

---

# Brunel Text

---

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

---

**DESIGNED BY**  
PAUL BARNES

**PRODUCTION ASSISTANCE**  
CHRISTIAN SCHWARTZ  
DAVE FOSTER

---

**PUBLISHED**  
2019

**20 STYLES**  
2 HEIGHTS, EACH HAVING  
5 WEIGHTS W/ ITALICS

---

**FEATURES**

PROPORTIONAL/TABULAR  $\frac{1}{2}$  HEIGHT FIGURES  
PROPORTIONAL/TABULAR OLDSTYLE FIGURES  
PROPORTIONAL/TABULAR LINING FIGURES  
SMALL CAP PROPORTIONAL/TABULAR LINING FIGURES  
FRACTIONS (PREBUILT & ARBITRARY)  
SUPERSCRIPT/SUBSCRIPT  
ORDINAL LETTERS  
SMALL CAPS (ROMAN & ITALIC)  
SWASH CAPITALS  
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

---

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*

---

The Manchester Trilogy

*The Manchester Trilogy*

ROMAN & ITALIC, 16 PT

The Manchester Trilogy

*The Manchester Trilogy*

ROMAN NO. 2 & ITALIC NO. 2, 16 PT

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.

---

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***

---

**COMPARISON OF BRUNEL TEXT & BRUNEL TEXT SHORT AT THE SAME POINT SIZE & LEADING**

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, 9/11 PT

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 SHORT, 9/11 PT

---

Symbol

BRUNEL TEXT, 60 PT

---

Symbol

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT, 60 PT

---

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.

---

**RECOMMENDED MINIMUM & MAXIMUM SIZES**

TEXT, 8-18 PT

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

---

DECK, 18-60 PT

Even following setbacks in 1711 through the Conduct of competing European firms However despite much aggravation  
STEADFASTLY ENDURES

---

POSTER, 60-96 PT

Eventual forging  
Downtown

---

HAIRLINE, 100 PT+

Edits  
WRRY

IL 1° GIUGNO 2016, IN ATTUAZIONE DELLA LEGGE  
 Ultimately resulted in the creation of the Republic of Siena  
*A LOS VEINTITRES ENCABEZÓ UN GOLPE DE ESTADO*  
*Glass carafes, martini shakers, and aprons designed for service*

BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN, ITALIC, 16 PT

OVER 274,000 INTERNATIONAL ARRIVALS IN 2018  
 Na území metropolitního města se v Parco Regionale Etna  
*VACATED THE THRONE WHEN HE FLED TO FRANCE*  
*At the time she was the youngest person to ever hold this office*

BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN NO. 2, ITALIC NO. 2, 16 PT

A TELEPÜLÉS LAKOSSÁGA AZ ELMÚLT ÉVEKBEN  
 Originally a 452-room hotel, opened on October 30, 1925  
*A PHASE OF SIGNIFICANT LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY*  
*The 2016 race ran on the combined 23.56-mile road course*

BRUNEL TEXT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, 16 PT  
 [ALTERNATE t 4]

OMFATTER 58 KOMMUNER OG DÆKKER 7.28 KM<sup>2</sup>  
 The Marquessate of Sambuca passed to the Beccadellis  
*MENTIONS KING ARTHUR & THE ROUND TABLE*  
*A series of talks nearer the border village of Panmunjom*

BRUNEL TEXT SEMIBOLD, SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 16 PT  
 [ALTERNATE g v, SWASH A K M N]

HE DESIGNED IT AS AN OBSERVATION CENTER  
 Awarded “The Best of 2011” at the Games Convention  
*BEI DEN SIZILIANISCHEN REGIONALWAHLEN*  
*Sequestered in different sections of the Grand Palace*

BRUNEL TEXT BOLD, BOLD ITALIC, 16 PT  
 [ALTERNATE 2]

**GEBREVETTEERD HOFLEVERANCIER VAN BELGIË**  
 Signature dishes include busiate short pasta with qualeddu  
***APPOINTED REVISING BARRISTER FOR SHROPSHIRE***  
*Deeply textured & speckled fabrics from the Mourne Mountains*

