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The Ian Potter Museum of Art is delighted to present Stephen Bush: Steenhuffel, a major exhibition of the work of acclaimed Australian painter Stephen Bush. Steenhuffel is the fourth in the Potter's series of Vizard Foundation Contemporary Artist Projects, a creative initiative of the Vizard Foundation which offers mid-career and senior artists a significant grant to produce new work. Following on from previous exhibitions by Jenny Watson (2011), Geoff Lowe / A Constructed World (2012) and Philip Brophy (2013), Bush’s unique iteration of the project has not only enabled him to both make and exhibit new paintings, but to also shape a very particular viewing experience that allows audiences to see his work from across the decades outside of the linear and largely narrative framework of the traditional survey exhibition. As a result, Steenhuffel becomes both a powerful and playful meditation on the role and contribution of the artist in contemporary society. I have no doubt that visitors familiar with Stephen Bush’s impressive oeuvre, as well as those new to the artist’s work, will thoroughly enjoy this journey.

This beautiful publication includes new writing on Stephen Bush’s practice by curator and writer Liza Statton and the Potter’s Director, Kelly Gellatly, and I thank them both for their contributions and the insights they contain. Steenhuffel is the first curatorial project undertaken by Kelly at the Potter, and I congratulate her on her efforts. Thanks are also due to the Vizard Foundation for their ongoing support of the Potter, this exhibition, and the Contemporary Artist Project series as a whole. The invaluable acknowledgement and encouragement that the Foundation provides mid-career and senior artists is unique within Australia and the Potter is pleased to be able to exhibit the exciting new work that develops from their very direct support. We are also indebted to Bernard Shafer for his assistance with the freight of his monumental painting included in the exhibition.

Thanks are due to the Potter’s Assistant Curator, Suzette Wearne, and Collections and Exhibitions Officer Steve Martin for their invaluable assistance as well as to all of the Potter staff for helping to ensure the exhibition’s success. We also owe a debt of gratitude to Kate Dow, Head of the Victorian College of the Arts’ Painting program and to Darren Munce for their help in coordinating a group of VCA students to execute a wall mural, under Stephen Bush’s direction, within the exhibition. Finally, we congratulate Stephen Bush and warmly thank him for his work, the exhibition, and his enthusiastic collaboration with the entire Potter team.

Julie Ann Cox
Chairman, Ian Potter Museum of Art Board
Before I knew Stephen Bush as a person, I knew him as a painter. Like many admirers, I became familiar with his work by way of his monochrome painting series, *The lure of Paris* (fig. 1) (1992– ). Witty and cryptic, these serialized depictions of Jean de Brunhoff’s portly Babar the Elephant exploring a Turner-esque landscape read as wry send-ups of European academic painting and a metaphor for the postcolonial condition in Australia. In de Brunhoff’s 1931 children’s story, *L’Histoire de Babar*, Babar travels to Paris from Africa, where he is ‘civilised’ by Western society. Having adopted Western cultural dress, customs, and behaviors, Babar returns to the jungle in Africa to ‘civilise’ his fellow elephants. The British did the same to the Aboriginal Australians when they claimed the land for the monarchy, and the legacy of postcolonialism is part and parcel of contemporary Australian visual culture.

Yet to consider the works only within the purview of postcolonial discourse, or solely as signifiers of Australian identity, is to limit their discursiveness. Spanning twenty-one years, and now thirty paintings strong, Bush’s *The lure of Paris* paintings do more than make allusions to the maladies and injustices of History. The paintings index the variety of influences that inform Bush’s work, while revealing the artist’s paradoxical attitude toward painting, which is both quixotic and pragmatic.

