Post-Abstract Expressionism: Abstraction

In the 1950s: two contradictory tendencies in art take shape at precisely the same time: the emergence and apotheosis of American abstraction (as embodied by Pollock or Newman and differing from the complete abstraction of the earlier 20th century in that this newer development did not ground itself in social or revolutionary manifestoes but in the persona of the artist) and an art which appears to be the complete opposite: the new realism of Jasper Johns (and its evolution into pop art in the 1960s).

Although Clement Greenberg's interpretation of abstract expressionism viewed it as an extension and development of the implications of cubism, Pollock and the other abstract expressionists were doing something radically different – centralizing or foregrounding the process of making art as a new point of departure. At precisely the same time as Pollock's death, Jasper Johns is setting out on a path which appears to be utterly contrary to the idea of a passionate, self-involved and chaotic process. Johns comes out of a tradition which is not descended from Picasso but from Duchamp. If Pollock was remaking Picasso into something unrecognizable, Johns was remaking Duchamp. Duchamp's fountain was a way of “not making art” – Johns’ flag was a way of making a new kind of art.

Nonetheless, the history of the last 50 years of the 20th century is one in which both directions interact and feed off each other. This is not the postmodern response to and cancellation of modernism but the moment in which artists begin to recognize and synthesize two apparently contradictory lines of development, from Picasso and Duchamp, creating a hybrid language of art without which few of the developments of the latter 20th century would have been possible.

Here we need to confront the standard reading of Duchamp's notorious Fountain. That where almost every textbook asserts that the value of this work lies in 1) Duchamp took an already existing object (a ready-made) and called it art, thereby extending the domain of what is art; and 2) Duchamp signed it with an invented name, thereby suggesting that anyone can be an artist -- the significance of this work may be neither of those. What Duchamp did was a subversive joke and attack on the history of art. Duchamp's goal was not to say that anything can be art and anyone can be an artist; it was an anti-art statement intended to open up the discourse of art and take it in a direction which was not anticipated by the western European tradition of illusion. Interestingly, we might say that Duchamp is doing the same thing that Picasso did – but Picasso did it from within the tradition whereas Duchamp did it from outside.
Life in the 1950s:
The domestic scene: the US was becoming a society of suburbs and a society of abundance—what was called: “an affluent society.” It was a post-industrial society, meaning that the emphasis shifted away from production and toward consumption—the best example of that shift is the growth of the suburban malls. At the same time, it is not only a society of consumers but a mass society: mass media and improved transportation shrink the world as people watch the same television shows, read the same magazines and buy the same clothes. But the dark side of mass society is estrangement: people are increasingly alienated or estranged from each other. There are two solutions to alienation: the search for personal fulfillment and the attempt to believe that you are like everyone else. Put them together and the result is self-fulfillment in terms of satisfying external norms: a cult of conformity—social conformity, political conformity, the belief that all the country’s problems come from abroad, that ideology is no longer necessary—only pragmatic or practical responses to the few problems which haven’t yet been solved: problems of large-scale poverty, problems related to a growing student population, problems related to the existence of cultural groups who were not part of either the affluent society or the cult of conformity. In the 50s, they have no voice to speak for them, and the few people who do continue to speak for radical or progressive politics moderate their language and their focus: rather than attacking capitalism, they attack the culture of the middle class.

How are these social changes reflected in culture?
In general terms, culture and art at the end of the 1950s is often characterized by the word “cool.” Cool: meaning impersonal, rather than passionate, meaning that inspiration comes from events happening outside the artist, rather than from the interior life of the artist. This was often a thing-oriented art, an art which manifested a shift from "psychology to physicality, from subjectivity to objectivity, from interpretation to presentation, from symbol to sign..." These are the characteristics of the post-abstract expressionists, from Frank Stella to Helen Frankenthaler to Alex Katz, and even, oddly enough, of someone like Leon Golub.

Second generation/post-abstract expressionism/terminology
• most of these artists had their artistic origins in the decade of the fifties and were beginning to form what might be seen as a signature style, at least for the beginning of their careers, in the 1950s
• two major categories of responses to abstract expressionism—a category of artists who pursued abstraction (an interest in color and form as such), and a category of artists who pursued figuration (color and form being secondary to the creation of figures and
narratives).