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN, ITALIC, 16 PT

**GABARDINE HAS MORE WARP THAN WEFT YARNS**  
 This Enamel Cast Iron Dish shown in Gunmetal is €284.75  
***DISTINCT CONCEPTION OF A HIGHLAND CÒSAGACH***  
*À partir de 1217, sous l'influence aragonaise, Catane devint la*

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN NO. 2, ITALIC NO. 2, 16 PT

**2009 STRUCTURAL CHANGES TO GOVERNMENTS**  
 Founded in 1907 with a preliminary investment of £1,723  
***DET BLE I MODIFISERT VERSJON TATT I BRUK AV***  
*A 1,425 m<sup>2</sup> design/build labor of love nestled next to the sea*

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, 16 PT  
 [ALTERNATE v1 2 4\*]

**FAZ FRONTEIRA A NORTE E A NOROESTE COM A**  
 It was by far the world's least subtle literary reference  
***CAFODD CACI EI FABWYSIADU MEWN RHANNAU***  
*A temperamental man but capable of unusual clemency*

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT SEMIBOLD, SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 16 PT

**DATORITĂ POZIȚIEI STRATEGICE ÎN CENTRUL**  
 Made in the area since the time of the ancient Greeks  
***Á STÓRBORGARSVÆÐINU BÚA UM 750 ÞÚSUND***  
*Established in 1851—the year of the Great Exhibition*

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT BOLD, BOLD ITALIC, 16 PT

BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 16/20 PT

ROMAN SMALL CAPS

ROMAN

SEMIBOLD

PROPORTIONAL  
¾ HEIGHT FIGURES

ITALIC

SEMIBOLD

PROPORTIONAL  
OLDSTYLE FIGURESPROPORTIONAL  
LINING FIGURES

ITALIC

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-



BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 16/18 PT

ROMAN SMALL CAPS

ROMAN

SEMIBOLD

PROPORTIONAL  
¾ HEIGHT FIGURES

ITALIC

SEMIBOLD

PROPORTIONAL  
OLDSTYLE FIGURESPROPORTIONAL  
LINING FIGURES

ITALIC

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, therefore, the public debt of Great Britain, funded and unfunded together, amounted, according

BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 10/13 PT

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

BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN NO. 2, ITALIC NO. 2, SEMIBOLD, 10/13 PT

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,”

---

 BRUNEL TEXT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 10/13 PT

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

---

 BRUNEL TEXT SEMIBOLD, SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 10/13 PT

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

---

 BRUNEL TEXT BOLD, BOLD ITALIC, 10/13 PT

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,

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 10/12 PT

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN NO. 2, ITALIC NO. 2, SEMIBOLD, 10/12 PT

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was

---

 BRUNEL TEXT SHORT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 10/12 PT

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases.

---

 BRUNEL TEXT SHORT SEMIBOLD, SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 10/12 PT

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

---

 BRUNEL TEXT SHORT BOLD, BOLD ITALIC, 10/12 PT

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

BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 9/11.5 PT

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 State of Criticism**

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which

BRUNEL TEXT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 9/11.5 PT

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 State of Criticism**

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 9/11 PT

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 State of Criticism**

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate. But it is clear that neither has

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 9/11 PT

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 State of Criticism**

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate. But it is clear that neither has empirical

---

 BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 9/11.5 PT

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 State of Criticism**

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate. But it is clear that neither has empirical aesthetics said the last word concerning beauty. Criticism is still in a chaotic state that would be

---

 BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 9/10 PT

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 State of Criticism**

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate. But it is clear that neither has empirical aesthetics said the last word concerning beauty. Criticism is still in a chaotic state that would be impossible if aesthetic theory were firmly grounded. This situation appears to me to be due to the inherent



BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 8/10.5 PT

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 State of Criticism

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate. But it is clear that neither has empirical aesthetics said the last word concerning beauty. Criticism is still in a chaotic state that would be impossible if aesthetic theory were firmly grounded. This situation appears to me to be due to the inherent inadequacy and inconclusiveness of empirical aesthetics when it stands alone; the grounds of this inadequacy I shall

BRUNEL TEXT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 8/10.5 PT

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 State of Criticism

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate. But it is clear that neither has empirical aesthetics said the last word concerning beauty. Criticism is still in a chaotic state that would be impossible if aesthetic theory were firmly grounded. This situation appears to me to be due to the inherent inadequacy and inconclusiveness of empirical aesthetics when it stands alone; the grounds of this inadequacy I shall

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN, ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 8/9 PT

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 State of Criticism

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate.

