Replica Mono

Family Overview

Styles

Replica Mono

Separate PDF

Replica

About the Font

LL Replica is a bold sans-serif design conceived for both text setting and use at large point sizes – e.g. for headlines, graphic applications, sign-writing, etc.

The font was constructed on a strict grid which was rigorously referred to in order to shape the individual characters. In place of the 700 units for standard caps height in Fontlab, the grid was reduced to just 70 units. This arbitrary simplification and self-induced restriction strongly influences the shape of each individual glyph.

For example, the bevels on the inner and outer corners function as a sort of negative ink trap. The vertical cuts of diagonals enable users to set LL Replica very tightly, especially in the bold and the heavy weights. The result is a typeface that has all the features of a classic sans-serif font of Middle-European descent, but with slightly altered DNA.

LL Replica is currently available in four weights with matching italics. A monospaced cut in the regular weight was released independently.

Supported Scripts	Latin Extended
File Formats	Opentype CFF, Truetype, WOFF, WOFF2
Design	NORM (Dimitri Bruni, Manuel Krebs) (2008)

Contact

General inquiries:
service@lineto.com

Technical inquiries:
support@lineto.com

Sales & licensing inquiries:
sales@lineto.com

Lineto GmbH
Lutherstrasse 32
CH-8004 Zürich
Switzerland

Telephone +41 44 545 35 00
www.lineto.com

Glyph Overview

Uppercase

A B C D E F G H I J K L M N O
P Q R S T U V W X Y Z

Lowercase

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n
o p q r s ß t u v w x y z

Proportional, Tabular Figures

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Ligatures

ff fi fl ffi ffl

Std Accented Characters – Standard Western

À à Á á Â â Ã ã Ä ä Å å Æ æ
Ç ç È è É é Ê ê Ë ë Ì ì Í í
Î î Ï ï Ð ð Ł ł Ñ ñ Œ œ Ò ò
Ó ó Ô ô Õ õ Ö ö Ø ø Š š Ù ù
Ú ú Û û Ü ü Ý ý Ÿ ÿ Ž ž Þ þ

Pro Accented Characters – Latin Extension

Ā ā Ă ă Ą ą Ǎ ǎ Á́ á́ Ǽ ǽ Ḃ ḃ
Ć ć Ĉ ĉ Ċ ċ Č č Ď ď Ḋ ḋ Ḍ ḍ
Ḏ ḏ Ḑ ḑ Đ đ Ē ē Ĕ ĕ Ė ė Ę ę
Ě ě Ḟ ḟ Ĝ ĝ Ğ ğ Ġ ġ Ģ ģ Ǧ ǧ
Ḡ ḡ Ĥ ĥ Ħ ħ Ḣ ḣ Ḥ ḥ Ḫ ḫ Ĩ ĩ
Ī ī Ĭ ĭ Į į İ ı Ɨ ɨ Ĳ ĳ Ĵ ĵ
Ķ ķ Ǩ ǩ ĸ Ĺ Í Ļ ļ Ľ ľ Ŀ ŀ
Ļ̄ ļ̄ Ḹ ḹ Ļ̲ ļ̲ Ḿ ḿ Ṁ ṁ Ṃ ṃ Ń ń
Ṇ ṇ Ň ň ŉ Ǹ ǹ Ṅ ṅ Ṇ ṇ N̲ n̲ Ŋ
ŋ Ɲ Ō ō Ŏ ŏ Ő ő Ȯ ȯ Ǫ ǫ Ǒ ǒ
Ó́ ó́ Ṗ ṗ Ŕ ŕ Ṛ ṛ Ř ř Ṛ ṛ Ṝ ṝ
Ṟ ṟ Ś ś Ŝ ŝ Ṡ ṡ Ṣ ṣ Ş ş Ș ș
Ţ ţ Ṭ ṭ Ť ẗ Ŧ ŧ Ṫ ṫ Ṭ ṭ Ṯ ṯ
Ũ ũ Ū ū Ŭ ŭ Ů ů Ű ű Ǔ ǔ Ų ų
Ʉ ʉ Ṽ ṽ Ŵ ŵ Ẋ ẋ Ŷ ŷ Ȳ ȳ Ź ź
Ż ż Ƶ ƶ Ə ə Ɛ ɛ Ɣ ɣ

