

"Where shall we have our picnic?—that is the point, I think," says Scarlett, with a view to preventing further discussion.

"Why not Uplands? It is a charming place, with such a pretty view."

"Yes, when one gets up to it. The last time I ventured there and reached the summit I was so depressed I longed for nothing but—"

"Death," says Brandy. "I remember it. I was with you."

"Then it is not to be wondered at," puts in Flora, viciously, if softly.

"Is not Uplands rather far away?" says Gretchen, gently; "and it certainly is mountainous. Why not try that wood near Myross?"

"That is almost as hilly a road, and not so pretty, I think."

"But nearer home; and one hates a long drive back when tired."

"Better to bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of," quotes Brandy. "Why didn't you say that, Dandy? It was quite in your line, and a splendid chance absolutely thrown away."

"What about the evening?" asks Scarlett, addressing Gretchen in a low one, who is still sitting on the wicker chair near Dugdale. "Would you come to our place and have tea? We might afterwards, you know, get up a small dance in the hall."

"Oh, thank you, no: do not mention that," Gretchen replies, earnestly. "We must be home early: must we not Kitty? There are many reasons."

Her eyes for an instant rest on Dugdale. How long the day will be for him, poor fellow, when they are all away!

"Tell you what," exclaims Sir John, with sudden and unlooked-for animation: "you all come and have your dinner in my grounds. They are near enough, and no hills to speak of. You shall have tea in gypsy fashion towards evening, and get home as early as ever you like. And—and I'll go home with you." With a faint laugh, and a glance at Kitty, who is busy tracing a pattern on the back of Trimmer, her fox terrier.

"That will be quite too charming," says Gretchen, with a quick smile; and then they all say the same in different language, except Scarlett, who would have liked to drive her home to his mother's house through the cool night-air and to have danced with her afterwards in a gay informal fashion in the old hall.

(To be continued.)

Musical.

PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY.

The first concert for the present season took place in the Queen's Hall on Thursday evening. In addition to the members of the Society and the Société des Symphonistes, the members of the "Carreno" troupe took part in the performance, Madame Carreno contributing the most enjoyable piece of the evening, Mendelssohn's Capriccio in B. minor. The Choir sang Gounod's Messe Solennelle very creditably, and Solos were contributed by Miss Beere, Mr. Toedt and Mr. Adolph Fischer.

THE CHOIRMASTER.

To the Musical Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—I read with interest your article on "Church Music" in the paper of 20th ultimo, concurring in the views expressed, with one exception. The total exclusion of the clergyman from all "interference" with what you style "a most important accessory to religious worship," (I should style it a most important part of religious worship,) and the investiture of the choir-master with "absolute control," including even "the selection of the hymns," I cannot but regard as highly objectionable. It is the clergyman's function and prerogative to lead the worship of the congregation, and the choir-master is, in point of fact, his assistant and deputy, so far as conducting the "service of praise" is concerned. If there is to be due harmony of topic between what is preached and what is sung, the clergyman must either choose the hymns himself or inform the choir-master of the train of thought to be pursued in the sermon (simply naming the text would not suffice), otherwise there may be great incongruities. I should not care to have the hymn "Hark, from the tombs a doleful sound" follow the sermon. After discoursing on the act of faith, the hymn "Just as I am without one plea" would be appropriate, while "On Jordan's stormy banks I stand" would be most inappropriate. I have read of a parish-clerk in England who had this "absolute control." After a sermon he considered heretical, he gave out the stanza:

"The men who keep Thy law with care,
And meditate Thy word,
Grow wiser than their teachers are,
And better know the Lord."

You say that "no clergyman who knows anything of music would be guilty of anything so presumptuous" as to interfere in these matters. On the contrary, I believe that the more a clergyman knows about music, the more anxious he will be to have a finger in the pie. The music has many a time made or marred the entire service for me. It has given me a delightful sense of liberty, or occasioned a painful restraint all through the sermon. As an illustration of this, I may state that, many years since, I supplied the pulpit of the late Dr. Budington, of Clinton Avenue Church, Brooklyn, N.Y., on a certain Sunday. I felt somewhat nervous at the idea of appearing before so large a congregation, and was relieved in this wise:—The organist, who was also choir-master (a foreigner, by the way,) came to the minister's vestry just before service began, and enquired if I had any directions to give about the music. I replied, "only to request a very soft, soothing opening voluntary." He said, "I shall play you von." And he did. The effect of it was magical. It put me wholly at ease, and completely charmed away all nervous embarrassment. I could give many instances, amusing enough now, but painful at the time, of incongruities arising out of something else than the clergyman having "absolute control" of "the service of song in the house of the Lord."

