th June Robinson arrived back from one of his excursions, bringing with him "seven aborigines, the last of the Port Davey Tribe". Commandant Baylee wrote to Mr. Burnett, Colonial Secretary, advising him that these would be embarked on board the brig Tamar for Hobart Town via Port Arthur. It was probably at this time that Gould's drawings were done, for he returned to Hobart Town on the same trip of the Tamar as G. A. Robinson and the aborigines.

Some of the best of Gould's work which I have seen is this which he did at Macquarie Harbour.

Perhaps it was one of the few times when liquor was hard to obtain and one report does say that he was sent to paint the place.

Mr. Henry Allport, of Hobart, has a most delightful sketch book of the fish and shellfish found at Macquarie Harbour. As Mr. Allport says, "Each study is an exquisite example of water colour art". Many of them are signed by Gould, and have obviously been done by the same hand, and on several pages there is a pencil note at the bottom, "Dr. de Little, Macquarie Harbour".

Mr. Henry Allport tells me, also, that a series of native birds and native flowers in a sketch book, possibly painted by W. B. Gould, was sold in Hobart about 1890.

The late W. B. Beattie said that he had seen one of these sketch books and that it was then owned by a woman in New South Wales.
An oil painting, "Macquarie Harbour", in the Tasmanian Museum, was probably painted at this time also. After nine months here, Gould was sent back to Hobart Town in the brig Tamar on the 22nd June, 1833. In the accompanying list of prisoners signed by the Commandant, the entry referring to Gould reads:—

No. 521: Name, William Gould; Ship from Europe, Asia; How employed, Drawing, &c. Remarks: Returned to Hobart Town, having completed the work he was sent down for.

There seems to have been some lack of co-operation between Hobart Town and Macquarie Harbour on this point, for the Governor's comments on "what Gould was sent down for" are "Gould is a very drunken and dangerous person to be in Town." He was not sent to Macquarie Harbour to do any work, but was to be removed there for being drunken and dangerous. By His Excellency's Order, "He should be removed to Port Arthur," and then comes Governor Arthur's reproof: "In the evening of any morning sentence, be so good as to refer to the Principal Superin­dent for his opinion how they should be disposed of." Initialled G.A., 19th July.

Commandant Baylee complained frequently that he had received "no instructions." When Dr. de Little, Gould's master, arrived he was not put in charge of the hospital and surgical stores as he thought he would be because Baylee said he "had received no instructions". But communications between Macquarie Harbour and Hobart Town were few. When James Backhouse arrived there he was given a great welcome, for they had had no news of Hobart Town for more than three months.

So the following month finds Gould at Port Arthur ("this man should be removed to Port Arthur"). He arrived there on the 16th August, 1833, in the Government brig Isabella.

In a return six months later, 31st March, 1834, Gould is listed as house servant to the Assistant Surgeon, Thomas Coke Brownell.

Thomas Coke Brownell was replaced by John McBraire in July of the same year, and probably Gould was transferred to him. We do not know what opportunities Gould had for painting at Port Arthur, for O'Hara Booth's discipline was very strict, but a note referring to two of Gould's fish studies in the Beattie Catalogue says, "These were painted by Gould when he was at Port Arthur.

Mr. Sharman, State Archivist, has worked through the lists of convicts at Port Arthur during this period, through the Commandant's letters forwarding convicts back and acknowledging the arrival of convicts, and through the Returns of Punishments, but, apart from Gould's assignment to Thomas Coke Brownell, his name is not men­tioned.

Gould would normally have received his freedom in 1834, his original sentence being for seven years, but, because of the concurrent sentence passed upon him in the Supreme Court for stealing a silver watch eighteen months after his arrival, the certificate was not issued until the 25th June, 1835, which would mean that he had been at Port Arthur for nearly two years. The late J. W. Beattie says that he received his "Certificate of Freedom" at Port Arthur.

With this certificate, William Buellw Gould came north to Launceston and entered into written agreement with Henry Palmer. Henry Palmer was a coachbuilder, at first in Elizabeth Street, Launceston, and then, from 1834 onwards, in York Street.

In return for the stipulated wages, clothing, food, &c., Gould undertook to paint armorial decorations on the carriages of the wealthy merchants and landlords of Launceston Town. Having worked for Ackerman he would be very familiar with this work.

