

Here's the difference that typesetting can make

Seen around, I'm sad to say

As a child, I was an inordinate sucker for an exceptionally good cover. I still am. And for books that fit into my chubby little hands, which are still, actually, little and chubby. I still like books that open easily, with no cracking glue and no threads showing and no words disappearing into the gutter. If the stock is nice, smooth, and soft to the touch, it's like finding a treasure. And if the type is crisp but not too crisp, easy to read, not scrunched, no holes between words to fall into, well that's a book I want to read.

#1 Basic: Just flowed into InDesign...still a little jumpy

As a child, I was an inordinate sucker for an exceptionally good cover. I still am. And for books that fit into my chubby little hands, which are still, actually, little and chubby. I still like books that open easily, with no cracking glue and no threads showing and no words disappearing into the gutter. If the stock is nice, smooth, and soft to the touch, it's like finding a treasure. And if the type is crisp but not too crisp, easy to read, not scrunched, no holes between words to fall into, well that's a book I want to read.

#2 Better: Flowed into InDesign & massaged (typeset)

As a child, I was an inordinate sucker for an exceptionally good cover. I still am. And for books that fit into my chubby little hands, which are still, actually, little and chubby. I still like books that open easily, with no cracking glue and no threads showing and no words disappearing into the gutter. If the stock is nice, smooth, and soft to the touch, it's like finding a treasure. And if the type is crisp but not too crisp, easy to read, not scrunched, no holes between words to fall into, well that's a book I want to read.

#1...with word spacing from #2 shown in blue

As a child, I was an inordinate sucker for an exceptionally good

