Brunel is a quintessentially British Modern. With multiple weights from a delicate thin to a forceful black, in optical sizes from the robust Text to the extreme contrast of the Hairline, Brunel maintains a gentle elegance throughout. This makes it a face for multiple applications, from editorial and book design to everyday graphic design.
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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 even following setbacks in 1711 through the Conduct of competing European firms. However, despite much aggravation, STEADFASTLY ENDURES.
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Brunel Hairline

With extreme contrast and the finest serifs, Brunel Hairline is designed for the largest sizes. It is the modern of the past made with the possibilties of today, where the elegance and beauty of the form takes centre stage.
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Brunel Poster

In larger sizes Brunel’s character changes from a workhorse to simple elegance. Less severe than the Didot style, Brunel Poster is a beautiful display face with an *expressive italic* for sizes above 60 point.
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**FEATURES**
- Proportional ¾ height figures
- Proportional oldstyle figures
- Proportional lining figures
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- Fractions (prebuilt & arbitrary)
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Brunel Deck

The modern relies on a higher than normal contrast, so Brunel is designed with multiple optical variants, optimizing it at all sizes. Designed for sizes between text (14 point and below) and headlines (48 point and above), Brunel Deck has an additional weight compared to the Text, from Roman to the emphatic Black.
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INHABITED FOR OVER 500 YEARS
Early tie-in with the architectural trade
PEMBROKE QUAY CUSTOMS ZONES
The various Savoyard states were unified

TUGADH AITHEANTAS OIFIGIÚIL
It was cast by Walter MacFarlane & Co.
COAST OF THE COWAL PENINSULA
Den største by og hovedstad i regionen er

THE EPONYMOUS PROTAGONIST
Od 1871 r. stanowi część zjednoczonych
BILAN ÉNERGÉTIQUE EST DÉFINI
Expressed his skepticism of these results

VILLAGES INCLUDE ARROCHAR
Very first cabinet minister to the king
FIVE MILES TO THE SOUTHEAST
Kutatása a második világháború után
IL LEGAME CON IL PAESAGGIO
In mid-1957 ZETA began its operation
NEW 3.8-LITRE FLAT-6 ENGINE
Alueella on 24,8 miljoonaa asukasta

BAMBOO-FACED CUPBOARDS
Fue obligada a abdicar el 5 de julio
A MUCH SIMPLER SOLUTION
Virtually 10.6 percent of all voters
Electro-mechanical
National regulator
Méthodes utilisées
Titans of industry
Græske mytologi
£1.7 billion stake
La extensa colección
Quaintly historical
Zoals fotopolymeer
Influencing policy
Technical master
New freneticism
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.

**Features**

- Proportional/tabular 1/8 height figures
- Proportional/tabular oldstyle figures
- Proportional/tabular lining figures
- Small cap proportiona/tabular lining figures
- Fractions (prebuilt & arbitrary)
- Superscript/subscript
- Ordinal letters
- Small caps (roman & italic)
- Swash capitals
- Stylistic alternates
IL 1º 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

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

A TELEPÜLÉS LAKOSSÁGA AZ ELMÚLT ÉVEK BEN
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

OMFATTER 58 KOMMUNER OG DÆKKER 7.28 KM²
The Marquessate of Sambuca passed to the Beccadellis
MENTIONS KING ARTHUR & THE ROUND TABLE
A series of talks nearer the border village of Panmunjom

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
Signature dishes include busiate short pasta with qualeddu

Deeply textured & speckled fabrics from the Mourne Mountains

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

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 m² design/build labor of love nestled next to the sea

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

DATORITĂ POZIȚIEI STRATEGICE ÎN CENTRUL
Made in the area since the time of the ancient Greeks

Á STÓRBORGARSVÆDINU BÚA UM 750 PÚSUND
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, therefore,
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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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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 definitions of beauty as “the union of the Real and the Idea,” “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 the essential elements of aesthetic feeling, thereby indicating the
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