consequently, cost much less than equal accommodation in stone or brick, yet the average rent is fifteen dollars per month, or nearly forty pounds per annum.

Such are Waverley, Owego, Binghamton, Athens, Ulster, &c., &c., beautiful as Paradise, and inhabited by a people keen in the pursuit of business during business hours. Sober, so far as an outsider can see, no place had its name been discovered. And as a matter of fact, is it not, after all, the same as the other, far removed from poverty as the Seven Dials from St. James's.

But, of course, this is not photography, and I suppose that is what my readers are expecting in the first place. And if this is not what they ask, I am sorry that there is little to be said regarding it. Photographers are there in plenty, and in most cases a tolerably good trade is being carried on. I write "trade" advisedly, as, with very few exceptions, the average work done is destitute of every vestige of art—inferior, to say the least, to the ordinary engraver's work. And in most cases the business must be carried on. I write "trade" advisedly, as, with very few exceptions, the average work done is destitute of every vestige of art—inferior, to say the least, to the ordinary engraver's work.

Excused with the ground of insufficient payment. Something like the balustrades are there in plenty, and in most cases at tolerably good trade is being done. I write "trade" advisedly, as, with very few exceptions, the average work done is destitute of every vestige of art—inferior, to say the least, to the ordinary engraver's work. Something like the balustrades are there in plenty, and in most cases at tolerably good trade is being done.

A visit to the United States would not be complete unless it included Niagara, and so in my next I shall have something to say of the peculiar class of photography practised there and of the men who practise it.

JOHN SNOD, Ph.D.
A composite portrait represents the picture that would rise before the mind’s eye of a man who had the gift of pictorial imagination in an exaggerated or a somewhat violent manner, being subject to no errors beyond those incidental to all photographic productions.

I submit several composites made for me by Mr. H. Reynolds. The first set of portraits are those of criminals convicted of murder, manslaughter, poisoning, and other heavy crimes. The second set is of persons whose faces are so similar that they are likely to fall into crimes. All composites are better looking than their components, because the averaged portrait of many persons is free from the irregularities that variously blashm the looks of each of them. I selected these for my first trials because I happened to possess a large collection of photographs of criminals through the kindness of Sir Edmund Du Cane, the Director-General of Prisons, for the purpose of investigating criminal types. They were peculiarly adapted to my present purpose, being all made of about the same size and taken in much the same attitudes. It was while endeavouring to elicit the principal criminal types by methods of optical superimposition of the portraits, such as I had frequently employed with maps and meteorographs, that the idea of composite portraits occurred to me.

The other set of composites are made from pairs of components. They are selected to show the extraordinary facility of combining almost any two faces whose proportions are in any way similar. In the first set of composites, it has been observed that four at least of the six composites are closely alike. When we deal with faces of the same type, the points of similarity far outnumber those of dissimilarity, and there is a much greater resemblance between faces generally than we who turn our attention to facial differences can possibly realize. I am therefore not surprised that the composites bear so much resemblance to each other. In the second set of composites, it has been observed that four at least of the six composites are closely alike. I should say that in each of this set of the last three components was always allowed a longer exposure than the second, and the second than the first, but it is found better to allow an equal time to all of them.

The stereoscope, as I stated last August in my address at Plymouth, affords a very easy mode of optically superimposing two portraits, and I have much pleasure in quoting the following letter, pointing out the fact as well as some other considerations, which further enhanced the early promise of composite portraits, which I had made in binocular vision in the stereoscope. I find by taking two ordinary carte-de-visite photos. of two different persons’ faces, the portraits being about the same sizes and looking about the same direction, and placing them in a stereoscope, the faces blend into one in a most remarkable manner, producing in the case of some ladies’ portraits in every instance a decided improvement in beauty. The pictures were not taken in a binocular camera, and therefore do not stand out well, but by moving one or both until the eyes coincide in the stereoscope the pictures blend perfectly. If taken in a binocular camera for the purpose, each person being taken on one-half of the negative, I am sure it would be equally successful. Perhaps it might be made of this in regard to the expression of emotions in man and the lower animals, &c. I have not time or opportunities to make experiments, but it seems to me that this might be done by photographing the faces of different animals, different races of mankind, &c. I think a stereoscopic view of one of the ape tribe and some low caste human face would make a very curious contrast to the miner of cataracts and his offspring. It seems to me something also might result in photos. of husband and wife and children, &c. In any case the results are curious if it leads to nothing else. So far as I can judge from the few composites I have now before my eyes, I do not look upon myself as suggesting the experiment and perhaps send me some of the results. If not likely to come to anything a reply would much oblige me.

Dr. Carpenter informs me that the late Mr. Appold, the mechanician, used to combine two portraits of himself under the stereoscope. The one had been taken with an assumed stern expression, the other with a smile; and this combination produced a curious and effective blending of the features.

Convenient as the stereoscope is, owing to its accessibility, for determining whether any two portraits are suitable in size and attitude for a composite portrait, it is nevertheless a makeshift and imperfect way of attaining the required result. It cannot of itself combine two images; it can only place them so that the office of attempting to combine them may be undertaken by the brain. Now the two separate modular images are subject to too many disturbing influences, and the stereoscope fails from two causes. One is that it does not seem to me, to be relatively constant in their vividness, but sometimes the image seen by the left eye prevails over that seen by the right, and vice versa. All the other instruments I am about to describe accomplish this much more successfully than the stereoscope fails to do; they create true optical combinations. As regards other points in Mr. Austin’s letter I cannot think that the use of a binocular camera for taking the two portraits intended to be combined into one by the stereoscope would be of importance. The only true method of securing the combination of the same size. In every other respect I cordially agree with Mr. Austin.

FRANCIS GALTON, F.R.S.

(A To be concluded in our next.)
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