

toning and other operations through which it is destined to go.

"Well, how is that? Explain, please."

In the first place, the print is most wofully "*woolly*," and looks as though it had almost been floated a week upon the bath, so bad is it, for there is no richness whatever. In fact it looks *dead*, for there is not any relief to it, but all together looks alike, flat and mean.

Yes, I understand what you are going to say, and it is the following, is it not?

About the *negative* not being so very bold, and hence a very bold print cannot be expected from such, was not that it? Yes, I thought so. Well, let us place out *this other negative* to print, and see if the print is any bolder printing it on a piece of the same sheet of paper. Now is this print as bold as might be obtained from the very rich negative?

"No; I must confess that it is not. How can I make it, by floating longer so as to get more silver on it?"

"No! For you make it worse in every respect than what it is now, for there is now too much silver on the paper."

"Why, how is that? I thought that it was a great deal of silver that made the prints so bold."

"You are right, if it is worked in harmony with other things, such as the time of floating, which is the point under discussion now; but we are wandering from our subject, and let us return to that now, and we will take this up after awhile. I said a short time ago, that the print was not bold, but sunk in, and to make it bold, you wanted to know if it should be floated longer. I answered, no! but will say, that to make it bold, it must be floated not longer, but *shorter*. Oh! I see you look surprised,