Although Bush might best be described as a figurative painter, it doesn’t tell the whole story about an artist whose exuberant eclecticism defies easy categorisation. For the past three decades, Bush’s painting style and choice of subject matter has been vast and varied. In addition to costumed elephants, Bush has painted farm equipment, potatoes, rubbish bins, humble cabins, and beekeepers, to name a few. And despite his catholic interests, what remains consistent is the artist’s commitment to representational painting, which has been steadfast since the late 1970s. This was a decidedly unfashionable choice, as the flamboyant figuration and gestural brushstrokes of the Neo-Expressionists had become painting’s *lingua franca* at the time. Bush turned his attention to the landscapes of nineteenth-century European and American painters, the mannered figuration of American Regionalist painters, and the iconography of Pop Art, among others. Though seemingly curious and incongruous, such an assortment of interests reveals a fascination with the ordinary, contempt for the notion of progress, and a view that paintings are constructed things that question both the subjectivity of the artist and the viewer.

In *The lure of Paris*, Bush’s overt blend of high and low subject matter lends the work an air of visual slap-stick that belies its technical virtuosity. Using classical techniques such as *grisaille* and *chiaroscuro*, Bush creates a pictorial space that looks visibly plausible. Babar is painted so convincingly, we believe he occupies the space Bush depicts. With its portentous skies, ethereal light, surging tides, and monumental, rocky bluffs, *The lure of Paris* banes the stylistic hallmarks of nineteenth-century Romantic painters such as Caspar David Friedrich, Eugène Delacroix, Thomas Cole, and Frederic Edwin Church, among others. Broadly speaking, landscapes by these artists often reflected a view of nature as dramatic and unforgiving; yet, man remained at the center of it all. Travel and exploration were key themes; the individual beholding nature was another.
Twilight in the wilderness (1860) [fig. 2] by Frederic Edwin Church is emblematic of the symbolism that underscores such American romanticism. The painting presents a spectacular view of Mount Katahdin, in Maine, seen at dusk. The sky, streaked with vermillion, contrasts with the sulfurous light that hovers over the purple mountain. Church directs our gaze inward toward the rapidly dissolving radiant light. Framed by the gnarled, barren trees and a rocky outcrop, we find ourselves at the center of the composition, beholding the placid bay and serpentine river that winds through the wilderness. While Church is literally taking the wilderness as a nineteenth-century amateur explorer. In Bluff (1990) [fig. 5], and Looking for a prospect (1987) [fig. 3], Bush’s conscious poses occupy the idealised wilderness or the scenic backdrop set before a stage curtain. Bush arranges the figures parallel to the picture plane, and they occupy the shallow space in the foreground of the painting. A dark shadow line running along the bottom of the painted screen reinforces this lack of depth, while also articulating the screen as an object within the painting. These compositional designs compress the visual space into foreground and background, creating an emphasis on the figures’ pictorial space, which is continuous with ours—an effect realised by pre-Renaissance Italian painters such as Giottto. While the painting may echo the reduction of forms and schematised space consistent with Giottto, the frontality of the figures, strong use of contour lines, and overall flatness, also recall the pictorial sensibility of Édouard Manet.

Broadly speaking, Manet’s paintings are pictures of pictures [fig. 6]. His nineteenth-century modern translations of Titian, Goya, Velázquez, and Hals, among others, challenged the relentless classicism of the French academy and embraced the spontaneity of photography, which by the 1860s, was embedded in visual culture. Manet’s works convey a sense of detachment and alienation, conditions described by the poet Charles Baudelaire as endemic to modern, urban life. In a sense, Bush’s From the field to figuration, a picture of a picture, is a conceptual conceit to Manet, whose painting simultaneously absorbed photography’s narrative possibilities while rejecting its representational accuracy.

These contemplative scenes, particularly those by the American painters like Cole and Church, carried moralising and nationalistic messages that spoke particularly to the American viewer. As American art scholar Barbara Novak writes:

