

daiδala



*words on letters*

June through August 2002

19-JUNE 2002 THROUGH 30-JUNE 2002



ANGIE: 1 OF 20

Technically, FF Angie. Early, humanistic face by Jean-François Porchez. Winner of the Brattinga prize at the 1990 Morisawa Awards. Compare to Angie Sans, available through Porchez's site. For more information, see designer's article in *Serif 6* (Spring 1998, pp 24–31) and the info page at FontFont.

19-June 2002

DTL LOVE/HATE

Seen this? It's the news page at the Dutch Type Library, and every once in a while, it gets an update. This time around, we have a nice specimen book of DTL Paradox, by Gerard Unger, and a presentation showing off a forthcoming typeface called DTL Prokyon, by Erhard Kaiser – the designer of DTL Fleischmann.

We've admired Paradox for some time now; what's not to like? And according to Mr Blokland, it should be coming out next year in an OpenType version; we may finally get ff, ffi, and ffl. But save room in the drool bucket for Prokyon – this sure ain't Fleischmann! Rather, it is an adventurous sans-serif that serves purposes of titling and text very well. Download the show and see. Four weights in roman, italic, and small caps; text, lining, and hybrid figures; a wider range of accented characters than is usually included. And check out the philosophy behind the lower case, roman g: roman and "italic" forms are compared; in the case of the former, "...diese g-Form wurde vom Designer verworfen..."

But what will this novel sans-serif cost us? Right – US \$100. That's per style per weight, folks. Mr Bringhurst tells us that "commerce knows no conscience," and he does so in the case of mislabeling typefaces. But what about charging too much for them – I wonder what Bringhurst thinks about this, and I wonder what, exactly, is Mr Blokland's philosophy here? I'd love to buy Caspari, Dorian, Paradox, and the forthcoming Prokyon as much as anyone, but I simply cannot afford them. What's more, compare the prices of DTL Albertina to MT Albertina... Of DTL Haarlemmer to MT Haarlemmer. Same cuts, big difference in price. I think it simply comes down to a mix of arrogance and ignorance – in any case, a bad business model. (I work at Great Big American Company, so I know all about busi-

ness models.) Honestly, for every person who will buy a weight and style of Prokyon at \$100 a crack, there are 20 more who would cave at \$40. So, what'll it be, Mr Blokland, \$100 or \$800. Think about it – you could have your conscience *and* your commerce...

20-June 2002

PASTONCHI: 2 OF 20

Designed in 1927 by the Italian poet and author, Francesco Pastonchi, and digitized by Monotype in 1997. Fuller description in *Serif 5* (Fall 1997). Pretty and ornate; check out the ff ligature in the roman. Potential for many uses in titling and text; a PhD thesis, however, is probably not one of them.

21-June 2002

EHRHARDT: 3 OF 20

Monotype staff, 1937–1938. Adapted from the designs of Kis, and named for the Ehrhardt foundry in Leipzig. Gets short shrift in contemporary literature on typography, but sees deservedly frequent use. See Harry Carter's article in the Appendix of *A Tally of Types*; see also D.B. Updike's *Printing Types: Their History, Forms, and Use*, vol 2, pp 43 and 45 for Ehrhardt foundry specimens c. 1739.

23-June 2002

BIT CONFUSED...

...I am, about just what the designers at *Smithsonian* have been thinking lately. A beautiful, informative, and important American monthly has become muddled in typographic experimentation. Formerly eschewing all faces but PMN Caecilia and FB Village (an unintuitive, albeit harmonious, marriage), the magazine floated Helvetica (mon Dieux!) over a downright cute cover shot last October, making me wonder momentarily if I hadn't received my neighbor's issue of *Parenting*.

Since then, however intact the marriage has remained, FB Village has been stretched and compressed nearly beyond recognition (for example, see cover, March 2002, and article "Kung Fu U.," May 2002), and yet another face has been introduced – FB Relay, by Cyrus Highsmith – which is sprinkled on the cover for May and used in titling as well for July.

One of two "American" typefaces released in recent days (the other being Tobias Frere-Jones's Gotham), Relay is offered in Regular and Italic in five weights and four widths. It will make you think of Gill Sans, Metro, Nobel,

and perhaps even Tempo and Arta. Yet it is distinct, and the flexibility of the series, along with its pedigree, should ensure wide use.

