IMPORTANCE OF TRIFLES IN POKER

Bill Quigley Demonstrates His Theory by Putting It Into Practice.

GREENLAW TELLS OF IT

By DAVID A. CURTIS.

"A pair in the hand is wuth two in the deck, as the Good Book says," declared old man Greenlaw so positively that he seemed to think there could be no question raised as to the correctness of the proposition.

It did not appear, however, that his opinion was the same as that of his hearers. He had made the remark apropos of nothing that had been said before, and they were taken by surprise, wherefore they remained doubtfully silent for an interval, during which he regarded them defiantly, as if challenging contradiction.

The usual course of procedure among the chosen few who made a constant practice of spending their spare time in the old man's little saloon in Arkansas City was to listen in silence whenever he enunciated any bit of profundity like the foregoing, and then to persist in their silence so long as it was humanly possible so to do. At times the things he said bred such exasperation in them that they were forced to speech, but for the most part an unresponsive silence was the most efficacious means of discouraging his discourse, and accordingly they seldom replied.

On this occasion, however, his defiant expression was fairly intolerable. They realized that he would interpret silence as a confession of such inferiority on their part as made them incapable of disputing his assertion. It was therefore felt to be necessary for some one of them to controvert him, regardless of the merits of his speech. If he had declared that one and one made two and had looked at them as he was now looking they would have been compelled to dispute the statement.

Accordingly Jake Winterbottom spoke up, and managed to convey by his tone a maddening contempt for what the old man had said.

"I reckon what seven high, if a man reely helt it, 'd be wuth 's much as a straight flush in the deck, if it was a question o' bettin' onto it," he drawled, "but 'tain't freq'nt what a single pair has no gre't value even if yo' does have it in yo' hand. Nor it don't make no gre't diff'rence what they is into the deck 's fur 's the bettin' 's c'nc'erned. Whatever 'tis, I hain't never heer'd o' nobody fillin' of it in the draw."

"Well, o' co'se, one pair ain't no gre't hand fo' to hold a'ter the draw," admitted the old man, taken somewhat aback, "but it's a hellova lot if he pulls two mo' like 'em when he does draw. I done seen that did mo' 'n onc't."

"Ya'as, an' I done seen the sun rise this mawnin,' just afo' I got home," retorted Jim Blaisdell witheringly, "but I didn't throw no fit consequent. 'Pears like 'tain't nothin' amazin' when things happens legitimate. If this yer man yo' all is talkin' about done it on his own deal o' co'se they was some room fo' s'picion."

"Wa'n't talkin' o' nobody p'tic'lar," declared the old man rather hotly. "What I was doin' was to p'int out th' mpo'tants o' trifles. O' co'se one pair ain't no gre't of a hand a'ter the draw, an' th' ain't no sense in stayin' onto it, 'thouten it's aces, but it's a hellova lot mo' 'n somepin' what yo' ain't got."

"I hain't never been to school a heap," said Sam Pearsall, contemptuously, "but 'pears like I c'n onderstand that much 'thouten strainin' my intelleck. Question is, what good is it? 'Pears like it's c'nsid'able triflin'."

"Oh, I don't know," said Mr. Owen Pepper. "I reckon 'tain't no mo' triflin' 'n a heap o' things what's spoke 'round these parts, mo' special when the old man gits talkin'."

Nobody interfered when the old man got out his bungstarter and Mr. Pepper withdrew from the company under compulsion, but when the old man, after putting away his weapon, undertook to resume the discussion there was unanimous protest.

"I reckon we uns is done heer'd enough 'bout a pair," said Joe Bassett impatiently. "If they's gwine to be conversation c'ncernin' what a man ain't got or is got into his hand afo' the draw or a'terwards why not make it straight flushes, or somepin' else what's worth while?"

"Minds me o' what Bill Quigley done," said the old man, who was plainly determined to talk about something, and the others, having from long experience learned the futility of opposition, resigned themselves to listen.

"I reckon Quigley was nigh 'bout the most triflin'est man I ever knowed afo' he done got fo'ced fo' to make a livin' fo' hisself, long o' his pa havin' done died 'thouten leavin' him nothin.' Long's his old man was 'round Bill never done nothin', on'y loaf 'round town an' look pretty.

"Uster shave hisself three or fo' times a week, an' put on a clean shirt every time he shaved, b'sides havin' a diff'rent cravat every two or three weeks. 'Peared like he didn't have no aim at nothin' mo' n' to be the best dressed man in Greenville."

"Oh, Lawd!" exclaimed Sam Pearsall, and he left the room. He had married in Greenville.

"But when his pa died," continued the old man, "Bill seen it was up to him fo' to do somepin' mo' 'n to wear good clothes. He mought a married the Widder Goggins, mebbe, him havin' cotched her steady fo' c'nsid'able while, her havin' property enough fo' to justify it, but she had c'nsid'able of a bad fo' business, an' she seen what he wan't no good 'nvestment the way he was.

