

With the Henry typeface, Matthieu Cortat provides a personal interpretation of the Deberny & Peignot foundry's Garamond, engraved by Henri Parmentier between 1914 and 1926 under the direction of Georges Peignot.

Its authors sought to recover the grace of the typefaces of Claude Garamont, while at the same time taking into account the reality of the modern paper industry, that uses wood based papers and not cloth based ones, as was the case in the 16th century. Henry is based on medium type sizes (9 to 14) of Parmentier's engraving.

It is a quite slim Garalde, a little narrow, lean and slender. We feel an inspiration that is almost "Art Nouveau" in its z that leans towards the left, its winding a and j, the lower loop of its heavily curved t, the ample loop of its Q... These features are still visible in the italic with its changing rhythm and its joyous ligatures.

Henry is a delicate typeface; its design precise if not a little dated.



HENRY FAMILY

240 PTS

Henry

120 PTS

*Henry*

60 PTS

Henry *Henry* HENRY

32 PTS

Henry HENRY Henry *Henry*

24 PTS

Henry HENRY Henry *Henry* Henry *Henry* HENRY

16 PTS

Henry *Henry* HENRY *Henry* Henry Henry *Henry* Henry

## INTRODUCTION

## OWNERSHIP AND LICENCE

A typeface is created by a designer whose art is to transform an original typographic artwork into a computer file or files. As a consequence a typeface is – as a work – protected by laws pertaining to intellectual property rights and – as software – can not be copied and/or installed without first acquiring a nominative licence.

In no way, shape or form may a typeface be transmitted to a third party or modified. The desired modifications in the context of the development of a visual identity, can only be effected by the designer himself and only after acquisition of a written authorisation from 205TF.

The user of a 205TF typeface must first acquire of a licence that is adapted to his needs (desktop, web, application/epub, TV/film/videos web).

A licence is nominative (a physical person or business) and is non-transferable. The licensee can not transmit the typeface files to other people or organisations, including but not limited to partners and/or subcontractors who must acquire a separate and distinct licence or licences. The full text of the licence and terms of use can be downloaded here: Any person or entity found in breach of one or more terms of the licence may be prosecuted.

## THE OPENTYPE FORMAT

The OpenType format is compatible with both Macintosh and Windows platforms. Based on Unicode encoding it can contain up to 65,000 signs\* including a number of writing systems (Latin, Greek, Cyrillic, Hebrew, etc.) and numerous signs that allow users to create accurate and sleek typographic compositions

(small capitals, aligned and oldstyle numerals, proportionals and tabulars, ligatures, alternative letters, etc.). The OpenType format is supported by a wide range of software. The dynamic functions are accessed differently depending on the software used.

\*A Postscript or Truetype typeface can contain no more than 256 signs.

## SUPPORTED LANGUAGES

Afar	French	Malagasy	Silesian
Afrikaans	Gaelic	Malay	Slovak
Albanian	Gagauz	Maltese	Slovenian
Azerbaijani	German	Manx	Somali
Basque	Gikuyu	Maori	Sorbian
Belarusian	Gilbertese	Marquesan	Sotho
Bislama	Greenlandic	Moldavian	Spanish
Bosnian	Guarani	Montenegrin	Setswana
Breton	Haitian	Nauruan	Swati
Catalan	Haitian Creole	Ndebele	Swahili
Chamorro	Hawaiian	Norwegian	Swedish
Chichewa	Hungarian	Occitan	Tahitian
Comorian	Icelandic	Oromo	Tetum
Croatian	Igbo	Palauan	Tok Pisin
Czech	Indonesian	Polish	Tongan
Danish	Irish	Portuguese	Tsonga
Dutch	Italian	Quechua	Tswana
English	Javanese	Romanian	Turkish
Estonian	Kashubian	Romansh	Turkmen
Esperanto	Kinyarwanda	Sami	Tuvaluan
Faroese	Kirundi	Samoan	Uzbek
Fijian	Luba	Sango	Wallisian
Filipino	Latin	Scottish	Walloon
Finnish	Latvian	Serbian	Welsh
Flemish	Lithuanian	Sesotho	Xhosa
Frison	Luxembourgish	Seychellois	Zulu

## ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OF USE

**To buy or...** By buying a typeface you support typeface designers who can dedicate the time necessary for the development of new typefaces (and you are of course enthusiastic at the idea of discovering and using them!)

