As Bodoni is Italian and Didot French, so Brunel is a British modern. Based on the first modern of the Caslon foundry cut by John Isaac Drury at the end of the eighteenth century, it has a gentler appearance than its continental cousins, whilst retaining the elegance we associate with the modern style. Brunel expands the original model to a large family for modern designers, with multiple styles for different optical sizes.

Brunel Text has been specifically designed for use at small sizes and continuous reading matter, taking Drury’s single weight in roman and italic, and extending to five weights, from roman to a forceful but easy to read bold. It manages to maintain the appearance of higher contrast, whilst being robust enough for text sizes. Like the entire Brunel family, it has small capitals in both roman and italic, multiple numeral styles and swash italic capitals.
Different printing methods – and different taste – make for disparate requirements in the overall color of a block of text, so we have included two different Roman weights in the Brunel Text family. Brunel Text Roman is lighter and airier, working best at slightly larger sizes and on uncoated paper. Brunel Text Roman No. 2 is noticeably darker, giving it a more forceful presence on coated paper and allowing use at smaller sizes.
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Kant, Schelling, and Hegel made use of the concept of the Beautiful as a kind of keystone or cornice for their respective philosophical edifices. Aesthetics, then, came into being as the philosophy of the Beautiful, and it may be asked why this philosophical aesthetics does not suffice; why beauty should need for its understanding also an aesthetics “von unten.” The answer is not that no system of philosophy is universally accepted, but that the general aesthetic theories have not, as yet at least, succeeded in answering the plain questions of “the plain man” in regard to concrete beauty. Kant, indeed, frankly denied that the explanation of concrete beauty, or “Doctrine of Taste,” as he called it, was possible, while the various definers of beauty as “the union of the Real and the Ideal” “the expression of the Ideal to Sense,” have done no more than he. No one of these aesthetic systems, in spite of volumes of so-called application of their principles to works of art, has been able to furnish a criterion of beauty.

Brunel Text has fairly generous ascenders and descenders which are typical of the modern style from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. This gives it an easy appearance for text with plenty of breathing space between lines, but less economical than other text faces such as Austin Text or Lyon Text. Brunel Text Short reduces the ascenders and descenders to make a typeface that is more compact on the vertical axis, whilst retaining the horizontal proportions of Brunel Text. This allows the designer to switch between styles with no changes in line breaks, but allows for either a tighter leading or an even more generous appearance at the same leading.
The English East India Company was established in 1600, and Royal Charter was granted by the Queen soon thereafter. In their first nine voyages they fitted out for India. Their main provinces were in cotton, tea, and silk. In 1647, new voyages confirmed by Act.
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Established in 1851—the year of the Great Exhibition
THE SPANISH WAR, which began in 1739, and the French war which soon followed it occasioned further increase of the debt, which, on the 31st of December 1748, after it had been concluded by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, amounted to £78,293,313. The most profound peace of the seventeen years of continuance had taken no more than £8,328,354 from it. A war of less than nine years’ continuance added £31,338,689 to it (Refer to James Postlethwaite’s History of the Public Revenue). During the administration of Mr. Pelham, the interest of the public debt was reduced from 4% to 3%; or at least measures were taken for reducing it, from four to three per cent; the sinking fund was increased, and some part of the public debt was paid off.

In 1755, before the breaking out of the late war, the funded debt of Great Britain amounted to £72,289,673. On the 5th of January 1763, at the conclusion of the peace, the funded debt amounted to £122,603,336. The unfunded debt has been stated at £13,927,589. But the expense occasioned by the war did not end with the conclusion of the peace, so that though, on the 5th of January 1764, the funded debt was increased (partly by a new loan, and partly by funding a part of the unfunded debt) to £129,586,782, there still remained (according to the very well informed author of Considerations on the Trade and Finances of Great Britain) an unfunded debt which was brought to account in that and the following year of £975,017. In 1764, there-
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EVERY INTRODUCTION to the problems of aesthetics begins by acknowledging the existence and claims of two methods of attack—the general, philosophical, deductive, which starts from a complete metaphysics and installs beauty in its place among the other great concepts; and the empirical, or inductive, which seeks to disengage a general principle of beauty from the objects of aesthetic experience and the facts of aesthetic enjoyment: an example of Fechner’s “aesthetics from above and from below.”