- another level of distinction is possible: the degree of subjectivity in the artist's engagement with the artwork, with a greater degree of subjectivity suggesting a more gestural and expressionist approach and the degree to which the interest in materials and, in some cases, technique, dominates the interest in content or its rejection.

For the most part, the pursuit of abstraction followed from the implications of the abstract part of abstract expressionism and turns away from the implications of the expressionist part. There are divisions within this category:

A. a more objective or "cool" type of approach, rather than an emotional or personal form of art, an art which is primarily a rejection of the expressionist features of abstract expressionism, which pursues abstraction in the name of abstraction and in the name of an objective aesthetic which comes from the environment and not from the artist. I divide these artists into two types: the "scientist" and the formalist. [compare Bridget Riley and Helen Frankenthaler in the slide show]

The formalist direction: the premise of these artists is that gestural painting is exhausted and conventions that are not necessary should be discarded. This is a process of artistic self-purification, as Greenberg would put it, and some writers call these artists "the Greenberg School," while other writers refer to them as chromatic abstractionists.

These artists focus on the medium--for some, the focus leads to staining the canvas, which we might see as a complete rejection of gestural painting, unless we call the gesture the act of staining. For others, it leads to a hard-edged style of geometric abstraction. In either case, the aggressive touch of the abstract expressionist artist, the brush stroke, is nearly invisible or silent.

What seems to characterize the formalists as a whole is a tendency for the paint and canvas to merge and become a new object--a new type of unity of painting which is the goal of many of the artists who fall into this group. A key difference between them is that the stained canvas can create a uniformly textured field with almost no sense of depth, whereas the hard-edged treatment of paint and color focuses attention on the interaction between colors to a greater extent than stained paintings do.

Today, Helen Frankenthaler is the first example most people think of for the category of the stainers. Frankenthaler has described the fifties generation as being polarized between leaning toward Pollock or de Kooning. To her, you could only be a satellite or disciple of de Kooning but you could learn from Pollock and take off in new directions with that knowledge. In particular, the most important lesson was his rejection of the brush and easel. Having started her career in a fairly conventional mode of painting Picasso-like abstractions, in 1952 she
produced her break-through painting, Mountains and Sea, a painting which later inspired artists such as Kenneth Noland and Morris Louis to produce paintings of a purely optical effect with no recognizable references to the visible world and no intention of producing any. Although Frankenthaler, like the abstract expressionists, was significantly affected by Picasso and his shallow, cubist space, she moved away from it before many of her peers had. She was equally responsive to Matisse’s use of color and Kandinsky’s lyrical quasi-landscape paintings of his early improvisations. Because she was a generation later than the abstract expressionists, she could also look to Gorky as an artist who had arrived at his own lyrical response to Kandinsky. If, from Kandinsky, Frankenthaler learned a poetic and vivid use of borderless colors, from Gorky she learned a more fluid and atmospheric treatment. But as some critics have observed, staining becomes her motive for painting rather than the vehicle for reaching some other end, and her work becomes emotionally dry as a result, a judgement which I am inclined to share. Nonetheless, her technique continues to have an influence on painting which is more currently thought of as “post-painterly abstraction.” Although Frankenthaler is the first name we think of when we talk about stained paintings, she did not actually receive wide-spread acknowledgment until Noland and Louis began to apply her technique in their work. Legend has it that Greenberg was so taken with her art that he introduced Morris Louis to her, who then began working in a comparable fashion, but in a reversal of patrilineal criticism, Frankenthaler has always been given credit for inspiring him. Their work is different though: Louis diluted his pigment even more than Frankenthaler did and began to work in acrylics. Paradoxically, he used a gestural technique—pouring—to create what he thought of as a non-gestural painting. The veils were his first series of expansive color-field paintings but they raised another contradiction, inherent in the painting: even though the surface and the color were merged, there is still a sensation of depth, leading him to abandon the veils and move on to a series dominated by large blank areas in the body of the canvas with rivulets of color in the corners: the unfurleds, later followed by striped paintings. In some of these paintings, it is difficult to situate Louis: he seems less of a stainer or chromatic abstractionist and more of a hard-edged formalist who has turned to banal compositions so as to ensure a complete focus on color. Although Noland also produced some stained paintings, he quickly moved on to more geometric and hard-edged compositions. Along with Frank Stella and Ellsworth Kelly, these artists comprise a group of formalists who do not stain the canvas, with Stella being the artist who is probably the most committed to removing the presence of the artist from the painting and creating a painting which will be perceived as an object in itself. It is a goal which overlaps in certain respects with Jasper Johns, whose work influenced both Stella and Noland, and it is
a goal which makes Stella himself an influence for the minimalists of the late sixties. To reach his goals, Stella approached his work as a series of problems to solve— the problems of composition, of balance in a non-representational painting, of eliminating the ambiguity of pictorial depth. How does he solve these problems? By using the depth of his canvas to derive the module of space between stripes of color, by using modular design which is symmetric, regulated, and repeated, by alternating stripes of paint with the raw canvas so that the canvas appears in the picture and is, in a more literal sense, the picture itself, and by shaping the canvas.