This arrangement, however, lasted but two or three days and his employer, evidently very dis­tracted at losing labour, then hard to get, especially for such a specialised job as armorial painting, threatened in a public notice in the Launceston "Advertiser" to have a warrant issued for his arrest if he did not return. This reads as follows:—

"Whereas, a man named William Gould, by trade a painter, and artist, recently from Hobart Town, with a Certificate of Freedom, entered into a written agreement to serve the undersigned for a period of six months, on stipulated wages, and after obtaining a considerable advance in new clothing, &c, absconded a fortnight ago, having remained only a few days in his employment. Now, this is to give notice, that any person in whose employ­ment he may be found will be proceeded against according to law, and should this meet his eye he is hereby informed that if he does not immediately return to perform his engagement a warrant will be issued for his apprehension."

Henry Palmer, Launceston, October, 14, 1835.

"Launceston Advertiser", 22nd October, 1835.

Gould did return and the following month, on 21st November, 1835, when the "Bushrangers, or Norwood Vale", a melodrama written by Henry Melville, was played in Launceston for the first time, Gould is featured as the artist who has done the scenic painting.

Dr. E. Morris Miller in "Pressmen and Governors", 1952, p. 50, has given us a description of this melodramatic piece. It is the first dramatic piece on an Australian theme printed and published by an author living in Australia and was played in Launceston. It was really a play of one act, divided into three with thirteen scenes. A settler is attacked by bushrangers but is saved by his daughter's lover, of whom he has previously dis­proved, and a native.

The advertisement in the "Cornwall Chronicle" says: "In the course of the piece will be exhibited an applicable and well-known scenic view of 'Molly York's Night Cap at Sunset', painted by Mr. Gould, an eminent Colonial Artist. Done expressly for this occasion."

A little money in his pocket, however, and Gould fell in with the bad companions who frequented one or other of the old pubs then in Brisbane Street. Not, I think, Dickey White's, but more probably the Currency House which was pulled down soon after, or the Joiner's Arms.
On New Year's Day, Gould was evidently celebrating too well and was found drunk in Brisbane Street, arrested and taken to the local watchhouse which stood then on the present site of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Church, at the corner of St. John and Paterson Streets.

He resented this bitterly, and after much kicking and shouting for the Chief Constable he was handcuffed and chained by Constable John Williams. Constable Williams says briefly in his charge: "He was drunk".

Next day he was brought before the Magistrate, Ronald Campbell Gunn, found guilty, and fined five shillings. (This is the charge found in the Records of the Museum.)

Immediately on this he decided to shake the dust of Launceston from 'neath his feet and his employer, Henry Palmer, reported to the Magistrate on the 4th January that Gould was last seen four or five miles out on the Paterson's Plains Road (now St. Leonards) on his way to the country, taking with him money that he had collected for his employer.

The police apprehended him on the 26th February—nearly two months later—and sent for his employer. Henry Palmer said he was too busy to come that day for "he was attending on a gentleman and that a night's lodging would do Gould no harm". When the case was heard, on the 3rd March, evidently Gould had had more than one night's lodging, it was dismissed, the Prosecutor, Henry Palmer, stating he was in error.

By now Gould had almost completed his six months service with Henry Palmer which had begun on the 12th September, and the parting was probably mutual. Not being happy in Launceston, he returned, evidently, to his old haunts in Hobart Town, but immediately upon his arrival back, perhaps celebrating his return, with his last pay, he was in trouble. Again the charge is larceny, probably a drunken misdemeanour for, after being tried in the Supreme Court, he was found "guilty, but mercy".

In December of this year (1836), nine years after his arrival in Van Diemen's Land, he, as William Buelow, bachelor, took unto himself a wife, one Amy Reynolds, spinster. The banns were called and he was married in Old Trinity Church, Hobart, by the parish priest, Philip Palmer. Old Trinity Church is now the Supreme Court.

History has not revealed what happened to the wife and children left in England nearly ten years before, but Van Diemen's Land was a long way away and news travelled very slowly, if at all.

After his marriage, Gould appears to have endeavoured to earn an honest living, but, having probably earned a name as a ne'er-do-well around town, this was difficult. He finds himself accused of crimes which he may or may not have committed, including a charge of stealing an engraving, for which he was committed for trial.

But the attempt at reformation was evidently sincere and for the next eight years he keeps out of serious trouble. Most of his Tasmanian painting which is about at the present time seems to have been done during these years and includes the self portrait which is hung in the Tasmanian Museum.

It may be noted here that the many examples of Gould's work held by the Queen Victoria Museum, Launceston, Tasmania, were collected by the late J. W. Beattie and came to Launceston when the collection was purchased by the Launceston City Council in 1936.

In spite of this period seemingly being Gould's most prolific in painting, it was not his best, and it is hard to know how he supported his wife and family. Virtually it would have been impossible for him to do so by painting, especially as tradition says his paintings were taken by publicans in lieu of payment of his drink bill.