#### New Concerns

But it is clear that neither has empirical aesthetics said the last word concerning beauty. Criticism is still in a chaotic state that would be impossible if aesthetic theory were firmly grounded. This situation appears to me to be due to the inherent inadequacy and inconclusiveness of empirical aesthetics when it stands alone; the grounds of this inadequacy I shall seek to establish in the following. Granting that the aim of every aesthetics is to determine the Nature of Beauty, and to explain our feelings about it, we may say that the empirical treatments propose to do this either by describing the aesthetic object and extracting the essential elements of Beauty, or by describing the aesthetic experience and extracting

BRUNEL TEXT SHORT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 8/9 PT

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 State of Criticism

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 that the philosophical path leaves one in conceptions that, by reason of their generality, *do not well fit* the particular cases. And so it was that empirical aesthetics arose, which does not seek to answer those plain questions as to the enjoyment of concrete beauty down to its simplest forms, to which philosophical aesthetics had been inadequate.

#### New Concerns

But it is clear that neither has empirical aesthetics said the last word concerning beauty. Criticism is still in a chaotic state that would be impossible if aesthetic theory were firmly grounded. This situation appears to me to be due to the inherent inadequacy and inconclusiveness of empirical aesthetics when it stands alone; the grounds of this inadequacy I shall seek to establish in the following. Granting that the aim of every aesthetics is to determine the Nature of Beauty, and to explain our feelings about it, we may say that the empirical treatments propose to do this either by describing the aesthetic object and extracting the essential elements of Beauty, or by describing the aesthetic experience and extract-

## BRUNEL TEXT ROMAN, 7/9 PT

[TRACKING +6]

SITUATIONIST INTERNATIONAL (SI) was a group of international revolutionaries founded in 1957. With their ideas rooted in Marxism and the 20th century European artistic avantgarde, they advocated experiences of life being alternative to those admitted by the capitalist order, for the fulfillment of human primitive desires and the pursuing of a superior passional quality. For this purpose they suggested and experimented with the construction of situations; the setting up of environments favorable for the fulfillment of such desires. Using methods drawn from the arts, they developed a series of experimental fields of study for the construction of such, like unitary urbanism.

The sense of constructing situations is to fulfill human primitive desires and pursue a superior passional quality. From *Internationale Situationiste #1*: “This alone can lead to the further clarification of these simple basic desires, and to the confused emergence of new desires whose ma-

## BRUNEL TEXT MEDIUM, 7/9 PT

[TRACKING +6]

SITUATIONIST INTERNATIONAL (SI) was a group of international revolutionaries founded in 1957. With their ideas rooted in Marxism and the 20th century European artistic avantgarde, they advocated experiences of life being alternative to those admitted by the capitalist order, for the fulfillment of human primitive desires and the pursuing of a superior passional quality. For this purpose they suggested and experimented with the construction of situations; the setting up of environments favorable for the fulfillment of such desires. Using methods drawn from the arts, they developed a series of experimental fields of study for the construction of such, like unitary urbanism.

The sense of constructing situations is to fulfill human primitive desires and pursue a superior passional quality. From *Internationale Situationiste #1*: “This alone can lead to the further clarification of these simple basic desires, and to the confused emergence of new desires whose ma-

## BRUNEL TEXT SEMIBOLD, 7/9 PT

[TRACKING +6]

**SITUATIONIST INTERNATIONAL (SI) was a group of international revolutionaries founded in 1957. With their ideas rooted in Marxism and the 20th century European artistic avantgarde, they advocated experiences of life being alternative to those admitted by the capitalist order, for the fulfillment of human primitive desires and the pursuing of a superior passional quality. For this purpose they suggested and experimented with the construction of situations; the setting up of environments favorable for the fulfillment of such desires. Using methods drawn from the arts, they developed a series of experimental fields of study for the construction of such, like unitary urbanism.**