What does he achieve? The canvas and painting, or the picture and the object are the same; the picture refers only to itself and nothing outside itself, and the composition has been derived from artifacts or formula, not from the artist’s subconscious or even conscious wishes. This is art that stands for itself; or to use Stella’s words: “this is art in which you can see the whole idea.”

Cool: primarily a rejection of the expressionist features of abstract expressionism, it is a pursuit of the abstract in the name of abstraction and in the name of an objective aesthetic which comes from the environment and not from the artist. Stella is not alone, although his interest in the modular and repetitive dimensions of his composition is somewhat unique, a situation which raises a problem: if Stella is trying to erase the signature of the artist, but we can identify this artist from his modular, shaped canvases, has he succeeded in reaching his goal? Or has he translated the gesture of the artist into a quasi-mathematical approach to composition? And is it his recognition of failure that leads him to his more sculptural and narrative works of the 80s and after? That may be simplistic on our part; Stella was part of an art world that was quite visibly changing. He also was an artist who never really ceased to think of the artwork as inherently architectural.

In general, we have a number of artists who are arriving at similar aesthetic directions for different reasons and producing different effects. Some of them have looked at Josef Albers, at Le Corbusier, at Mondrian; others, like Kelly, approach geometric abstraction as an art of chance AND an art of form; others were influenced by design principles which they imported into art, and for another group abstraction related to pure opticality.

The “Scientists”: Op Art
Another category of artists, who gravitate towards cool objectivity but for a different reason, are the artists I call “scientists.” The scientist, a term I’m using metaphorically, is an artist whose process and product seems, at least at first sight, to be driven by laws of optics, laws of perception. Stella would almost fit in this category but for the fact that the primary goal of the
op artist was the production of an optical and sensory experience in the viewer. Op art was therefore based on the notion that the viewer's response could and should be automatic, should not be a psychological response, and would therefore be pretty much the same for all viewers—this implies a different type of relationship between artist and viewer, a relationship which can be summed up with one question: If the response to art occurs on an automatic and physiological level, does it matter who the artist is? Is op art new and does it have any importance for the art world of the late 20th century? The interest in the optical effects of color was not new, and might be traced back at least as far as Seurat, although Seurat's goal was not the production of physiological effects in the viewer but psychological effects along with an attempt to produce a version of perceptual reality that was based on the laws of nature. Josef Albers in the early and middle 20th century pursued his own studies of the optical effects produced by neighboring colors. The chief difference between artists such as Vasarely and the models provided by Albers, Mondrian, or Seurat was the interest of op artists in the social implications of their optical experiments, and their belief that they could create patterns which produced the sensation of movement. In other words, the interaction between positive and negative spaces in works of op art creates secondary forms which are not really there, or a sensation of instability which then suggests movement. This sense of movement is part of the social message which has to be seen in the context of the sixties: it is not only America but much of the world which begins to deal with crises of emerging levels of sub-cultural consciousness; movement is a metaphor, and not a very subtle one, for change.