By the middle of the 40's Gould is again in trouble with the authorities. In July, 1845, he is convicted of stealing a musical snuff box, valued at £3, again the kind of theft a drunken man would commit. For this he was given two years' imprisonment but again his term is commuted to six months, this time by the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Eardley-Wilmot.

In spite of this preferential treatment, little more than twelve months elapse before he is again in trouble. This time it is for stealing a pair of razors valued at 2s. 6d. He was tried in the Supreme Court and sentenced to two years' hard labour.

This sentence evidently left his wife and family destitute and the necessitous state of Mrs. Gould led her to petition the Lieutenant-Governor, now Sir William Denison, for help. She says "That (she) petitioner is left wholly destitute with five helpless children without any means of support and have since that period (the imprisonment of her husband) been depending on the benevolent hand of a humane and generous public and petitioner has since been allowed a weekly donation of 2s. from the Benevolent Dorcas Society, which gratuity has ceased and was petitioner's principal dependence whose helpless family are now left without a home to suffer the pinching pangs of starvation . . . May they (the Legislative Council) be mercifully pleased to some trifling weekly allowance for the support of five of Her Majesty's helpless and starving subjects without whose assistance must inevitably perish ".

This petition is supported by letters from E. A. Brown, 28 Patrick Street; J. T. Butler, J. H. Smales; and J. Montgomery, Murray Street, the landlord of 24 Harrington Street where Mrs. Gould lived. Number 24 Harrington Street stood as part of Wilmot Terrace until a few years ago.

Gould, in spite of reprieves during other terms of imprisonment, appears to have completed this two years' sentence and was kept at hard labour at Bridgewater and Jericho.

This appears, however, to have been his last misdemeanour. Continual drunkenness and then hard labour evidently broke his constitution. Upon his release, I imagine, he hung around the streets of Hobart Town getting drink when he could.

The tradition that publicans locked him in a garret to paint for them in return for a drink probably dates from this period.

In January, 1852, Gould attended the wedding of a daughter, Dinah Buelow Gould, who married Thomas Smith at St. George's Church, Battery Point, Hobart.
But life for him was drawing to a close, and his end was miserable. Perhaps, like his contemporary, Thomas Griffiths Wainwright, he had been brought up in an artistic atmosphere where hulks, treading-mills, chain gangs and hard labour were unknown.

William Buelow Gould, or Holland, died in his late forties or early fifties on the 11th December, 1853, in Macquarie Street. The cause of death is "natural causes". An obituary notice in the "Hobart Town Daily Courier", when such notices for other than the wealthy were rare, reads:—

"On the 11th instant, at his residence, Macquarie Street, Mr. William Buelow Gould, aged 49 years. The funeral will take place on Wednesday next at 3 o'clock. Friends at a distance will please accept this notice."

Monday, December 12, 1853.

I would suggest to you that, although the life of William Buelow Gould is a pitiful story of cruelty, hardness, sorrow and waste, brought about "natural causes", as his contemporaries, possibly brought in an artistic atmosphere, Gould "led a so-called Bohemian life. This brought him, on his own confession, in contact with evil companions of the type so vividly described for us by Charles Dickens."

After transportation, life in Hobart Town would do little to help him. We can imagine the evenings spent at the "Jolly Sailor" in Goulburn Street in Hobart Town in the 1830's. I would like to suggest here that the so-called Wainwright tavern sketches held by the Queen Victoria Museum, Launceston, could be the work of Gould. These tavern sketches and tavern scenes of the type that hung around Hobart Town at this time; these would be the people who would be his companions as he crawled from pub to pub.

Unfortunately, we cannot say that Gould made any new contribution to Australian Art, for his whole life in Van Diemen's Land militated against this.

He has left us, however, some beautifully executed flower studies which are unique. These belong to Miss E. M. Hugh Smith, England, and I am much indebted to her for making them available. They include three sketch books of native flowers of Van Diemen's Land and are, as the inscription says, "copied from nature".

How many such studies were done by Gould I do not know, but these drawn 1830-1 are characteristic of his fineness of brushwork and of a minute finish which it would be difficult to excel.

These botanical studies are all named, and are signed "B." or "J.B.". It is almost certain that the specimens were named by James Backhouse, Quaker, Missioner and botanist, who was in Van Diemen's Land from February, 1832, to November, 1834, and again from April to November, 1837. How James Backhouse came to name them is not quite clear but there is evidence that he and Gould travelled roads that converged quite often.