**The sense of constructing situations is to fulfill human primitive desires and pursue a superior passional quality. From *Internationale Situationiste #1*: “This alone can lead to the further clarification of these simple basic desires, and to the confused emergence of new desires whose**

## BRUNEL TEXT SHORT ROMAN, 7/8 PT

[TRACKING +6]

SITUATIONIST INTERNATIONAL (SI) was a group of international revolutionaries founded in 1957. With their ideas rooted in Marxism and the 20th century European artistic avantgarde, they advocated experiences of life being alternative to those admitted by the capitalist order, for the fulfillment of human primitive desires and the pursuing of a superior passional quality. For this purpose they suggested and experimented with the construction of situations; the setting up of environments favorable for the fulfillment of such desires. Using methods drawn from the arts, they developed a series of experimental fields of study for the construction of such, like unitary urbanism.

The sense of constructing situations is to fulfill human primitive desires and pursue a superior passional quality. From *Internationale Situationiste #1*: “This alone can lead to the further clarification of these simple basic desires, and to the confused emergence of new desires whose material roots will be precisely the new reality engendered by situationist constructions. We must thus envisage a sort of situationist-

## BRUNEL TEXT SHORT MEDIUM, 7/8 PT

[TRACKING +6]

SITUATIONIST INTERNATIONAL (SI) was a group of international revolutionaries founded in 1957. With their ideas rooted in Marxism and the 20th century European artistic avantgarde, they advocated experiences of life being alternative to those admitted by the capitalist order, for the fulfillment of human primitive desires and the pursuing of a superior passional quality. For this purpose they suggested and experimented with the construction of situations; the setting up of environments favorable for the fulfillment of such desires. Using methods drawn from the arts, they developed a series of experimental fields of study for the construction of such, like unitary urbanism.

The sense of constructing situations is to fulfill human primitive desires and pursue a superior passional quality. From *Internationale Situationiste #1*: “This alone can lead to the further clarification of these simple basic desires, and to the confused emergence of new desires whose material roots will be precisely the new reality engendered by situationist constructions. We must thus envisage a sort of situationist-

## BRUNEL TEXT SHORT SEMIBOLD, 7/8 PT

[TRACKING +6]

**SITUATIONIST INTERNATIONAL (SI) was a group of international revolutionaries founded in 1957. With their ideas rooted in Marxism and the 20th century European artistic avantgarde, they advocated experiences of life being alternative to those admitted by the capitalist order, for the fulfillment of human primitive desires and the pursuing of a superior passional quality. For this purpose they suggested and experimented with the construction of situations; the setting up of environments favorable for the fulfillment of such desires. Using methods drawn from the arts, they developed a series of experimental fields of study for the construction of such, like unitary urbanism.**

**The sense of constructing situations is to fulfill human primitive desires and pursue a superior passional quality. From *Internationale Situationiste #1*: “This alone can lead to the further clarification of these simple basic desires, and to the confused emergence of new desires whose material roots will be precisely the new reality engendered by situationist constructions. We must thus envisage a sort of situationist-oriented**

UPPERCASE

ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

LOWERCASE

abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

SMALL CAPS

ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

STANDARD PUNCTUATION

¡!¿?.,:;...--—()[]{}/|\&@\*“”‘’‚„,«»<> §•¶†‡©®™

ALL CAP PUNCTUATION

¡¿?(){}[]/\&@\*“”‘’‚„,«»<>

SMALL CAP PUNCTUATION

¡!¿?(){}[]/\&@\*“”‘’‚„,«»<>

LIGATURES

fb ff fh fi fj fk fl ft ffb ffh ffi ffj ffk ffl fff

PROPORTIONAL  $\frac{2}{3}$  HEIGHT  
default figures

\$£€¥1234567890¢ f%‰# <+ = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠ ' ”

PROPORTIONAL OLDSTYLE

\$£€¥1234567890 <+ = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠

PROPORTIONAL LINING

\$£€¥1234567890%‰# <+ = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠

TABULAR  $\frac{2}{3}$  HEIGHT

\$£€¥1234567890 ¢ f%‰# <+ = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠

TABULAR OLDSTYLE

\$£€¥ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 ¢ f % ‰ # < + = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠

TABULAR LINING

\$£€¥1234567890 ¢ f%‰# <+ = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠

SMALL CAP  
PROPORTIONAL LINING

\$£€¥1234567890%‰# <+ = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠

SMALL CAP  
TABULAR LINING

\$£€¥ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0%‰# <+ = - x ÷ > ≤ ≈ ≠

PREBUILT FRACTIONS

1/2 1/3 2/3 1/4 3/4 1/8 3/8 5/8 7/8 1/2 1/3 2/3 1/4 3/4 1/8 2/3 5/8 7/8

NUMERATORS,  
DENOMINATORS

H1234567890/1234567890

SUPERSCRIPT,  
SUBSCRIPT & ORDINALS

H<sup>1234567890</sup> H<sub>1234567890</sub> abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

t ft fff 12478 347 1222337 ½ ¼ ⅓ ¼ ⅔ ⅕ ⅞ tt†

ACCENTED UPPERCASE

Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß à á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý ÿ

ACCENTED LOWERCASE

á â ã ä å æ ç è é ê ë ì í î ï ñ ò ó ô õ ö ø ù ú û ü ý ÿ

ACCENTED SMALL CAPS

Á Â Ã Ä Å Æ Ç È É Ê Ë Ì Í Î Ï Ñ Ò Ó Ô Õ Ö Ø Ù Ú Û Ü Ý Þ ß



| OPENTYPE FEATURES<br>FAMILY WIDE                      | DEACTIVATED   | ACTIVATED   |
|---|---|---|
| ALL CAPS<br>opens up spacing,<br>moves punctuation up | ¿Fish & «Chips» @ £24.65?   | ¿FISH & «CHIPS» @ £24.65?   |
| SMALL CAPS  | ¿Fish & «Chips» @ £24.65?   | ¿FISH & «CHIPS» @ £24.65?   |
| ALL SMALL CAPS<br>includes punctuation<br>and figures | ¿Fish & «Chips» @ £24.65?   | ¿FISH & «CHIPS» @ £24.65?   |
| PROPORTIONAL ¼ HEIGHT<br>default figures              | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| PROPORTIONAL OLDSTYLE                                 | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| PROPORTIONAL LINING                                   | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| SMALL CAP<br>TABULAR LINING                           | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | ON SALE: \$3,460 €1,895<br>ORIGINAL: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| TABULAR ¼ HEIGHT                                      | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| TABULAR OLDSTYLE                                      | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| TABULAR LINING  | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| SMALL CAP<br>PROPORTIONAL LINING                      | On Sale: \$3,460 €1,895<br>Original: \$7,031 £9,215   | ON SALE: \$3,460 €1,895<br>ORIGINAL: \$7,031 £9,215   |
| FRACTIONS<br>ignores numeric date format              | 21/03/10 and 2 1/18 460/920   | 21/03/10 and 2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>18</sub> 460/920   |
| SUPERSCRIPT/SUPERIOR                                  | x <sup>158</sup> + y <sup>23</sup> × z <sup>18</sup> - a <sup>4260</sup>                        | x <sup>158</sup> + y <sup>23</sup> × z <sup>18</sup> - a <sup>4260</sup>                        |
| SUBSCRIPT/INFERIOR                                    | x <sub>158</sub> ÷ y <sub>23</sub> × z <sub>18</sub> - a <sub>4260</sub>                        | x <sub>158</sub> ÷ y <sub>23</sub> × z <sub>18</sub> - a <sub>4260</sub>                        |
| DENOMINATOR<br>for arbitrary fractions                | 0123456789 0123456789   | 0123456789 0123456789   |
| NUMERATOR<br>for arbitrary fractions                  | 0123456789 0123456789   | 0123456789 0123456789   |
| ORDINAL   | 1 <sup>st</sup> 2 <sup>nd</sup> 3 <sup>rd</sup> 1 <sup>er</sup> 2 <sup>e</sup> Arr <sup>t</sup> | 1 <sup>st</sup> 2 <sup>nd</sup> 3 <sup>rd</sup> 1 <sup>er</sup> 2 <sup>e</sup> Arr <sup>t</sup> |
| LANGUAGE FEATURE<br>Català (Catalan) l glyph          | IL·LÒGIC al·lusió COL·LECCIÓ  | ILLÒGIC allusió COLLECCIÓ   |
| LANGUAGE FEATURE<br>Polski (Polish) kreska accent     | GŁÓWNA których MOŻLIWOŚĆ  | GŁÓWNA których MOŻLIWOŚĆ  |
| LANGUAGE FEATURE<br>Română (Romanian) s accent        | ÎNSUȘI conștiința ȘTIINȚIFICE   | ÎNSUȘI conștiința ȘTIINȚIFICE   |