**Copy?** By copying and illegally using typefaces, you jeopardise designers and kill their art. In the long term the result will be that you will only have Arial available to use in your compositions (and it would be well deserved!)

**Test!** 205TF makes test typefaces available. Before downloading them from [www.205.tf](http://www.205.tf) you must first register. These test versions are not complete and can only be used in models/mock ups. Their use in a commercial context is strictly prohibited.

## RESPONSIBILITY

205TF and the typeface designers represented by 205TF pay particular attention to the quality of the typographic design and the technical development of typefaces.

Each typeface has been tested on Macintosh and Windows, the most popular browsers (for webfonts) and on Adobe applications (InDesign, Illustrator, Photoshop) and Office (Word, Excel, Power point).

205TF can not guarantee their correct functioning when used with other operating system or software. 205TF can not be considered responsible for an eventual "crash" following the installation of a typeface obtained through the [www.205.tf](http://www.205.tf) website.

---

STYLES

---

REGULAR

Henry Regular

---

ITALIC

*Henry Italic*



## OPENTYPE FEATURES

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Automatically spaced capitals.</li> <li>2. Punctuation is optically repositionning</li> <li>3, 4. Specific small capitals whereas optically reduced capitals.</li> <li>5. Specific glyphs in several languages.</li> <li>6, 7, 8, 9. Specific superior and inferior glyphs.</li> <li>10, 11. Proportional figures.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12, 13. Tabular figures, practical when the user needs alignment in columns.</li> <li>14. Slashed zero to distinguish with letter 0.</li> <li>15. Standard ligatures automatically correct collision between two characters.</li> <li>16. Smart ligatures.</li> <li>17. Specific contextual glyphs.</li> <li>18. Specific titling capitals.</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

	FEATURE OFF	FEATURE ON
1. FULL CAPS	Lacassagne	LACASSAGNE
2. CASE SENSITIVE FORMS	(Hôtel-Dieu)	(HÔTEL-DIEU)
3. SMALL CAPS	Caluire-et-Cuire	CALUIRE-ET-CUIRE
4. CAPS TO SMALL CAPS	CALUIRE-ET-CUIRE	CALUIRE-ET-CUIRE
5. LOCALIZED FORMS		
ROMANIAN...	Chişinău Galaţi	Chişinău Galaţi
CATALAN	Paral·lel	Parallel
FRENCH	Il dit: «Ah!»	Il dit: «Ah!»
TURKISH...	lafı	lafı
6. ORDINALS	No Nos no nos Ia	N <sup>o</sup> N <sup>os</sup> n <sup>o</sup> n <sup>os</sup> I <sup>a</sup>
7. AUTOMATIC FRACTIONS	1/4 1/2 3/4 889/60	¼ ½ ¾ 889/60
8. SUPERIORS	Mr Mlle I <sup>er</sup> I <sup>a</sup> I <sup>o</sup>	Mr M <sup>lle</sup> I <sup>er</sup> I <sup>a</sup> I <sup>o</sup>
9. INFERIORS	H <sub>2</sub> O Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub>	H <sub>2</sub> O Fe <sub>3</sub> O <sub>4</sub>
10. PROPORTIONAL LINING FIGURES	×	×
11. PROPORTIONAL OLD STYLE FIG.	oI23456789	oI23456789
12. TABULAR LINING FIGURES	×	×
13. TABULAR OLD STYLE FIG.	oI23456789	oI23456789
14. SLASHED ZERO	o o	o o
15. LIGATURES	Affiches siffle flight off Cergy Lille Reggio Sutton	Affiches siffle flight off Cergy Lille Reggio Sutton
16. DISCRETIONARY LIGATURES	Activiste esprit Nîmes Arras Paris Fréjus	Activiste esprit Nîmes Arras Paris Fréjus
17. CONTEXTUAL ALTERNATES	28x32 mm 10x65 mm Question CINQUIÈME Vélizy Skye	28x32 mm 10x65 mm Question CINQUIÈME Vélizy Skye
18. TITLING ALTERNATES	×	×