Clive Turnbull, in his introduction to the Jubilee Exhibition of Australian Art says: "Gould's skillful and often extremely attractive still lifes reminded the colonists of an older and more settled civilization". The Gould exhibited in the Jubilee Exhibition was the Still Life Study of Flowers and Fruit held by Sir Lloyd Jones. This was also included in the Exhibition which was sent to the United States and Canada in 1941. In it Gould shows an almost simple minded delight in colour and texture. His use of blue is also artistic and reminds one of the blue of the Dutch artists.

Arnold Shore says that this Dutch influence is very evident in Gould's still life studies, and I think that all artists would agree on this point. It is very reminiscent of the still life work done in Holland over a century ago. Holland is unique in having had over a century of still life painting. The 17th and 18th century was the time of the Dutch overseas discovery. Seagoing merchants brought back with them new and strange fruits and flavours which were displayed by the wealthier classes. Artists found in these newly-discovered things fascinating forms and colours. Simple studies of fish and dead animals, particularly hares, also gave pleasure to art patrons. This school of painting had much influence on English artists and was very popular with them. It would appear to have influenced Gould. All his studies of dead game—fish—flowers—all these when painted in oil have the same flat decorative touch of the Dutch School.

This influence could, however, not only have been one of taste, but also one of racial instinct coupled with his Spode training.

You will remember that Gould's real name was Holland. Possibly Holland was the country of his father's origin. During the 18th century there was considerable interchange in craftsman and artists, especially in the pottery industries; also, again we are remembering the Spode tradition. An artist named Buelow might, quite easily sign himself "van Holland", as we might today sign ourselves "Australia" when in a strange country. As such he would be indexed on pay sheets, &c. This could result in his being eventually known as Holland. There are many examples of this kind in history.

As we have been unable to learn very much either of Gould's background or of his work in England, we cannot tell how far he fulfilled or fell short of any promise shown in his early years.

We cannot say, either, how far he was actually influenced either by the Dutch School, by Spodes, by Rudolph Ackerman, or by his teachers, possibly his father and then later Mulready.

With William Buelow Gould's death in 1853 the period of early art in this land almost finished. Not many of the early colonists who had pioneered art in this new colony of Van Diemen's Land lived after the turn of the mid-century.

Thomas Griffiths Wainwright had died in 1847; John Glover in 1849; Benjamin Duterrau in 1851;

It is perhaps fitting that it should be so, for in 1853 Van Diemen's Land began a new life as Tasmania.
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1. GUNN, RONALD CAMPBELL, 1808-1885, was Superintendent of Convicts, Northern Division, and Police Magistrate, 1830-1836.

2. BOSCAVEN, CAPTAIN E. P., Captain 40th Regiment, was in Hobart Town in 1828. He sailed for Bombay with a detachment of his Regiment in the Royal George, R. Embleton, Master, 1st March, 1829.

3. MURRAY, WILLIAM, 1788-1863, genre painter, taught drawing, illustrated children’s books, exhibited at Royal Academy, illustrated the “Vicar of Wakefield”, c. 1840. Designed the first penny postage envelope issued by Rowland Hill, 1842.

4. ACKERMAN, RUDOLPH, 1764-1834. Art publisher and bookseller.

5. The Jolly Sailor was a Public House in Goulburn Street, Hobart. In 1835 the licence was held by Francis William Cobb. H.T.G., 8 Oct., 1836, p. 92.

6. ARTHUR, SIR GEORGE, Governor of Van Diemen’s Land, 1824-1836.

7. Macquarie Harbour, Penal Settlement on West Coast of Tasmania, (1824-1833).

8. WILMOT, SIR EARLEY, Governor of Van Diemen’s Land, 1842-1846.

9. DE LITTLE, DOCTOR. Arrived in Hobart Town in the Cloyston in May, 1832 and went to Macquarie Harbour shortly afterwards, succeeding Dr. Denny. He remained until the settlement was disbanded, and in 1834 succeeded Dr. Sharland at Bothwell. In 1839 he was found drowned and was buried in the Bothwell cemetery.

10. DENISON, SIR WILLIAM. Governor of Van Diemen’s Land, 1847-1855.


13. SNAVES, JOSEPH H., was a Church of England catechist. He was appointed as a “temporary clerk” at St. David’s Church in 1833 and as catechist at Trinity Church, Hobart, 1851. He was ordained as a deacon in 1866 “after 23 years’ lay ministry”.

14. MONTAGU, JOHN, 1797-1853. Came to Van Diemen’s Land in 1823 with Governor Sir George Arthur.

15. The Brig Cythere, 108 tons, was purchased in August, 1826, by Governor Arthur for the penal settlement of Macquarie Harbour. The cost was £1,700 sterling.