I can do little more in this letter than put in a respectable protest against the sole supremacy of the choir-master for which you contend. I would as soon think of permitting some one else to select the Scripture lessons, or write out a prayer for me, as relegate the selection of hymns to another. I also claim the right to say something about the class of tunes to be sung. It would tear my nerves to pieces, if my choir-master insisted on singing some of the old fugue tunes that were so popular 30 or 40 years ago. Of course it will be said there are some clergymen who have no musical ear, taste, or knowledge. The more's the pity. I subscribe to Shakespeare's assertion:

"The man who hath no music in his soul,
And is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treason, stratagems and spoils,"

but he isn't fit for the pulpit.

The objections to putting church music absolutely under the control of the choir-master are less serious in cities than in small towns, villages, and rural neighbourhoods, but I believe the principle a wrong one anywhere and every where. Choirs are proverbially quarrelsome and rebellious. In my view, the difficulties in connection with their management largely

arise out of their supposed independence of both church and minister. They form in their own estimation, an "imperium in imperio," and when their high-mightinesses are not treated as they think they ought to be, there is trouble in the the camp. The choir-master often becomes the leader of discord instead of harmony; and, not unfrequently, ministerial settlements that might have been prolonged and prosperous, are brought to an untimely end by discussions arising out of musical matters. Let it be understood that the minister has the direction of public worship, that the choir-master is his assistant, and that, consequently, there should be respectful consultation at the very least, and such deplorable circumstance^s will be brought about far less frequently. At anyrate so thinks

A Country Parson.

[The remarks of "A Country Parson" about unity of ideas contained in the sermon and closing hymn bear only on a single item in the programme of music, and even this we hold will be better selected by a competent choir-master (who has been notified of the style of sermon) than by a clergyman who is ignorant of music. In most churches the interposition of a showy organ voluntary cuts off whatever connection there might be between the sermon and the closing hymn, frequently nullifying the effect of an impressive homily. Our correspondent mentions a foreigner who "charmed away all nervous embarrassment" with a voluntary; will he not admit that men of that kind may be trusted to select music in keeping with the character of the service? We remember once having in an English Cathedral after a particularly prosy sermon, the Anthem "Sleepers Wake!" thundered forth by the organist and choir. It was selected by the Dean, and can hardly be said to have been inappropriate; yet we do not think any choir-master could have perpetrated such a practical piece of sarcasm.]

As regards the management of choirs we think that when an organist provides a choir, he ought certainly to have "absolute control" of his forces without interference from anyone.—Mus. Ed.]

Chess.

Montreal, December 11th, 1880.

CHESS INTELLIGENCE.

50-MOVE LIMIT LAW.

To the Chess Editor CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

DEAR SIR,—Now that Dr. Ryall has plainly stated his position and his reasons for assuming it, it may be in order to expose the fallacy of his arguments. I will be as brief as possible, and, to be so, pass over some personal points. Dr. Ryall and his referee do not appear to be in accord on all points, and, as regards the latter, when a contestant is driven to deliberate falsification of his opponent's statements, it may be fairly assumed that he must be conscious of having a very poor case. As to the fact that all end-games are subject to the law, and the question of the *Globe* Editor as to how this is to be disposed of, the reply appears very simple. It will hardly be disputed that each member of a community is liable to its laws, and that they apply to him, but the penalty imposed is only inflicted on transgressors. In this case, the penalty (*i.e.*, the 50-move limit) has been applied to an innocent party, for even if the *Globe* Editor's absurd assumption that the position is an end-game be granted, he has done nothing to show his incapacity to win it, and no one yet has claimed that it is likely to be drawn. The clause on which Dr. Ryall relies, says:—"That when one player thinks one side can force the game, or that neither can win it, he may appeal to the umpire to decide if he can call for the action of the law." Now this does not say, as is argued by Dr. Ryall, that if one side can win, that the limit is to be enforced. If it did, what becomes of the statement that it is impossible to define the exact conditions which call for the limit? Besides the cases specified in the law, it would only be requisite to add, "and all positions where the umpire considers one player has preponderance of force enough to win, or that the game should be drawn." The fact that the umpire has to decide whether any specified case of preponderance of force is subject to the enforcement of the limit, clearly shows that all cases are *not*, and Dr. Ryall's whole case collapses. We have then to find out what cases call for the limit, and where should we do so but in the references to the law made by the maker himself?