Just don't tease me with it, *Smithsonian*. Don't make me ask, every few months, "Who are you now?" Divorce Caecilia from Village, and introduce Relay. Use it generously and decisively, and for keeps.

28-June 2002

#### ORTHOGONAL PLANE

Have you purchased your very own copy of *Gudrun Zapf von Hesse: Bindings, Handwritten Books, Typefaces, Examples of Lettering, and Drawings*? Yes? Then perhaps you are as awestruck as I am; much more than the wife of Hermann Zapf, much more than a typographer, Gudrun Zapf von Hesse is the consummate book artist, and you – proud owner – know that this retrospective provides ample evidence, and that you needn't read on.

No? Oh dear... Here you are, then. Skip the restaurant this week and hand over the \$75 – you will not be sorry.

Nearly half of the 220-page review is devoted to Zapf von Hesse's book-bindings; of particular beauty are (1) her edition of Goethe's *Faust*, in which interrupted rules tooled in gold work to mesmerizing effect, and (2) *Das Blumen ABC*, by Hermann Zapf, wherein ornamental stamps crafted by Zapf von Hesse convey august serenity.

Zapf von Hesse's mastery of Carolingian, Civilité, Cursive, Roman, and Uncial script styles is displayed over 30 pages; the 60+ pages that follow show some of her typefaces – with particular emphasis on Diotima, Hallmark Shakespeare, and Bitstream Carmina – as well as samples of her hand lettering. While the former are indeed impressive, the latter are stunning: The alphabet and quotations plate shown on the website and found on p 193 is just one of many of her breathtaking watercolor and ink creations. And the final 15 pages treat the reader to examples of Zapf von Hesse's drawings and paintings, which range from simple, monochromatic geometric shapes, to landscapes in pastel, to flowers in vivid color.

The volume was designed by Zapf von Hesse and was set in Nofret by Hermann Zapf. There is little text outside of an eight-page introduction by Hans A. Halbey. But of course, this is work that speaks for itself and stands on its own; let the commentary, critique, and explanation wait for another time, another place.

29-June 2002

AVENIR: 4 OF 20

Designed by Adrian Frutiger and issued by Linotype in 1988. Clean as they come; based on Erbar and Futura. Sebastian Carter describes it as “oddly restrained” – not as restrained, in my opinion, as Univers or the face that carries the designer’s name. See Hunziker’s article in *Serif 6* (Spring 1998, pp 32–43).

30-June 2002

1-JULY 2002 THROUGH 15-JULY 2002



WHEREFORE ART THOU BEMBO...?

Dean Allen writes: “In its metal version, Bembo is my favourite thing to read; with acknowledged subjectivity, it is the most beautiful and readable text face of all.” I agree with Mr Allen; I also agree with his opinion on the digital incarnation, which is indeed thin, wispy, and squat.

We can apparently blame the 8 point size in metal, for it served as the master from which the digital version was designed. Walter Tracy, in *Letters of Credit*, writes (pp 54–55):

“When photo-composition became a reality in the 1950’s the manufacturers of typesetting machines had to make an important decision: whether or not to carry forward into the new system the principle of optical compensation, when the plain and tempting fact was that the photographic part of the system was capable of producing a considerable range of type sizes from just one font. To abandon the principle altogether was to risk forfeiting a substantial part of a reputation for typographic quality.” He continues, “Some [manufacturers] apparently thought that increasing the x-height of the faces would be an acceptable alternative. It is not.... The Bembo face, an admirable example of optical compensation by the Monotype drawing office, demonstrates the point.” Tracy here refers to a figure in which the metal version of Bembo at 24, 12, 8, and 6 pt is compared to a film version derived from the 8 pt – essentially identical to digital Bembo.

While Edward Tufte has admirably continued to use metal Bembo, what recourse is there for those of us who must work in the digital realm? One option is to use Poliphilus, a typeface constructed from tracings of letters in the Dream of Poliphilo. It has not become obsolete as quickly as Stanley Morison predicted (see *A Tally of Types*, pp 46–56), but its faithfulness to the original impressions limits its use.