## OPENTYPE FEATURES

The stylistic set function allows to access to specific signs which replace glyphs in the standard set.  
A typeface can contain 20 stylistic sets.

	FEATURE OFF	FEATURE ON
STYLISTIC SET 01	--W	←
	--E	→
	--S	↓
	--N	↑
	--NW	↖
	--NE	↗
	--SE	↘
	--SW	↙

56 PTS

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you

32 PTS (REGULAR &amp; SMALLCAPS)

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. NEVER US A LONG WORD where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.

24 PTS (REGULAR &amp; ITALIC)

Never use a *metaphor*, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never us a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, *always cut it out*. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a *foreign phrase*,

16 PTS

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never us a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing

12 PTS

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still write bad English, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end.

10 PTS (REGULAR &amp; ITALIC)

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. *Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.* Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and *still write bad English*, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, *but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought.* Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of

political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end. *If you simplify your English, you are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy.* You cannot speak any of the necessary dialects, and when you make a stupid remark its stupidity will be obvious, even to yourself. Political language – *and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists* – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind. One cannot change this all in a moment, but one can at least change one's own habits, and from time to time one can even, if one jeers loudly enough, send some worn-out and useless phrase – some jackboot, Achilles' heel, hotbed, melting pot, acid test, veritable inferno, or other lump of ver-

8 PTS

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still write bad English, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement

by starting at the verbal end. If you simplify your English, you are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy. You cannot speak any of the necessary dialects, and when you make a stupid remark its stupidity will be obvious, even to yourself. Political language – and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind. One cannot change this all in a moment, but one can at least change one's own habits, and from time to time one can even, if one jeers loudly enough, send some worn-out and useless phrase – some jackboot, Achilles' heel, hotbed, melting pot, acid test, veritable inferno, or other lump of verbal refuse – into the dustbin, where it belongs. Most people who bother with the matter at all would admit that the English language is in a bad way, but it is generally assumed that we cannot by conscious action do anything about it. Our civilisation is decadent and our language – so the argument runs – must inevitably share in the general collapse. It follows that any struggle against the abuse of language is a sentimental archaism, like preferring candles to electric light or hansom cabs to aeroplanes. Underneath this lies the half-conscious belief that language is a natural growth and not an instrument which we shape for

6 PTS

Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still write bad English, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal

end. If you simplify your English, you are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy. You cannot speak any of the necessary dialects, and when you make a stupid remark its stupidity will be obvious, even to yourself. Political language – and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind. One cannot change this all in a moment, but one can at least change one's own habits, and from time to time one can even, if one jeers loudly enough, send some worn-out and useless phrase – some jackboot, Achilles' heel, hotbed, melting pot, acid test, veritable inferno, or other lump of verbal refuse – into the dustbin, where it belongs. Most people who bother with the matter at all would admit that the English language is in a bad way, but it is generally assumed that we cannot by conscious action do anything about it. Our civilisation is decadent and our language – so the argument runs – must inevitably share in the general collapse. It follows that any struggle against the abuse of language is a sentimental archaism, like preferring candles to electric light or hansom cabs to aeroplanes. Underneath this lies the half-conscious belief that language is a natural growth and not an instrument which we shape for our own purposes.