Punctuation

(. , : ; ? ! ¿ ¡ …) [& @
] { - – — } « » ‹ › „ “ ”
, ‘ ’ _ / \ ' " † ‡ ✳ • ¶ §
© ® ℗ ™

Case Sensitive Forms

( ) [ ] { } - – — ‹ › « » ¡
¿ @ •

Currency, Mathematical Operators

€ $ £ ¥ ₡ ₦ ₲ ₵ ₺ ฿ ¢ ¤ % ‰
+ − × ÷ = ≠ ≈ < > ≤ ≥ ± ~ ¬
◊ ∂ Δ ∏ ∑ Ω µ ł ∫ ∞ √ ^ | ¦
℮ °

Glyph Overview

Superscripts, Subscripts, Fractions, Ordinals

H ⁰ ¹ ² ³ ⁴ ⁵ ⁶ ⁷ ⁸ ⁹

H ₀ ₁ ₂ ₃ ₄ ₅ ₆ ₇ ₈ ₉

1 ⅟₁ ½ ⅓ ¼ ⅕ ⅙ ⅐ ⅛ ⅑ ⅒

⅔ ⅖ ¾ ⅗ ⅜ ⅘ ⅚ ⅝ ⅞

1 º ª

Numerators, Denominators

1 ⁰ ¹ ² ³ ⁴ ⁵ ⁶ ⁷ ⁸ ⁹

1 ₀ ₁ ₂ ₃ ₄ ₅ ₆ ₇ ₈ ₉

Arrows

← → ↑ ↓ ↖ ↗ ↘ ↙

Symbols

▯ ▮ ▯ ▯ ▯ ▮ ▯ ▯ ▮ ▮ ▮ ▮ ▫

■ □ ⊠ ▲ ▶ ▼ ◀

Layout Features

Case Sensitive Forms	[Discret] May–July «Hello»	[DISCRET] MAY–JULY «HELLO»
Standard Ligatures	flat office	flat office
Oldstyle Figures	8.5.2009 2.6.1974	8.5.2009 2.6.1974
Arbitrary Fractions	6 2/5 × 9 4/5 34 1/6 ÷ 7 1/7	6 ⅖ × 9 ⅘ 34 ⅙ ÷ 7 ⅐
Superscript	North1, East2	North¹, East²
Subscript	H2O	H_2O
Ordinals	1a 1o	1ª 1º
Sharp S	Nebenstrasse	Nebenstraße

Layout Features

Stylistic Set 1: Alternate Arrows	↗Top↖ ↘Bottom↙ ←Sides→ ↕Lift↕ ↑Up↑ ↓Down↓	↗Top↖ ↘Bottom↙ ←Sides→ ↕Lift↕ ↑Up↑ ↓Down↓
Stylistic Set 2: Single-Storey a	Decimals	Decimals
Stylistic Set 3: Alternate long s	long s stylistic set	long ſ ſtyliſtic ſet
Stylistic Set 5: Alternate Slash	Grid/Grid Grid\Grid	Grid⁄Grid Grid⧹Grid
Stylistic Set 7: Alternate Em Dash	Em–Dash	Em—Dash
Stylistic Set 8: Thin Alternate Em Dash	Em—Dash	Em—Dash
Stylistic Set 9: Alternate Ampersand	Nodes & Points	Nodes & Points

LL Replica Mono

4.5 Points

MK→ Work on Replica took several years, which was longer than we expected, since we actually intended to be finished in 2007. Previously, we had worked on other typefaces, that can be considered precursors, especially Standard, but we didn't really make headway. Do you remember the beginnings and the problems we faced?
DB→ The first idea emerged after we finished Normetica. Normetica was closely connected to the era in which it was created, the late 1990s. So we WANTED OUR NEXT TYPEFACE TO BE NEUTRAL, WHATEVER THAT MEANS, AS TIMELESS AS POSSIBLE. STANDARD WAS SUCH AN ATTEMPT, TAKING UP THE LINEAR ROMAN typefaces of the 1950s and 1960s. Perhaps we were expecting too much. In any case we were not satisfied with the first attempts.
MK→ When I look at the designs today, I find Standard's weaknesses striking. The drawing was really not good. And we actually never used the typeface.
DB→ Yes we did, we used it for very small things, such as the sign on the door to our office and a few flyers. But you're right: Standard was not VERY SUCCESSFUL, APART FROM ITS NAME. THE AMBITION AND INTENTION EXPRESSED BY THE NAME WERE GOOD. I THINK THE PROBLEM WAS THAT WE TRIED TO MAKE something that "looks like" something else. It was a typeface based on clear models, but meanwhile it lacked a concept, a methodological approach. When you try to copy something, there are many ways to do it.
MK→ Another problem, in my view, was that it wasn't clear to us how much time we should invest. Normetica and also Simple, the successor to Normetica, were developed quickly. They were constructed typefaces. Standard, by contrast, was already moving in A LESS GRAPHIC DIRECTION, AND AT THE TIME WE HAD HAD LITTLE EXPERIENCE WITH DRAWING.
DB→ I SEE THE PROBLEM AS NOT SO MUCH THE DETAILS OF THE