Another alternative may be found in Jack Yan's Aetna. In fact, this face comes as close as anything I've seen to metal Bembo. In the upper half of this figure, metal Bembo and JY Aetna are shown first and second, respectively, while in the lower half, the upper and lower case letters, text figures, and ligatures are displayed at 24 pt in Aetna Roman. This face cannot be considered a digital incarnation of metal Bembo at 12 or 24 pt – there are too many subtle deviations. And not so subtle is the lower case a, in which the Aetna glyph appears to lack the modulation of stroke seen in the metal analogue, as well as in several of the other Aetna glyphs. But you can mourn the lack of a digital Bembo based on its 12 pt metal antecedent, or you can compromise. And if you're willing to compromise, Jack Yan's Aetna is perhaps your best bet.

*05-July 2002*

#### MENDOZA: 5 OF 20

By José Mendoza y Almeida and issued by ITC in 1990. Rugged yet elegant; avoid the fi “ligature,” however. See the full page sample in Bringhurst (2nd edition, p 108); see also the short article in Carter (pp 160–161).

*08-July 2002*

#### COMPARING TYPEFACES 1: A TALE OF TWO SABONS

The Sabons of Linotype and Monotype are quite similar, but there are some subtle differences; I've made a partial list. Compared to the Monotype version, the Linotype version:

1. Is slightly heavier
2. Has somewhat lower contrast between thin and thick strokes
3. Is larger, which is typical for a Linotype-to-Monotype comparison; to achieve equal x-height, Monotype Sabon must be enlarged by roughly 7%
4. Has a more angular lower case roman a and f; note the increased curvature of the ascender in the Monotype roman f versus the Linotype version; compare also the cross-strokes of the f
5. May have a greater axis angle in the italic; compare the g's in the example shown; notice also the differences in the teardrop terminals in this letter
6. Has that extra bit of space – almost too small to measure, yet discernable enough – after the lower case roman a. Or perhaps the spacing is a bit off overall. Or perhaps it's just my imagination...

*11-July 2002*

#### UNUSUAL FF LIGATURE

I recently posted the following question on `TYP0-L`: “The ff ligature in `MT Pastonchi` is unusual in two ways: (1) the first f is of greater height than the second, and (2) the ascender of the first leapfrogs well over much of that of the second.

“I’m looking for a precedent for this and cannot seem to find one. Was this novel form of the ff ligature a development of Francesco Pastonchi or of someone else?”

Thanks to Gerald Lange for his interesting and informative reply to the list, and for his permission to reprint it here:

“I have the original Lanston Monotype specimen book that came out with the release of Pastonchi (printed by hand at the *Officina Bodoni*), which gives a bit of the history and intent. I do not think you will find precedent as I believe this was an attempt to redefine previous typographic misconceptions of Renaissance letterforms. Truly a remarkable typeface. I bought a lot of the metal version for a book I did and the very day I completed printing, Monotype Typography sent me the beta version. I believe this was the last face to be issued before they merged with Agfa. Found the digital version to be quite exacting to the original and used it for the letterpress-printed prospectus for the book!!!

“Many of the combination characters (ligatures and tied characters) are quite unique. I don’t think Pastonchi proved to be much of a commercial success for Lanston or for that matter Agfa Monotype; but it is certainly one of the great neglected serious typographic investigations of the twentieth-century.”

*12-July 2002*

15-JULY 2002 THROUGH 31-JULY 2002



#### CELESTE: 6 OF 20

By Christopher Burke, type designer and scholar. Introduced in 1994 and sold via FontFont; Greek and small text versions have more recently become available, making this one of the most versatile faces available.

*18-July 2002*

SYNTAX: 7 OF 20

Designed by Hans Eduard Meier in the late 1960s and expanded in the year 2000 to include two additional weights as well as small caps and text figures. The canonical humanist sans-serif; inspired by Sabon. And perhaps the best deal in type – only \$119US for the full set on hard media. See Sumner Stone’s excellent article in *Fine Print on Type*.