The emphasis on artifice and theatricality is perhaps most literal in From the field to figuration. In this monochrome work, derived from a found photograph, three gentlemen-mountaineers pose before a painted alpine backdrop. The men clutch guide poles and a climbing rope; each places one foot on top of a rock, a gesture conveying the action they will undertake. Two realistically rendered fake trees frame the edge of the painting as well as the scenic backdrop set between a stage curtain. Bush arranges the figures parallel to the picture plane, and they occupy the shallow space in the foreground of the painting. A dark shadow line running along the bottom of the painted screen reinforces this lack of depth, while also articulating the screen as an object within the painting. These compositional designs compress the visual space into foreground and background, creating an emphasis on the figures’ pictorial space, which is continuous with ours—an effect realised by pre-Renaissance Italian painters such as Giottto.
Artists have employed these compositional devices to convey ideas about power and worship to viewers for centuries, and Bush uses such conventions to subvert the authority we assign to such historical representations. In effect, his dressed up elephant sermonising on the mountaintop is a form of pantomime—a gestural exaggeration of the reverential and the heroic that amuses while it critiques. As much of his work, Bush employs humor to circumvent any singular notion of meaning that might be ascribed to Type cast. In this way, the painting provokes rather than explains. What are we to make of an artist who paints people dressed up in elephant costumes performing in the landscape? Is the painting simply the artist’s folly? Or, does the work complicate the ideals and values that we place upon art and artists? By establishing a tension between the absurdity displayed and the implications of such a presentation, Bush subjects us to our own self-awareness.

If Type cast is an example of Bush’s whimsical and irreverent sensibilities employed for aesthetic means, it also reflects his use of parody as a form of questioning. Parody relies on the deliberate exaggeration of a known genre, and good parody requires a command of the form being parodied. One of the principle devices of parody is incongruity, which is achieved through the juxtaposition between form, which is followed faithfully, and content, which is foreign to the form in which it is inserted. With Type cast, Bush appropriates and erases the formal conventions of ‘high art’ classics—ranging from Piero della Francesca to Nicolas Poussin—and juxtaposes them with humorous cartoon-inspired imagery, creating a psychological tension between the two that is not easily reconcilable.

Quotation and appropriation are integral to parody, and despite Bush’s informed art historical borrowings, his references often lead him back to himself. Theosed elephants in Type cast for example, ‘talk back’ to earlier works, such as This big in the Afterlife (1990) [fig. 7] and This big in the Afterlife, too (1992) [fig. 8]—two landscape-based, historical genre paintings depicting costumed figures in similar poses. While the compositional formula is the same for both paintings, Bush’s use of color, change in setting, and costume details distinguish the two from one another.

With Type cast, Bush adapts pictorial elements previously displayed and recontextualises them. He reverses the elephants’ pose; the crimson toga is now golden; the snow-covered peaks have given way to a majestic waterfall. The effect is one of subtle change over time. It involves analysing and following an established convention but evolving or deviating from it in order to see something anew. For example, the contrasting textures of the elephant costumes in When I was here I wanted to be there (1994) [fig. 9], and Just wait till now becomes then (1996) [fig. 10]. With its pairing of elephants in an alpine landscape, Bush employs the same composition for both works, yet differentiates between the two with his depiction of the elephants and the landscapes they inhabit. In When I was here I wanted to be there, the costumed elephants appear on a bluff framed by views of a valley, a glacial lake, and snow-capped mountain peaks. The orator figure wears a classical crimson toga. The drapery folds read as soft and fluid against the elephant’s hide, which appears rubbery and synthetic. In Just wait till now becomes then, the costumed figures appear on a bluff before an alpine lake. They wear coarse, wooly costumes that contrast in style to those found in When I was here I wanted to be there.