"She didn't make no bones o' wantin' to marry him, long o' him bein' 's good lookin' 's he was, an' her bein' a widder some longer 'n 'peared to be nachul, bein' lively an' c'nsid'able of a good looker her own self, but she didn't p'pose fo' to let nobody have her money 'thouten he had some hisself.

"So she says to him what if he was to git into some business what 'd pay his sheer o' th' 'expense he c'd have her an' welcome, but she wa'n't gwine to s'po't no husband into luxury an' idleness. They wa'n't no trifler gwine to git the Widder Goggins, she said, an' bein' 's she was full as obstinent 's women gen'ly is, Bill seen how 'twa'n't no good tryin' to p'suade her.

"Just nachully, he did try first off. Said to her what they didn't 'pear to be no sense in him doin' nothin,' bein' 's she had enough fo' the two on 'em to git along com'fable, but she said what in the co'se o' nature she'd be liable fo' to be b'reft ag'in, an' if he was to cash in she'd need the prop'ty her own self, bein' 's they didn't nobody 'pear to be overly anxious fo' to marry no widder if they was po'.

"Well, it sho' was some hard on Bill, bein' 's he was sho' 'nough quality even if he didn't had no money 'long o' his pa havin' done squandered the fambly fortune afo' it come to Bill.

"Them days they wa'n't on'y three ways fo' a Southern gentleman to git money. One was to git it f'm the fambly. Quality fambies al'ays had it, an' anybody 't b'longed to the fambly al'ays had all they wanted, 's long 's it lasted, but that didn't do Bill no good, bein' 's his pa was all fired 'xtravagant, like I said, an' didn't leave Bill nothin'.

"A other way was fo' to marry somebody what had money, an' just nachully Bill done reckoned on that first off, bein' 's 'twas the easiest way to git it, next to 'nheritin' of it, but luck was ag'in Bill thataway too. They was c'nsidable many gals an' widders 'round Greenville what wouldn't a had no 'bjections to him a marryin' of 'em, but they wa'n't none on 'em had money enough fo' to make 'em marriageable 'xcept the Widder Goggins, an' she turned him a deef ear, like I done said, when he p'posed to her. So they didn't 'pear to be no show fo' Bill in that d'rection.

"The on'y other way they was was fo' to play cyards. If a man had a nuchul talent fo' draw poker he c'd set in with his friends an' pull down enough to live on 'thouten bein' obliged to go to work, what o' co'se he couldn't be 'xpected to do if he was sho' 'nough quality, like Bill was, as I was a-sayin'. So when Bill done found hisself up ag'in it, like he sho'ly was, he just nachully turned his 'tention to poker, an' I will say what the prospeck was c'nsid'able d'scouragin'. 'Peared like they wa'n't no gre't show fo' him thataway neither.

"O' co'se draw poker is the most elevatin' p'suit what they is fo' them 't has 'ntelligence enough fo' to play it scientific, but it don't p'vide no gre't op'nin' fo' them what ain't gifted, an' Bill hadn't never been nothin' but a trifler, like I done said afo'. O' co'se he'd al'ays played the game mo' 'n less ever sinct he knowed enough fo' to tell fo' aces f'm a dirty deuce, but he hadn't never made nothin' outen it, bein' a p'sistent loser, like his pa afo' him. 'Peared like they wa'n't nothin' ahead of him but d'aster an' sorrer. They didn't nobody 'xpect nothin diff'rent fo' him when they seen how he was done lef'.

"But they was mo' into him 'n anybody reckoned up to that time. He done come round to the tavern one night where I was keepin' bar, an' he says: 'Greenlaw, I done been thinkin' a heap 'bout poker recent, bein' 's they don't 'pear to be nothin' else fo' me to study onto, an' 'pears to me,' he says, 'what they is c'nsid'able mo' into it 'n I al'ays reckoned they was.'

"'Yes,' I says, 'they's a heap mo' into it 'n anybody reckons, an' they is a heap mo' 'n that, if anybody sh'd ast yo'. But how come yo' all d'scovered it?'

"'Well, he says, 'I done been studyin' onto it, an' the mo' I study the mo' it looks to me like they was a heap o' trifles into the game, like they is into everythin' else, an' I'm all hell on trifles,' he says. 'I al'ays was.'

"'Yes,' I says, 'they sho' is a heap o' trifles into poker, but th' ain't no money to be made a-bettin' onto 'em.'

"'I know that f'm 'xper'ence,' he says, 'but sometimes trifles is 'mpo'tant.'

"'As how?' I says.

"'Well,' he says, 'one pair is gen'ly triflin' when it comes to the showdown, but if a man was to better it into the draw mebbe it 'd be wuth bettin' onto.'

"'Mought be wuth somepin' if it come out threes,' I says, 'but they ain't no gre't d'pendence to be put onto the draw. An' even threes ain't such a hellova lot.'