18-July 2002

GO FIGURE

Sooner or later, you’ll want to (or have to) make a graph. Many software programs can do this, and many books tell you how. But if you really care about the appearance of your graph, and perhaps more importantly, about the clear communication of the information contained therein, there is relatively little software flexible enough to give you ideal control of the parameters, and there are only a few guidebooks worth reading.

I’ll cover graphing software in more detail in another entry, and I’ll focus primarily on two programs – called SigmaPlot and S-Plus (available, unfortunately, only to users of Microsoft Windows; a freeware program called R, however, is available for the Mac as well and shares many of the features of S-Plus) – that enable the easy creation of publication-quality graphs of many kinds. Here, I’ll focus on a few of the guidelines or rules to follow when making graphs, and I’ll illustrate these rules using only one kind of plot – the scatterplot. In addition, I’ll pair bad examples with good ones, and I’ll explain why the rules work.

These rules aren’t mine; they have been formulated and put into practice by many researchers before me. But the person who has perhaps done the most and best work to understand the theory and practice of statistical graphs, and to consolidate and illustrate these rules, is William Cleveland. His book, *The Elements of Graphing Data*, is to graph-makers and statisticians what Robert Bringhurst’s *The Elements of Typographic Style* is to typographers. It is a how-to compendium of graph-making, and is indispensable to those of us who plot data on a routine basis.

Cleveland’s overarching message is: Draw the eye to the data; treat the data fairly and carefully. Six of what I consider Cleveland’s most important rules are:

(1) *Use a pair of scale lines for each variable.* Cleveland makes a strong argument for table look-up here – that “judging the scale value of a point by judging its position along a scale line...is easier and more accurate as

the distance of the point from the scale line decreases.” Compare figures 1a and 1b (made-up data set), and notice how much easier table look-up is when two scale lines are used for each variable, rather than just one.

(2) *Make the data rectangle slightly smaller than the scale-line rectangle.* In figure 2a, the data rectangle and the scale-line rectangle are coincident; some data points therefore fall on the scale lines and are difficult to see. A “padding” of 5% is added to the data rectangle in figure 2b; all data points are contained within the scale-line rectangle and are easily visualized.

(3) *Use outward-pointing tick marks.* Inward-pointing ticks, as shown in figure 3a, simply add clutter to the interior of the graph, and in my opinion, make table look-up more difficult. Compare to figure 3b.

(4) *Avoid slavishly including zero on the axes.* Cleveland here refers to the widely-read book by Darrell Huff – *How to Lie with Statistics* – wherein Huff says that a graph without a zero line is dishonest. Cleveland argues that to include zero, however, may result in a waste of space, and more importantly, may interfere with our judgment of the data (figure 4a). Therefore, fill the scale-line rectangle with the data (figure 4b). Cleveland emphasizes: “Assume the viewer will look at the tick mark labels and understand them.”

(5) *Use open rather than filled symbols to mark the data points.* Invariably, some of the data will fall on or close to the same coordinates; see the points that lie roughly at (26, 7) in figures 5a and 5b. They are hard to distinguish in 5a, in which filled circles are used to denote the data, but the overlap can clearly be seen in 5b.

(6) *If summarizing the data or drawing the eye to them with a line, use the line that best fits them.* It is tempting to superimpose a straight-line regression fit to the data – this is the easiest (or only) option in some graphing programs – but it may not be fair to the data or to the reader. The data set used here has some curvature, and the straight-line fit shown in figure 6a does not adequately represent it. A technique called locally-weighted regression (*loess* for short) draws a smooth curve to the data by connecting locally fitted regions of data (figure 6b).

A review of *The Elements of Graphing Data* in *Meteorological Magazine* states, “Ideally, everyone interested in getting the most out of their data or

presenting data clearly and concisely should have a copy handy.” My recommendation is no less enthusiastic. Buy, read, and digest (\$52.95 US); the quality of your graphs will improve, and the clarity of the information you convey will increase dramatically.

23-July 2002

1-AUGUST 2002 THROUGH 19-AUGUST 2002



#### INTERVIEW WITH ERIC OLSON

Eric Olson is a Minneapolis-based type designer whose studio – Process Type Foundry – specializes in fonts for custom and retail use. I recently asked Mr Olson to discuss his philosophy and practice:

JC: *What is your training in typography?*

EO: While studying graphic design at the University of Minnesota, I had very little formal typographic training. In general, we studied the mechanics of the trade-page layout, color theory, print production, mark-making, etc... For better or worse, I learned much of what I know about typography and type design through independent study.