Type cast echoes the conscious theatricality of these works, yet speaks directly to the subject matter depicted in paintings such as When I was here I wanted to be there (1994) [fig. 9], and Just wait till now becomes then (1996) [fig. 10]. With its pairing of elephants in an alpine landscape, Bush employs the same composition for both works, yet differentiates between the two with his depiction of the elephants and the landscapes they inhabit. In When I was here I wanted to be there, the costumed elephants appear on a bluff framed by views of a valley, a glacial lake, and snow-capped mountain peaks. The orator figure wears a classical crimson toga. The drapery folds read as soft and fluid against the elephant’s hide, which appears rubbery and synthetic. In Just wait till now becomes then, the costumed figures appear on a bluff before an alpine lake. They wear coarse, wooly costumes that contrast in style to those found in When I was here I wanted to be there.
Moreover, the self-referencing evident in *Type cast* is a form of visual reiteration, which involves re-stating something for emphasis or clarity rather than simply an act of repetition. Bush’s *The Ionisation of Paris* paintings embody this kind of process of revision. Despite the constancy of the subject depicted, each *The Ionisation of Paris* is a new version of itself produced by the artist at a distinct moment. Bush’s serialisation of his own work is not unique to the artist. Consider Gilbert Stuart’s iconic portraits of George Washington. Stuart re-painted Washington over one hundred times; each version was a variation of another. The figure of Ariadne in the piazza was a constant subject for Giorgio de Chirico; he painted different versions of this painting throughout his career. Water-lilies forever compelled Claude Monet. Andy Warhol painted versions of Campbell soup cans, Brillo Boxes, and Marilyn. Ed Ruscha ensnared Hoover vacuum cleaners and basketballs in multiple variations. Despite the differences in their historical and cultural contexts, these artists, like so many others, reconsidered and revised their own works in order to illuminate different pictorial possibilities.

The parodic sensibility that underscores Bush’s work leads him to create paintings that often feel nostalgic, yet reveal themselves to be anything but.1 The historicising nature of paintings such as *Bluff*, *Cabin II* in the Adirondacks, and *Type cast* for example, are grand tableaux filled with frustrated narratives that speak as much to the present and future as they do to the past. The pictures neither explain themselves nor Bush’s possible intentions. Yet, they reveal the conceit of style as an artifact, which suggests that the pictorial reality Bush embodies this kind of process of revision. Despite the constancy of the subject depicted, each *The Ionisation of Paris* is a new version of itself produced by the artist at a distinct moment. Bush’s serialisation of his own work is not unique to the artist. Consider Gilbert Stuart’s iconic portraits of George Washington. Stuart re-painted Washington over one hundred times; each version was a variation of another. The figure of Ariadne in the piazza was a constant subject for Giorgio de Chirico; he painted different versions of this painting throughout his career. Water-lilies forever compelled Claude Monet. Andy Warhol painted versions of Campbell soup cans, Brillo Boxes, and Marilyn. Ed Ruscha ensnared Hoover vacuum cleaners and basketballs in multiple variations. Despite the differences in their historical and cultural contexts, these artists, like so many others, reconsidered and revised their own works in order to illuminate different pictorial possibilities.
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Bush creates a similar sense of volatility in Goat willow (2005) [cat. no. 9, p. 38], where a viscous stew of browns, ochre, black, bright green, and white enamel determines the topographical surface. Situated within these eddies of color are fragments of our built environment. A timber suspension bridge spans an implied cliff, wooden scaffolding extends upward and outward; and, two modernist buildings occupy the center of the composition. In this strange assemblage of imagery, we find a confluence of languages and ideas at odds with one another. The linearity of the rickety timber scaffolding and sleek minimalist buildings contrast with the amorphous forms and flamboyant fields of color that define the atmospheric landscape. The bridge becomes symbolic in effect; it reconciles the organic with the man-made; the old with the new; and, conscious with intuitive mark making.

With Lauterbrunnenental and Goat willow, Bush employs a single perspective to construct the pictorial space. In later spall works such as Road with such intent (2007) [cat. no. 10, p. 39], Shoot on the hills of glory (2008) [cat. no. 11, p. 41], and Alahauter willow (2008) [cat. no. 58, pp. 42–43], the space becomes more complex through his use of multiple perspectives and dense layering of fragmented imagery. In Shoot on the hills of glory, a familiar alpine view dissolves into flows of color that form vague plateaus and marshes. A handful of spare trees surround a hollowed out log dwelling that extends upward and outward; and, two modernist buildings occupy the center of the composition. In doing so, Bush allows us to consider his paintings through the context of our own experiences, giving us the freedom to see what we desire.