"'No,' he says, 'but threes is a heap better 'n the av'rage. The way I reckons,' he says, 'I ain't got the talent fo' to play no dazzlin' game, an' th' ain't no use fo' me to go in fo' big hands, but 'pears like I got a nachul aptitude fo' trifles, an' I reckon I can't do no better 'n to stick to 'em. If I c'n make out to git threes by drawin' to a pair, I c'n win mo' on the av'rage nor I could waitin fo' them fancy hands.'

"'They is somepin' in that,' I says, 'but how is a man to know when he's gwine to git the third one?'

"'They is diff'rent ways,' says Bill. 'O' co'se if it's his deal 'tain't al'ays 's hard 's it looks, but if a man fills his hand too freq'nt onto his own deal they's liable fo' to be some s'picion rose. Looks to me like it was better fo' to have a 'sortment o' extry cyards handy where he c'n git at 'em to fill out a pair 'thouten ref'rence to the deal.'

"'Well,' I says, 'they is a heap mo' things c'n be did into a poker game 'n they is drempt of in ph'losophy, as the Good Book says, an' I dunno but what yo' all is done hit onto one on 'em. 'Tain't 'xactly new,' I says, 'but if yo' all was to practise up on it fo' a year or two an' was to play it with judicion, not never tryin' fo' no big hands, but stickin' to three of a kyind, I dunno but what they mought be a stiddy income made outen it. 'Tain't no kyind of a game fo' a camp meetin' nor a river boat,' I says, 'but it'll do to play round home.'

"F'm that time on Bill Quigley's prospecks in life 'peared to be 'mprovin' c'nsid'able. He didn't never git to be no gre't of a expert, an' he didn't never make no phenombenal winnin's. Never showed no gre't nerve, an' uster lay down freq'nt when he mought 'a' win the pot if he'd a called, but he done win a c'nsid'able p'centage o' them what he done stayed fo', an' grajally he done got rich an' respectable.

"When the Widder Goggins seen what he was doin' 's well 's he done she says to him what she didn't had no gre't 'bjections to hitchin' up, but Bill says what he reckons what a com'fable income with peace o' mind is wuth mo' 'n gre't riches an' a widder fo' a wife. So neither on 'em ever got married.

"Proves what they is c'nsid'able mo' 'mpo'tance in trifles 'n what's gen'ly reckoned, mo' special in draw poker."

POEMS WORTH READING.

"The New Grain of Flanders."

Translation of a lyric written by a young Belgian artist in this country, who entitles his song of patriotism and nostalgia "Les Blés de Flandre."

All in the morning's spacious calm
Springs the new wheat again;
Each blowing blade a tiny palm—
How beautiful the grain!

Now, edged with golden light it sways
And dominates the plain;
Through all the growing summer days
How full, how wide the grain!

Its roots are in the sun baked earth—
And in dead hearts, God knows!
Because it had such costly birth
The grain—how strong it grows!

So beautiful, in dawn light tender;
So full, it lips the river flood,
So strong it is—this grain of Flandre,
For it has drunk of heroes' blood!

EDITH M. THOMAS.

Blackstone de Luxe.

Those dainty essays Blackstone wrote
On legal rights and duties
Are out in handy form, I note,
Embellished with new beauties;
The thrill of witenagemote
(Thin papered) more acute is.

The feel of limp morocco lends
A rapture to embracery;
How gracefully misprision blends
With the title's gilded tracery!
The tooling almost makes amends
For subornation's base array.

The genial sage has won a place
Right on the centre table;
Henceforth the rule of Shelley's Case
Shall be as dear to Mabel
As Shelley's odes, or some pièce
De résistance by Cable.

O great Augustan age of limp!
Thus have your pliant backs done
A service to mankind which simply rivals that of Caxton;
And so we see the self-same imprint on "Lucille" and Blackstone.

CHARLES J. BAYNE.

A Street Car Miracle.

The baby laughed—and through the car
Of dull eyed folk, at nightfall weary,
The little silvery ripple ran,
And in its wake the smiles began,
Like sunshine over waters dreary.

The baby laughed—and shoulders bent
'Neath weight of toil and trouble tragic
Straightened, with motion swift and strong,
As if that burden, carried long,
Had lifted been by merry magic!

The baby laughed—and one who came
As slumber stilled that music's ringing
Looked wondering down the crowded car,
"How brave, how kind, these faces are!"
He thought, with hope and faith upspringing.

MINNIE LEONA UPTON.

The Sailor's Girls.

From Judge.

He has met every type of a girl,
From Alaska to far Hindustan,
Has danced the Bolero in Rio Janeiro,
And flirted with girls in Japan.

A cunning Creole may allure;
Or a Geisha be winsome and sweet,
Or a Genoese beauty bethink it a duty
To kiss him, the rapture is fleet.

For back from his travels afar
He comes with a heart pit-a-pat,
And soon 'twill be laid with some shy little maid
Who lives in Manhattan at that.

JOSEPH P. HANRAHAN.

The Book.

From the Saturday Review.