My greatest resources for learning have been specimen books, typefaces, and other designers, not to mention trial and error. It was several years after designing my first typeface that I actually released a font. Although a digital typeface can be created very rapidly, I spent those years developing a solid understanding of letterforms, spacing, kerning and font production.

JC: *Your typefaces – Elderkin and Process Grotesque, in particular – draw inspiration from late 19th/early 20th century grotesques. Why this class of typefaces?*

EO: I didn't consider either face on these terms. I'm a big fan of solid and straightforward typefaces with a little something extra to offer. The original grotesques have that extra something so their influence on my work is inevitable.

JC: *Who do you design type for (i.e., who is your intended user or audience)?*

EO: Because I was trained both academically and professionally as a graphic designer, I design what I think I would use or need. I work within the parameters of actual projects and think, would I actually use this?

I'm also interested in creating typefaces for designers who are actively shaping visual culture. The popularity of faces like Helvetica, Franklin Gothic, Akzidenz Grotesk, and Univers still amazes me. They are masterful faces, but they are also tied mechanically and conceptually to a specific era – regardless of their supposed neutrality. In turn, they have become out of place in current design because they do not reflect our time. Eventually, I hope to create typefaces for work that embodies our current environment.

JC: *Why did you choose to distribute your typeface Indivisible free of charge?*

EO: The face was an experiment. I wanted to see if people would actually use a free typeface regularly. I find monos really useful, especially for grading student papers and general utility so I'm curious to see if others will do the same. It's unlikely that I'll keep the face up for very long. It is something I made to amuse myself while working on larger type families.

JC: *Who is your inspiration/who, among typographers or designers, do you admire most?*

EO: For type designers my list includes Matthew Carter, Fred Smeijers, Adrian Frutiger, Gerard Unger, Peter Bilak, Jonathan Hoefler, Zuzana Licko, Peter Matthias Noordzij, John Downer – the list goes on and on. There are too many to name.

Many of my biggest influences, however, are within the larger field of design. I'm impressed with any well thought out, functional design object: American automobiles of the 50s, the furniture of Charles and Ray Eames, the posters of Josef Müller-Brockmann, the graphic design of Karel Martens, and the furniture and graphic design of Foundation 33, just to name a few. I am inspired by work that seizes the technology, opportunity, and atmosphere of its time, and channels it into a meaningful design solution.

JC: *What are you working on now?*

EO: Currently I'm finishing up a yet unnamed typeface based on the mechanical lettering of the Wrico lettering system. It will be my first publicly released family of typefaces containing a full range of weights and alternate character sets. Additionally, I'm working on a typeface proposal/commission for the Design Institute at the University of Minnesota to accompany the Twin Cities Design Celebration 2003.

JC: *What tools do you use in font production?*

EO: I try to keep things as simple as possible. All of my drawing is done in Adobe Illustrator 8. From there I paste directly into Fontographer 4.1.5. I use Fontographer for all of my spacing, kerning and testing. I always generate working beta versions and test them sometimes for several months. After I have everything tied up and I'm satisfied, I import the files into Fontlab 3 for hinting and final file preparation.

JC: *What is your ideal type project?*

EO: Something with a conceptual framework and relevance to current culture and technology. A tall order!

Process Type currently offers five typefaces: (1) Elderkin – based on early 20th century gothics, (2) FIG – inspired by the FIGlet application, (3) Kettler – a revisitation of and tribute to Howard Kettler's Courier, (4) Process Grotesque – an “aggressive” descendant of the Stephenson and Blake model, and (5) Indivisible – a 10 pitch monospace, which, as aforementioned, is currently available for free download.

*02-August 2002*

#### COMPARING TYPEFACES 2: SERIA AND SCALA

Template Gothic was not the face of the 1990s (see Blackwell, p 144); Scala was. Designed and expanded throughout the decade by Martin Majoor, Scala is a cohesive Joanna – a fresh, elegant slab-serif face that is deservedly well-used.