Concealed in the guise of a highland clansman, the tartan figure is emblematic of the artist as an aesthetic heretic in search of pure visual experiences that defy temporal boundaries. Seemingly removed from time and place, Bush’s subjects, ranging from toy elephants and explorers, to farm equipment, beekeepers, and modernist architecture, among others, are inherently reflective of our contemporary cultural mindset, one which is trapped in a nostalgic gaze. Over the past three decades, Bush has created figurative paintings that follow no linear trajectory. He conforms to established pictorial conventions only to deviate from them. And while he embraces a multitude of representational painting styles, he rejects outright any stylistic consistency. There is a constant interplay between image and technique, and form and content in Bush’s work, and these elements are often at odds with one another. This kind of painting enthralles, yet refuses easy explanation. It uses familiar imagery and situational ambiguity to question the kinds of subjects and images we value. In doing so, Bush allows us to consider his paintings through the context of our own experiences, giving us the freedom to see what we desire.

Liza Statton is an independent curator based in Australia. Previously, she was the Director/ Curator at Artspace in New Haven, Connecticut, and served as the first Eugene V. Thaw Fellow at SITE Santa Fe in Santa Fe, New Mexico, where she helped organise Stephen Bush’s solo exhibition in 2007. She worked as a curatorial assistant at the Massachusetts Museum of Contemporary Art (MASS MoCA) while receiving her MA from the Williams College Graduate Program in the History of Art. edspProjects.com
Stephen Bush's painting, *Col du Galibier* (2003) [cat. no. 7, p. 33] assumes an almost talismanic presence in this exhibition. Spate, and somehow singular in the company of a gallery of paintings seemingly brought together because of a consistent yet loose interest in both the expressive and narrative possibilities of landscape that plays out across them, *Col du Galibier* is at once related to this quest but not of it. The glossy purple, blue and green globules in the work certainly resemble a mountaneous mass, but this mass is formed by a rather precarious looking pile of paint that literally bears the physical markings of it being squeezed from the tube. Like the expectant blank screen that faces the twenty-first century author, Bush has captured the precious and anxious moment of beginning, the daunting task of making a start; painting a painting about the act of painting at the moment before the brush is loaded and that first mark is made.

At the heart of Stephen Bush's practice is the constant, almost nagging question of what it means to be an artist and particularly, what it means to work in the most anachronistic of mediums: paint. Bush's oeuvre is tantalisingly playful and confounding in its embrace of circularity and repetition, and never ceases to surprise in its creative re-use of an expansive back catalogue of subject matter and motifs. His paintings continue to be made within a variety of self-imposed and at times, performative frameworks; whether it be painting Babar the Elephant from memory in his ongoing *The Jure of Paris series* (1992); working monochromatically with a particular colour (sienna red, green, purple); introducing the use of paint as viscous liquid as a way of embracing chance and the accidental and as a means by which to interrupt an over-reliance on figuration; or populating the combination of 'straight' landscapes and psychedelic high-keyed vistas that have appeared across the years with the ever-stoic, hard-working presence of the beekeeper. However, the push-pull that reverberates across his work like a refrain is the presence of the beekeeper. However, these 'groups' of works are in no way contained by the walls of the spaces that house them, and continue to remain in dialogue through the (re)appearance of various shared attributes—workily constructed log cabins, sweeping alpine vistas, modernist structures, and a cast of animals (often, the goat), to name but a few—that hover incongruously within swirling, apocalyptic landscapes of oil and enamel paint whose pooled surfaces and acidic palette are like the stuff of toxic waste; bringing in a turn a new, more insidious inflection to the hooded figure of the beekeeper.