The guns had ceased, the new sun blest the earth,
Into my heart there stole a sense of ease
Soft as the summer wind through summer trees
That brings a thousand airy scents to birth
I took my Book that tells of pure Love's worth.
St. John, historian of mysteries,
And read that tale illumined by degrees
Written in tears of men for angels' mirth,
Of sisters twain who mourned a brother dead;
Of Martha grave, who went her Lord to meet,
Of Him who wept, then raised His friend from tomb;
Of Him a guest at a white table spread,
And Mary's tears prophetic at His feet,
And of her incense filling all the room.

GUARBECQUE. H. B.

By the Grave of Thoreau.

From the Boston Transcript.

Some earth, some grass, and solitude—
Three things he loved, three things he wooed
Lifelong; and now no rhyme can tell
How ultimately all is well
With his wild heart that worshipped God's Epiphany in crumbling sods
And like an oak brought all its worth
Back to the kindly mother earth.

But something starry, something bold
Eludes the clutch of dark and mould—
Something that will not wholly die
Out of the azure of the sky.
No spell in all the lore of graves
Can still the plash of Walden waves
Or wear away the vivid stain
Of Concord skies in heart and brain.
Clear pealteries and faint citoles
Only recall the orioles
Flouting reveille to the morn
Across the acres of the corn.

I see him wandering lonely still
Along the solitary hill,
Each evening building lonelier fires,
Remote from heaven's bright rampires—
A hermit in the blue Beyond
By shores of some celestial pond,
With beams to hoe and wood to hew
And halcyon days to loiter through,
With angel visitors, no doubt,
To shut the air and sunlight out.
And he who scoffed at human ways
And, since we were unworthy praise,
Sang misanthropic pæans to
The muskrat and the feverfew
Will droop those archangelic wings
With praise of how we manage things,
Prefer his Walden cupelo
To all the Trees of Life, and grow
A little wistful looking down
Across the fields of Concord Town.

ODELL SHEPARD.

The Best.

From the Youth's Companion.

Did you fall in the race?
Did you faint in the spurt
Where the hot dust choked and burned?
Did you breast the tape midst the flying dirt
That the leader's spikes had spurned?
Did you do your best—
Oh, I know you lost. I know that your time was bad.
But the game is not in the winning, lad.
The best of it since the beginning, lad,
Is in taking your licking and grinning, lad,
If you gave them the best you had.

Did your tackle fail short?
Did the runner flash by
With the score that won the game?
Did it break your heart when you missed the try?
Did you choke with the hurt and shame?
If you did your best—
Oh, I know the score; I followed you all the way through.
And that is why I am saying, lad,
That the best of the fight is the staying, lad,
And the best of all games is the playing, lad,
If you give them the best in you.

NELSON ROBINS.

Prescience.

What do I see now the night so still is
Under the winter moon?
Not the snow that so white and chill is,
But the chalices of lifted lilies
Under the skies of June!

CLINTON SCOLLARD.

Nothing to Fear.

A pacifist in summer glee
Beheld the mounting mercury.

Quoth he, "All surely must confess
The folly of preparedness.

"I see no cause to spend my dole
In purchasing the winter coal.

"My observation shows right here
That there is simply naught to fear."

The summer fled, came winter's pall;
The mercury began to fall.

The pacifist of summer cheer
Discovered he had 0 to fear.

The moral whereof seems to strike
Cold steel and mercury alike.

MCLANDBURGH WILSON.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

A dozen readers report that the verses about "Don Camillo Miguel Petrillo" and his combat with Peter Brown are called "Magdalena; or The Spanish Duel." The poem is by J. F. Waller and may be found in the following volumes: "How to Speak in Public," by Grenville Kleiser (Leadership Library, Funk & Wagnalls); "The World of Wit and Humor," "Burbank's Recitations and Readings" (Dick & Fitzgerald, New York, 1878); "Choice Readings" (Jansen, McClurg & Co., Chicago, 1878), by Robert McLain Cummock; "Advanced Readings and Recitations," by Austin B. Fletcher (Lee & Shepard, Boston, and Charles T. Dillingham, New York, 1881, pages 221 to 229). The poem is too long for reprinting here. William S. Burns notes that according to Granger's "Index to Poetry and Recitations" the verses are included in six or seven different collections.

Please give the dates on which the different nations declared war, commencing with Austria against Serbia on July 28, 1914.

RICHARD HICKSON.

The following list is offered without confidence in its completeness:

July 28, 1914—Austria declares war on Serbia.

August 1—Germany declares war on Russia.

August 3—France in a state of war with Germany.

August 4—Great Britain declares war on Germany. Germany declares war on Belgium and France.

August 6—Austria declares war on Russia.

August 8—Montenegro declares war on Austria.

August 10—France in a state of war with Austria.

August 12—Montenegro declares war on Germany. Great Britain in a state of war with Austria.

August 23—Japan declares war on Germany.

August 25—Austria declares war with Japan.

