

---

# Brunel

## *Collection*

---

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.

---

**DESIGNED BY**  
PAUL BARNES

**PRODUCTION ASSISTANCE**  
CHRISTIAN SCHWARTZ  
BERTON HASEBE  
DAVE FOSTER

**PUBLISHED**  
2019

**4 FAMILIES**  
4 OPTICAL SIZES

**FEATURES (VARIES BY FAMILY)**

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

---

**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  
WRY

---

# 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 possibilities of today, where the elegance and beauty of the form takes centre stage.

---

**DESIGNED BY**  
PAUL BARNES  
BERTON HASEBE

**PRODUCTION ASSISTANCE**  
CHRISTIAN SCHWARTZ  
DAVE FOSTER

**PUBLISHED**  
2019

**18 STYLES**  
9 WEIGHTS W/ ITALICS

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

MONT

Extents

BRUNEL HAIRLINE THIN, 140 PT

QUAYS

Reckon

BRUNEL HAIRLINE THIN ITALIC, 140 PT

IDEAL

Tijdens

BRUNEL HAIRLINE EXTRALIGHT, 140 PT

*KWITS*

*Lazing*

BRUNEL HAIRLINE EXTRALIGHT ITALIC, 140 PT

PRICE

Forests

BRUNEL HAIRLINE LIGHT, 140 PT

*PAESI*

*Quirky*

BRUNEL HAIRLINE LIGHT ITALIC, 140 PT

BOWL

Centro

BRUNEL HAIRLINE ROMAN, 140 PT  
[ALTERNATE t]

INTRĂ

Walnut

BRUNEL HAIRLINE ITALIC, 140 PT  
[SWASH W]

MAASK

Round

BRUNEL HAIRLINE ROMAN NO. 2, 140 PT  
[SWASH K]

*JOIST*

*Strayße*

BRUNEL HAIRLINE ITALIC NO. 2, 140 PT



KIDYŽ

Argyle

BRUNEL HAIRLINE MEDIUM, 140 PT

AJAR

Quant

BRUNEL HAIRLINE MEDIUM ITALIC, 140 PT  
[SWASH A J Q]

VOTE

Bæerer

BRUNEL HAIRLINE SEMIBOLD, 140 PT

WÖK

Lights

BRUNEL HAIRLINE SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 140 PT  
[ALTERNATE g]

LAYO

Razor

BRUNEL HAIRLINE BOLD, 140 PT

FACT

Series

BRUNEL HAIRLINE BOLD ITALIC, 140 PT

IOWA

Guide

BRUNEL HAIRLINE BLACK, 140 PT

SJOS

Après

BRUNEL HAIRLINE BLACK ITALIC, 140 PT  
(ALTERNATE A)

Thermoplastic  
Cosmopolitan  
Kaleidoscopic  
Konungdæmi  
Embarcações  
Demografico  
Agricultural  
Spectacular  
Regenerate

BRUNEL HAIRLINE, 75 PT

*Developments*  
*Aberdeenshire*  
*Radicalement*  
*Photographer*  
*Improvement*  
*Culminación*  
*Ambassador*  
*Renovating*  
*Beschouwd*

BRUNEL HAIRLINE ITALIC, 75 PT

---

# 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.

---

**DESIGNED BY**  
PAUL BARNES

**PRODUCTION ASSISTANCE**  
CHRISTIAN SCHWARTZ  
DAVE FOSTER

**PUBLISHED**  
2019

**12 STYLES**  
6 WEIGHTS W/ ITALICS

**FEATURES**

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

FILOZOFIJU  
Breakthrough

BRUNEL POSTER ROMAN, 70 PT  
[ALTERNATE t]

*POLYMATHS*  
*Underground*

BRUNEL POSTER ITALIC, 70 PT

VÄHENDATI  
Mittenåsikter

BRUNEL POSTER ROMAN NO. 2, 70 PT

*PREWOVEN*  
*International*

BRUNEL POSTER ITALIC NO. 2, 70 PT  
[SWASH N V W]



LÜBECKER  
Development

BRUNEL POSTER MEDIUM, 70 PT

*OBJECTIVE*  
*Confectioners*

BRUNEL POSTER MEDIUM ITALIC, 70 PT  
[SWASH J V]

ENTRAMBI  
Provisionally

BRUNEL POSTER SEMIBOLD, 70 PT

*TELEVISÃO*  
*Kazandı*

BRUNEL POSTER SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 70 PT

**SPECIFICS**  
**Nominasyon**

BRUNEL POSTER BOLD, 70 PT

***MIEDLIMIR***  
***Algorithmic***

BRUNEL POSTER BOLD ITALIC, 70 PT  
[ALTERNATE g]

