

ECV 2 FOOTNOTES

Peter Fayers and I have collected some of David Pritchard's material from Elaine and Wanda, including a copy of Verney's *Chess Eccentricities* of 1885, a source David frequently cited. Jurgen Stigter, in turn, has kindly checked some of Verney's source material for me, and this has clarified various points. References "LN" are to the catalogue of the Royal Dutch Library in The Hague.

Van der Linde's Games [1] and [2] (page 72). Given by Verney, but not mentioned in the *Encyclopedia*, is a further game with the pieces reduced to QR, K, KN only (8xP as usual). Verney cites "his book on Chess in Dutch, published in Utrecht in 1876", and Jurgen Stigter confirms: "LN 973 Linde (A. van der). *Leerboek van het schaakspel*. Utrecht 1876. [973 A 29] On p. 265-266, he refers to van Zuylen and gives some diagrams, one of which has indeed QR, K, KN only (8xP as usual). Also, several other variants (pp. 138 and following) originate from Van Zuylen." The latter is "LN560 (Zuylen van Nyevelt, P. J. van). *Het schaakspel*. Campen 1792. [972 D 38]."

It would therefore appear that the variants which David attributed to van der Linde should in truth be called **Van Zuylen's Games**.

As regards the asymmetry of the h-pawns in game [2] (c), this was taken from Verney, and David was right to suspect that it was a mistake. Jurgen tells me that the h3 pawn should be on h2.

The Emperor's Game (page 121). The references "L. Tressau, 1840", here and elsewhere, appear on the evidence of Verney to be to his book *Das Schachspiel, seine Gattungen und Abarten*, published that year in Leipzig. I haven't seen this, but it would appear to have been largely a description of existing games, and here at least it would seem that Tressau should not have been cited as the game's originator. The game appears to have been no more than "Das Kaiserspiel" of c.1815, possibly

with a modified baseline. Not having seen the source material, I cannot say whether the slightly different baselines reflect a genuine change or merely an error in one source or the other.

Courier-Spiel (page 131). This entry should not have been included. Verney cites two descriptions of "The Courier-Spiel", one by H. G. Albers (1821) of a game "played by the peasants at Ströphe (province of Halberstadt) from olden time" and the other by Tressau, and these are duly included in the "Courier Game" entry on page 245. The Gollon material behind the entry on page 131 appears to have been no more than a slightly incomplete description of the Albers game.

Grande Acedrex (page 244). The "second 12x12 game with unicorns attributed to the Alfonso MS", which was in the first edition as "Great Chess (III)" and which I relegated to an editorial note, can be found on pages 175-6 of Verney with source "Dr. Van der Linde, Berlin, 1881". But Verney's source can be identified as "LN 226 Linde (A. van der). *Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Schachspiels*. Berlin 1881. [972 A 12]", and Jurgen Stigter tells me that the "Grande Ajedrez" on pages 265-266 of this is the "Grande Acedrex" of the second edition of the *Encyclopedia*. This is emphatically not the game as given by Verney.

So it would seem that the "Great Chess (III)" of the first edition was a myth. It may have been faithfully copied from Verney, but Verney's copying from his stated source seems to have gone sadly adrift.

The details given in the second edition were taken from Murray, and this should have been acknowledged.

Game of the Four Seasons (page 342). The date 1031 which I query in my editorial note appears to have come from Verney (page 84), and to be due to a misunderstanding of a note in van der Linde's 1881 book. Jurgen Stigter, citing pages 260-1 of this: "The Game of the Four Seasons [...] is from the Alfonso MS, 1283, a free interpretation of Al-Biruni's

Indian four chess (1031)." The latter is "Chaturaji" in the *Encyclopedia*.

On rereading the first edition's note "Van der Linde gives the earlier date of 1031" in the light of this, I see that it was intended to refer to the game and not to the Alfonso manuscript. Even so, I cannot see more than the most superficial resemblance between the games (size of board, number of players, number of men), and to call the Game of the Four Seasons even "a free interpretation" of Chaturaji strikes me as mere speculation. On the evidence reported by Jurgen Stigter, I can see no reason to ascribe any date other than 1283 to the Four Seasons.

The material also turned out to include some sheets of trial masters for the diagrams in the first edition, and one of these, not used in the final book, shows the array for the hex version of **Dragonfly** (second edition, note on page 205). This has the same relationship to the square board array as that between the hex and square versions of Loonybird Chess: baseline RBBKNNR on b4-e1-h4, fronted by 9xP on a5-c7-e5-g7-i5. I was most surprised to see this, because a hex game normally uses three bishops so that cells of all three colours can be covered, but the sheet had apparently been prepared by the game's inventor and it included an explicit claim to copyright in his name. It is true that the ability to reintroduce captured men means that a bishop covering the missing cells can be introduced later, but I would not expect this to be full compensation for the initial imbalance. A similar imbalance is to be found in the hex version of Loonybird Chess.

And I should have recorded that David's principal source for the rules of **Makruk** (page 268), and in particular for the various material-dependent equivalents of the "50-move" rule, appears to have been a letter of 4 June 1992 from the Vice President of the Thailand Chess Federation. So here, at least, we have something more than the mere "travellers' tales" on which writers about foreign games so often have to rely.