I think I have said enough to prove the soundness of my own position, which is not only reasonable, logical, and consistent with all Staunton writes on the subject, but is also in accord with the practice of all players up to the present. I proceed to show the flimsiness of the other opposing arguments. Dr. Ryall's assertion that the position can be won in 50 moves, and that the force to do it is there, is a remarkably bold one. I differ from him, and venture to say he would find it impossible to prove himself correct; if he could, he would probably be the greatest analyst living. His confession that he had never even heard of Staunton's Notes and Observations, while it may partly account for his remarkable ruling, will hardly be considered to increase his influence as a Chess authority, or as an expounder of Chess laws. The *Globe* Editor appears to consider that he confounds his adversaries by asking them to reconcile the statements that all end-games are subject to the law, and that the law is simply intended to force drawn games to an end. I have already shown that the contradiction is only an apparent one. I think the term "fatuous" might be used justly here for what he proffered in his own favour? Reverse the questions and ask him to dispose of the drawn game part. Another remark of Staunton, which he would have to explain, is that the clause is so seldom enforced. Now, if all end-games and cases of preponderance of force call for it, how many games would be played without it?

The Editor gave great praise to Staunton, yet he makes him out a fool. The Dr. states that the Notes and Observations are contradictory, which they are, as applied by his reasoning. Now this case resolves itself into just this, that rather than admit having made an error, they make out that instead of Mr. Staunton being a great authority on the game and perfectly qualified to deal with law-making thereon, he must have been little better than an idiot, incapable of understanding the subject or even the meaning of his words, and also that none of the great players since his day have been able to detect his inconsistency and stupidity. No, sir, it has been reserved for Dr. Ryall and the luminary of the *Globe* to enlighten a generation of "fatuous" chess players.

New York, 3rd December, 1880.
Yours truly,
A. P. Barnes.

With this letter we close our Column to any further discussion of this matter. The absurdity of the position taken up by Dr. Ryall, Mr. Kittson and the *Globe* Chess Editor has been everywhere made apparent, and has called down the deserved contempt of every chess writer or player who has ventured into print. These three gentlemen are the only ones we can hear of who support Dr. Ryall's position, a position made still more ridiculous by his own confession that he had never read the Praxis Rules when he gave his decision, and was not aware of "the Notes and Observations" which are among the most important features of Staunton's Code of Laws. Except from the pen of one or other of this trio the *Globe* Chess Editor has not favoured the public with the views or opinion of any player in support of their case, though Dr. Ryall intimates that he has the support of men of superior judgment. Who and where are they? We cannot think that any higher authority can be found anywhere than the *Chess Monthly*, and that journal superciliously dismissed the matter with the words, "simply preposterous." The Cincinnati *Commercial* poured contempt on such a silly interpretation of the Law. We can only believe that, as applied to certain parties of the opposite sex, "when they went, they won't, so there's an end on't." The truth is, the Law was invoked and supported as a bit of spleen out of disappointment at the loss of the Queen, for never before, we venture to assert, has either Mr. Kittson or Dr. Ryall used the Law or heard of its application in such cases, though probably they have more than once lost their Queen for an inferior piece in similar positions.

NOTE.—Since the above was put in type we have received a letter from a valued correspondent and English Chess authority in England, and shall insert it in our next issue. While it deals with the question above referred to, it touches on some other matters connected with the Chess Laws.