I had used Scala and its unserifed companion successfully in several text applications in the late 1990s, and so when I opened my FontFont 2000 catalog to find a new face from Majoor – called Seria – I did not hesitate to download and start setting text.

I quickly realized that Seria was a beautiful, complex typeface, yet I was unsatisfied with the printed output and didn't quite know why. And to this day – still somewhat puzzled – I have yet to find the “right” application for it. And so I am beginning to investigate...

At first glance, Scala and Seria are essentially the same face by the same artist; one might conclude initially that several of the lower case romans appear to differ only in the extent of the ascender or descender. A closer look, however, reveals that the faces are more like cousins than twins – of the same pedigree yet distinct in physiognomy. To compare the two in a sentence, Scala is a chiseled, neoclassical face with a relatively large x-height; Seria is a humanist-Renaissance hybrid with its long ascenders and

descenders and its modulated stroke. And to compare them more systematically and in more detail, I have made some lists of points of differentiation and have included figures for each major component of both faces.

#### *Lower case roman*

In this figure, the lower case romans of Scala and Seria are shown normalized to x-height. Doing so requires that Seria be multiplied by about 25%. After normalization, the strokes of Seria are 15–20% heavier, the letters are 5–15% wider, and the ascenders and descenders are around 45–55% longer.

But it is not the dimension of Seria's lower case roman that defines its character. Rather, it is a motif that is seen throughout the face – a motif that is defined and repeated in the counters. Begin with c, d, e, and p; you will see that the top-center regions of the counters are relatively horizontal and straight. As you move to the left, you see that the bowl thickness sharply increases to form a counter angle of around 60–70°. A more comprehensive look will reveal this motif in the ascender of the f and the descender of the j; indeed, it is present in all letters but b, i, k, l, t, and v–z.

Another prominent difference between Scala and Seria is in the serifs. Whereas those of Scala are defined largely by 90° angles, the serifs of Seria have a concave base with a convex join to the stroke; the letter k shows this clearly, both in arm and leg.

Other notable features:

- the crossbar of the f also shows the concavity/ convexity
- the rightmost strokes of h, m, and n are not vertical; rather, they curve inward
- in contrast to Scala, the bowls of b and q completely close the counters
- the first two stems of w are joined by an extended serif

#### *Lower case italic*

“It is true that most romans are upright and most italics slope to the right – but flow, not slope, is what really differentiates the two,” writes Robert Bringhurst (p 56). The italics of Seria serve as a case in point. While the italics of Scala slope at about 8°, those of Seria do so at only about 1–2°; nonetheless, there is no mistaking them for roman forms.

One similarity between the italics of the two faces is the distinctive lower case y, in which the stem of the letter lies to the left, rather than the right, and the descender is roughly centered. A notable difference between the two, however, is seen in the letter f, in which that of Seria breaks away from Scala's form by extending a straight, serified descender below the baseline

in a manner à la Jan van Krimpen's Romanée.

The form of the counters links Seria's italic to its roman; the aforementioned motif is preserved and is seen in all letters save i, k, l, s, t, and v-z.

#### *Upper case roman*

The upper case roman in Scala seems to be about right angles; indeed, stems and serifs in E, F, H, I, L, and T combine to create perpendicular forms. As expected, there is more curvature in the upper case romans of Seria. Compare the Ks; in Seria the arm and leg gracefully curve away from the stem; those of Scala shoot out linearly. And compare the Rs; the leg of the R in Seria extends, tapers, and ends well below the baseline. Finally, note that the angular-counter motif is absent in the upper case.

Also:

- the serifs are more prominent in Seria than in Scala; on letters such as B and D, they stretch relatively far to the left of the stem
- to achieve equal cap height, Seria must be enlarged by about 15%
- while the bowl of the P is open in Scala, it is closed completely in Seria

#### *Upper case italic*

In Scala, the major distinguishing feature of the italic caps is the slant; in Seria, the italic caps do not slant at all but are marked by increased curvature, and some letters approach swash form – see J, K, N, T, and Y. Note also the prominent tail in Q.

#### *Numerals*

The roman numerals in Scala and Seria are very similar; a major difference is the modulated stroke of the zero in Seria.

