

## ECV 2 FOOTNOTES

There are inevitably places where the text of the new *Encyclopedia* has proved to need correction or amplification, and *VC* offers a convenient place to report them. My thanks to all my correspondents.

**Kriegspiel** (pages 33-36). A recent clear-out of old papers reminded me of an eight-page typed pamphlet "Kriegspiel" by Fred Galvin. It bears no date but would appear on internal evidence to be from 1958-62.

Its interest from our point of view is that it has the umpire automatically announcing the possibility of a pawn capture in the way I have always encountered when playing myself, but which David had apparently not met. Typically, the umpire says "No" or "Yes" to the player trying the move, and after "Yes" he says "White has moved" or "White has captured on ..." followed as appropriate by "Black is in check on the longer diagonal" [on the shorter diagonal, on the file, etc] and "Black has a pawn capture". A capture en passant is explicitly announced, but in other cases the identity of the man captured is not disclosed. Fred's accompanying comment is of interest (typography converted): "The rules of Kriegspiel are by no means uniform: there are many local variations. There are no 'official' rules of Kriegspiel. The above rules are those I am used to playing with, and in my opinion they make the best game." Fred then gives some alternative versions of the rules, one of which is the original version with "Any?".

Fred's pamphlet cites three sources for the rules of Kriegspiel: *The New Complete Hoyle* by Richard M. Frey (1947, I think), *The Official Blue Book and Encyclopedia of Chess* by Richard Harkness, and the *Chess Correspondent* for May-June 1951. I have not seen any of these myself, so I am unable to say whether the deviation from the original "Any?" rule was due to Fred and his circle or whether it comes from one of these, but Fred tells me that Frey's 1957 paperback *According to Hoyle* gives

the "Any?" rule. His pamphlet also mentions the Boyer books and G. F. Anderson's problem book *Are there any?*, but these again have the rule in its original "Any?" form.

I therefore went through all 32 notes and cuttings which David had filed under "Kriegspiel", and found that 14 assumed or explicitly stated the "Any?" rule, a further 12 made no assumption (either because they were merely general descriptions or because they discussed positions where the question did not arise), Fred's pamphlet recommended the rule as described above, one other paper gave it as a permitted option, and four described other rules. On this evidence, I don't think David can be blamed for concentrating on the "Any?" rule, and not singling out the Galvin rule for any particular mention. However, the Galvin rule, whether imported or independently reinvented, is now in my experience standard in France, and I think it excellent; it simplifies and speeds up the game without significantly changing its nature. It is of course possible to construct positions where the "Any?" rule leads to one result and the Galvin rule to another, but I don't think these happen often enough to be of importance.

**Scaci Partonici** (pages 42-3). Parton's booklets as cited on page 43 and perhaps elsewhere should be *Chesshire Cat Playeth Looking Glass Cheessys* and *100 Squares for Chess and Damante* (not Diamante). The insertion of hyphens between the words of the former appears to depend on the view taken on the typography of the booklet's front cover.

**Koopa Chess** (page 45) is due to Ralph Betza (thus Philip Cohen, citing the Chess Variant Pages).

**Reinforcement Chess** (page 53). The first edition included a statement that the basic concept "was suggested by L. Tressau of Leipzig as long ago as 1840", but the details that followed appeared to be those of the "Double Chess Game" which now has a separate entry and I took the reference to have been to this game. There

should perhaps have been an explicit note to this effect.

**Ambiguous or Substitution Chess** (page 62). Fabrice Liardet points out that on the Internet, where most games are now played, the original name and mode of play have been retained.

**"Buckzo's Game"** (page 112) should be **Buczko's Game** (and in the index).

**Balbo's Game** (page 116). A note from Ken Whyld preserved in David's files suggests that the inventor was in fact "G." Balbo, the source's "M." standing merely for "Monsieur".

**Ninerider Chess** (page 140). From Philip Cohen, edited: "I'm almost certain this is my invention, but if I couldn't find the original rulesheet in 1979 I'm not likely to find it easily now. I see Michael Howe attributes it to me and Wayne Schmittberger in the Chess Variant Pages, the RWS part being, I believe, just the K/Q interchange."

**Regional and historical games** (page 237 and onwards). It should perhaps have been stressed that in the absence of an "official" body with authority over a game there can be no "official" rules, and where a game is widely played there may be considerable variation: certainly in minor detail (for example, in equivalents of the "fifty-move" and "three repetitions" rules), and perhaps even in the moves of the pieces. However careful foreign observers such as ourselves may be, we are inevitably limited by the knowledge of our informants, and the completeness and accuracy of this is not always easily judged. Western chess *does* have "official" rules, but how many players, encountered in a café or even in a chess club, could give a foreign observer a complete and reliable account of them?

**OrthoChess** (page 242). The most recent change to the "fifty-move" rule does not postdate the first edition. There have indeed been minor changes to the laws since that edition appeared, but this particular change dates from 1992.