Methodologies of Aesthetics
The first was the method of aesthetics par excellence. It was indeed only through the desire of an eighteenth-century philosopher, Baumgarten, to round out his “architectonic” of metaphysics that the science received its name, as designating the theory of knowledge in the form of feeling, parallel to that of “clear,” logical thought. Kant, Schelling, and Hegel, again, made use of the concept of the Beautiful as a kind of keystone or cornice for their respective philosophical edifices. Aesthetics, then, came into being as the philosophy of the Beautiful, and it may be asked why this philosophical aesthetics does not suffice; why beauty should need for its understanding also an aesthetics “von unten.” The answer is not that no system of philosophy is universally accepted, but that the general aesthetic theories have not, as yet at least, succeeded in answering the plain questions of “the plain man” in regard to concrete beauty. Kant, indeed, frankly denied that the explanation of concrete beauty, or “Doctrine of Taste,” as he called it, was possible, while the various definers of beauty as “the union of the Real and the Ideal” “the expression of the Ideal to Sense,” have done no more than he. No one of these aesthetic systems, in spite of volumes of so-called application of their principles to works of art, has been able to furnish a criterion of beauty. The criticism of the generations is summed up in the mild remark of Fechner, in his “Vorschule der Aesthetik,” to the effect
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<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPORTIONAL OLDSTYLE</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPORTIONAL LINING</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL CAP</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABULAR LINING</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABULAR 1/2 HEIGHT</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABULAR OLDSTYLE</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABULAR LINING</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALL CAP</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
<td>On Sale: $3,460 €1,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPORTIONAL LINING</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
<td>Original: $7,031 £9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRACTIONS</td>
<td>21/03/10 and 2 1/18 460/920</td>
<td>21/03/10 and 2 1/18 460/920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x_{158} + y_{23} \times z_{18} - a_{4260}</td>
<td>x_{158} + y_{23} \times z_{18} - a_{4260}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0123456789 0123456789</td>
<td>0123456789 0123456789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st 2nd 3rd 1er 2e Arrt</td>
<td>1st 2nd 3rd 1er 2e Arrt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE FEATURE</td>
<td>IL·LÒGIC a·l·lusió col·lecció</td>
<td>IL·LÒGIC allusió coŀlecció</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Català (Catalan) glyph</td>
<td>GŁÓWNA których możliwość</td>
<td>GŁÓWNA których możliwość</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE FEATURE</td>
<td>ÍNSUȘI conștiința științifice</td>
<td>ÍNSUȘI conștiința științifice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polski (Polish) kreska accent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STYLES INCLUDED IN COMPLETE FAMILY

Brunel Text Roman
Brunel Text Italic
Brunel Text Roman No. 2
Brunel Text Italic No. 2
Brunel Text Medium
Brunel Text Medium Italic
Brunel Text Semibold
Brunel Text Semibold Italic
Brunel Text Bold
Brunel Text Bold Italic
Brunel Text Short Roman
Brunel Text Short Italic
Brunel Text Short Roman No. 2
Brunel Text Short Italic No. 2
Brunel Text Short Medium
Brunel Text Short Medium Italic
Brunel Text Short Semibold
Brunel Text Short Semibold Italic
Brunel Text Short Bold
Brunel Text Short Bold Italic

SUPPORTED LANGUAGES

Afrikaans, Albanian, Asturian, Basque, Bosnian, Breton, Catalan, Cornish, Croatian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, Esperanto, Estonian, Faroese, Finnish, French, Galician, German, Greenlandic, Guarani, Hawaiian, Hungarian, Ibo, Icelandic, Indonesian, Irish, Gaelic, Italian, Kurdish, Latin, Latvian, Lithuanian, Livonian, Malagasy, Maltese, Maori, Moldavian, Norwegian, Occitan, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Romances, Saami, Samoan, Scots, Scottish Gaelic, Serbian (Latin), Slovak, Slovenian, Spanish (Castillian), Swahili, Swedish, Tagalog, Turkish, Walloon, Welsh, Wolof

ABOUT THE DESIGNER

Paul Barnes (born 1970) is a graphic and type designer, and a partner with Christian Schwartz in Commercial Type, a type foundry based in London and New York. He has also been a long term collaborator with Peter Saville which has resulted in such diverse work as identities for Givenchy, ‘Original Modern’ for Manchester, the England football team kit and the logo for Kate Moss.

Barnes has also been an advisor and consultant on numerous publications, notably Wallpaper*, Harper’s Bazaar and frieze. His interest in the modern and vernacular is encompassed in his type design ranging from the contemporary such as for Björk, through to the extensive Chiswick typeface (2017). Whilst consultant to The Guardian he designed Guardian Egyptian with Christian Schwartz. He has designed typefaces for the National Trust in England, the numbers for Puma at the 2010 World Cup and also the England football team for Umbro. For Commercial Type he has codesigned Publico with Schwartz, and independently Austin, Dala Floda and Marian.

Following the redesign of The Guardian, as part of the team headed by Mark Porter, Barnes was awarded the Black Pencil from the D&AD. They were also nominated for the Design Museum ‘Designer of the Year’. In September 2006, with Schwartz he was named one of the 40 most influential designers under 40 in Wallpaper*. A year later The Guardian named him as one of the 50 best designers in Britain.