56 PTS

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used*

32 PTS

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where*

24 PTS (ITALIC &amp; REGULAR)

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon*

16 PTS

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still*

12 PTS

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still write bad English, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end.*

10 PTS (ITALIC &amp; REGULAR)

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still write bad English, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you*

*struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end. If you simplify your English, you are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy. You cannot speak any of the necessary dialects, and when you make a stupid remark its stupidity will be obvious, even to yourself. Political language – and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind. One cannot change this all in a moment, but one can at least change one's own habits, and from time to time one can even, if one jeers loudly enough, send some worn-out and useless phrase – some jackboot, Achilles' heel, hotbed, melting pot, acid test, veritable inferno, or other lump of verbal refuse – into the dustbin, where it belongs. Most people who bother with the matter at all would admit that the English language is in a bad way, but it is*

8 PTS

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still write bad English, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end. If you simplify your English, you*

*are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy. You cannot speak any of the necessary dialects, and when you make a stupid remark its stupidity will be obvious, even to yourself. Political language – and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind. One cannot change this all in a moment, but one can at least change one's own habits, and from time to time one can even, if one jeers loudly enough, send some worn-out and useless phrase – some jackboot, Achilles' heel, hotbed, melting pot, acid test, veritable inferno, or other lump of verbal refuse – into the dustbin, where it belongs. Most people who bother with the matter at all would admit that the English language is in a bad way, but it is generally assumed that we cannot by conscious action do anything about it. Our civilisation is decadent and our language – so the argument runs – must inevitably share in the general collapse. It follows that any struggle against the abuse of language is a sentimental archaism, like preferring candles to electric light or hansom cabs to aeroplanes. Underneath this lies the half-conscious belief that language is a natural growth and not an instrument which we shape for our own purposes.*

6 PTS

*Never use a metaphor, simile, or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print. Never use a long word where a short one will do. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out. Never use the passive where you can use the active. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous. These rules sound elementary, and so they are, but they demand a deep change of attitude in anyone who has grown used to writing in the style now fashionable. One could keep all of them and still write bad English, but one could not write the kind of stuff that I quoted in those five specimens at the beginning of this article. I have not here been considering the literary use of language, but merely language as an instrument for expressing and not for concealing or preventing thought. Stuart Chase and others have come near to claiming that all abstract words are meaningless, and have used this as a pretext for advocating a kind of political quietism. Since you don't know what Fascism is, how can you struggle against Fascism? One need not swallow such absurdities as this, but one ought to recognise that the present political chaos is connected with the decay of language, and*

*that one can probably bring about some improvement by starting at the verbal end. If you simplify your English, you are freed from the worst follies of orthodoxy. You cannot speak any of the necessary dialects, and when you make a stupid remark its stupidity will be obvious, even to yourself. Political language – and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind. One cannot change this all in a moment, but one can at least change one's own habits, and from time to time one can even, if one jeers loudly enough, send some worn-out and useless phrase – some jackboot, Achilles' heel, hotbed, melting pot, acid test, veritable inferno, or other lump of verbal refuse – into the dustbin, where it belongs. Most people who bother with the matter at all would admit that the English language is in a bad way, but it is generally assumed that we cannot by conscious action do anything about it. Our civilisation is decadent and our language – so the argument runs – must inevitably share in the general collapse. It follows that any struggle against the abuse of language is a sentimental archaism, like preferring candles to electric light or hansom cabs to aeroplanes. Under-*

---

**CAUTION**

In order to protect the work of the typeface designer,  
this pdf file is locked.  
205TF will initiate legal action against anyone unlocking this pdf.

---

**CONTACT**

205 Corp.  
24, rue Commandant-Faurax  
69006 Lyon  
France

T. +33 (0)4 37 47 85 69  
contact@205.tf

SAS 205 Corp.  
SIRET 522 580 430 00026  
TVA Intra FR-45522580430



---

**COPYRIGHT**

205TF is a trademark of 205 Corp.