Bridget Riley, who is often associated with op art, who, in fact, is seen as one of its leading exponents, has rejected the notion that she is interested in optical experiences only and that she is striving for some semi-scientific experience. To be sure, she is interested in visual problems, in much the same way that the neo-impressionists were, showing an early affinity with the work of Seurat at the beginning of her career. Her work in black and white, the more explicitly op art works of her career, gave her an opportunity to focus exclusively on the properties of light and the creation of optical interference through controlled cycles of changes in light and dark. But in terms of her goals, this was an experimental stage which allows her to apply what she has learned to color. When she returns to color at the end of the sixties, her work no longer shows any relationship to nature, something it had done when she first looked to Seurat. One of the principles behind her compositions is her belief that setting limits and restrictions can increase the power of an art work. In an interview in 1995, she referred to some writings by the composer Igor Stravinsky, The Poetics of Music, and the artist Paul Klee, The Thinking Eye, as her “bibles” in the 1960’s, at least, specifically quoting this paragraph from Stravinsky’s book:
“My freedom thus consists in my moving about within the narrow frame that I have assigned myself for each one of my undertakings. I shall go even further: my freedom will be so much the greater and more meaningful, the more narrowly I limit my field of action and the more I surround myself with obstacles. Whatever diminishes constraint diminishes strength. The more constraints one imposes, the more one frees oneself of the chains that shackle the spirit.” Somewhat following from this belief, and like Kandinsky in this respect, she embraces complete abstraction as being art with the greatest content, this content being one of spirituality. She describes Monet’s paintings of water lilies as being his greatest paintings and being about almost nothing but color and reflections in water: “in the end there seems to be hardly any subject matter left—only content.”

There is some overlap between the products of the op artists and of the formalist artists such as Stella or Kelly—inevitable because any focus on color will produce physiological responses. But similarities between op art and American formalist experiments were often denied by Americans, artists and critics both, who met the movement with a great deal of hostility. One critic (Lucy Lippard) wrote that optical effects “hold no interest for serious artists, who were more likely to be concerned with form, color, and the poetic and formal expansion of painting than with perceptual effects alone.” She was wrong: the op artists were interested in physiological, social, formal and perceptual effects. Second, there had long been many serious artists, American and non-American, who were interested in relationships between opticality and physiological responses, an interest which goes to changed attitudes or beliefs about the nature of vision. At this point in time, though, the late 50s and the 60s, this interest was interpreted as a rejection of the art work’s expression of the inner reality of the artist, and as such, it was a rejection of abstract expressionism.

But there was some ambivalence about this rejection and there was another category of responses to abstract expressionism which centralized color and form without outright rejection of the subjective qualities of abstract expressionism. The rejection of subjectivity, for these artists, may take the form of making the subjective equal to the objective. In other words, instead of making the personal ritual into a metaphor for the act of remaking the world, the external world becomes the personal.

Joan Mitchell is one example of this group. Mitchell, like Frankenthaler, and like most of the artists of the fifties generation, had no time or interest in the mythic and primitivist associations which the abstract expressionists had centralized. Although they did not reject the techniques of the abstract expressionists, they severed those techniques from surrealism, from the jungian archetype, and for the most part,
from existentialism, as well. Mitchell's early 1950 paintings reflect or suggest the all-over style of Pollock, although the entire canvas is not subjected to this treatment. Somewhat like the paintings of Louis, one has the feeling of a magnet pulling lines and rivulets of color into the canvas. These rivulets also seem to be emerging from the undercoating and washed background which in a strange way seem to evoke a colorless chasm from which the chaos of color emerges. Mitchell's paintings have puzzled critics for years: they liken her paintings to landscapes without actually knowing why. For Mitchell, the reference to a landscape is more accurately to a memory of a landscape. She herself calls her paintings "remembered landscapes which involve my feelings" and it is this suggestion of different states of consciousness and involvement with the world which characterizes the psychological qualities of Mitchell's art. In this respect, she describes the initiation of a painting as lying in the memory of a feeling, but once she has started to paint, the process of painting takes over, and she enters a state of existence which she describes as outside herself and inside the picture. Perhaps this also suggests Pollock as an influence for Mitchell, but there is no assertion on her part of giving up conscious control when she is in the painting. Maintaining that control remains important to her vision and to another part of her process which is an exploration of the act of perception and the transformations it leads to on the canvas.

Mitchell was often described as an “abstract impressionist,” as was Philip Guston, in the first stage of his career, and Milton Resnick. They relate to the formalist interest in color and opticality as signs of color and opticality, but in the case of artists such as Mitchell there is a more subjective or personalized overlay that relates to abstract expressionism. The difference, though, is the equation of subjectivity with color, rather than the use of subjectivity in the interest of some grand narrative of universal reconstruction of the world.