August 28—Austria declares war on Belgium.

November 5—Turkey at war with Russia, France and Great Britain.

May 23, 1915—Italy declares war on Austria.

October 14—Bulgaria declares war on Serbia.

October 15—Great Britain declares war on Bulgaria.

October 16—Bulgaria in a state of war with Russia.

October 19—Russia and Italy declare war on Bulgaria.

Can you tell me where we can send things that will reach the Belgian soldiers? We do not wish to send through the Red Cross. G.

Their delivery can in no case be certain, but they should be sent to the War Relief Clearing House for France and Her Allies, 15 Broad street, New York.

Which of the belligerent nations started the aerial warfare on cities?

J. B.

German officials announced on August 2, 1914, that a French aviator had been dropping bombs on Nuremberg. That was the first word of such warfare. Germany and France were not then at war.

I think George L. Rockwell is mistaken in the year that Gen. Jackson rode up Broadway. My father told me that he saw the General ride up Broadway in the fall (?) of 1832. Old Hickory, who was mounted on a white horse, was in uniform and carried his chapeau in his hand. His stiff gray hair was combed straight up, as it is seen in his portraits.

One feature of the procession vividly recalled by my father was a number of pretty little children, mostly girls, carrying a banner, on which was inscribed: "We have no votes, but we have voices. Hurrah for Jackson!"

W. M. S.

Speaking of Spoonerisms, I dimly recall an anecdote of an audience electrified by the loudly uttered announcement of a nervous histrionic neophyte:

"My lord, the Buck of Dukingham is taken!"

Possibly you recall the circumstances.

H. E. W.

In regard to the discussion of Indian jugglers and the rope trick: I have toured India and have seen Indian fakirs perform time and again not only in India but elsewhere; indeed, the finest exhibition of East Indian legerdemain that I have ever witnessed was given on the famous terrace of Shepheard's Hotel at Cairo. But I have never seen attempted anything nearly so elaborate as the description of the so-called rope trick.

"Is a sort of hypnotic spell thrown over the audience?" asks your correspondent S. B. I used to believe that such must be the case. When I witnessed the mango trick in Benares I was fairly prepared to be placed under a hypnotic influence.

The trick was dependent entirely on "cheap deception." There was not a suspicion of illusion. The whole act was done behind a little cloth which concealed every movement of the fakir's hands. The thing was crude in comparison with the finished performance of a Herrmann or a Keller.

The Chinese juggler, infinitely more amusing than the East Indian fakir, is quite as clever; and yet during the entire performance of the Chinese artist the audience is aware that his apparatus, including the jars of water and globes of goldfish, is concealed beneath his flowing "mandarin" coat.

Thrice have I seen perform in the Orient one Mellini, an American. Mellini's apparatus consists of a pack of cards, a few tumblers, a piece of rope, perhaps, and a few eggs or lemons. Every detail of his finished performance is executed in plain view of his audience; there is no concealment, no "cheap deception." At the Tientsin Club a performance of his which I witnessed made the mango trick the work of a fakir in very truth. And in Mellini's tricks there is not even a suspicion of hypnotism.

R. M. E.

Is the New York Historical Society a private institution? Does it receive any money from the city? Does it pay taxes on its building? Is it open to the public?

HARLEM.

The society was incorporated by the State Legislature in 1809, in 1826 and in 1846 and chartered in 1846. Its membership is limited to 1,000. New members may be proposed by any member and are elected unless a ballot is demanded, when three negative votes exclude. A gift of $5,000 entitles the giver to be nominated for election as a patron with the right in perpetuity and the privilege of appointing a successor. A gift of $1,000 entitles the giver to be nominated for election as a fellow of the society for life. Gifts of books, manuscripts, art or archæological objects of the value of twice these sums carry the same privileges. Members pay $20 initiation and $10 yearly dues. For further particulars the society should be addressed. The society receives no money from city or State. It pays no taxes, under the law exempting educational institutions. It is open to the public daily from 9 A. M. to 5 P. M., except Sundays.

SCHOOL FOR CARD PLAYERS.

Auction bridge. W. N. W. says: The dealer bids no trump, second hand passes, third hand holds six clubs to the queen jack ten, three little diamonds and two small cards in each of the major suits. No score. What should he say?

It is usual to deny assistance for a no trumper, which may be only a light one, by bidding two clubs. If the partner does not like it, he can go back to no trumps or bid his own best suit. All the third hand can do is to warn him that there are no sure tricks in the hand that will be his dummy, unless clubs are trumps.

Mrs. J. says: We do not understand the reason for deducting the lower score from the higher when we are playing progressive. The ladies in our club never deduct, but keep all they get. We cannot see what difference it makes whether A has 1,200 and B has 800, or A 400 and B nothing, as A wins in either case.