**BATERIJO**  
**Uroczystość**

BRUNEL POSTER BLACK, 70 PT

***PREVIEW***  
***Anonymity***

BRUNEL POSTER BLACK ITALIC, 70 PT  
[SWASH A, ALTERNATE SWASH V W]

Hilfsmaßnahme  
Proportionately  
Apprenticeship  
Régulièrement  
Constituciones  
Psychological

BRUNEL POSTER, 60 PT

*Sajtótájékoztatót  
Ailddechreuodd  
Monmouthshire  
Recommencing  
Homogenizing  
Uitgebreidere*

BRUNEL POSTER ITALIC, 60 PT

---

# 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.

---

**DESIGNED BY**  
PAUL BARNES

**PRODUCTION ASSISTANCE**  
CHRISTIAN SCHWARTZ  
DAVE FOSTER

**PUBLISHED**  
2019

**12 STYLES**  
6 WEIGHTS W/ ITALICS

**FEATURES**

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

**INHABITED FOR OVER 500 YEARS**  
 Early tie-in with the architectural trade  
*PEMBROKE QUAY CUSTOMS ZONES*  
*The various Savoyard states were unified*

BRUNEL DECK ROMAN, ITALIC, 24 PT  
 [SWASH A K M N Q Y Z]

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

BRUNEL DECK ROMAN NO. 2, ITALIC NO. 2, 24 PT  
 [ALTERNATE ROMAN t, ITALIC A V g v]

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

BRUNEL DECK MEDIUM, MEDIUM ITALIC, 24 PT  
 [PROPORTIONAL OLDSTYLE FIGURES, ALTERNATE x]

**VILLAGES INCLUDE ARROCHAR**  
 Very first cabinet minister to the king  
*FIVE MILES TO THE SOUTHEAST*  
*Kutatása a második világháború után*

BRUNEL DECK SEMIBOLD, SEMIBOLD ITALIC, 24 PT

**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***

BRUNEL DECK BOLD, BOLD ITALIC, 24 PT

**BAMBOO-FACED CUPBOARDS**  
**Fue obligada a abdicar el 5 de julio**  
***A MUCH SIMPLER SOLUTION***  
***Virtually 10.6 percent of all voters***

BRUNEL DECK BLACK, BLACK ITALIC, 24 PT  
[SWASH A M N V]

Electro-mechanical  
National regulator  
Méthodes utilisées  
Titans of industry  
Græske mytologi  
**£1.7 billion stake**

BRUNEL DECK, 50 PT



*La extensa colección*  
*Quaintly historical*  
*Zoals fotopolymeer*  
*Influencing policy*  
*Technical master*  
*New freneticism*

BRUNEL DECK ITALIC, 50 PT

---

# 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 ¼ 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

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 THE SPANISH WAR, which began in 1739, and the  
 ROMAN French war which soon followed it occasioned  
 further increase of the debt, which, on the 31st  
 SEMIBOLD 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  
 PROPORTIONAL no more than £8,328,354 from it. A war of less  
 ¾ HEIGHT FIGURES than nine years' continuance added £31,338,689  
 to it (Refer to James Postlethwaite's *History of  
 ITALIC the Public Revenue*). During the administration  
 of Mr. Pelham, the interest of the public debt  
 was reduced from 4% to 3%; or at least mea-  
 SEMIBOLD sures 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  
 PROPORTIONAL to £72,289,673. On the 5th of January 1763, at  
 OLDSTYLE FIGURES 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 con-  
 PROPORTIONAL clusion of the peace, so that though, on the 5th  
 LINING FIGURES of January 1764, the funded debt was increased  
 (partly by a new loan, and partly by funding a  
 ITALIC 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,

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 to

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

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 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

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, 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 the essential elements of aesthetic feeling, thereby indicating the

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 extracting the essential elements of aesthetic feeling, thereby indicating the

## INCLUDED FAMILIES

Brunel Hairline  
 Brunel Poster  
 Brunel Deck  
 Brunel Text

## 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 DESIGNERS

**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.

**Berton Hasebe** (born 1982) moved from Hawaii to study and work in Los Angeles, obtaining a BFA from Otis College of Art and Design in 2005. In 2007 he moved to the Netherlands to study type design through the Type and Media masters course at the Royal Academy of Art (KABK) in The Hague. Berton has resided in New York since 2008, and was a staff designer with Commercial Type from 2008 to 2013, when he left to start his own studio.

Berton's typefaces have been awarded by the New York and Tokyo Type Directors Club, the ATypI, and the Brno Biennial. In 2012 he was awarded *Print Magazine's* 20 Under 30 Award. Berton currently teaches typography at Parsons and has taught type design at The University of the Arts in Philadelphia and the Type@Cooper program at the Cooper Union in New York City.