To summarize this particular response, not only is it a more subjective response to color and form: it is a type of abstraction which may hint at a human presence without signs of the figure, and because it does this, it establishes a stronger personal presence than hard-edged or color-field painting is likely to have. Some writers put the stainers in this category as well—my own sense is that the staining dissolves the persona of the artist, so that the paintings are not, in the end, subjective, but that, ironically, is my own subjective point of view.

All of these artists were grouped together in an exhibition in the early 60s called “the responsive eye.” The link appeared to be the emphasis on optical qualities of the painting, whether this opticality was intended to arouse a physiological response, draw attention to the art work as object, or replace the figure with a subjective use of color. None of the artists in the show were figural painters. They were grouped together in a different show under the title of “the new realists” and many of them included in a show called “New Images of Man.”
Elizabeth Murray

“Elizabeth Murray is one of the most dynamic American painters at the end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century, and one of the hardest to assimilate.”¹

Murray doesn’t fit with any of the abstractionists just discussed. Nor does she fit with any of the figural artists of this period. But as Storr said, she is (or was, since she died in 2007), definitely an artist of importance and an artist to reckon with.

Murray is an artist who layers the influences of various styles with her own associations to mundane, often domestic subject matter, and draws on references to popular media, cartoons, Disney movies, and pop art, much of which informed her childhood and dominated her earliest artistic ventures when she wanted to make her own comic books. At the same time (the 5th grade) she also made drawings of men and women engaged in what she believed to be sexual activities (usually sitting on a couch)

As a student at the Chicago School of the Art Institute, she found herself thrown into a world of iconoclastic artists, and a school which had just graduated such students as Nancy Spero and Leon Golub. And regardless of what she thought of her art history classes (boring), to get to classes she had to walk through the museum where she discovered the excitement of looking at paintings via a Cezanne still-life of apples which, she said, she “realized was really about the joy of looking at painting.”² She also discovered Max Beckmann, realized that she disliked the other German artists around him, did not like Jackson Pollock but understood that if he did what he did, then one could do anything, and was drawn irrevocably to de Kooning’s painting Excavation.

Undoubtedly helping and contributing to Murray’s ability to stand outside the mainstream was the fact that she came of age in Chicago. Chicago in the 1950s, although not unaware of the developments in NY, had a distinctly different answer to the questions of modernism. Dubuffet alone contributed to that radical change of course by promoting a philosophy of art which embraced “outsider cultures” or art brut (the term he used) and which disdained the distinction between beautiful and ugly. As Dubuffet said in a talk he gave in Chicago in 1951, “I aim to capture the thought at a point of its development prior to the landing of elaborated

²Storr, p. 25
ideas....I try always to catch the mental process at the deeper point of its roots, where, I am sure, the sap is much richer...” He went on to note that he preferred painting to any other form of expression because painting is so much more concrete than written words.  

Inspired more by Dubuffet and Duchamp than by the surrealist-inspired abstraction of the New York artists, Chicago bred a type of art which stood at oblique angles to what was happening in NY. Even when pop art began to dominate art galleries on the east coast, the Monster Roster and eventually the Hairy Who were engaging in something completely different – vulgar, colorful, down-to-earth, and crude, chaotic, and grotesque.

From the Chicago Monster Roster and the Hairy Who to California where Murray next found herself encountering artistic influences of a different sort. Increasingly discriminating, what she studied in the painters she admired was how they handled the paint. Thus she found herself drawn more to the 1950s “large and sloppy” figure paintings of Joan Brown than to Diebenkorn or Bischoff, Brown’s contemporaries at that point. She also began a lifelong friendship with the younger artist Jennifer Bartlett who described Murray at that time as the most ambitious woman artist she had ever met. Visiting museums together, Bartlett was surprised by Murray’s tendency to move up close to the paintings which interested her. In response to Bartlett’s questioning, she told her that she wanted to study the surface and see how it was painted.

The question for artists more or less of Murray’s generation in the 1970s was how to use the advancements of “academic” painting (the minimalists) but to complicate it, to put back the thing which had been erased and omitted without making this task into an issue that demanded an answer. Murray’s approach was, as Storr more or less describes it, akin to making a Stella painting as if drunk or ravaged by a flood. She eliminates the pop subject matter and kitschy quality of her 1960s paintings, replaces it with uneven or knotted lines, increases the size of her canvases, and begins to make paintings that are angled or tilted.