Created over extended periods and returned to and re-worked time and again, these paintings, drawn from across the decades, similarly embody a respect for process and hard work that is ultimately subsumed by both the 'doing' and the end result. Many of Bush's paintings are replete with the 'stuff' of making art and of things in progress—landscapes formed from clay squeezed and moulded by the artist's hands (I have come to the creek and Lampre, both 2003 [cat. no. 20, pp. 34–35; cat. no. 22, p. 32]), the introduction of lens flares as otherworldly incursion within these strange environments, and even the appearance of the artist as performer, in a constant state of willing adaptation. Bush's lingering interest in 'the journey' also resonates in his decade-long engagement with the 'persistent redundancy' of life on the land—"think of the role assumed by the humble tractor in his work of 1980s; the heroic elevation of produce in *Carn scene on Rhudding doesn't help* (both 1997) [figs. 12 and 13]; or the recurrence of the two 'country idyll' in works such as *Lady Campbell Weed: William of Orange* (2009) [cat. no. 23]—come from an interest in fluctuations in European and American history that relate to cultural shifts; more specifically, how artist's careers ebb and flow with time. Once-successful salon painters in their day can, in the eyes of the art world, almost disappear (some not without reason). A good example is Clement Greenberg naming Jules Olitski the greatest painter of our time. History as it runs out hasn't revered Olitski in that light, not at this stage anyway."
As an artist who has lived and continued to paint throughout the endless ‘deaths’ and revivals of painting deemed across the decades, Bush remains ever-conscious of the irony of his own position. On one level, the perilous pick-up-sticks wooden structures, strange heraldic forms, and vast array of log cabins that float within Bush’s paintings are an ode to the unknown maker, raising questions of authorship, taste, value and ‘signature style’ that play against and within his own instantly recognisable images. The artist’s recent body of gouaches, Saunders Cuthbert (2013–14) [figs. 1 and 2], for example, both depict and venerate the chook shed. Encompassing a catalogue of different shed styles—from simple wooden enclosures, shrunken replicas of North American farmhouses to streamlined modernist factories—this series presents the viewer with a suite of extraordinary structures whose imaginative design extends far beyond the everyday practicalities and demands of their use. Disconcertingly ‘out of time’—neither of the present or the past—their sepia palette nevertheless evokes a sense of history and of memory (with all its ‘tricks’ of accuracy, re-writing and subsequent fabrication).

This interest in the traditional use of images as recording tools, instruments of learning and as conveyors of information is also apparent in the, it must be said, rather whacky group of works from the University Art Collection that Stephen Bush has included within the exhibition. Described by the artist as a kind of ‘mad uncle art’, the selection of objects ranges from prints by celebrated colonial artists such as Nicholas Chevalier, ST Gill and John Gould’s work (one cannot help but imagine that Bush’s selection of Gould was at least partly informed by childhood memories of the ubiquitous Gould League of Victoria’s flora and fauna posters of the 1960s and 70s); watercolours and botanical illustrations by unknown artists; drawings by Saunders Cuthbert and Lloyd Orton; a pair of carved wooden panels, and a wonderfully naïve illustration by unknown artists such as Nicholas Chevalier, ST Gill and John Gould’s work (one cannot help but imagine that Bush’s selection of Gould was at least partly informed by childhood memories of the ubiquitous Gould League of Victoria’s flora and fauna posters of the 1960s and 70s); watercolours and botanical illustrations by unknown artists; drawings by Saunders Cuthbert and Lloyd Orton; a pair of carved wooden panels, and a wonderfully naïve illustration by unknown artists; gouaches, Saunders Cuthbert (detail) 2013–14 [fig. 3]; and even a painted wall mural adjacent to the large group of beekeeper works that are displayed en masse in the Potter’s level one gallery. A deliberate translocation or schematic of an intricate (and mass produced) paisley design sourced by Bush, the execution of Coppersmith by a group of students from the Victorian College of the Arts’ Painting program informally mirrors the traditional atelier model, in which the artist assumes the position of both mentor and directress. While its explosive areas of bold, clashing colour gleefully amplifies the celebratory chorus of Bush’s own work, its presence, along with the collection works displayed in the gallery below, similarly encourages us to ponder the complex web of issues and value judgements that separate the artist from the artisan, and the craft of simply making something well, from art. In the end, this exhibition is, of course, both an acknowledgement and celebration of the ongoing contribution and work of Stephen Bush, painter, but the work itself, with all its twists, turns and dead ends, never allows us to assume this position easily or lightly.

