
Caslon Doric Condensed Text

Designed for smaller sizes, Caslon Doric Condensed Text, is a face not just for continuous reading matter, but also as a wider alternative to the original Caslon Doric Condensed. Originally created for global cycling clothing brand, Rapha, its seven weights offer designers a wide palette of weights from thin to extrabold. Apart from its width, it modifies several other characteristics to improve legibility at smaller sizes. The inward turning of end strokes on such characters as the a s t & y have been reduced, and the angle of the italic is less steep. Caslon Doric Condensed Text expands the Caslon Doric collection to five widths, and 78 individual members, making it a wide ranging family for multiple applications.

DESIGNED BY
PAUL BARNES

PUBLISHED
2019

14 STYLES
7 WEIGHTS W/ ITALICS

FEATURES
PROPORTIONAL/TABULAR LINING FIGURES
FRACTIONS (PREBUILT AND ARBITRARY)
SUPERSCRIP/T/SUBSCRIPT
STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Thin

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Thin Italic

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Light

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Light Italic

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Regular

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Regular Italic

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Medium

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Medium Italic

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Semibold

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Semibold Italic

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Bold

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Bold Italic

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Extrabold

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Extrabold Italic

WHILE THE WRITERS WHO GATHERED AROUND SCHLEGEL WERE INCLINED
 The team competed for Canada's Stanley Cup five times between 1903 and 1907
UNICI ELEMENTI STILISTICI A RESISTERE AL FURORE DELL'ORO, E A RIMANERE
Street Food Cinema presented a series of movies & festivities among the Victorian

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT THIN, THIN ITALIC, 16 PT

FILM AZ EGYIK LEGKORÁBBI, LEGNAGYOBB HATÁSÚ ÉS LEGELISMERTEBB
 Modern art critics and historians have justly praised it as the most revelatory
DELIVERED SCATHING CRITIQUES OF CONTEMPORARY WESTERN CULTURE
He is notable for arguing that realism is the most important function of cinema

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT LIGHT, LIGHT ITALIC, 16 PT

IN 2005, THE FESTIVAL WAS EXPANDED TO A EUROPÄISCHES THEATER
 Son intérêt pour le marxisme le conduit à rejeter la plupart des aspects du
AN APPROACH FROM NASDAQ VALUING THE COMPANY AT \$3.64 BILLION
Strauss's compositional output began in 1870 when he was just six years old

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT REGULAR, REGULAR ITALIC, 16 PT
 (ALTERNATE Q,j)

15 CZECH-BUILT STREETCARS BEGAN ARRIVING IN SEPTEMBER 2007
 In the early 15th century, members of the House of Luxembourg reigned
AFTER A DEVASTATING FIRE IN 1869, THE OPERA HOUSE WAS REBUILT
Frankfurter Jahre waren für Kracauers Entwicklung in mehrfacher Hinsicht

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, 16 PT
 (ALTERNATE G R g f r 1)

THE OFFICIAL DU PAGE COUNTY COURTHOUSE WAS BUILT IN 1889
 In the late 1780s the Spanish Empire commissioned an expedition to
VRIJEME UMJETNIČKE OBNOVE I UMJETNIČKOG BUNTA TE RAĐANJE
The settlements listed in Domesday grew from an ancient village close

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT SEMIBOLD, SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 16 PT

BLEV ETABLERET I 1811, OG ER EN AF VERDENS STØRSTE BØRSER
 The seat of the parliament assembled by King Charles I during the
THE BOARD RELEASED \$1.27 MILLION IN STATE & FEDERAL FUNDS
Locke made three separate voyages from Britain to North America

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT BOLD, BOLD ITALIC, 16 PT
 (ALTERNATE \$)

BRICK & STONE MASONRY WITH TIMBERS ON UPPER FLOORS
 Vast improvement to all the waterborne infrastructure of the
THE CESTUI QUE USE & TRUST WERE ROOTED IN MEDIEVAL LAW
Yhtiöllä on 185 toimistoa 43 maassa ja 14 huutokauppakamaria

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT EXTRABOLD, EXTRABOLD ITALIC, 16 PT

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT LIGHT, LIGHT ITALIC, MEDIUM, 18/21 PT

LIGHT ALL CAPS

LIGHT

MEDIUM

PROPORTIONAL
LINING FIGURES

LIGHT ITALIC

MEDIUM

LIGHT 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 to this author, to £139,516,807. The annui-

 CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT REGULAR, REGULAR ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 18/21 PT

REGULAR ALL CAPS

REGULAR

SEMIBOLD

PROPORTIONAL
LINING FIGURES

REGULAR ITALIC

SEMIBOLD

REGULAR 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 to this

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 18/21 PT

MEDIUM ALL CAPS

MEDIUM

BOLD

PROPORTIONAL
LINING FIGURES

MEDIUM ITALIC

BOLD

MEDIUM 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 to this

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
THIN, THIN ITALIC, REGULAR, 12/14 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
LIGHT, LIGHT ITALIC, MEDIUM, 12/14 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
REGULAR, REGULAR ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 12/14 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 12/14 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
REGULAR, REGULAR ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 12/14 PT
[NO ALTERNATES]

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 and 50¢. The most just and 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*).

Mr. Pelham's Quest for Rate Reduction

During the latter half of the administration of Mr. Pelham, the interest of this public debt was reduced from $4\frac{3}{4}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; or at least measures were taken for reducing it; the sinking fund was increased by $2\frac{1}{8}$ per cent, and $1\frac{1}{3}$ per cent 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.

Long Term Debt Management

However—according to the very well informed author of *Considerations on the Trade and Finances of Great Britain*—there still remained 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 to this author, to \$139,516,807. The annuities for lives, too, had been granted as premiums to the subscribers to the new loans in 1757, estimated at fourteen years' purchase, were

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
REGULAR, REGULAR ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 12/14 PT
[ALTERNATE G Q R f g j r \$ ¢ 1]

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 and 50¢. The most just and 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*).

Mr. Pelham's Quest for Rate Reduction

During the latter half of the administration of Mr. Pelham, the interest of this public debt was reduced from $4\frac{3}{4}$ to $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent; or at least measures were taken for reducing it; the sinking fund was increased by $2\frac{1}{8}$ per cent, and $1\frac{1}{3}$ per cent 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.

Long Term Debt Management

However—according to the very well informed author of *Considerations on the Trade and Finances of Great Britain*—there still remained 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 to this author, to \$139,516,807. The annuities for lives, too, had been granted as premiums to the subscribers to the new loans in 1757, estimated at fourteen years' purchase, were

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
LIGHT, LIGHT ITALIC, MEDIUM, 11/13 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 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
REGULAR, REGULAR ITALIC, SEMIBOLD, 11/13 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 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, BOLD, 11/13 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 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
SEMIBOLD, SEMIBOLD ITALIC, EXTRABOLD, 11/13 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

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
BOLD, BOLD ITALIC, 11/13 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 feel-

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
REGULAR, REGULAR ITALIC, 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 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.

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
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 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.

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
REGULAR, REGULAR 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.

An Aesthetic of Empiricism

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 seek to establish in the following. Granting

CASLON DORIC CONDENSED TEXT
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.

An Aesthetic of Empiricism

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 seek to establish in the following. Granting

UPPERCASE

ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ

LOWERCASE

abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

STANDARD PUNCTUATION

! " # \$ % & ' () * + , - . / : ; < = > ? @ [\] ^ _ ` { | } ~ ¡ ¢ £ ¤ ¥ ¦ § ¨ © ª « ¬ ® ¯ ° ± ² ³ ´ µ ¶ · ¸ ¹ º » ¼ ½ ¾

ALL CAP PUNCTUATION

! ¢ £ ¤ ¥ ¦ § ¨ © ª « ¬ ® ¯ ° ± ² ³ ´ µ ¶ · ¸ ¹ º » ¼ ½ ¾

LIGATURES

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

PROPORTIONAL LINING
default figures

\$ £ € ¥ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 ¢ ¤ ¥ ¯ ° ² ³ ´ µ ¶ · ¸ ¹ º » ¼ ½ ¾

TABULAR LINING

\$ £ € ¥ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 ¢ ¤ ¥ ¯ ° ² ³ ´ µ ¶ · ¸ ¹ º » ¼ ½ ¾

PREBUILT FRACTIONS

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

NUMERATORS &
DENOMINATORS

H 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 / 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

SUPERSCRIPIT &
SUBSCRIPIT

H^{1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0} H_{1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0}