When the game is pivot, it makes no difference, as the player with the 800 stays at the same table with the player who has the 1,200. But in a progressive game, suppose that the player goes to another table with the 800 points, and wins 1,200 against 1,000, while A wins 800 against 600 at the table B has just left. On the differential count, A is now 600 plus and B is only 200. Playing keep all, A and B are tied with 2,000 each. Had A won 400 against 200, her differential count would stay the same, but B would be 400 points ahead of her on the keep all system of scoring. The laws of the game require the lower score to be deducted from the higher to find the value of the rubber. The same should be done when four deals are a rubber.

J. L. P. says: I bid no trump, second hand passes and my partner says two spades. When fourth hand passes, how am I to tell whether the takeout is from strength or from weakness? I have only two little spades, six diamonds to the ace king jack and two other aces.

What do you care which it is? All your partner asks you to do is to drop your no trumper if you can help him in spades. As you have nothing in that suit, bid your diamonds, and if his spades are tops he will go back to no trumps. If it is a weak takeout he will let you play diamonds.

M. R. R. says: The declarer hesitates a little on the play of the last three tricks, whereupon the opponent on his left, A, remarks, "What is the use of playing it out? My partner has the best club." The declarer thereupon calls upon B to lay that card on the table. B objects, on the ground that A is mistaken and that B does not hold the best club. Can the declarer make B lay down the best club he has in hand? He quotes law 68 (4) as covering this point.

The law referred to says that a card mentioned by an adversary as being in his partner's hand may be called as an exposed card. If the card mentioned is "the best club" and that card is not in his partner's hand how can it be called? How B knew that his club was not the best is not stated, but it is assumed that his statement is correct.

H. C. K. says: The bidding goes round until A says three diamonds. Y, on his left, says "Four clubs—I mean three hearts. It takes only three hearts to overcall three diamonds." B bets that the bid must stand at four clubs, but Y insists that he can correct it before the next player bids.

Y is correct in saying that he is in time to change his declaration if he speaks before the next player acts; but this change is restricted to the suit, as it is assumed he did not mean to say clubs but hearts. He cannot reduce the bid to three, however, and it must stand at four hearts.

E. J. says: We are playing in a pivot game for prizes. In one hand A makes a small slam in hearts and her partner detects their opponents in a revoke. The adversaries admit it, but prove that the declarer herself revoked on the same trick, so it is all square, and the small slam and four honors are scored. One of the ladies says this was unfair to the others at other tables. What difference does it make?

When both sides revoke there is no score except for the honors as held. The 48 and 125 for game and 50 for little slam make up 223 points that the declarer was not entitled to, and such a score might easily decide the possession of the first prize.

H. McK. says: There are six forming a table. Those playing the hands are A, B, C and D. One of the others, E, is called away and appoints an outsider, X, to play during his absence, although another is waiting to cut in if there is a vacancy. The rubber is finished on that deal, A and B being the outgoers, while F and X come in. The outsider protests that the substitute has no right to hold the place for E.

This is correct. He must cut for the privilege of entering the table if there is a vacancy. Substitutes can be appointed only to play the hands, not to hold a place at the table.

Poker. F. A. B. says: B picks up six cards and leaves only four for C, on his left. C picks up his cards. The dealer insisted that he had dealt the cards correctly and the players had mixed them. Can C draw to the four cards?

No, because both hands are foul. C should have counted his cards face down before he lifted them. Then he could have called upon the dealer to draw one from B's hand and give it to him to complete his hand, and only B's hand would be foul as B lifted it.

R. D. P. says: A is accustomed to another game and turns up a trump after completing the deal. What happens?

It is a misdeal, just as if the card had been found faced in the pack. The same dealer deals again.

C. E. says: Three men in a pot. A drops out when C raises, but B calls. When C says "pair of tens" B throws away his hand, but when C shows his cards B takes his hand back again and shows a better pair.

B cannot take back into his hand any cards once thrown into the discard. It is C's pot.

M. T. J. says: The dealer fills his hand without audibly announcing the number of cards he draws. C bets he forfeits his rights in the pot if he fails to call his draw aloud.

It is usual for the dealer to do so, but if he does not, or a player does not hear him, he may be asked how many he drew, provided the player asking is still in the pot.

NOVEL POINTS OF THE LAW.

The *Law Times* of London has an instructive editorial on the liability of a landlord to a tenant in the case of the destruction of leased property in England by enemy air raids, "under the plea, unfortunately not cognizable in any human court, of military necessity and advantage." The *Law Times* decides that the question of liability is so surrounded with doubtful features that it is impossible to predict what the decision will be when such a case is tried. The editorial brings to light the following step taken by the English Government for the protection of the landlord:

"The Government, as is well known, has put forward a scheme of insurance. But it is not, as perhaps it ought to be, and as it was in the case of the East Coast naval raids in the earlier stages of the war, one of a national character. Its benefits are confined to those who choose to take advantage of it by paying the necessary premiums, in consideration of which the policies are issued. The prudent owner or occupier of house property will no doubt endeavor to avail himself of those benefits; and, having regard to the uncertainty which must prevail, as the following observations will show, until actual decisions are pronounced, as to the real incidence of the liability in question, as well as to the uncertainty respecting the financial ability to bear the burden, of those on whom it falls, the best course would obviously be for the parties to arrange between themselves, if possible, to share the payment of the insurance in agreed proportions. There will, however, be a vast number of cases in which persons will prefer to run the risk in question (which appears to them perhaps to be only trifling) rather than add, even to a slight extent, to the heavy burdens which they have to bear at this difficult time; and it is to such cases in particular that the following remarks will apply. The leases and agreements referred to are of course those which were entered into before the beginning of the war."