NOTES
1. With its related notions of ‘ownership’ and, within an Australian context, the ongoing legacy of colonisation.
2. Lisa Statton, ‘No consolation prizes’, Stephen Bush: Goldfield (LaGrata Fe, SITE Santa Fe, 2007). Statton also notes a biographical connection here, as Bush grew up on his family’s farm in Pennyroyal, near Colac, in rural Victoria.
3. Email correspondence with the author, 17 February 2014.
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Bluff, 1990-91
oil on canvas
171.5 x 141 cm
Cat. 5
Type set 1996
oil on canvas
198 x 233.5 cm

Cat. 18
Woodstock 1996
oil on canvas
134 x 187 cm
Cat. 6
My name is the great went 2001
oil on canvas
200 x 235.5 cm
Cat. 22
Lamped 2003
oil on canvas
198 x 234 cm

Cat. 7
Col du Galibier 2003
oil on canvas
201 x 244 cm
Cat. 20
*I have come to the creek* 2003
oil on canvas
201 x 295 cm

Cat. 8
*Lautenbrunnen* 2004
oil on canvas
107 x 193 cm
Cat. 9
Goat willow 2005
oil on canvas
183 x 183 cm

Cat. 10
Road with such intent 2007
oil on canvas
183 x 183 cm
Cat. 11
Shout on the hills of glory 2008
oil on canvas
200 x 300 cm
Cat. 58
Alabaster walls
2008
oil on canvas
183 x 183 cm
Cat. 68
Rhodamine Mabel Bungaara 2011
oil on canvas
121 x 96 cm
Cat. 13
Bassell hunter 2012
oil on canvas
183 x 183 cm

Cat. 14
The recliners were only the beginning 2012
oil on canvas
200 x 300 cm
Cat. 15

Angelys 2013
oil on canvas
183 x 183 cm

Cat. 16

Moonmoote 2013–14
oil on canvas
183 x 183 cm
Cat. 33
Tomintoul 2013
oil on canvas
145 x 198 cm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Collection Location</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My name is the great went</td>
<td>Stephen Bush</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Private collection, Sydney</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
<td>57 x 57 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type cast</td>
<td>Stephen Bush</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
<td>57 x 57 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corn scene</td>
<td>Kathy Montgomery</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>City of Port Phillip Collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
<td>77 x 77 cm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bluff</td>
<td>Australian Art</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rooftop washing</td>
<td>Fiona East</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I could have been someone</td>
<td>Samantha Thomas</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Collection of Jonathan and Sophie MacMillan, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Col-de-Cailles</td>
<td>Paulsen</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Sydney</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Sir John H Lombe</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Captain Pasley</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Sir John H Lombe</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Samuel Gill</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Private collection, Melbourne</td>
<td>oil on canvas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Artist unknown
42 Untitled (Hornbill on branch) c. 1900 ink on wood 30.4 x 25.4 cm (right) The University of Melbourne Art Collection 0000.0202
43 Untitled (Kookaburra in tree) c. 1900 ink on wood 30.4 x 25.4 cm (right) The University of Melbourne Art Collection 0000.0201
44 Untitled (Owl on branch) c. 1900 ink on wood 31.8 x 25.4 cm (right) The University of Melbourne Art Collection 0000.0204
45 Untitled (Parrot on branch) c. 1900 ink on wood 31.7 x 25.4 cm (right) The University of Melbourne Art Collection 0000.0203

Artist unknown
46 Citrus Aurantium date unknown lithograph on paper 39.2 x 29 cm (image); 49 x 39.5 cm (sheet, irreg.) The University of Melbourne Art Collection 0000.1301
47 Laurus Cinnamomum date unknown lithograph on paper 28.7 cm x 20.5 cm (sheet, irreg.) The University of Melbourne Art Collection 0000.1300
48 Untitled (Two decorative panels) date unknown wood 53 x 52.1 x 2.1 cm, 53 x 50.4 x 2.3 cm (sheet, irreg.) The University of Melbourne Art Collection 0000.1302