**OPENTYPE FEATURES**  
ROMAN & ITALIC

STYLISTIC SET 08  
alternate 2

STYLISTIC SET 08 + 10  
alternate oldstyle 2

STYLISTIC SET 09  
alt 1478, oldstyle 247, lining 123

STYLISTIC SET 10  
alternate oldstyle 3

STYLISTIC SET 11  
alternate lining 2 3

STYLISTIC SET 14  
sets all figures to ¼ height

STYLISTIC SET 15  
nut fractions

**OPENTYPE FEATURES**  
ROMAN ONLY

SWASH  
K

STYLISTIC SET 01  
alternate t

**OPENTYPE FEATURES**  
ITALIC ONLY

SWASH  
A J K M N Q V W Y Z 4

STYLISTIC SET 02  
alternate g

STYLISTIC SET 03  
alternate v w

STYLISTIC SET 06  
alternate x

STYLISTIC SET 12  
alternate 4

STYLISTIC SET 16 + SWASH  
alternate swash V W

**DEACTIVATED**

Gaining just 2.72% in Q2 of 2017  
Yields over 12,742 tons of arabica  
No. 231: 2,147 new sorts of V.4718  
The 3 farms totaled 32,638 acres  
Wind power made 2.13 kilowatts  
Item #5: Mark \$12703 as utilized  
Q4: £1,275,961 €1,434,620  
¾ of the area is under 7½ meters

**DEACTIVATED**

RECKLESS BRINKMANSHIP  
Critics expect not to rate exhibit

**DEACTIVATED**

YEAR 4 KALE QUOTE ZONES  
*Newest Venues Just Won Matches*  
*A challenging figurative language*  
*Traveling to new and varied cities*  
*Next express train in sixty seconds*  
*The diaries of a 4<sup>th</sup> century trader*  
*Newest Venues Just Won Matches*

**ACTIVATED**

Gaining just 2.72% in Q2 of 2017  
Yields over 12,742 tons of arabica  
No. 231: 2,147 new sorts of V.4718  
The 3 farms totaled 32,638 acres  
Wind power made 2.13 kilowatts  
Item #5: Mark \$12703 as utilized  
Q4: £1,275,961 €1,434,620  
¾ of the area is under 7½ meters

**ACTIVATED**

RECKLESS BRINKMANSHIP  
Critics expect not to rate exhibit

**ACTIVATED**

YEAR 4 KALE QUOTE ZONES  
*Newest Venues Just Won Matches*  
*A challenging figurative language*  
*Traveling to new and varied cities*  
*Next express train in sixty seconds*  
*The diaries of a 4<sup>th</sup> century trader*  
*Newest Venues Just Won Matches*

## 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, Romansch, Saami, Samoan,  
 Scots, Scottish Gaelic, Serbian (Latin), Slovak,  
 Slovenian, Spanish (Castilian), Swahili, Swedish,  
 Tagalog, Turkish, Walloon, Welsh, Wolof

## CONTACT

|                            |        |                        |
|----------------------------|--------|------------------------|
| Commercial Classics        | office | 212 604-0955           |
| 110 Lafayette Street, #203 | fax    | 212 925-2701           |
| New York, New York 10013   |        | commercialclassics.com |

## COPYRIGHT

© 2019 Commercial Classics. All rights reserved.  
 Commercial Classics® and Brunel® are registered  
 trademarks of Schwartzco Inc., dba Commercial Classics.

*This file may be used for evaluation purposes only.*

## 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.