STYLISTIC ALTERNATES

Œ œ Ḟ ḟ Ꞁ ꞁ Ꞃ ꞃ Ꞅ ꞅ Ꞇ ꞇ ꞈ ꞉ ꞊ Ꞌ ꞌ Ɥ ꞎ ꞏ Ꞑ ꞑ Ꞓ ꞓ ꞔ ꞕ Ꞗ ꞗ Ꞙ ꞙ Ꞛ ꞛ Ꞝ ꞝ Ꞟ ꞟ Ꞡ ꞡ Ꞣ ꞣ Ꞥ ꞥ Ꞧ ꞧ Ꞩ ꞩ Ɦ Ɜ Ɡ Ɬ Ɪ ꞯ Ʞ Ʇ Ʝ Ꭓ Ꞵ ꞵ Ꞷ ꞷ Ꞹ ꞹ Ꞻ ꞻ Ꞽ ꞽ Ꞿ ꞿ

ACCENTED UPPER CASE

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 þ ß

ACCENTED LOWER CASE

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
FAMILY WIDE

ALL CAPS
opens up spacing,
moves punctuation up

PROPORTIONAL LINING
default figures

TABULAR LINING

FRACTIONS
ignores numeric date format

SUPERSCRIPT/SUPERIOR

SUBSCRIPT/INFERIOR

DENOMINATOR
for arbitrary fractions

NUMERATOR
for arbitrary fractions

LANGUAGE FEATURE
Català (Catalan) l glyph

LANGUAGE FEATURE
Polski (Polish) kreska accent

LANGUAGE FEATURE
Română (Romanian) s accent

DEACTIVATED

¿jFish & «Chips» @ £4.15!?

Quarter: \$3,460 €1,895
Annual: ¥7,031 £9,215

Quarter: \$3,460 €1,895
Annual: ¥7,031 £9,215

21/03/10 and 2 1/18 460/920

$x^{158} + y^{23} \times z^{18} - a_{4260}$

$x_{158} \div y_{23} \times z_{18} - a_{4260}$

0123456789 0123456789

0123456789 0123456789

SÍL·LABA novel·la cal·ligrafia

GŁÓWNA możliwość których

CÂȘTIGAT totuși conștiința

ACTIVATED

¿iFISH & «CHIPS» @ £4.15!?

Quarter: \$3,460 €1,895
Annual: ¥7,031 £9,215

Quarter: \$3,460 €1,895
Annual: ¥7,031 £9,215

21/03/10 and 2 1/18 ⁴⁶⁰/920

$x^{158} + y^{23} \times z^{18} - a^{4260}$

$X_{158} \div Y_{23} \times Z_{18} - a_{4260}$

0123456789 0¹²³⁴⁵⁶⁷⁸⁹

0123456789 0¹²³⁴⁵⁶⁷⁸⁹

SÍL·LABA novel·la cal·ligrafia

GŁÓWNA możliwość których

CÂȘTIGAT totuși conștiința

OPENTYPE FEATURES
ROMAN & ITALICSTYLISTIC SET 01
alternate GSTYLISTIC SET 02
alternate RSTYLISTIC SET 03
alternate QSTYLISTIC SET 04
alternate gSTYLISTIC SET 05
alternate f jSTYLISTIC SET 09
alternate rSTYLISTIC SET 10
alternate 1STYLISTIC SET 11
alternate \$ ¢**DEACTIVATED**

Garrulously Gregory Grants

Righteously Risking 2 Rooks

Quick Quests of Quizmaster

Prestigious inaugural guests

Conjecture of junior founder

Thirty worried requirements

Causing a net 1 $\frac{1}{8}$ point gain

Dropping from \$2.50 to 50¢

ACTIVATED

Carrulously Gregory Grants

Righteously Risking 2 Rooks

Quick Quests of Quizmaster

Prestigious inaugural guests

Conjecture of junior founder

Thirty worried requirements

Causing a net 1 $\frac{1}{8}$ point gain

Dropping from \$2.50 to 50¢

STYLES INCLUDED IN COMPLETE FAMILY

Caslon Doric Condensed Text Thin
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Thin Italic
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Light
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Light Italic
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Regular
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Regular Italic
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Medium
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Medium Italic
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Semibold
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Semibold Italic
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Bold
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Bold Italic
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Extrabold
 Caslon Doric Condensed Text Extrabold 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® and Caslon Doric™ are 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.