Comparing the italics, those of Seria have more ornate forms – notice the curl of the descenders of 5 and 7 and the open counters in 8. Compare also the numeral 1, which is bilaterally serifed in Seria and unilaterally so in Scala.

Andy Crewdson wrote about Scala and Seria several months back. I forget some of the particulars, but I do recall his praise for the new face. I also recall that, as I read, there was no hint of disappointment in Mr Crewdson's experience with it. I felt a bit stupid as a result; why hadn't I been satisfied with any of my attempts to set text in Seria?

I believe that the answer may lie in the relationship between the angular beauty of the face and the conditions under which I normally print. One of Bringhurst's principles (6.1.3, p 94) is: "Choose faces that will survive, and

if possible prosper, under the final printing conditions.” Twelve pt at 600 dpi – while perfectly sufficient for Scala – will simply not do for Seria.

The angular motif, the subtle tapers, and the curvature of Seria’s letterforms are all there for a reason – to be seen, not smudged. And to be seen adequately requires high quality in both printer and paper; this is a typeface that deserves to be treated with the same care that the designer applied in its creation.

Somewhat equipped with an answer, I’ll continue to investigate, more aware of Seria’s limitations, and more aware also that its limitations derive from its exquisite form.

*11-August 2002*

#### A WHOLE SLEW OF ‘EM

A few weeks ago, I wrote that the new Linotype Syntax, with its added weights, small caps, and text figures, was the best deal in type. A close second must be Bitstream’s Cambridge Collection. For under \$200US you get, among others, Bitstream Amerigo, Arrus, Charter, and Iowan Old Style, 18 weights/widths of Futura, Oranda, Serifa, and Venetian 301 (Centaur). Alas, no expert sets here; you’ll have to supplement as needed. (Parenthetical double alas: Bitstream apparently no longer sells its 500 Font CD, which I obtained two years ago for a ridiculously low price.) Nonetheless, if you want to want to get your hands on a few styles of two of the most underrated typefaces in recent memory – yes, Arrus and Iowan Old Style (both recently expanded) – and then some, this is the CD (dual platform) for you.

*14-August 2002*

#### MRS EAVES: 8 OF 20

Of course; it’s ubiquitous, after all. Plant yourself anywhere in a Barnes and Noble, swivel, and you’ll spot this Baskerville revival/parody gracing a cover or two. You won’t likely find it on the pages, however; it’s a face that demands attention, rather than one that invites reading.

The crown jewel of the Émigré empire – and IMHO, one of the outstanding offerings of the 1990s – is now available in OpenType format. Those 213 ligatures should be easier to implement than ever before.

*19-August 2002*

#### BIT BEHIND, I AM...

FontFont 2002 catalogue arrived in the mail on Friday. Um, yeah... You’ve had yours for half a year now. Truth is, I wrote in to request a copy

of *font 002* and the catalogue tagged along. This is a good thing; looking at the fonts online is nice, but seeing them on paper is a necessity. You've already formulated your thoughts; here are a few of mine.

The first thing I noticed is that the catalogue is thicker (no surprise), expanding from 144 to 192 pages. The second is that it's roomier; more white space, and some of the stock samples are now large enough to be useful.

Third, the categories – once a bit arbitrary – have been reduced in number from nine to six. Gone are Geometric, Intelligent, and Destructive, and several of the faces formerly therein have found their way into Typographic. One could still make some arguments for misidentification (Why aren't Hardcase, Maverick, Karbid, and Schulbuch typographic?), but overall, the arrangement makes sense.

Fourth, larger font families are now supplemented with matrices of weight by style, providing for a quick read on the combinations available.

Fifth, and finally, the notes are now in Mike Abbink's Kievit (2001), replacing Spiekermann and Schaefer's Info. I've developed a new appreciation for this open, unserifed face. Kievit might conjure up Myriad or Frutiger, though it is not as restrained as either. It's available in six weights and includes text figures and expert characters. It is just one of the several new faces issued semiannually by FSI that make the Font-Font 2002 catalogue a necessary part of one's specimen book library and the FontFont collection the most comprehensive – and perhaps the most important – series of new types today.

*19-August 2002*

N.B. See [daidala.com](http://daidala.com) for links.