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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, whereas 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
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Every introduction to the problems of aesthetics begins by acknowledging the existence and claims of two methods of attack—the general, philosophical, deductive, which starts from a complete metaphysics and installs beauty in its place among the other great concepts; and the empirical, or inductive, which seeks to disengage a general principle of beauty from the objects of aesthetic experience and the facts of aesthetic enjoyment: a prime example of Fechner’s “aesthetics from above and from below.”

Methodologies
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
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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 seek to establish in the following. Granting that the aim of every aesthetics is to
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Sehen wir das Gesamtbild unseres heutigen Lebens nur mit unseren Augen an, so können wir die Folgerung ziehen, daß dieses Gebilde einen chaotischen Charakter trägt, und es kann uns nicht wundern, daß diejenigen, welche sich in diesem scheinbaren Chaos unwohl fühlen, der Welt entfliehen oder sich in geistigen Abstraktionen verlieren wollen. Doch jedenfalls muß es uns klar sein, daß diese Flucht vor der Wirklichkeit ein ebenso großer Irrtum ist wie jene Anlehnung an den reinsten Materialismus. Weder die Flucht in das Mittelalter, noch der von verschiedenen Kunsthistorikern empfohlene Wiederaufbau des Olympos kann und die Lösung bringen. Unsere Zeit hat eine andere Mission zu erfüllen als die des Mittelalters und des Hellenismus. Um die Aufgabe unserer Zeit richtig zu verstehen, ist es notwendig, daß wir nicht nur mit unseren Augen, sondern vielmehr mit unseren innerlichen Sinnesorganen die Lebensstruktur erfassen. Haben wir einmal die Synthese des Lebens aus der Tiefe unseres Wesens gewonnen und als Inhalt von Kultur und Kunst anerkannt, so wird es uns nicht schwer fallen an Hand von Dokumenten, die uns die wesens gewonnen und als Inhalt von Kultur und Kunst anerkannt, so wird es uns nicht schwer fallen an Hand von Dokumenten, die uns die
Hajnali két órakor a segédsítsz belépett a tábornok szobájába és jelentette, hogy a járórók elindultak a hajnali két órakor a segédtiszt belépett a tábornok geste noble et avec des manières raffinées. Jusqu’à


Dapprima, ripetendo l’errore commesso in gioventù, scrisse di animali che conosceva poco, e le sue favole risonarono di ruggiti e barriti. Poi si fece più umano, se così si può dire, scrivendo degli animali che credeva di conoscere. Così la mosca gli regalò una grande quantità di favole dimostrandosi un animale più utile di quanto si creda. In una di quelle favole ammirava la velocità del dittero, velocità sprecata perché non gli serviva nè a raggiungere la preda nè a garantire la sua incolumità. Qui faceva la morale una testuggine. Un’altra favola esaltava la mosca che distruggeva le cose sozze da essa tanto amate. Una terza si meravigliava che la mosca, l’animale più ricco d’occhi, vedesse tanto lontano. Infine una raccontava di un uomo che, dopo di aver schiacciato una mosca noiosa, le gridò: “Ti ho beneficata; ecco che non sei più una mosca”. Con tale sistema era facile di avere ogni giorno la favola pronta col caffè del mattino. Doveva venire la guerra ad insegnargli che la favola poteva divenire un’espressione del proprio animo, il quale così inseriva la mummietta nella macchina della vita, quale un suo organo. Ed ecco come avvenne. Allo scoppio della guerra italiana, Mario
D. Benedita levantou-se, no dia seguinte, com a ideia de escrever uma carta ao marido, uma longa carta em que lhe narrasse a festa da véspera, nomeasse os convivias e os pratos, descrevesse a recepção noturna, e, principalmente, desse notícia das novas relações com D. Maria dos Anjos. A mala fechava-se às duas horas da tarde, D. Benedita acordara às nove, e, não morando longe (morava no Campo da Aclamação), um escravo levaria a carta ao correio muito a tempo. Demais, chovia; D. Benedita arredou a cortina da janela, deu com os vidros molhados; era uma chuvinha teimosa, o céu estava todo brochado de uma cor pardo-escusa, malhada de grossas nuvens negras. Ao longe, viu fluatar e voar o pano que cobriá o balao que uma preta levava à cabeça; concluíu que ventava. Magnífico dia para não sair, e, portanto, escrever uma carta, duas cartas, todas as cartas de uma esposa ao marido ausente. Ninguém viria tentá-la. Enquanto ela compôs os babadinhos e rendas do roupão branco, um roupão de cambraia viria tentá-la. Enquanto ela compôs as feições. vê que não lhe dou Vênus; também não lhe dou Medusa. Ao contrário de...
| UPPERCASE  | ABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWXYZ |
| LOWERCASE  | abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz |
| STANDPUNCT | !@#$%^&*()_+{}[]|:;'",<>/? |
| ALLCAPPUNCT | i!@#$%^&*()_+{}[]|:;'",<>? |
| LIGATURES  | ff fi fl ffi ffl |
| PROPORTLIN | $£€¥1234567890¢£‰àœ®âœ®<+–×÷>'" |
| TABULAR     | $£€¥1234567890%œ°<+–×÷> |
| LINES       | ½ ⅓ ⅔ ¼ ⅜ ⅝ ⅞ ⅛      |
| PREBUFLR   | ½ ⅓ ⅔ ¼ ⅜ ⅝ ⅞ ⅛      |
| NUMDENO     | H1/234567890/1234567890 |
| SUPSUB      | H1234567890 H1234567890 |
| STYLALT     | JKMQ gkly KJ g[color]gg[white]kl[black]lýýýý |
| ACCUP       | ၆ＡＡＡＡＡＡABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWX |
| ACCLO        | ၆ＡＡＡＡＡＡABCDEFGHIJKLMNOPQRSTUVWX |
**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 making arbitrary fractions