6 Points

drawing but as the lack of a concept. That was the big difference from Replica. In the latter case, there was an idea, a method, from the outset. After our failure with Standard, we had dropped the project of a more neutral typeface for a while, and when we took it up again in 2004–5, we soon noticed that we had to start with formal, almost mathematical decisions, which WOULD THEN AFFECT THE DRAWING AND THE FORM. WE DID NOT KNOW EXACTLY WHAT THE EFFECTS WOULD LOOK LIKE, BUT WE BEGAN BY DEFINING formal principles. The most important of these definitions was to enlarge the grid that the FontLab software provides for designing fonts. We multiplied this grid ten times, so that we were working not with a 700 grid (700 units is the standard Caps height in FontLab), as the software intends, but just a 70 grid. Consequently we had many fewer possibilities to place NODES AND BÉZIER CONTROL POINTS, which EXTREMELY LIMITED THE FREEDOM OF DRAWING. ON A PLANE THAT WOULD NORMALLY HAVE A HUNDRED DOTS

7,5 Points

available, we only had four from which to choose.
▸M▸ That was a somewhat anachronistic decision, since the trend today is in the opposite direction. You mentioned once that some typography blog called for the grid in FontLab to be made much smaller. Somebody called for a 7,000 grid in order to be able to draw more accurately. But it seems to me that, in addition to your deliberately anachronistic attitude, there was also a pragmatic reason for your decision: you wanted to be able to see in the program's preview mode what the drawing would look like, and because THE PREVIEW USED A LARGER GRID THAN WAS AVAILABLE WHEN DRAWING, YOU TOOK THIS ONE AS THE STANDARD.
▸D▸ RIGHT. THAT WAS, ADMITTEDLY, AN IMPORTANT REASON. IT

9 Points – SS02 Single-Storey a

[…][DIMITRI] provoked me that the preview mode of the software can only render a tenth of the actual grid, and I said to myself: "What you see is what you get." So I only drew the letters as sharply as I could see them. But the discussion you mention in the typography blog also provoked us. We said to ourselves, if you demand a grid which would have ten times as many dots as are currently availeable, now we'll show you that we can even work with ten times less. Naturally the possibilities are very limited, if you arrange all nodes and Bézier control points on such a coarse grid. BUT BY DOING SO WE FOUND WHAT WE HAD BEEN LOOKING FOR: A PREDEFINED CONCEPT THAT HAD AN INEVITABLE EFFECT ON THE DRAWING.
[MANUEL] A SECOND, FORMAL DEFINITION WE MADE EARLY ON FOR REPLICA CONCERNED THE SO-CALLED BEVEL.

10.5 Points

■ […] All of the characters are cut off in the corners, so that there are no right angles at all. This results in a kind of rounding effect, and when the type is small, it looks slightly damaged, as if it hadn't been drawn clearly. We had rounded off the corners before, for Normetica and Simple. But in my view the difference is that it wasn't necessary then, whereas with Replica it was about making the grid visible.
□ Yes, I see it that way as well. The bevels OF REPLICA SERVE TO MAKE THE GRID VISIBLE, SINCE THE CUTOFF CORNERS ARE EXACTLY THE SAME WIDTH AS A UNIT IN OUR NEW, LARGER GRID.
■ THIS FUNCTION OF MAKING THE GRID VISIBLE