Her affinities with Stuart Davis: Davis’s palette, his Americanized cubism with its popular subject matter, and its cheery attitude in the face of depression seem to find a parallel in Murray’s brightly colored and graphic paintings of the late 1970s, a period of hardship in NYC and for Murray, but during which she makes playful paintings with titles like “Children

\textsuperscript{3}Sotrr, p. 28.
Meeting" and generally ignores the mood of the financial crisis and the tenor of more academic paintings of the period.

Elizabeth Murray had an interesting answer to the question asked her about her parallels or relationships between her work and that of Philip Guston. She agreed that there were similarities but ultimately she wasn’t like Guston because Guston, she said, was part of art history, and she was not. She did not mean by this that Guston was a better artist than she was but that there was an understanding of art and art history which was deeply gendered: all the great artists were male and if that fact predicts or describes what will be thought of as great art, then great art will have male qualities. Murray had an interesting comment: “There was no tradition for a woman to be a painter, although, oddly enough, painting always seemed a feminine pursuit. In America, for instance, since the arts only rarely were considered a masculine profession, I think it’s no accident that Pollock and others in the New York School felt compelled to exaggerate their masculinity. All the art I learned from at that time was made by men, but in the end, art transcends gender.” To Murray, what this eventually meant was not that she should try to paint like a man but that she would opt out of the history by seeing herself as standing outside of it and inventing her own route.

Murray, without intending to do this, might be seen as a “test” case for Greenberg’s theory of the evolution of media towards increasing specificity and definition. She is also a test case for the idea that art develops in a linear fashion, with each style building on the one which came before, implying the next step, and shutting the door on the past. Or, as Robert Storr describes it, Murray, who had already eliminated much of the kitsch-like confusion of her early art, did not continue in this direction of reducing painting to the minimalist concerns of the medium. Instead, she strove to recomplicate it.

Around the same time that Murray was complicating painting by beginning to structure her canvases in a way that made the container (the canvas) almost equal to the contained (the figure) – something which Jasper Johns had done with his flags but in retrospect, his choice of a flag imposed a recognizably familiar shape on the canvas in a way which Murray’s subjects did not – a downtown NY gallery had a group show which the curator called “bad painting.” Most of the artists were out-of-towners, none of them were minimalists, and all of them included the human figure. But what they shared, in the words of the curator, Marcia Tucker, was an

*Murray, quoted in Storr, p. 12.*
indifference to “good” taste. Although Murray never lost her early interest in mundane, comic-book types of images, she was no longer interested in representing them. And as her canvases began to subsume the shape of what she painted, she also began to break them apart. The results are fascinating conundrums: the most banal of subject matter, often household objects, but the most unrecognizable manner of representing them. Drawing on influences from all periods of art, she literally fractures the picture plane in a cubist-inspired manner but reconstructs it with the biomorphic lines of surrealism. The combination of deconstructing and reconstructing results in enigmatic puzzles which have become the containers or receptacles for the unexpected. Interestingly, Varnedoe said nothing about Murray in his talk on ironic abstraction. Yet what better model can we find of an art which is both abstract and representational than Murray’s? Perhaps he omitted her from his dialogue because she isn’t being ironic or parodic; she doesn’t really seem to be engaged in a dialogue with abstraction at all: her dialogue seems to be with all of art history even as she admittedly stands outside. Nor is she engaged in a dialogue about gender, telling an interviewer on one occasion that “my art is androgynous. Art is about the male and female components in all of us. Art is sexy, but it doesn’t have sex. When you think of great paintings, you don’t think this image is masculine, that one feminine.” Or at least Murray doesn’t.

By the mid-1980s, Murray’s canvases were less fractured than they were warped. As surfaces began to fold in on themselves, and parts of the work opened up to reveal innards and glimpses of the wall, the edges were also left unfinished, creating an archeology of the work which the viewer was privy to. Although her work, to this point, showed a strong parallel to the work of Frank Stella, here she begins to move in a direction which Stella himself believed was necessary but hadn’t yet done. In part, she was able to do this because she had never given up her interest in the everyday and in caricature. And in part, she was also able to do this because she applied the principles of biomorphic abstraction not just to the objects she painted but to the canvas she shaped.

---

*Murray, quoted p. 56.*