The decision by the Court of Queen's Bench in Baily vs. De Crespigny is referred to as citing a general principle in favor of the landlord as follows:

"There can be no doubt that a man may by an absolute contract bind himself to perform things which subsequently become impossible, or to pay damages for the non-performance, and this construction is to be put upon an unqualified undertaking where the event which causes the impossibility was or might have been anticipated or guarded against in the contract, or where the impossibility arises from the act or default of the promisor. But when the event is of such a character that it cannot reasonably be supposed to have been in the contemplation of the contracting parties when the contract was made, they will not be held bound by general words which, though large enough to include, were not used with reference to the possibility of the particular contingency which afterward happens. It is on this principle that the act of God is in some cases said to excuse the breach of a contract. This is in fact an inaccurate expression, because where it is an answer to a complaint of an alleged breach of contract that the thing done or left undone was so by the act of God, what is meant is that it was not within the contract."

The *Law Times* says that applying "this test it seems capable of being urged with some force that as destruction of the premises by aircraft could scarcely, before the beginning of this war, be reasonably be supposed to have been within contemplation, the general words of the covenant to repair, in the terms of the learned Judge which have just been quoted, 'were not used with reference to the possibility of the particular contingency which afterward happens.' And the argument, at least at first sight, appears a formidable one. The answer, however, seems to be supplied by a consideration which has already been referred to. It is no doubt true that if the 'event' spoken of is the destruction of the property by bombs or missiles from aircraft, and that only, it is probably one altogether outside the contemplation of the parties. But the acts of foreign enemies taken as a whole class cannot be so spoken of, and the acts in question are, as already pointed out, only particular instances of that class."

In Mercer vs. Lowery, in the St. Louis Court of Appeals, Missouri, in the Supreme Court of Missouri (January, 1916, 181 S. W., 1050), it was held that where a husband took his wife to a hotel and contracted for lodging there, his goods but not his wife's were subject to the lien provided by Revised Statutes 1909, section 8247, of Missouri, providing that hotel keepers shall have a lien on the baggage and other valuables of their guests brought into the hotel by the guests for proper charges due from the guests, since the word "guest," as used in the statute, applies to the party contracting for the entertainment and not to his guests.

The question as to whether the will of a blind man was valid as complying with the North Carolina statute requiring that it be "subscribed by the witnesses in the presence of the testator," although they were in the same room with him, was decided in the case of Allred's will by the Supreme Court of that State, in which the court said:

"There was at one time a disposition to give a restricted meaning to the term 'in the presence of the testator,' and to hold that it meant 'in the sight of or within the scope of the vision,' but, as it was soon seen that this narrow construction would prevent a blind man from making a will, and that it excluded the operation of the other senses, except that of sight, a broader and more liberal construction has been generally adopted and it is now well settled that a blind man may know of the presence of the witness without sight, and that he may make a will."

The court refers to the decision in Reynolds vs. Reynolds before the Supreme Court of South Carolina, in which the opinion said:

"It is true that it is stated in many cases that witnesses are not in the presence of the testator unless they are within his sight; but these statements are made with reference to testators who can see. As most men can see, vision is the usual and safest test of presence, but it is not the only test. A man may take note of the presence of another by the other senses, as hearing or touch. Certainly, if two blind men are in the same room, talking together, they are in each other's presence. * * * In cases where he has lost or cannot use his sense of sight, if his mind and hearing are not affected, if he is sensible of what is being done, if the witnesses subscribe in the same room, * * * and within his hearing, they subscribe in his presence."

Concluding its opinion the North Carolina court said:

"A notable instance of the execution of a will by a blind man is that of Francois Xavier Martin, who after he left this State was for thirty-one years a member of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, and during the last eight years of his service he was totally blind. His will was contested by the State upon the ground that a blind man could not make a will, and also because of an alleged illegal trust, but was sustained —State vs. Martin, 2 La. Ann. 667."

The Supreme Court of Georgia in Papley vs. Georgia and Florida Railway Company reversed a verdict of $500 recovered by the plaintiff for injuries received when a train he tried to stop at a flag station failed to stop and his foot was injured while he was endeavoring to leave the track. The court held that where one goes to a flag station on the line of a railway company, at which passenger trains are accustomed to stop to take on passengers upon being signalled, and gives a proper signal to indicate his intention to get upon an approaching passenger train, he does not ipso facto become a passenger, and a charge to that effect was erroneous.