**Korean Chess** or **Changgi** (pages 250-1). Peter Blommers and Peter Michaelsen have dictionaries giving the spelling Janggi. Peter Michaelsen draws my attention to a rule given in the book *Chinesisches Schach - Koreanisches Schach* by David Wurman, Frankfurt am Main 1991, whereby in some regions and provinces of Korea the players usually agree before the start of the game that there is no double or triple check. This means that, if a King is threatened by several of the opponent's pieces, the attacking player must announce by which man he intends to give the check, and his opponent need only defend against this man. Wurman recommends that European players should ignore this rule, and allow multiple checks as usual.

**Vietnamese Chess** or **Co-Tuong** (page 251). Peter Michaelsen draws my attention to the chapter "Chinesisches Schach in Vietnam" contributed by Pham Cong Thanh to the Wurman book mentioned above. According to this source, Co tuong is identical with Xiangqi except for a special rule which is followed only in some provinces of Vietnam. Under this rule, a Chariot is not allowed to move so as to attack a General from behind (active attack), though if a General moves into the line of fire of a Chariot standing behind him the attack is valid (passive attack). Suppose Red Gf3, Black Chariot (R) i1; Ri1-f1 (active attack) is not permitted. Now suppose that the Black chariot is already on e1, and that Black also has soldiers on g2 and g4; now the chariot passively attacks e3, which is valid, and he can mate by Sg4-g3 or Sg4-f4. This rule, which has been passed down only orally and is not recommended, appears in no Vietnamese rule book.

Peter also tells me, quoting further information from Lev Kisliuk, that the variants mentioned in the second paragraph were not historical games but modern creations. Apparently the inventor bewailed the absence of a chess game specific to Vietnam and produced three variants to fill the gap, later replacing them by the 10 x 10 variant described.

**Shogi** (page 252 and onwards). On page 253, below the diagram, "9xS" should be "9xP". The later statement that Black starts and plays down the board (on page 255, in the entry for Chu Shogi) is not correct. A 1995 book *First Step to Shogi*, published under the authority of the Oyama Memorial Museum, has the player who starts playing *up* the board, and Peter Blommers tells me that this is the normal convention.

**Tenjiku Shogi** (pages 256-7). Peter Blommers questions the statement that Tenjiku is "not related" to the other large shogis. "Tenjiku is 'not related' only in the sense that it is *later* than the foursome Dai, Dai-Dai, Maka-Dai-Dai, and Tai, which, in everybody's view, belong together. The larger shogis are all elaborations of Chu."

Peter also tells me that Tenjiku literally means Heavenly Bamboo, and was an old Japanese name for India. The alternative name Exotic Shogi apparently derives from Hodges.

**Wa Shogi** (page 257). "Violent Stage" should be Violent Stag. Peter Blommers, like Wayne Schmittberger, prefers the game with drops, but he stresses that no such preference can be more than a personal opinion; no game scores have survived, nor have any composed problems.

**Small Shogi** (page 258). Peter Blommers tells me that this is not modern, but is simply Sho Shogi (9x9 shogi) as opposed to Dai and Chu Shogi. There were two forms, a 42-piece form with just the Drunk Elephants and a 46-piece form with the Ferocious Leopards as well.

**Cannon Shogi** (page 258). Peter Michaelsen draws my attention to a minor inaccuracy: pawns move and capture as in Korean Chess. "The game is no doubt also playable with Chinese/Japanese pawns, but I chose to make them 'Korean' in order to get a better balance between the pawns and the new cannon pieces." The pawns promote to Gold Generals, exactly as in Shogi.

**Blind Shogi** (page 261). Peter Blommers tells me that this is Tsuitate Shogi (Screen Shogi) in Japanese. He thinks that the source is an early Hodges magazine, perhaps *Shogi 2*.

**Indian Chess** (pages 262-6). A faulty edit took out intended references to Bhagavathi (Replacement) Chess and to **Radha-Madhava**, not mentioned elsewhere in the text, "in which the power of a captured piece is added to that of its captor" (as in Absorption Chess).

**Makruk** or **Thai Chess** (page 268). Further to my note about draws in contemporary master play, Peter Michaelsen quotes a Thai player named Poompat writing in the Chess Variant Pages: "Thai Chess gained much popularity in the 1990s, with 5-7 televised national events/year, but after lots of published analysis, the knowledge of Thai Chess techniques + strategies seem to have reached the peak. Sadly, almost all serious games between similar-level pros are draws. Now, they have to invent tie-break games called 'Makpong' (Defensive Chess) wherein the player who checks the opponent's King such that he has to MOVE the King wins. BAD IDEA!"

**Cambodian Chess** (pages 268-9). Contrary to my editorial assessment, there is independent evidence for the game reported by Hill. See overleaf.

**Shatra** (pages 271-2). In the diagram, the White array should mirror the Black (bishops on the third rank).

**The Jungle Game** (page 292). Peter Blommers tells me that this is Shou Dou Qi in Chinese, literally Animal Fighting Chess.

**Chessball ["Kamzalov"]** (page 299). "Kamzalov" should be "Kamzolov" (and in the index).

**Panzyk's Four-Handed Chess** (page 346). Although this is correctly classified as an all-play-all game, the game credited to "a German doctor" was a partnership game and should have appeared in chapter 35.