**NUMERATOR**
for making arbitrary fractions

**LANGUAGE FEATURE**
Română (romanian) a accent

---
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Glass @ [Only] $190 / €150

Sale Price: $3,460 €1,895

Originally: ¥7,031 £9,215

Sale Price: $3,460 €1,895

Originally: ¥7,031 £9,215

Glass @ [only] $190 / €150

Sale Price: $3,460 €1,895

Originally: ¥7,031 £9,215

Sale Price: $3,460 €1,895

Originally: ¥7,031 £9,215

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

x\(^{158}\) + y\(^{23}\) × z\(^{18}\) − a\(^{4260}\)

x\(^{158}\) ÷ y\(^{23}\) × z\(^{18}\) − a\(^{4260}\)

0123456789 0123456789

0123456789 0123456789

0123456789 0123456789

0123456789 0123456789

21/03/10 and 2\(\frac{1}{18}\) 460\(\frac{920}{920}\)

x\(^{158}\) + y\(^{23}\) × z\(^{18}\) − a\(^{4260}\)

x\(^{158}\) ÷ y\(^{23}\) × z\(^{18}\) − a\(^{4260}\)

0123456789 0123456789

0123456789 0123456789

0123456789 0123456789

0123456789 0123456789
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ABOUT THE DESIGNERS

Christian Schwartz (born 1977) is a partner, along with Paul Barnes, in Commercial Type, a foundry based in New York and London. A graduate of Carnegie Mellon University, Schwartz worked at MetaDesign Berlin and Font Bureau prior to spending several years working on his own before forming Schwartzco Inc. in 2006 and Commercial Type in 2008. Schwartz has published fonts with many respected independent foundries, and has designed proprietary typefaces for corporations and publications worldwide.

Schwartz’s typefaces have been honored by the Smithsonian’s Cooper Hewitt National Design Museum, the New York Type Directors Club, and the International Society of Typographic Designers, and his work with Barnes has been honored by D&AD. As part of the team that redesigned The Guardian, they were shortlisted for the Designer of the Year prize by the Design Museum in London. Schwartz and Barnes also were named two of the 40 most influential designers under 40 by Wallpaper*, and Schwartz was included in Time magazine’s 2007 ‘Design 100’. In early 2007, Schwartz and German design luminary Erik Spiekermann were awarded a gold medal by the German Design Council (Rat für Formgebung) for the typeface system they designed for Deutsche Bahn.

Vincent Chan trained as a graphic designer at Monash University in Melbourne and worked as a type designer at Commercial Type in New York in 2012–13. He is a PhD candidate and teaching associate at Monash University.