CHESS FOR PLAYER, LOVER AND STUDENT

Manhattans Win Championship by Beating Brooklynites.

JANOWSKI-JAFFE BOUT ON

Another contest for the Metropolitan championship under the auspices of the Metropolitan Chess League, the third annual competition, came to a close and this year the Manhattan Chess Club took championship honors after beating the Brooklyn Chess Club in the final bout on Saturday, February 19. From the appended table the details of the whole competition can be seen, namely, that the Manhattans came out victorious in the six matches they had to engage in, making a total of 38½ points, the Isaac L. Rice Progressive Chess Club won four matches and drew one, losing one and getting a total of 36 points, while the Brooklyn Chess Club had an equal score of won, drawn and lost matches, but its total of points was 34½. Next on the list is the Staten Island club, with three matches to its credit and 27 points won, while the students of Columbia won two matches and 15½ points in all. The Ocean Hill and City College men drew one match, losing the rest, but while the former made a total of 8½ points, the latter made 7 points in all.

The table, showing the results of all the 21 matches played in the contest:

	Man C.C.	I.L.RicePr.	Brooklyn	Staten Isl.	Columbia	OceanHill	City Col.	Total won
Man.C.C.	....	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
I.L.Rice Prog.	0	....	½	1	1	1	1	4½
Brooklyn	0	½	....	1	1	1	1	4½
Staten Isl.	0	0	0	....	1	1	1	3
Columbia	0	0	0	0	....	1	1	2
Ocean Hill	0	0	0	0	0	....	½	½
City Col.	0	0	0	0	0	½	....	½
Tot.lost	0	1½	1½	3	4	5½	5½	21

The Manhattan-Brooklyn match in the final round was looked upon as the most important contest of the twenty-one. Try as they would, the representatives of the Manhattan Chess Club had almost always to play second fiddle to the Brooklyn club in any encounter on eight boards, and in order to make things doubly sure they paid the Brooklyn club the compliment of adding to their team three grand masters of international renown, namely, Capablanca, Janowski and Marshall. To the terzett were added A. Kupchik, L. B. Meyer, C. Schneider, J. Rosenthal and L. Rosen, and the result of the encounter was never in doubt. The only question under consideration was by how many points the men across the great bridge would have to go under. R. T. Black, A. C. Cass and H. Zirn managed to hold their own and draw their games, but the rest of the men suffered defeat, and so the final score was 6½ to 1½ in favor of the Manhattans. The match over, the Manhattans at once began analyzing the score, and they found that they could have won the match even without the assistance of the three grand masters. That might have come about, but analysts should not forget that there is something lacking in the morale of a team when the men go to the boards with certain defeat staring into their faces. Moreover, inasmuch as the Brooklynites counted upon three lost points for sure, the other men had doubly to exert themselves to save the day. They had to play for wins, as by drawing the match would have been lost anyhow.

However, the men from Brooklyn need not to be ashamed at the results so far recorded. They won the championship twenty-one years ago, when the Metropolitan Chess League was first established. After one season the league went into eternity and was only reestablished three years ago.

Again the Brooklynites practically won the championship three years ago, but by waving a point to the Progressive Chess Club, the Manhattan and Progressive clubs were tied, being unable to break the tie by a specially arranged match. Last year, however, the Brooklyn Chess Club again won the championship by beating both the Manhattan and Progressive chess clubs.

The match of five games up between the local player Charles Jaffe and the Franco-Polish expert D. Janowski was duly begun on Friday afternoon, and there is not the slightest doubt that this contest will greatly interest metropolitan chess players. It is generally believed that the Parisian will win the bout, but the latter's most ardent admirers maintain that he will have to play his best chess in order to dispose of Jaffe, who is looked upon as one of the most dangerous men in serious contests. It is well remembered that out of four games Janowski and Jaffe had engaged in the latter won two and drew two. On the other hand, it must be taken into consideration that Janowski was the hero of several international tournaments, that he won and lost one match to Marshall and that he made a draw with Lasker in a series of match games played in Paris. In fact, there is no more uncertain quantity than Janowski, that is to say, he is a player who can greatly excel one day and play very indifferently the next. It all depends upon his disposition. Of course, this applies, in a sense, to all chess masters.

Owing to the lack of interest and seeing that a big tournament has just been concluded, the annual championship of the New York State Chess Association was not played on Washington's Birthday this year. All sorts of schemes are in the air to bring about this event some time during the present season, but nothing definite can be announced for the present. At the local clubs, however, things were pretty lively on Tuesday. As early as 10 o'clock in the morning a round robin rapid transit tournament was played at the Manhattan Chess Club, and with A. Schroeder, R. T. Black, R. Raubitschek and F. Altschul in the ring, gallant Major J. Moore Hanham carried away the first prize by beating all the players. In the afternoon the chief contest was a major solving tourney, conducted by Frank Janet, the well known composer, Leonard B. Meyer, who solved