Level 1 south gallery
49 The caretaker 1988 oil on canvas 66 x 66.5 cm Collection of Malinda Cain, Melbourne
50 A caretaker #1 1988 oil on canvas 60 x 71 cm The John L Stewart Collection, New York
51 A caretaker #3 1988 oil on canvas 71 x 60 cm Collection of Michael Schwarz and David Clestein, Melbourne
52 Jardine de noche 2003 oil on canvas 56 x 66.5 cm HOLLBRAND Collection, Melbourne
53 John G 2003 oil on canvas 183 x 183 cm Collection of Museum of Old and New Art (MONA), Hobart
54 Light in the valley 2008 oil on canvas 46 x 46 cm Private collection, Melbourne
55 Committed to Parkview 2 2007 oil on canvas 51 x 41 cm Private collection, Melbourne
56 Committed to Parkview 3 2007 oil on canvas 51 x 41 cm Private collection, Melbourne
57 Proposal to do whatever it takes… 2008 oil on canvas 69 x 88 cm The collection of Mr CJ Clague, Melbourne
58 I am a giant, I am an eagle 2009 oil on canvas 94.5 x 102 cm Private collection, Melbourne
59 Rhodamine Mabel Bungaara 2011 oil on canvas 121 x 96 cm Collection of Dr Clinton Ng, Sydney
60 Vert Or 2003 oil on canvas 56 x 66.5 cm Collection of Melinda Cain, Melbourne
61 Come that done autumn 2008 oil on canvas 66 x 86 cm Private collection, Melbourne
62 Jaune de nickel 2003 oil on canvas 50 x 66 cm Collection of Annabelle and Rupert Myer, Melbourne
63 Jean 2003 oil on canvas 35 x 38 cm Collection of Fred and Mary Schepisi, Melbourne
64 Prepared to do whatever it takes… 2008 oil on canvas 69 x 88 cm The collection of Mr CJ Clague, Melbourne
65 Billbrae South 1 2008 oil on canvas 35 x 38 cm Private collection, Dallas, Texas
66 Billbrae South 2 2008 oil on canvas 35 x 38 cm Private collection, Dallas, Texas
67 Cows that doze autumn 2008 oil on canvas 66 x 86 cm Private collection, Melbourne
68 Applestroop 2009 oil on canvas 56 x 51 cm Private collection, Melbourne
69 Coincident 2014 synthetic polymer paint 333 x 339 cm executed by Kirsty Budge, Jack Halls, Kendall Mantz and Gervaise Netherway from the Painting program of the Victorian College of the Arts, University of Melbourne
70 Alabaster welcome 2008 oil on canvas 183 x 183 cm Collection of Museum of Old and New Art (MONA), Hobart
71 Prepared to do whatever it takes… 2008 oil on canvas 69 x 88 cm The collection of Mr CJ Clague, Melbourne
72 Wall-a-rie, I can hear the river call 2008 oil on canvas 66 x 86 cm The Michael Burns Collection, Melbourne
73 Rhodamine Mabel Bungaara 2011 oil on canvas 121 x 96 cm Collection of Dr Clinton Ng, Sydney
74 Light in the valley 2008 oil on canvas 46 x 46 cm Private collection, Melbourne
75 I am a giant, I am an eagle 2009 oil on canvas 94.5 x 102 cm Private collection, Melbourne
76 Vert Or 2003 oil on canvas 56 x 66.5 cm Collection of Melinda Cain, Melbourne
77 Come that done autumn 2008 oil on canvas 66 x 86 cm Private collection, Melbourne
78 Jaune de nickel 2003 oil on canvas 50 x 66 cm Collection of Annabelle and Rupert Myer, Melbourne
79 Jean 2003 oil on canvas 35 x 38 cm Collection of Fred and Mary Schepisi, Melbourne
80 Prepared to do whatever it takes… 2008 oil on canvas 69 x 88 cm The collection of Mr CJ Clague, Melbourne
81 Billbrae South 1 2008 oil on canvas 35 x 38 cm Private collection, Dallas, Texas
82 Billbrae South 2 2008 oil on canvas 35 x 38 cm Private collection, Dallas, Texas
83 Cows that doze autumn 2008 oil on canvas 66 x 86 cm Private collection, Melbourne
84 Applestroop 2009 oil on canvas 56 x 51 cm Private collection, Melbourne

For an exhibition and publication history see www.stephenjbush.com
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