12 Points

is especially important for letters where the grid would not otherwise be seen, like the uppercase I, for example. Nevertheless, it is striking that we have had rounded corners on all our typefaces so far, and the reason is perhaps that it is a way to make a typeface more specific.
DB It makes the typeface more identifiable. BUT IN A SENSE IT IS ALSO A TRICKY DECISION, PERHAPS NOT SO MUCH WITH THE OUTER BEVELS BUT WITH THE INNER ONES. IF YOU COMPARE IT

16 Points

Bevel
Bruce Lee Book
Constructed Typeface
Control Points
Coordinates, Damaged look
Decimals
121 dots (11²)
[E→C09□23][D→C14□50]
Functional
FONTLAB

20 Points

Formal Principles
7,000 Grid
Kerning Process
Linear
Methodological
↕40MM - ↕26MM - ↕7MM
Pragmatic
Remake, Replique
TIMELESS

30 Points

Unit: 80,690
Visible Grid
Very limited options
“What you see
is what you get.”
X AXIS – Y AXIS

25 Points

A4–A3–A2
Bézier, Blurry
Corners
Diagonal Endings
EVIDENCIES

32 Points

——10% Wider
Familiar Shapes
Grid System
INK TRAP SYSTEM

45 Points
– ss01

Normetica
Mathematical
METHOD

52 Points

Ortho
PT: 283.46
Ratio
STANDARDS

75 Points

Units
Visible
WIDTH

135 Points
Replica Mono

Univers

135 Points
Replica

Univers

80 Points
Light
Default

80 Points
Medium
Stylistic Set 1

A conversation about REPLICA

34 Points
Default

Control Points
Formal approach
Norm-etica
Rational/Sensible
←Side Bearings→
[570,330]&[180,400]

34 Points
All Alternates

Control Points
Formal approach
Norm——etica
Rational／Sensible
←—Side Bearings—→
[570,330]&[180,400]

Technical Information

Latin

Afrikaans
Albanian
Asturian
Asu (Tanzania)
Basque
Bemba (Zambia)
Bena (Tanzania)
Breton
Catalan
Chiga
Cornish
Croatian
Czech
Danish
Dutch
Embu
English
Esperanto
Estonian
Faroese
Filipino
Finnish
French
Friulian
Galician
Ganda
German
Gusii
Hungarian
Icelandic
Igbo
Inari Sami
Indonesian
Irish
Italian
Jola-Fonyi
Kabuverdianu
Kabyle
Kalaallisut
Kalenjin
Kamba (Kenya)
Kikuyu
Kinyarwanda
Koyra Chiini Songhay
Koyraboro Senni
Songhai
Kölsch
Langi
Latvian
Lithuanian
Lower Sorbian
Luo (Kenya and Tanzania)
Luxembourgish
Luyia
Machame
Makhuwa-Meetto
Makonde
Malagasy
Maltese
Manx
Meru
Morisyen
North Ndebele
Northern Sami
Norwegian Bokmål
Norwegian Nynorsk
Nyankole
Oromo
Polish
Portuguese
Prussian
Quechua
Romanian
Romansh
Rombo
Rundi
Rwa
Samburu
Sango
Sangu (Tanzania)
Scottish Gaelic
Sena
Serbian
Shambala
Shona
Slovak
Slovenian
Soga
Somali
Spanish
Swahili (macrolanguage)
Swedish
Swiss German
Tachelhit
Taita
Tasawaq
Teso
Turkish
Upper Sorbian
Uzbek
Volapük
Vunjo
Walser
Welsh
Western Frisian
Yoruba
Zarma
Zulu

Open Type Features

aalt	Access All Alternates	pnum	Proportional Figures
case	Case-Sensitive Forms	salt	Stylistic Alternates
ccmp	Glyph Composition / Decomposition	sinf	Scientific Inferiors
dnom	Denominators	ss01	Stylistic Set 1
frac	Fractions	ss02	Stylistic Set 2
hist	Historical Forms	ss03	Stylistic Set 3
liga	Standard Ligatures	ss05	Stylistic Set 5
locl	Localized Forms	ss07	Stylistic Set 7
numr	Numerators	ss08	Stylistic Set 8
onum	Oldstyle Figures	ss09	Stylistic Set 9
ordn	Ordinals	subs	Subscript
ornm	Ornaments	sups	Superscript
		zero	Slashed Zero

Codepage

Please refer to the Technical Document

Copyright